

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT
RE: RAILWAY ACCIDENT NEAR
YESHWANTPUR IN HYDERABAD
STATE**

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): In continuation of the statement made by the Minister in the Lok Sabha yesterday in respect of the accident to No. 319 Down Hyderabad-Kazipet Express train on the night between the 27th and 28th September, I have the following further information to give to the House.

As a result of the further search for dead bodies, the number of the dead is now reported to be 123. The total number of the injured is now 85 including 17 with serious injuries and 34 with minor and 34 with trivial injuries. One of the seriously injured has succumbed to the injuries and that is included among the 123 dead. The other injured are reported to be progressing satisfactorily in Hanuman Hanamkonda Civil Hospital, Lallaguda Railway Hospital, Secunderabad Military Hospital, Hyderabad Osmania Hospital, Kazipet Railway Hospital and Jangaon Civil Hospital. Those in the hospitals in the Hyderabad and Secunderabad area were visited by the General Manager, Central Railways, accompanied by some senior officials.

The communication between the section Secunderabad and Alir was restored at 15-10 hours and that between Kazipet and Raghunathpalli at about 17.00 hours on 29th September, 1954. Some skeleton train services ran on this section yesterday. From today the passenger train services are being introduced on these sections on a time-table basis which has already been given local publicity. Transhipment over the section between Alir and Jangaon is not at present possible as operations for the restoration for through communications are in progress.

The Government Inspector of Railways will commence a statutory enquiry into the accident from 4th December, 1954.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. M. M. Das: I introduce the Bill.

SEA CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Sea Customs Act, 1878."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I introduce the Bill.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—concl'd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 29th September, 1954, namely:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the

Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

There will also be the further consideration of the amendments moved—some of them are in substitution of the original motion. I need not read the names of all the Members who have moved these amendments.

The discussion on this motion will end at 2.30 p.m., and the hon. Prime Minister will make his reply from 2.30 p.m. onwards.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): I was at Shanghai-chop-sui in a Geneva restaurant, when we adjourned yesterday. It is a delicious Chinese dish, and I can recommend it to everybody here, I guess, a number of hon. Members like our Prime Minister must have tried it, and also taken rice with two pencil-like long bamboo chopsticks.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This helps you in understanding the Chinese mind, which is a bit complicated, and also the present Chinese intricacies in world politics.

During my last visit to the Chinese restaurant in Geneva, they told me that besides his chop-sui, if there was any other important factor which has helped in bringing about peace in Indo-China, or in bringing about the realisation of the realities of Asia,—it was the gentlemanliness of the Chinese Prime Minister Mr. Chou En-lai. A few ladies who were there, of course, improved this verdict. They said "Yes. Mr. Chou En-lai is no doubt a communist gentleman, but Monsieur Nehru is a bit different from that." And then they all joined in saying '*Comme il est charmant*' (How charming he is!) in their Geneva accent

It is surprising how the charming manners or the gentlemanliness of the Prime Ministers have brought in this world politics a very important factor which is expressed in

one phrase, 'the new outlook'. Perhaps, the better expression would be 'the new look'. This new look we must see in the lights of Geneva. The lights of Geneva are beautiful. If you stand on the *Ile de Rousseau* and see the reflections of different colours in Lake Lemén, you will find that it is magnificent. It is something like a dream. And what do you think about? The first thought that comes to you is about peace. In the Geneva light, if you see the politics of Asia or of the world, the first thing which you care for is the preservation of peace in the world. There are many disturbing factors, no doubt. We have not to go very far to find out such disturbing factors, but we have to find a remedy peacefully only. If the world begins to take to violence, one does not know where it will stop. That is why, when we see in this Geneva light one by one, we shall find that there is no other way but a peaceful approach to all the problems of the world today.

Let us see the disturbing factors. They are not very far from us. Only at our doors is the problem of Goa. Although the problem of Goa is a comparatively small one, it has been an ideal example of provocations against which one must always guard oneself. At the eve of our Independence Day this year, the Portuguese Prime Minister had definitely fallen a victim of what I should call, a war hysteria of his own creation. I have observed his activities from some close quarters in Central Europe this year, and that is why I may tell you that I found also a few crazy newspapers mentioning about an ultimatum or a crusade on India. At this stage, I must appreciate that the attitude and the action which our Government took were very creditable. At that time, they were conscious of all these provocations which came from the other side, and they did not fall a victim to these provocations. For this action, for their foresight, for their tolerance, and for the diplomatic

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

attitude and skill they have shown, the country is grateful.

Our country is a strong country, and we do not doubt for a second that Goa is going to come to our Indian Union. The inevitable historical forces which are working, are bound to bring Goa to our Indian Union. What we have to do today is to accelerate the tempo or the speed of these inevitable historical processes.

I would like to throw some light on our diplomatic missions abroad in this connection. When Dr. Salazar's anti-Indian propaganda was at its pitch in Europe, I expected that our Embassies there will do their best in removing the shady atmosphere and in making our point of view clear to the people. I am not going to criticise any activity of our External Affairs Ministry. Since I have been working in Central Europe under them for some time, my suggestion is that we can do better. We must take lessons from episodes like Goa, and train ourselves to be better diplomats than many countries can boast of. We can, and we must, do it. We must surpass them.

Yesterday I was surprised to find that a number of hon. Members from the Opposition Benches repeated what Signor Salazar has said as his anti-Indian hysterics in that booklet. I do not think that that was worth consideration at all. I must say that those Members have fallen a victim of Salazar's propaganda, because Salazar himself, I am sure, does not believe what he said in that booklet. He does not believe it, but others have fallen victims to it.

An Hon. Member: What did he say?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: It is not worth mentioning at all, because it has nothing to do with reason. It would have been better if, instead of studying these things which have nothing to do with reason, we spent our time

pondering over the points our Prime Minister had raised in this connection, and the way which he had shown. Because that is the only way which can bring Goa to the Indian Union quickest and in the best possible way.

Now, I would like to have a small hop to our north-west border. A few weeks ago, I was in Kabul. I did not get any Indian newspapers there. So I read Russian. In one of the Russian newspapers, there was a very important item which is interesting and also for us of great importance. It said that at the command of the American Ambassador in Karachi—perhaps Hildred is his name—the Pakistan Government has been asked to raise an army of 100,000 Pathans who will be working under American command. I think I have the copy here and, since you are fond of nothing but the original, I will read it:

"PO UKAZANIU AMERIKANSKOVO POSLA V KARACHI XILDRETTA, PAKISTAN DOLZEN SFORMIROVAT 100-TISYACHNUYU PATANSKUYU ARMIU, 'GOTOVUYU VIPOLNYAT AMERIKANSKIE PRIKAZI'."

"PRAVDA". MOSCOW. 14th July, 1954.

I think you have now understood it better.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What language is that?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: It is Russian, much easier than English. It says that under the orders of the American Ambassador at Karachi, Mr. Hildred, Pakistan must form a hundred-thousand strong Pathan army always ready to carry out American orders. That is the literal translation.

Now, if it is so, then we are very much interested in this matter. And at this stage, without going further to

elaborate this point, I intend to draw the attention of our External Affairs Ministry, to check the matter through diplomatic channels whether this is a part of the SEADO plan. If it is, then it means a clear attempt at military encirclement of our country which, in no case, we can tolerate.

Coming to SEADO directly, we saw it in the light of what our Prime Minister explained yesterday. The matter has become quite clear now—it is a dangerous thing. I would go rather a little further and say that it is perhaps not a practicable thing or technically possible at this stage, for the following reason: Any plan for the security or defence of Asia must fall to pieces if countries like India and her allies do not joint it. In the East who counts if not India and her allies? So, we have our own reasons to oppose this move.

I would like to come to a third point which is perhaps a corner-stone of our foreign policy today. We have been working on this line for quite a number of years—I mean our relations with China. In the last few years, we have come to a very good and friendly understanding with China. This, in turn, has brought about a better relationship with the Soviet Union. Of course, we are glad about it, and our country will appreciate this move of the Government, because we are for peace and friendship with any country which wants to establish such relationship with us.

But in this matter, there is one misunderstanding which has been created by some of our friends in the Opposition—I mean the members of the Communist Party. They have always been saying that anybody who is opposed to the Communist Party of India must be opposed to friendship with the Soviet Union or China. This is quite a wrong approach—absolutely wrong. The truth is just the opposite. As things stand today, if you see in proper perspective, there remains no other alternative for the Communist Party of India than to commit *harakiri* and to liquidate themselves. (*Interruptions*).

It is for this reason, that I am going to tell the gallant and brave hon. Members belonging to the Communist Group—"if you do not liquidate yourselves, your own masters whom you are serving, are going to liquidate you". After the trial and fall of Beria, many things have become clear and come to light. It was his organisation which used to create underground organisations in other countries. The Soviet leaders have found it out today. They have given very serious thought to this matter, and have found out that those organisations which they had in foreign countries were not so useful to them at this stage. Friendship with those countries is much more useful to them today than having those organisations there. For the reason that they liquidated Beria in their own land, they will liquidate everybody who was under the command of Beria, including Members of our Communist Party here. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—South-East): We will appoint you the liquidator.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: It is a pure and simple logic. In this connection, what I was going to tell you was this. It is about, let us say, what Chou En-lai said once. I have information from the most reliable source. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Syed Ahmad (Hoshangabad): What is the source?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: The source is here. I will read it. I do not know Chinese, but the translation which was conveyed to me was, more or less, in these words:

"The Indian Communists are a bunch of unpatriotic—what shall I say—Don Quixotes who stand in the way.."

