

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

every possible manner and I can assure the House that similar assistance would continue to be extended in future.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received the following message from the President:

"I have received with great satisfaction the expression of thanks by the Members of the Lok Sabha for the address I deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 16th March, 1957."

#### MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

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

In the course of the last few days, when we were discussing the President's Address, many references were made to foreign affairs and, I also, in the course of my remarks, replied to many questions put. In a sense, therefore, we have partly covered the ground of international affairs in that previous debate.

It is now, I think, about four months since we had a debate on international affairs in this House. It was at the end of November last, I believe, when we had that debate, that we were confronted by a very serious situation which had arisen in the middle-eastern region, in Egypt, because of a military invasion of Egypt. Also, in central Europe a serious situation had been created in Hungary. On that occasion, in November,

I ventured to deal with these two matters. Many things have happened during these four months and considerable progress has been made in some matters, but I do not think I would be justified in saying that the general atmosphere in the world can be viewed with any optimism, indeed there are many factors in it which are very disturbing.

So far as the situation in Egypt, in the Suez Canal and round about is concerned, we have had the privilege of being in consultations with the Egyptian Government on the one side, and in the United Nations with others intimately connected with these matters, and we have tried to serve, in so far as we could, the cause of peaceful settlement, a settlement which would not only guard the rights of nations or sovereignty of nations concerned, but also be fair to the interests of the international community.

I am not in a position to say anything very much about what is happening in Egypt, now except that, I think, there are indications that a satisfactory solution may be arrived at in regard to the Suez Canal, the working or the functioning of the Suez Canal. Probably, in the course of a few days, a few weeks or a week or two, the Canal will be open to traffic. Now, the House will remember that much of the trouble of the last five or six months arose in connection with the Suez Canal and, therefore, if it is settled satisfactorily as to how it should work to the advantage of the international community and safeguarding the sovereign rights of Egypt, that will be a great gain.

I do not say that that will solve the problems of the Middle East. But, certainly, that will go a considerable way in easing tensions there. There are difficulties, as the House knows, in regard to Gaza in regard to the Gulf of Aquaba and, generally, in regard to conditions in

the Middle East. But, I suppose, you cannot expect them to be solved altogether; one has to go slowly step by step.

Possibly, looking at the world picture as it is today, the Middle Eastern region might be said to be the most difficult and potentially explosive region. In spite of the progress made towards a possible settlement of the Suez Canal issue and other matters, in spite of the fact that the invading forces were withdrawn from Egyptian territory, this area and the Middle East still continues to be a very difficult area. I do not mean to say that the area is difficult, inherently difficult, but it becomes a difficult area because of, I may say so with all respect, certain conflicts extraneous to the Middle East which are projected there.

Unfortunately, in a great part of the world real trouble arises partly from some local difficulties, partly from some distant difficulty which is reflected there in that particular part of the world. This House knows very well our general views about military pacts, which are called 'defensive' but, which inevitably have a certain offensive or aggressive look to others. The moment one has a defensive pact aimed at certain other countries, the result is something more than 'defensive', and we have therefore ventured to say, and repeat again and again, that these pacts, whoever may make them, do not tend to preserve peace, or further the cause of peace, or assure security.

Indeed, one of the obvious things that anyone can see, that has happened in the last few months in this Middle Eastern region or Western Asia, has been the disturbing factor of these pacts. If I may refer to another place, Central Europe and Hungary, it is the pacts that came into the way; so that we have had enough evidence that these military pacts by one group of nations, presumably against another group of nations, do not help the cause of peace or security.

Unfortunately, however, the pacts continue, and are even added on to. Only recently we have heard a great deal about the SEATO Pact, about the Baghdad Pact. These two affect us, India, naturally much more intimately and directly than any other pacts. The NATO alliance or the Warsaw Pact we can view distantly on grounds of certain principles and the approach we make to questions of world policy, but the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO, as everyone knows, have a direct effect upon India and, naturally, we have viewed them with suspicion and dislike.

In considering this question of military pacts, I am not, and I do not wish the House to consider that I am trying to run them down, and to be presumptuous enough to criticise the policies of foreign countries in the past, or to a large extent in the present. It may be that at one time something was necessary. What I am venturing to suggest is that in the present context of events, these pacts do not help the cause of peace. In fact, they have the contrary effect and this has been borne in upon us lately with greater force than ever. But we saw how these pacts, notably the Baghdad Pact, and to some extent, the SEATO arrangements also were utilised against us in connection with the Kashmir issue.

12 hrs.

Now, presumably, the Kashmir issue has nothing to do with the Baghdad Pact or any other pact, but it was dragged into this picture and the members of these pacts functioned, well, as members of those pacts in regard to a particular issue which had nothing to do with it. Thus, we see how these pacts which were meant presumably for some other purpose are used for different purposes and create, therefore, greater difficulties. And thus, because of these pacts, cold war comes and impinges upon the borders and frontiers of India. That is a matter of concern to us. We

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

do not want the cold war anywhere, much lessen the borders of India. I am quite convinced that the cold war approach is an approach which will continue to worsen international understandings for a certain basic reason, and that is, if the international situation is bedevilled today by fear, by suspicion, by dislike and hatred even, then you do not get over all these by the cold war. The cold war creates all these things or continues them. Some other approach has to be made, as I ventured to say.