—you know the story of Don Quixote by Cervantes—

"of India-China friendship by exaggerating unnecessarily their love for China and the Soviet

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

Union. They should have preserved that love for their own use

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): On a point of order.

Dr. S. N. Sinha:..and they would have served China much better”.

Dr. Rama Rao: Is it in order for an hon. Member of this House to quote the Premier of a country, which is in friendly relations with us, as having made a statement for which he has no authority and no proof?

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Dist.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West): He says he has got proof.

Dr. S. N. Sinha .rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. A point of order has been raised. The hon. Member cannot be jumping like that.

I presume every hon. Member will speak responsibly on the floor of this House, and therefore, we accept it without asking for further evidence or proof. If he quotes any particular passage from any printed matter or published material, I would ask him—if he makes a reference to it—to place it on the Table of the House. Otherwise, so long as any matter is relevant and is not obscene or unparliamentary, I will allow him to go on.

Shri B. C. Das (Ganjam South): What is the source of that information?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not bound to give the source.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I will substantiate my statement now. I may just tell them that lately I have come to know from one of the leaders of the Cominform in Berlin about the new directions which have reached them. It has been published in East Berlin and it reads like this.....

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Does it mean that the hon. Member is more

in the confidence of the Russians than the Indian Communists?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Each hon. Member commands confidence in the world at large.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: “The Moscow headquarters of the Cominform have bluntly told the Indian Communists that the development of uprising in India has no prospects. The Indian comrades should support Nehru’s policy of eastern orientation’. These are more or less the lines on which they are thinking. When some of the Communist leaders were in Moscow for consultations they were told that they should follow this line. They agreed to it there, but when they came back here they are acting otherwise.....(Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members may take it as the advice of the hon. Member.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: This is a widely known fact, and if necessary, I am prepared to quote from the originals, but the hon. Members may not be able to follow it accurately. The best proof of what I say is a comparison of any Russian newspaper of today with what was published say a year and a half back. You will find a marked difference. I have with me here a long article in a Russian paper....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the name of that paper?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: “Pravda”, which means truth.

This is the issue of the 24th September and I received it only yesterday evening. This is published in Moscow: I could not have printed it here. Every day when I return home I get a copy of this paper. What I wish to impress on the House is that there is a marked difference in the tone of the paper. Formerly they used to criticise us and say that our Government was a tool of British imperialism. Such expressions were invariably used. After the execution of Beria

I do not find these things in the Soviet newspapers at all. Now they are all praise for us.

Those hon. Members who do not follow Russian would at any rate have read in today's newspapers M. Men-shikov's speech at Naini Tal. Is there any expression to the effect that the Indian Government is the tool of any foreign government? So, the policy the Communists in India are carrying out is on the basis of various past instructions which have become quite old and out-of-date. Any Soviet paper, you will find today, is all praise for our culture, for our Government, for our Prime Minister, including myself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does appreciation of Dr. Sinha form part of the foreign policy of that country?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I was in East Berlin quite recently.....

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareli Distt.—East): All this may be attributed to Mr. Satyanarayan Sinha, the Chief Whip!

Shri Syed Ahmed (Hoshangabad): I shall furnish a photo also!

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I was in East Berlin with another Member of the Upper House, Acharya Narendra Deva, a few weeks ago. There we were afforded every facility. We were more or less their State guests in a restaurant. As Acharya Narendra Deva was not well and felt tired, I took him back to the hotel and went out alone. All gates are open today; it is not Beria's regime any more. The foreign visitor is quite free to move about. So, this is a difference in their outlook which is worth mentioning. Today Russia wants the friendship of India, the friendship of our Prime Minister and the friendship of our country. It is much more useful to them from every point of view than having any tools or underground workers here. That makes all the difference in the international affairs..

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): Nonsense!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Members says that the present-day Russian Government does not want any underground movement here, is it nonsense? Does the hon. Member want an underground movement here?

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: The point is we are not underground workers.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala—Simla): Yesterday they were saying that the Minister was lying; today they are saying it is 'nonsense'.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: There is no point in this argument. We are a national party and are working in the interests of the Indian people, for the benefit of the Indian peasant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I very often find very strong expressions being used from this side of the House. When hon. Members hit, they should be sufficiently thick-skinned to take back coolly. So, let it not be a one-sided affair. The hon. Member did not say that these gentlemen here on the left are underground workers. He only said that underground work in this country does not any longer help the Russians, or that the present Russian Government is against any such movement in this country, if there is such a movement. Hon. Member need not put on the cap, if it does not fit him.

श्रीअलरू राय शास्त्री : सभापति जी क्या आप आज्ञा देंगे कि यह जो शब्द 'नानसेंस' प्रयुक्त किया गया है वह काट दिया जाये ;

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does not matter occasionally.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: There is no reason to be excited, because in Russia they have already executed Beria who was the root of all such organisations and with whom our Members were in touch.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): How is all this relevant?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members must be following the debate to understand the relevance of it. It was said that Russia while outwardly friendly was sending emissaries to carry on propaganda in this country. The hon. Member who had been to Russia recently says that the present Russian Government is not for any underground movement and therefore you can trust Russia and Russia is a good friend of India. Far from taking exception to this statement, hon. Members must have welcomed the fact that Russia is a very good friend of India.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: This is a very bright prospect for the Asian countries. If Russia is helpful—we understand that they are ready to build a steel plant for us—it will go a long way in the rapid industrialisation of our country. Sir, whatever help comes from that country we are ready to take it. A year and a half back we were not prepared to do it. Today there is a very good atmosphere in Russia for friendship with India. I will just explain, in the same light as our Prime Minister said, yesterday—Cominform matters, without going into details. Although it is working in Asian countries it has taken quite a different turn. It is not the same as it is in European countries.

One of the biggest factors that count today in Asian affairs is the emergence of new China. There are many misunderstandings about Chinese intentions. I personally had many such misunderstandings about China until I heard our Prime Minister. In this connection I would request our Prime Minister when he goes to China, to invite Dalai-Lama to India. This idea has occurred to me for a long time. I am not a Lamaist. But I have studied Tibet and like that country very much, we had connections with Tibet for a very long time. And, I would like, to say, that if the Dalai-Lama comes to India for a pilgrimage of Buddha-Gaya and Sarnath, many of the misunderstandings which are existing today in our country will be removed and we will have no grievance against China.

Sir, in the end, when my time is going to be up, I would like to emphasise one very important point and that is in today's turmoil, in the wide world, we do not want that any one country should come forward and dominate over others. This is wrong. Our Prime Minister has made it clear quite a number of times that we have no intention to take the leadership of Asia or a group of nations. It is a very correct attitude. The same we expect from others, whosoever they may be, because from this turmoil, if one country emerges to dominate over Asia, that will bring a bad day. No sooner those countries leave such hopes of dominating over others, whosoever they may be, better days will dawn over Asia.

Finally, I support the foreign policy of our Prime Minister wholeheartedly and with much more enthusiasm than ever before; and I am also confident that his endeavours will carve out not only an area of peace but also transform the areas of war into abodes of new life and light.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Mr. Deputy-Speaker having heard many speeches delivered by Congressmen, I must say I am a convert to their views.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Dist. —South): Wonderful plasticity.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): You have been converted all your life.

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, in spite of what my colleague, Mr. Asoka Mehta and Prof. Mukerjee said yesterday and whatever may have been our failures at home, it will be ungracious even for me, a Member of the Opposition, to deny that in foreign and international affairs, our accomplishments have been great. They have not only been great but they have been glorious.

In all recent Conferences and Commissions, we have played a notable part. In Korea, we were entrusted with the custody of the prisoners of

war and we had to arrange for their repatriation. We sent a force of a few thousands of our *jawans* to undertake this mission, entrusted to us by the U.N.O. Circumstances beyond our control prevented us from solving the problem of the prisoners of war, yet our brave boys behaved splendidly. They were complimented by all the world, even though we had failed to accomplish the mission entrusted to us. But, Sir, in great causes it is better to have tried and lost than never to have tried at all.

Again, Sir, in Geneva, though we were not invited—of course, that was a mistake—we were not anxious to be invited, we do not care for these Conferences—even though we were not invited, we played a very notable part, though behind the scenes. The settlement reached there was on the lines suggested by us. As a matter of fact, Geneva was the triumph of India. In recognition of this silent service to the cause of world peace, we were appointed as the Chairman of the International Supervisory Commission for Indo-China (*Interruption*).

The two Power blocs, Sir, are competing with each other for our friendship and we keep them guessing as to what is going to be our ultimate attitude towards them. In the meantime, both are willing to help us with money and materials and technical skill (*Interruption*), to build our own economy.

Recently, I hear Russia is going to build for us a steel factory. This has gladdened the hearts of our communist friends; they take it as a triumph of Russia. And, I am sure, this factory will be built sooner than the factory that we had contemplated before with the help of the Germans. That will be another triumph for the communists.

In the U.N.O. we occupy an honoured position. Our advice is often sought and our vote canvassed. Last year, the highest honour was done to us when one of our distinguished nationals, a lady at that, was elected as the President of the U.N. General

Assembly. Sir, it is an honour universally coveted and we got it for the mere non-asking.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: For a few days.

Acharya Kripalani: Foreign statesmen who decide the fate of their nations are anxious to visit our country. They meet our Prime Minister and take counsel with him on international questions. Recently, the Prime Minister of China, Sri Chou-En-Lai, visited our country and certain valuable principles in international politics were enunciated. Any body reading that document can see the hand of our Prime Minister.

The Indonesian Prime Minister was in our midst only recently. And, with his help, there will not only be an Asian bloc but an Asio-African bloc. Soon, the maker of modern Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, would be in our midst. Under him, this small nation has kept at bay the big white Bear that sprawls over two continents and nibbles at its neighbours and ultimately swallows them up.

Getting for India an honoured place in International affairs and in the councils of the world is a glorious task. All this has been performed by our Prime Minister. In this task, he is ably helped by a galaxy of brilliant officers, the Bajpais, and other Pais and Menons and Ayyangars from the South. One would have supposed that, after centuries of slavery, these officials had no experience or training in international and foreign affairs. But, such has been their performance that they seem to have been born to their task. This is nothing to be wondered at. After all we had a very ancient and hoary past. We have tried much, accomplished much, experienced much and even suffered much. We have in the international field revived the glory that once was Hind. All these are our accomplishments.

Yet there is a slight flaw.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Now it comes.

Acharya Kripalani: Though we have succeeded in easing tensions in the world and securing an honoured place for our country in the councils of the world, nearer home, in matters wherein our interests are intimately and vitally concerned, we have unfortunately failed. We have failed in Kashmir after having spent crores of our money in that part of India. The Kashmir question solution seems to be as distant as it was when the invaders had come to Kashmir. We have failed also in Pakistan. The many problems that are there between India and Pakistan remain unsolved. We have failed in South Africa where our former citizens are living. We have failed miserably in Ceylon, a small island in the South. We have failed in arresting the march of Communist China to our borders. A small buffer State there was deprived of its freedom and that State was swallowed up. When we made a feeble protest, we were told—not very politely—to shut up. Not only that, we were told that we were the stooges of the western Powers. We have been unable to stop the formation of the South-East Asian Treaty Organisation which threatens the peace of Asia and even of the world. Even after 7 years we have failed to liberate the tiny foreign pockets in India. These are the integral parts of our country. I am sorry to say, even when some bits of the small pockets are liberated by the action of the people residing there, we refuse to accept them and leave them to their resources for civil administration and for any possible attack from outside. So far as the Portuguese pockets are concerned, not only have we totally failed, but a tiny nation in Europe—no bigger than the smallest Indian State—not only defies us but insults us. This is with the consent and the implied support of those in the West whom we consider our friends.

Sir, as the Goa question is the burning question of the day, I would, with your permission, talk of it at some length. Even today we do not know whether the liberation of the pockets is the sole responsibility of

the local inhabitants or it is also the responsibility of the rest of the inhabitants of India and the Government of India representing the people of India; or, is it the sole concern of the Indian and the Portuguese Governments who have to settle it on governmental level. The attitude of the Indian Government as to which of these points of view it favours is not quite clear. Sometimes the Prime Minister's utterance would lead us to think that the people living in these pockets are Indians; the pockets are a part and parcel of India and their freedom is the concern of the people of India and the Government of India. At other times, he makes a distinction between the local population and the rest of the Indian population. Still, at other times, his utterances and his actions give an idea that the question is one which has to be decided between the Indian and Portuguese Governments. Even then, it is not quite clear what our Government is going to do to settle the dispute as between the two Governments. Some months back, our friends in Maharashtra declared that they will organise *satyagraha* and the Goanese and Indians would march to Goa. The Goanese National Congress also announced that it would organise *satyagraha*. In Gujerat too, a batch of *satyagrahis* was formed to march to Goa. All these three bodies were to commence their *satyagraha* on the 15th August, our Independence Day. All the preparations were ready and they were only to march. However, a couple of days before the appointed date, our Prime Minister made a speech in which he said that he had no objection to Goanese residing in India to march as *satyagrahis*, but he would be reluctant to allow other Indians, under ordinary circumstances, to go to Goa. The meaning of this was not quite clear. As for Goan citizens resident in India, I suppose the Prime Minister could not have prohibited them from going home. As for the rest of the India population, of course he could prohibit them. But, he said 'under ordinary circumstances'. May I in all humility, of which I am

not credited with much, but in all sincerity about which I do enjoy a little credit in this House, ask how the circumstances can be 'ordinary' when the foreigners are yet on our soil and we claim to be an independent nation? I say again with all the emphasis that I can command: how can the circumstances be ordinary when from three points *satyagrahis* are being prepared and there are a couple of days for their march? The attitude of the Government of India has puzzled the people on both sides of the border. What does the Government want people to do? What does it propose to do itself beyond the exchange of diplomatic notes and useless correspondence? Does it think that the Goa question—as one Congressman said here—would be solved by the spirit of the age and historical forces? At least, one Chief Minister expressed the opinion that he did not mind if Goa remained in foreign hands for quarter of a century more. I do hope that this is not the Prime Minister's opinion too. However, we thought when the session began that the Prime Minister would throw some light on his position on this question when he made his statements in the House, whether on the 26th August or yesterday we found no clue to the working of his mind. His speech of August 26th.....

1 P.M.

Shri A. P. Sinha (Muzaffarpur East): 25th.

Acharya Kripalani: His speech was full of lofty sentiments about world peace, non-violence, Ghandhian techniques; and though couched in very eloquent and impassioned language, gives us no idea of what the Indian Government would do or allow the Indian people to do or not to do. The Prime Minister, in his speech on 25th August, said that "the resistance movement is an entirely Goan movement popular and indigenous". What does this exactly mean? Does it mean that the movement was initiated by the Goanese? Or does it mean also that the initiative lay with them and

they had the support of the people of India if not also of the Government of India? Or does it mean that the freedom movement of Goa is entirely the concern of Goa? The Prime Minister's statement throws no light on these questions. Yet he says in that very same speech, that "the position of the Government of India and indeed the people of this country, is well known and hardly needs re-statement. Goa and the Union of India form one country". This is very clear. If this is so, the struggle for the independence of Goa cannot be the sole concern of the Goanese people. It is also the concern of the people of India and the Government of India, if it really represents the people of India.

An Hon. Member: That is not.

Acharya Kripalani: So far as the people of India are concerned, they have shown that they can shoulder that responsibility. They were ready to cross the Indian border and enter the so-called Portuguese territory and offer *satyagraha*. If the Government of India felt that it was as much the concern of the people, the freeing of the foreign pockets, it would have at least not prohibited Indian volunteers to cross over and offer *satyagraha*. Does the Government of India want the freedom struggle to be confined to the Goanese people only? It would be very strange and it would be miraculous if the Goan people, unaided, can accomplish their freedom. Let us again see whether the Prime Minister's speech has in it some indication of Government policy. We are told by the Prime Minister "that the policy that we (the Government) have pursued has been even as in India under the British rule, one of non-violence and we have fashioned our approach and conduct accordingly. This adherence to non-violence means that we may not abandon or permit a deterioration of our identification with the cause of our compatriots under the Portuguese rule." This is one part of the non-violent approach to

[Acharya Kripalani]

the question. The second is: equally we may not advocate or deliberately bring about situations of violence."

May I again, in all humility, ask: Do these two negative attitudes sum up—the Indian struggle for independence under Gandhiji's leadership? I am afraid if we had confined ourselves to these two negative attitudes, we would not have been able to achieve the goal of independence. Under Gandhiji's guidance, there was a more positive method of achieving independence which we evolved and adopted and which called forth in the people initiative, a spirit of adventure, self-sacrifice and suffering for a great cause. This was the organisation of *satyagraha*, a movement of non-violent resistance. I say that it is this positive movement that ultimately resulted in the liberation of India and not the two negative principles enunciated by the Prime Minister. What is this *satyagraha* as conceived by Gandhiji? It is a non-violent direct action. It was designed by Gandhiji as a humane and civilised substitute for direct violent action, that is, for insurrection or war. If really our Prime Minister wants to adopt Gandhiji's technique, his Government will have to organise *satyagraha* for the liberation of foreign pockets or at least allow the people of India to do so. I claim that in any such organisation of *satyagraha* there can be no distinction between an Indian and a Goanese. They are all Indians. I go further and say that in such a *satyagraha* there can be no question of nationality. Those who join such a movement are the citizens of the world, fighting non-violently for the cause of justice and freedom. I talk of non-violence, but even in violent freedom movements, foreigners have freely taken part in Europe. With the Greek movement, of independence, the name of the great poet, Lord Byron, is associated. The English Government of those days did not interfere with his movements and I say that the Englishmen today feel proud of the fact. Fifteen years

back an international brigade was organised in Spain during the civil war. No democratic government put obstacles in the way of its nationals to join this international brigade. Our Prime Minister himself went to Spain, and when he returned back—if I remember aright, he said that he felt like taking a gun to fight in this international brigade. If he did not fight, it was, I suppose, because the independence movement of India was for him, as an Indian, the more important movement. If, however, the Prime Minister's Government wants to be Gandhian in its approach and action.....

May I have a ruling if I can, at this stage, read something that I have written, because, after all, we are not Englishmen, nor have we been brought up in this language? Sometimes it will be clearer if I read, but some people may think that we should closely follow and blindly follow what has been said in the Parliament of England.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought the hon. Member has all along been reading.....

Acharya Kripalani: No, Sir.....
(Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as yesterday is concerned, there was a reference when Mr. Asoka Mehta was reading. Some question was raised on a point of order as to whether any hon. Member could read a written speech here. I said he was referring to his notes. But Kripalaniji now wants a ruling on a point. He raised a question with respect to certain statements; so that he may be accurate and precise. He has committed them in writing and he now asks whether he ought not to refer to that statement. I feel that inasmuch as English language is not our language and responsible statements may be interpreted differently and sent in broadcast there is no harm particularly when hon. Members who are capable of speaking at length and for

long hours extempore want to take opportunities to read particular statements so as to be precise. I will allow them whatever might have been said. Whenever any hon. Member feels that in the interest of precision and to avoid any misunderstanding regarding his speech he would like to read portions—not putting the whole thing in writing and then reading it—I do not see any objection and I do not allow any point of order.....
(Interruptions.)

Several Hon. Members: It is for everybody.

Acharya Kripalani: If our Government wants to be Gandhian in its approach and action, it will have to do something more than mere exchange of diplomatic notes. Gandhiji organised a movement of *satyagraha*—we all had the honour to be the soldiers of this non-violent army. Gandhiji also held that if a foreign army has to be resisted and if it was to be done non-violently, an army of *satyagrahis* should be organised. A conflict between the *satyagraha* and a violent army would be less destructive of human life and property; it will eliminate much of the cruelty and hatred characteristic of war and armed conflict. It is not my purpose here to go into the advantages of *satyagraha*—political, moral, economic and social. All that I want to emphasise here is that if our Government is serious and is anxious to settle all international disputes through non-violence, it will have to create in India non-violent army of Gandhiji's conception. You will ask: what about the army? It does not matter if there is an organised army of some sort in India, even while it is there we can organise a separate non-violent army on Gandhian lines to demonstrate to the world that we really believe in non-violence. This would be something positive instead of the two negative principles enunciated by our Prime Minister. Mere diplomatic notes, I submit, are as non-violent as prayer, petition and protest of the old moderate politics with which we were familiar before our independence. This

moderate policy—I am sure the Prime Minister will agree with me—of non-violence, of prayer, petition and protest, was born of weakness and inability to take risk—I say it was born of fear.

Yet the Prime Minister in his speech on the 25th August told us that “we will never forget that in our approach and endeavours for freedom we were enjoined to eliminate fear.” I have no doubt that the Prime Minister and his Government are not afraid of the Portuguese. But there are other fears of which perhaps he is himself unconscious. It is very difficult to be self-analytical in this respect. May I say: what he is afraid of is international opinion of the western democracies. May I submit that it is a tainted opinion? They themselves have been encouraging the Portuguese; otherwise the Portuguese would never have taken the attitude they have taken. May I suggest that the fear which is at the base of our Prime Minister's policy of waiting is the fear of the Western Powers?

If of this very same international opinion at the time of the Quit India resolution Gandhiji said that it was not the opinion of that day that should count; it is the opinion of history that will count. We are living in historic times and our actions should be in historic perspective—not what England and America or any other country would say today but what will be written in history; whether we acted at the proper time or whether we did not. It is the only question that is before us and we know that the opinion of England does not count in this matter and should not count in this matter.

I am sorry to say that an impression has gone round that when the Prime Minister prohibited Indian volunteers from crossing the border, it was because some Englishmen had said something. I know that our Prime Minister will vehemently protest against this. But this is the suspicion and in politics we have to take into consideration the suspicions of

[Acharya Kripalani]

the people also; it is not always what we do but what the people think of what we are doing and the way in which they say this—that is also very important.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister was talking of our connections with the Commonwealth. He was saying that we are sentimental. We are not sentimental about this. What we are afraid of is that even if we do the right thing, some people, even in our own country, would suspect that we are yet under the thumb of England. What do we get from this Commonwealth link? If our Prime Minister wants it, he can have a treaty as we recently had with Communist China, if we are so enamoured of England. I have no objection if we have a treaty with every country in the world. We are a peace-loving people; let us have a treaty with England. But why are we connected with an Empire which is suffering from colour bar? It is not only Malan that is suffering from colour bar but I say that if there is one country in Europe and America where there is colour bar after Malan, it is England. Those Indians who have been there tell us, and those who have travelled in English ships know what the position is when they go in those ships to Europe. It is not a question of sentiment. I have got it from Sucheta Devi who has travelled in one of these ships and I have got it from many other people—the P. & O. steamers, the treatment they give to Indians. This is what we get from our connection with the Commonwealth.

But talking of Goa, we have spoiled the situation. I am sure if the Goanese people had known that in their struggle they would not have the support of India, and the Government of India, they would not have started this movement. They are too few to start a movement. And the Portuguese Government is supported by big and powerful Powers. We made them to understand, we by our ac-

tions, the Indian people, and I say also the Indian Government by its action, gave an impression that it was sympathetic to the movement and that it will not hamper it. Now we have left them in the lurch. What is the result? The result is leonine repression in Goa. And I say we are responsible for it. No respectable man can breathe freely there. There are no civil liberties. There is terrorism everywhere. Yesterday I read in the papers that the Portuguese have declared that all the Goanese living in Indian territory are non-Portuguese. That means they are Indians now. Even they cannot go and join the struggle there. I also read that the Portuguese Government in Goa has been taking signatures under pressure, under threats, saying that the Goanese want the Portuguese rule and they do not want amalgamation with India. I say we are losing valuable time. And Goa is a plague spot if we do not cure it of its plague of foreign rule.

That is all that I have to say, Sir.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): If we carefully analyse the speeches which have been delivered on the other side, except for one matter they mutually cancel each other. Professor Hiren Mukerjee's complaint that we are the lackeys of Anglo-American imperialism is cancelled by Mr. Chatterjee's criticism that we are fellow travellers with the Communists. That is how the whole debate has been progressing, except for one matter in which the opposition is more or less agreed. It is only in respect of that that I propose to confine my remarks this afternoon.

The point has been raised, both by Mr. Sadhan Gupta and by Mr. Chatterjee, and even by our esteemed leader Acharya Kripalani, that we are members of the British Commonwealth of Nations and therefore we have surrendered our national sovereignty and dignity and so on. Let us analyse this position. The House knows that the Commonwealth

is no body corporate. It has no membership. It has no obligations. It has no duties, nor has it any rights. Nor is it a treaty organisation like the N.A.T.O. or like the S.E.A.T.O. It is a loose association of members who have nothing in common except to follow what is agreed upon amongst them as the policy. They are not bound by any dictates of any country on any matter. If any one country in the Commonwealth were to be bound by the dictates of one country or by a group of countries, then it could be said that membership of the Commonwealth imposes an obligation on the part of the member countries which is derogatory to the sovereignty of that country.

Mr. Sadhan Gupta made certain pointed references and asked: what is it that we have gained by being members of this Commonwealth; if anything we have suffered all along the line. Firstly, he said: look at the sterling balances settlement. Mr. Sadhan Gupta did not develop that point. He merely said—I will quote the exact words—"We have to our great prejudice settled the sterling balances against our interests. Those balances were won with the sacrifice of three and a half millions of lives in Bengal." He did not say how we have settled this question of sterling balances to our disadvantage. If you carefully analyse the sterling balances settlement you will realise that at that time there was a general opinion that England would not be able to honour her obligations and that there should be an endeavour on the part of the United Kingdom and other countries to get an abatement of the liabilities of England in respect of goods and services supplied to them during the war. And a great endeavour was made by many politicians in the United Kingdom at that time saying that out of the balances which have been accumulated by the member countries in the sterling balance account, a portion of it at least should be treated as some contribution by them towards the war effort. If you recall that in 1919-20, immediately after the last war, we made a

glorious contribution of one hundred million pounds as India's contribution to the defence of democracy in the world, and when we realise that in the 1947-48 settlement the entire account that was due to us was kept intact and there was not even an abatement of a single farthing or penny that was due to us, I fail to see how it can be charged that we have made a settlement which is contrary or prejudicial to our interests.

The settlement, if anything, laid certain conditions as to withdrawal. But even those conditions with regard to withdrawal were not strictly observed. In 1949-50 we drew more than the amount which we were allowed to draw under the settlement. I think we drew to the extent of nearly Rs. 165 crores at that time, because of our food shortage difficulties and other national crises.

Then again it is not true to say that we have not been able to draw from the sterling balances. Our sterling balances position today is quite different from what my friend Mr. Sadhan Gupta believes. We have more accumulations to draw, and we have not drawn them. Thanks to the favourable balance of trade in our behalf we found that it has not been necessary for this country to draw on the sterling balances. So that is entirely a fallacious argument.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The financial settlement was also quite favourable to us.

Shri Venkataraman: I only met Mr. Sadhan Gupta's point. It is undoubtedly true that the financial settlement was very favourable to India.

Now, Mr. Sadhan Gupta asked: why is it that we are members of this Commonwealth. There are certain countries in the world which follow a same pattern of political systems. We follow parliamentary democracy with a cabinet system as the pattern of our political system. All the Commonwealth countries have the same system. Rule of law is the basic

[Shri Venkataraman]

principle of the Commonwealth countries. If you examine the constitution of other countries, they may have democracy of the parliamentary variety but not a cabinet system, or there will be no democracy of the type we know and there will be people's democracies of the definitions of their own. So a certain amount of uniformity in the Political System and administration brings us together, and there is nothing more than that.

There is the other aspect, namely the economic aspect, of our membership of the Commonwealth. Our pattern of trade is very largely with the Commonwealth countries. Either due to historical reasons or any other, India has nearly fifty per cent.—actually 48 to 49 per cent.—of her trade with Commonwealth countries. Because the pattern of trade is with the Commonwealth countries, we have certain advantages by being members in the Commonwealth. In the last debate relating to the Imperial preference, the Commerce Minister pointedly drew attention to one or two facts. He showed that we have actually given preference to the tune of Rs. 52 crores to the Commonwealth countries and we have obtained preference to the tune of Rs. 205 crores. Nobody would say that our membership of the Commonwealth is in any way disadvantageous to ourselves.

Shri Sadhan Gupta went on to refer to certain political aspects. He said that the fact that we have stopped non-Goans from entering into Goa territory is a proof of the pressure that has been exercised by the United Kingdom on us and that, he interpreted as pressure by the Commonwealth countries. In developing this point, Shri Sadhan Gupta made a mistake. It is absolutely true and correct to say that so far as the French possessions in South India are concerned, where the liberation movement has taken place, the movement has been entirely of the people of those territories. The Indian population did not go and offer them

any assistance. It was a movement for liberation of the people in those areas themselves. In fact, the Prime Minister in the course of his several statements has definitely stated that it is not for the other people to go and mix up with the liberation movement which is springing spontaneously in those areas. Shri Sadhan Gupta said, while you allowed the Indian nationals to go and mix with the liberation movements in Nettapakkan and other areas, in South India under French possession, you deliberately prevented non-Goans from entering into Goa, because of pressure. If his premises were right, the conclusion would be right. But, his premises are totally wrong. The premises on which he stands that in the case of the French possessions, the Indians were allowed to go and participate in the liberation movement are totally incorrect. Therefore, it does not stand to reason why we should have allowed Indians to go and participate in the liberation movement in the French possessions and not allow them in the case of Goa. The policy of the Government of India is consistent in this respect. It is that the liberation movement should be a movement of the people of those areas, and they should assert themselves to the extent that the Government of those countries will not be able to continue further without the co-operation of the local population.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Why should India then claim Goa?

Shri Venkataraman: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am not competent to lay down the policy of the Government. To the extent I know of the policy of the Government of India, we do not claim any particular area with a view to aggression or to take it into our possession. All that we have always said and have been saying consistently is, that the people of those territories have got the right to liberate themselves and join with the motherland of which they form part,

It is never the policy of the Government of India to say, we will go and annex Goa, or we will go and annex any other territory. I do not know: I may be wrong.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad—South): That belongs to India. It is the policy of the Government. That is ours.

Shri Venkataraman: No, no. I want to make a distinction between the Government of India claiming a particular territory and the people of those areas claiming their right to form part of the Indian territory.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Mother and child, both have the right.

Shri Venkataraman: My hon. friend asked the question, why should the Government of India claim Goa. I said that the Indian Government does not claim Goa. What I have said is that the people of Goa want to liberate themselves from foreign domination and join themselves with India.

Dr. N. B. Khare: You do not want to help them.

Shri Venkataraman: I do not understand the word 'you'. Does the word 'you' mean the Government of India? Does the word 'you' mean the people of India?

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Yes.

Shri Venkataraman: Does the word 'you' mean the people of Goa? If the word 'you' means the Government of India, I say it is not the policy of the Government of India to go and annex any territory. If you say that 'you' meant the people of India, certainly, we are brothers and we want to go and help.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Does not the Government of India represent the people of India?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let there be no questions.

Shri Venkataraman: I think I had better to go on with my speech.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): May I know whether the hon. Member holds that if the Goan people do not do *satyagraha* and liberate themselves, the Government of India will allow Goa to remain under Portuguese possession?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Never.

Dr. Rama Rao: I would like the hon. Member to reconsider his statement that the Government of India does not claim Goa. I think he was wrong.

Shri Venkataraman: I did not say that. I would like to make the point clear. Government of India does not want to annex any territory. That is what I said.

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar—North): For the present.

Shri Venkataraman: The people of India want Goa to be liberated and the people of French territories have

Dr. N. B. Khare: The people liberate and the Government of India will pounce upon them.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): There is no question of annexing Goa because it is our own territory.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The decision of not allowing Indians to go to Goa is in the present circumstances. If the circumstances changed, Indians may be allowed. The Prime Minister has never taken up the stand that at no time will Indians go to help the Goans.

Shri Venkataraman: I will illustrate my point by a reference to what happened in the territories under the French possession. Four or five communes have been liberated by the people themselves. The Government of India has not undertaken any responsibility in respect of them. These territories are being administered by the people themselves who have liberated themselves. They have formed their own police force. The law and order situation is maintained by them.

[Shri Venkataraman]

The 50,000 people constituting these liberated areas have got separate courts of law. So that, the point is clear. So far as the Government of India is concerned, its position should not be misunderstood as one of aggression on any territory. So far as the people of that area are concerned, they are entitled to liberate themselves and join with the people of India, which is their birthright. It is on that wrong premise that Shri Sadhan Gupta based his argument. He said, while you allowed the Indian people to go and participate in the liberation movement in the French possessions, you do not allow the Indian people to participate in the Goa struggle. That, I say, is incorrect. That, as a basis for the argument that we have been bound to that position by the Commonwealth, is totally unsustainable.

Then, Acharya Kripalani referred to a number of failings on the part of the Government of India. He said that we have failed to solve a number of things which he detailed. For the purpose of solving problems, I suppose the Government must have power. Even if we were the arbiters of the destinies of the world, we could not have solved all the problems in the world. He failed to realise that we are one of the many countries inhabiting this world. We are endeavouring to do our utmost. The only test that should be applied is, have or have we not done our duty on the right side at every stage when each mistake took place. Take the case of South Africa. Consistently for the last seven years,—now it is the 8th year,—India has placed this question of racial domination in South Africa on the agenda of the United Nations. It is in pursuance of the efforts of India that high-power Commission was constituted. If one of the countries refuses to abide by the decision of the United Nations, is India to be blamed? It is the country which refuses to abide by the decision of the general will of the people of the world that is to blame. That

cannot be said to be one of the failures of the Government of India. If we had failed in our endeavour to take this matter time and again in the highest councils of the world, if we had shown any laxity in pursuing that question, if we had been half-hearted in not only sustaining the case of the Indians, but of the Africans themselves, in South Africa, where racial discrimination is very acute, it may be said that we have failed in our duty. So far as that charge is concerned, it is very well known throughout the world that but for the endeavour that India has made every year persistently, this matter would have been relegated, as many other matters are, in the United Nations.

Then, let us take the question of SEATO. My friend Mr. Chatterjee said that we have failed to stop this SEATO coming into existence. As I said, it is not possible for a single country like India to stop the SEATO coming into existence. But, what is the attitude that we took in respect of SEATO when this matter was being discussed? And this will also be interesting because of the influence we tried to exercise over these Commonwealth countries. I am reading from a report in the *Daily Express* of England where one of the columnists, Derek Marks, says as follows:

"To ensure that White Hall is left in no doubt about what he thinks"

—"he" means Nehru—

"...he has sent Mr. Krishna Menon to London to impress the Indian view on the British Government."

Referring to Mr. Menon's two interviews with Mr. Eden, Marks said: "At each of his calls the Indian emissary stressed that his Government was unwilling to accept any guarantee against Communist aggression.

Mr. Menon made it clear that the Indian view is that the whole

SEATO plan is contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter."

That is how we are able to exercise our influence over the Commonwealth countries also. We do not care what they think about it, but it is the duty of India which she fearlessly discharges at every stage of bringing to the notice of the other countries the fateful decisions which they are taking which might endanger peace in the world.

Then so far as SEATO was concerned, India's opposition has been so well known that to a large extent the organisers of the Manila conference were on the defensive all the time. They were put on the defensive and they had to be apologetic. It was also pointed out, as Mr. Krishna Menon is reported to have said, that the SEATO agreement is contrary to the United Nations Charter. People know that under article 52 of the United Nations Charter, any regional agreement can be entered into provided that such arrangement or agencies and other activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Now, here is a case in which a regional agreement is sought to be made against another member of the United Nations. And this was also pointed out in the various discussions which took place.

Now, Mr. Sadhan Gupta may also remember another thing. He was in praise of what India had done in the Geneva conference. Now, so far as the Geneva conference is concerned, I submit the amount of success which it had achieved could not have been achieved by India if India were not a member of the Commonwealth. Our right to approach other nations, our freedom of expression with the other nations which constitute the Commonwealth, they all helped us and helped the world to tide over a very serious situation, and but for India being a member of the Commonwealth, she would not have been

able to exercise that amount of influence,.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: Is it not a fact that a citizen of the Indian Republic is still a British subject?

Shri Venkataraman: would not have been able to exercise that influence for the good of the world.

Now, there is another aspect of this question which is causing some disturbance, i.e., the relations with Ceylon. So far as the relations with Ceylon are concerned, I must convey our great fears and doubts with regard to the forthcoming conference between the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the Prime Minister of India. For the last several years now, we have entered into some agreements, pacts, arrangements and so on. It is unfortunate that each one of them is so interpreted to the disadvantage of the Indians. Now, if we have to take back all the Stateless persons into India, it will create such a great problem for South India, for the State of Madras, that it will not be possible to handle the situation. These people went to Ceylon at a time when her economy was entirely undeveloped and they have contributed during these years to the development of the economy of Ceylon, to the prosperity of Ceylon. Therefore, I submit they are entitled to share in that prosperity. Any endeavour on the part of the Ceylon Government to now send them away on one pretext or other and thus deprive them of the fruits of their own labour would be a serious matter of, I should say, a breach of good faith on the part of Ceylon. I fear that in the discussions which are now to take place in Delhi between the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the Prime Minister of India sufficient safeguards may not be forged for the benefit of the Indians who have been there for generations.

Lastly, I want to correct one misapprehension which has been repeated by Acharya Kripalani as well as Mr. Chatterjee and others regarding Tibet People who know history understand that from time to time

[Shri Venkataraman]

China has claimed some sort of suzerainty over Tibet. The amount or the extent of such suzerainty which was exercised over the area of Tibet was varying with the strength of the Government in China. If the Chinese Government was strong, then there was a greater exercise of suzerainty. If the Chinese Government was weak, there was greater autonomy in Tibet. Now, before the People's Government of China established itself, when still Chiang-Kai-Shek was the head of the Chinese Government, an application from Tibet went to America and they wanted to sell Yak tails, the tails of the animal Yak. They were politely told that they still were under the suzerainty of China and that they were not an autonomous independent State. Now, if they were under the suzerainty of China when Chiang-Kai-Shek was in charge of the administration of China, does it immediately become different because the Government of China has changed, or some other person has come into possession of control of the country? It continues to be. If the suzerainty of China over Tibet existed at all, it continues to exist, whatever is the Government. Therefore, there is not much of logic in saying that now it is no longer under the suzerainty of China and that it is a case of aggression. Well, we are trying to find out complaints against the Chinese Republican Government when we say that they have either made an aggression on Tibet or they have swallowed up Tibet as has been suggested by Mr. Chatterjee. The only question is if the people of Tibet had ever protested against such an act. Mr. Chatterjee referred to a complaint that was made by Tibet to the United Nations in 1950. I understand that it came before the General Committee, i.e., the steering committee which places the items on the agenda of the United Nations. At that stage itself it did not find any support from any nation and it failed. It would be wrong to accuse India as having betrayed Tibet.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: India is not omnipotent to see that the entire world questions are settled by India. Can we do it?

Shri Venkataraman: That is exactly my point. That is why I said, when a committee which consisted of representatives of the five Big Powers with the Chairman of the several committees of which India was only one member, that it cannot be said to be one of the failures of India if India was not able to get the question of Tibet on the agenda of the United Nationals. After all as I prefaced by speech, India is one of the nations in the world, and we would not even be able to say that it is one of the big Powers in the world.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): Do you want to be a Big Power?

Shri Venkataraman: It depends on the connotation of the word "big". If you mean big militarily, we are not very anxious to be. If you mean big in the way in which we are trying to find a solution for the problems of the world and find ways for peace for humanity, certainly, we do want to be big in that way. In that sense, we are really big today. Among the nations of the world which are now torn today into warring camps, it is only India that is trying to lead a path of friendship, a path of peace, and a path of progress. Peace is necessary to us, and as the Indonesian Prime Minister said, it is not a luxury but it is an absolute necessity for us. But for peace in the world, our progress would be stultified. It is for that reason more than anything else, and in the enlightened self-interest of our own nation, we should see that we must have peace.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Though I have been given time at the fag end of this debate, I am glad that the point which I want to make has not yet

been touched. The point which I want to make is indicated in the amendment, which I have given notice of, and which reads:

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

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that the Government of India should immediately declare that it does not recognise the sovereignty of any foreign nation in any of the foreign possessions in India."

This is a very simple amendment. I think there is none in the House who does not desire that the sovereignty of any foreign nation should come to an end in India. But it does exist, and the sovereignty of Portugal and France is being recognised by the Government of India even today. Therefore, through this amendment, I want that the Government of India should immediately declare the end of the recognition of the sovereignty of Portugal and France over Indian possessions here.

I do not want that the people of India should indulge in violence for liberating Goa, nor do I intend that the Government of India should march its army into Goa and take possession of Goa, but I do desire that the people of India, who also include the people of Goa, should be enabled and should be given full freedom to do what they like in regard to liberating Goa. But I emphasize the word 'non-violent'. They should not be allowed to be violent. Moreover, I want that the Government of India should not create conditions here in which the people of India may be compelled to remain silent spectators of the misdeeds which are being committed daily by the Portuguese authorities in Goa. There is a limit to all this, and I want that the Government of India and the people of India also

should impose a limit on the Portuguese authorities in Goa, so that they may not go on committing acts of omission and commission in Goa. For the last four hundred and fifty years, the Portuguese authorities have resorted to actions in Goa, which have been most deplorable and despicable. They have resorted to means which have practically ended everything that the Goans possessed. Despite the fact that they are undergoing untold sufferings and indignity at present under the blows and kicks of the Portuguese authorities, the Goans are practically devoting everything that they are having in the cause of liberating themselves. At this time, I think it should be the concern of the people of India and also the Government of India that they should stretch their helping hands to them, so that Goa may be liberated soon.

Now, let us see what the position of Goa today is. Time and again, the Portuguese authorities have pointed out that the Portuguese sovereignty over Goa is regulated by the Anglo-Portuguese Treaty of 1661, under which the territorial integrity of these Portuguese possessions was recognised by Britain, and Britain also assured Goa that she will go to their protection in case of need. Now, we are fortunate that the present Government of India do not recognise that position. Despite the fact that the Government of India do not recognise that position, for some time negotiations regarding Goa's future went on between India and Portugal, but the negotiations were sabotaged when Portugal became a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in 1950, and immediately after that, the Portuguese National Assembly modified the Portuguese Colonial Act, by virtue of which it included the foreign possessions of Portugal as overseas provinces. The idea behind that modification was that whenever the foreign possessions of Goa wanted to liberate themselves, Portugal should invoke the aid of the NATO Powers, which it is doing at present, by trying to persuade the NATO

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

Powers to come to Portugal's rescue, when the Goans wanted to start their *satyagraha* movement on August 15, 1954. After modifying that Colonial Act, Portugal intimated the Government of India that the Government of Portugal would not discuss Goa's future with the Government of India. This fact was intimated to the Government of India on 14th August 1950, and since then, any hope of a peaceful settlement of the Goa problem has been practically rendered futile, and if we say that we can get the Goa question settled peacefully, I do not think how far it is relevant. Even after getting that intimation, Government are still saying that it would be in their power to liberate Goa peacefully only by negotiation and exchange of notes.

After 1950, Goa progressively became a hotbed of intrigues and ruffians and so on and so forth. At present, there are over 30,000 White and Negro soldiers there, and everybody knows that seaports and airports are being constructed there at by American and NATO aid. I think here comes the question of Commonwealth friendship. Yesterday, the Prime Minister said that we have achieved a lot, and just now some hon. Members were pointing out that by being in the Commonwealth, we have gained a lot. But I notice that we have not gained anything so far as our interests are concerned, by being in the Commonwealth.

In regard to Goa, it was the Commonwealth, it was a senior member of the Commonwealth, our common colleague Britain, that was responsible for our banning non-Goans from entering into the Goan liberation movement. On 15th August this year, when the question of starting a *satyagraha* movement in Goa came up, Mr. Clutterbuck and other persons fluttered round the the Foreign Office here, they approached the Prime Minister, and they created a hue and cry throughout the world, and it was practically at their ins-

tance that the Government of India recognised the fact that we should not allow Indians to go into Goa, and said that it was only the concern of Goans to liberate Goa, and we had nothing to do with that liberation movement. I do not think that that is a sound argument.

If we leave this problem, and we do not actively participate, what is to happen? By active participation, I do not mean that we should go to liberate Goa by violent means or by sending our army there, but I think that morally, every Indian is justified to go to Goa, because Goa is within our territory, and Goans are having a common culture, and everything common with us. Just as it was the concern of the people of India and the Government of India, when we wanted to liberate Bhopal, Hyderabad or Junagarh, it should be the concern of the Government of India likewise to liberate Goa, Pondicherry and other enclaves. I do not understand why the Government should not allow the volunteers from Nagar Haveli and Dadra to go to Goa.

2 P.M.

We should learn something from history also. History is full of instances where such enclaves have been liberated by the country in which they were located. For instance, let us see what was the position in 1803 in the United States. The present administration of the United States of America is creating difficulties for everybody throughout the world. No liberation movement is being assisted by them and they are coming in the way of the persons who love freedom. But in the 18th and 19th centuries, the Americans were practically assisting the liberation movements throughout at least the western hemisphere. In 1803, Thomas Jefferson created conditions for France to leave Louisiana. France was compelled to leave Louisiana—which is about 30 times bigger than Goa in size and 4 times in population—at a nominal price. Apart from that, only after 20

years, on December 2, 1823, President Monroe delivered a message to the American Congress which later became known as the Monroe Doctrine which provides that the interposition of any European Power to control the destiny of a Spanish-American State should be looked upon as a manifestation of unfriendly disposition to the United States. At that time, most of the countries of the western hemisphere were ruled by Spain and Portugal. Today also, we see that some Spanish people are supporting Portugal. There is also the Pope. I had pointed out in 1950 that it was wrong on the part of the Government of India to have given recognition to any religious dignitary. I asked what was the good of recognising the Pope as a State. Even today, I am not able to understand the reason for it. The Pope and our Commonwealth friend, Britain, have created confusion in this matter. The same Spain and Portugal in those days—in the 18th century and early 19th century—had practically killed the freedom of all the western hemisphere countries, and it was America which was championing the cause of freedom in those days. President Monroe by the Monroe Doctrine decreed that the interposition of any European Power to control the destiny of a Spanish-American State should be looked upon as a manifestation of unfriendly disposition to the United States and that the American continent should no longer be subject to any new European political acquisition. President Theodore Roosevelt after sometime interpreted the Monroe Doctrine a little more broadly. He declared that European nations could not use force to collect debt over there.

Compared to the stand taken by President Monroe in the western hemisphere at that time, the case of India in regard to Goa stands on a much stronger footing in every respect, especially when Portugal is flirting with the imperialist Powers to invoke the NATO Powers' aid for perpetuating Goa's slavery. Apart from this, NATO's link with Goa is of considerable importance to the Anglo-Portugese and American glo-

bal strategy. I think it was because of this that the British Government, which is also our Commonwealth friend, sounded the Government of India not to work in the interests of any movement which the Goan Congress or the Goan people launched on August 15. Because of all these reasons, I think that Goa's continuation as a foreign possession might create global complications which might one day prove a threat to India's peace and independence. I think that this fact should be recognised by the Government of India. I am glad that the Goan people at least have read these writings on the wall and they are carrying on their movement for their liberation. I congratulate them, and, at the same time, I appeal to the Government of India to accept my amendment and to declare to the world that we do not recognise the sovereignty of Portugal, and France also, over any possessions which they are having here in India.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): The Prime Minister has covered a multitude of topics, each one of which might form a subject of debate; it is, therefore, not possible for me to do full justice to all of them. The basic questions which I propose to propound in the few minutes at my disposal are: Does our foreign policy harmonise with our national interest? Does this policy promote the interests of the world community of which we are part and parcel, and which is today in serious danger of facing a mortal threat to its very existence by being organised into alliances and blocs? We have differences with the Government on certain questions of emphasis, but the policies, more particularly those concerned with SEATO and non-involvement are accepted and are in my judgment, calculated to promote the interests of India and the world community. I have no doubt that the vast majority in this House will endorse these policies of the Prime Minister.

Addressing a meeting of members of Parliament a few days ago, the Prime

[Shri Krishnaswami]

Minister of Indonesia pointed out that there were basic principles which had to be taken into account by Indonesia and India and other like-minded nations which had newly won their freedom. I should like, with your permission, to quote some of the remarks which the Prime Minister of Indonesia made. He said:

"Peace is not a luxury but a vital necessity so that we might develop and stabilise the prosperity of our people".

These are wise remarks, and we have in the interests of peace, which rank higher than those of power and influence, taken all and great risks; in taking such risks, we have incurred the odium and, possibly, misunderstanding of powerful nations. What has really surprised me—and I put this point of view before this House—is that there should have been a misunderstanding of the attitude that we have adopted, by influential sections of public opinion in the United States of America. I should have thought that the United States of America which played such a vital part in initiating the charter of the United Nations would have hesitated to misunderstand the attitude that we adopted on the question of blocs and alliances. Article 10 of the Charter of the United Nations has propounded with clarity the essential requirements of a United Nations General Assembly. The letter of the Charter, the proprieties which govern it and the objectives of the United Nations organisation, dictate independent existence of countries and an independent exercise of volition by the member-states of the world community. Indeed, if one analyses the articles of the charter one will find that those relating to the General Assembly intend each member State to bring to bear on world problems its independent judgment and visualise each state making such recommendations, as it thinks fit and proper in the interests of the community. We should understand that this Charter was drawn up after

deep consideration of world problems and world security, and in the drawing up of it let us give credit to the United States of America—played a great part. It was even then suggested that disputes between member-States which did not belong to the category of the Big Five could be resolved by the Security Council bringing its pressure and its influence to bear on the disputants. But the vital question which faced the statesmen who drew up the Charter was: how to make the Big Five, in the event of their not acting together see light? How to bring to their attention the vital problems that faced the world community and of which they may not be keenly conscious? It was this problem that led to so much discussion on the powers that should be given to the General Assembly. According to article, practically unlimited powers have been given to the Assembly so that it may act as the 'open conscience of the world', or as Senator Vandenberg put it, in classic language as the 'town meeting of the world'. How is it possible to have a 'town meeting of the world' if day after day you go on organising the world into blocs, if you are to go on organising the world into alliances? We would soon be having no such thing as an open conscience of the world finding expression in the General Assembly. I venture to think that the organisation of nations into groups and into alliances does tend to undermine our security and the longevity of the Charter. From the point of view of long term interest, may it not be proper to affirm that even the United States of America would agree that organisation of blocs and alliances spells disaster to all nations big and small.

The Prime Minister devoted a good proportion of his speech to a consideration of S.E.A.T.O. Now, Sir, SEATO is not a regional organisation. It cannot be in the nature of circumstances. Article 52 of the Charter clearly points out that if nations enter into regional agreements such agreements must be

in harmony with the purposes and principles of the Charter. But the constitution, and the purposes for which SEATO has been formed, rule out its being considered a regional organisation. The time chosen for convening the SEATO Conference, the manner in which the parties were invited, the manner in which the articles were drawn up, all these go to prove that SEATO was not intended to be a regional organisation. It is only a new bloc. Maybe certain nations of the world felt that they should enter into an agreement for important reasons. But there is a duty cast on us who do not happen to share the view that blocs or alliances, promote security to organise area of freedom, area in which national initiative is not lost so that when we participate in world affairs we might bring to bear an element of sanity, and also persuade the world community to act in conformity with the principles of an open society of the world.

This in fact, is the main reason behind our opposition to SEATO. It is not that we believe in the slogan of Asia for Asians. We feel that we should play our part in creating an environment where the nations of the world may exercise their independent judgment and their independent volition in the United Nations Assembly. The nations of the world have to soften considerably harsh asperities that have tended to militate against the growth of normal understanding between members of the world community.

The Prime Minister referred to many developments occurring within each country. He gave expression, to a pertinent remark namely, that our times had witnessed the growth of subversive movements within many countries and that these movements had tended to evoke fear in the minds of millions and that these were responsible for the organisation of SEATO. But is SEATO the proper method of countering such subversive forces. What may help to curb if not scotch interference from abroad is the possibility of having this debated openly, in the

world forum. Indeed, if one analyses the constitution of the general Assembly and I am referring to it again, because the United States of America, played such a great part in the evolution of the charter one will find that Article 11 of the Assembly gives unlimited powers to member-States to bring to the notice of the world community the manner in which interference from abroad tends to overthrow a Government. Possibly, as a result of discussions, possibly as a result of compromise, possibly fearing from exposé we may be able better to avoid interference than by keeping ourselves in isolated camps.

Today it is difficult for the United States of America to appreciate our view point. Let us remember, after all, that SEATO has been inaugurated in a year in which elections in the Senate are to take place. In that great country, domestic issues sometimes tend to dominate judgement on international problems; often it is considered to be good election propaganda to have something to the credit of a party and SEATO might after all be a make-shift organisation which has been devised with a view to getting more votes in the coming elections. But sooner or later—sooner rather than later—I venture to think that the sleeper must awake. There is a feeling even among those countries which are closely allied with the United States of America in feeling and objectives that this organisation of nations into blocs spells disaster, that such an organisation will bring about a collapse of the world community and that steps should be taken to arrest this development. Those who are familiar with what takes place in international conferences will admit that many of the nations of the world have begun to think of a new and fresh approach to international questions. Speaking quite recently at the Economic and Social Council Conference held on the 21st of July 1954, at which Sardar Swaran Singh and Mr. Dharma Vira represented our country, the delegate of Chile, the representative of

[Shri Krishnaswami]

the Chilean Government, Mr. Diaz Casanueva, made the following observations which should be pondered over by this House as well as by our friends in the U.S.A. :

"The experience of United Nations debates had shown that delegations' stands on procedure were determined by their positions on substance. The consequent division of delegations into opposing blocs often prevented effective decisions and led to weak resolutions. Such methods might satisfy some members of the Council, but could not meet the aspirations of the peoples of the world. The tendency to vote in blocs had had an adverse effect on such questions as economic development, which had some analogies with the principle of self-determination. Thus, under-developed areas which were dependent on metropolitan Powers were hampered in their efforts to achieve industrialisation and economic development."

Partisanship does not promote durable peace. Nor should an absence of partisanship be confused with neutrality of identification with the Soviet bloc. Here is an instance not a solitary instance of the representative of the Chilean Government, which is linked by close economic and social ties with the United States of America, being unable to stifle the demands of his conscience. Such speeches and they must be numerous throw a flood of light on the way in which public opinion is moving in different parts of the world.

I have time to refer to only one other matter of great importance to us in India and particularly in the South. This is an important question of implementation of the Indo-Ceylon agreement. When it was signed I was one of those who was critical of the ambiguous terms found in that agreement. Perhaps, out of a desire to promote a more cordial understanding,

perhaps relying on a sense of fair judgement, we gave our neighbours free scope to interpret it. All this is creditable to our sense of generosity. Nevertheless I am glad that the Government has adopted a correct stand on the issue of 'Stateless persons'. I should like this House to realise that is an important question which affects us both nationally and regionally. Historically, as the Prime Minister pointed out on a previous occasion, circumstances led to people of our country going over to Ceylon. We never foisted an Indian population on Ceylon. Now productivity in the tea estates is in a large measure due to labour which is primarily of Indian origin. If the Government of Ceylon denies these people citizenship and keeps them as Indian nationals then a serious question of national interest and national importance arises. India cannot under any circumstances be the supplier of coolie labour which is what it would be if citizenship rights are denied to these people. It is derogatory to our self-respect; it would cause intense resentment in our free country. If the Government of Ceylon wants the Indian worker, let Ceylon be honest about it and give him citizenship rights. Otherwise, we might have to consider whether this labour force which is of Indian origin cannot be withdrawn. Happily, the Government of India has decided to act firmly and I would wish it to be both polite and firm and impress on the Government of Ceylon the advantages of cordiality and the need for taking a long-range view of Ceylon's interest. We have nothing else but friendship for Ceylon, but friendship must be based on mutuality of interest.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli):
Chairman, Sir, the previous speaker touched upon Ceylon and I would like to devote some time. Our Prime Minister finished it in a few words. Those few words show how much he feels about it and the difficulty of the situation. But, Sir, I submit that in applying a formula for solving cer-

tain problems, let us not forget to apply that to ourselves. Our Prime Minister criticised both American and European countries of trying to settle things about Asia without even consulting Asian countries. Let us not do the same to Indian settlers in Ceylon by doing anything which will affect them without consulting them. In dealing with other countries we endorsed co-existence which connotes diversity and differences and also unity in diversity which has been our motto. But our friends criticise this formula from two angles. One side shouts co-existence with us but does not cooperate or contribute to co-existence. The other side ridicules co-existence but does not suggest any other alternative or accept the consequences of siding with one bloc or the other.

Sir, our country has contributed much for the peace in Indo-China and Korea, but the credit is not being conceded to India. Our Communist friends opposite are so zealous of their cause that they say that this peace in Indo-China is the outcome of liberation of other countries like Russia and China and India also has contributed.

What our people are doing is not appreciated by others, and not even by our little brother Ceylon and it is doing things which are not good in reciprocity, things which are bad. They are doing propaganda every day against India. The other day, a leading paper of Ceylon was giving alarmist news about India that Kashmir is infested with Communists and that it should be protected from Communists. You can imagine what they want. This is what they give in return for all the moderation and cooperation which we want to extend to them even though it causes some difficulties for our own people. They are not doing this for the sake of any political ideology or principle but because of personal grudges among themselves. There is a race going on amongst cousins for the post of Prime Ministership and no conces-

sion from us can save the situation. That has been the trouble for our people and their political ideology has always been to raise the Indian bogey and go to the people for catching votes and seek power.

We have been obliging them when we were not a free people by allowing Indian labourers to be exploited economically, culturally and politically. But, after becoming a free country, after the declaration of independence we have been telling our people—this we have been doing even before we were free—that the honour and the prestige of the Indians throughout the world will be protected by our nation and by our Government. But now to shirk that responsibility is not proper. Our people have gone there, not of their own free will, but at the invitation of Ceylon which wanted our help. Not only labourers but other people of Indian origin who continue to be Indians are also there. It is amazing that a friendly country is trying to deport thousands of Indians who are normal residents and who are leading peaceful lives. I have not heard of any other country, deporting people of other countries during peaceful times. Our Prime Minister told us yesterday that 10 million Chinese are spread throughout South-east Asia. I have not heard of any Chinese being deported from anywhere in any country. There are about 3 million Indians living outside India. But the Indians overseas are the only people that are being deported. Ceylon is so close to us and they claim such kinship with us—they call themselves descendants of Indian origin—and still they are doing this. I cannot understand the philosophy behind it or the reasonableness about it.

Sir, we have agreed to take back some of these persons in lots of 5,000 about 25,000 people. They are, of course, of Indian origin but have decided to be Indian. This is a great concession that is being granted to Ceylon to accommodate her wishes; but that concession is now being tried to be extended to the permanently settled population of Indian origin, who are,

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

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

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

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

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

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

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

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

Some Hon. Members: In Madras.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. P. M.

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to vote, and then put amendment No. 11.

The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that—

- (a) Government has completely failed in its foreign policy by pursuing a policy of unnecessary interference in China, Indo-China and Korea affairs and thereby antagonising Powers which would have been helpful to us;
- (b) the Government of India has done great harm to the cause of liberation of Portuguese possessions in India by involving itself in negotiations for International Observers and placing a ban on the entry of non-violent *satyagrahis* in the Portuguese India territories;
- (c) Government is persisting in its policy of weakness towards Pakistan resulting in danger to the interests of Hindu minorities in Pakistan and even threat to India's integrity; and
- (d) Government has failed to take proper cognisance of threat to India's integrity by the Pak-American military alliance and has failed to make sufficient defence preparations to meet the threat."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

"This House having considered the international situation and the

policy of the Government of India in relation thereto regrets:

- (a) that in spite of professions of neutrality between two power blocs and allegiance to the idea of enduring international peace the Government has entered into serious economic and military entanglements with the United States of America and Great Britain, which will ultimately force India into war or to serve as the war-base of belligerent powers;
- (b) that Government has not only not taken any steps to rid the country of Commonwealth commitments, but has taken steps to integrate the defence of India with the defence of British empire more closely than ever before;
- (c) that by its policy in Indo-China it has lent support to a patch-up compromise which has only prolonged the life of French colonialism in that country, instead of stopping cold-war tension in the South East Asian region;
- (d) that it has completely failed to build such peripheral defensive and mutual-aid alliances which would broaden and strengthen the security of India against aggression; and
- (e) that it has failed to uphold the dignity and honour of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon, South Africa and British colonies in general, including British Guiana, or to take any single effective step in the matter of liquidating foreign pockets from Indian soil."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves of the foreign policy of Government which has not only enhanced India's prestige abroad, but has also promoted the cause of world peace by easing tension among nations and by propagating, *inter alia*, the idea of peaceful co-existence and of respect for each other territorial integrity."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the other amendments are barred.

4. P.M.

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): **Mr. Deputy-Speaker,** how important this automobile industry is in the economy of a country and what effect it has got on other sectors of the industry in any particular country can best be illustrated by reference to a pamphlet that I have got, which is entitled '*American Trucking*'. It only deals with goods transport vehicles. And, about U.S.A., the figures given are that there are more than eight million motor trucks and trailers. They provide direct employment for over five million workers and pay 1,161 million dollars a year in special highway taxes. These vehicles use 568 million quarts of oil a year; they use 8,400 million gallons of anti-freeze a year, as also 85 million gallons of gas a year. I need not go into the further details that are given. But, what quantity of iron, tin plates and steel and other things are used in this industry is very well given in that pamphlet.

The importance of the industry in our country too was realised by the

Planning Commission: And, they have laid very great stress on the manufacture of vehicles in our own country, for no country which wants to advance can depend for all times on the imports from outside. We have been mostly dependent on imports. We have about eleven assemblers here. When they were asked to submit proposals for manufacture, five did come up with their own programmes but six declined to do that for they found that the demand was low and they could not carry on the manufacture.

As I said just now, this was realised by our Planning Commission as well and it was thought that we should have our own industry. The Planning Commission thought that two points of importance arose in connection with the purchase of transport vehicles.

(i) standardisation of vehicles used by the State transport services and co-ordination of programme of replacement and expansion of the transport fleet with the development of the indigenous automobile industry, and

(ii) use of diesel *versus* petrol-driven vehicles.

The Planning Commission said that these two issues have been referred by the Central Government to the Tariff Commission in connection with the investigation into a claim for protection for the indigenous automobile industry. The State transport services should adjust their programmes in accordance with the recommendations that may be made by the Tariff Commission.

The Tariff Commission was assisted by a German expert, Vorwig by name, and he has made certain useful recommendations and given sound advice. On page 10, he says: that this country is far behind others so far as road transport is concerned. He gives a table on pages 16 and 17 and he compares our country with other countries. We find that India is almost at the bottom. He says, 'India's road development is far behind most other countries as the following chart shows'.