I cannot say that in this country or any other, we can give up, abandon, our defensive apparatus or do something which will involve us in grave risks. No country can do that. Nobody suggests to any country that they should be prepared to take risks and hope that all will be well. But there is something in between these two policies. One is of just taking risks and hoping for the best. The other is taking no risks and yet working in the direction of peace.

Take even one of the major issues of today. What is going to happen to hydrogen bombs and the nuclear weapons and the like? I suppose it is the fear of attack by other party that drives those countries which possess these weapons to go on enlarging them, everybody knowing that if once they are used, they may be destructive to both as well as to a great part of the world, everybody realising that they should not be used. Yet, they go on using them for fear that the other might have more of them. And so, we go on moving in this vicious circle and we do not get out of that vicious circle by the methods of cold war. It is obvious some other method has to be adopted, at the same time, protecting yourself against any possible danger or risk. I admit that. Great countries or small countries, both have to do that, but I do submit that the protection has not come in the past and will not come in the future by the systems of military alliances, whether they are with the Soviet Union or the United

Kingdom or the United States of America or any other country, because, the whole effect of it is that the other party has them too and they go on balancing these nuclear weapons and other forms of armaments.

Take the question of disarmament. Lately, there have been some indications, some slightly hopeful indications, that this question of disarmament might perhaps yield some results. There is the disarmament conference. But, during the past months and years, there have often been some such indications which have not yielded any result that we hoped for. So, I do not wish to be too optimistic about it, but; anyhow, I do feel that there is something today which if pursued in the right way might lead to some substantial step later on. More I cannot say, because we have been disappointed so often in the past and it has become a little frustrating experience to hope too much.

Yet, the real reason for disarmament remains there, namely, that any other course really leads to something which may and in utter disaster and that it does not, in the present stage, ensure security. In fact, it has the opposite effect; apart from the vast sums of money that are spent on armaments, so much is required for developing the countries of the world for achieving higher standards for the people.

Recently, two of the great men—of the biggest and the most powerful nations in the world, United States of America and Soviet Union—made certain proposals. The President of the United States made some proposals which are called the Eisenhower doctrine now. They are referred to like that. The Soviet Union made some independent proposals. I do not presume, at this stage, to discuss or criticise any of these proposals. I have no doubt that both were meant to advance the cause of security and peace. But, what I ventured to suggest on another

occasion was this: that proposals being drawn out from a distance in this atmosphere of suspicion and fear, even when they are good proposals, do not take one far, because nobody accepts them or few people accept them as *bona fide* proposals.

I venture to suggest that the situation in the world is difficult and serious enough for these questions to be tackled face to face by the great leaders, more particularly by the great President of the United States and the leaders of the Soviet Union, as well as others if necessary, but more particularly those two. It is just possible that that might lead to something better than we have seen in the last few months. On the one occasion that they did meet—it was about two years ago, I believe—that meeting resulted in a change in world atmosphere and the first hopes of some kind of peace.

This is not a question of favouring any particular proposal or not favouring it. I have no doubt that a great deal in President Eisenhower's proposals, more especially those dealing with economic help, are of importance and of great value. I have no doubt that many of the proposals that were put forward by the Soviet Union, on the face of them, are helpful. How they are carried out is a different matter.

But there is one approach that troubles me, and that is this idea of thinking that areas in Asia, say in West Asia, are vacuum which have to be filled in by somebody stepping in from outside. That, I feel, is a dangerous approach, and I think an unreal approach when you say that every country which has not got sufficient armaments is a vacuum. At that rate, if you think in terms of armament, then there are only two countries which have an adequate supply of hydrogen bombs—the United States of America and the Soviet Union. You may say, all other countries are vacuums, because they have not got hydrogen bombs, which would be, of course, an absurd thing.

What is the test then? Military power? Two countries stand out above all others. There are other countries, powerful military nations, great powers, two, three, four or five whatever the number may be. Are all the smaller and militarily weaker countries vacuums, apart from these six or seven? What is the test of this vacuum idea? It is a dangerous idea, especially for Asian and African countries. It seems to me really to lead to the conclusion that where an imperialist power gradually withdraws, or circumstances compel it to withdraw, necessarily you must presume that it has left vacuum. If so, how is that vacuum to be filled? Suppose there is a vacuum in power. How is it to be filled? Surely if somebody else comes in, it is a repetition of the old story, maybe in a different form. It can only be filled by the people of that country growing and developing themselves economically, politically and otherwise. Another difficulty is, when there is a conflict in the world, if one country wants to fill a vacuum, if I may use that word, or to have an area of influence, immediately, the hostile group suspects the intentions of this country and tries to pursue a policy in which it can have its area of influence there or elsewhere. So, you get back into this tug-of-war of trying to capture as areas of influence various parts of the world, which are not strong enough, if you like, to stand by themselves or to prevent this kind of thing happening.

This thing happened, you will remember, two years ago, or probably more, three years ago, in Indo-China, where war was in progress. Ultimately an agreement on Indo-China was reached at the Geneva Conference, which agreement was essentially based on this fact that those great power groups should not push in aggressively in the Indo-China States, but leave them to function for themselves. In effect it meant that those Indo-China States should follow an independent and unaligned policy. They may have their sympathisers.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Of course, they have them; nobody prevents that. But, there should be no military intervention, pacts etc. of a military kind, because the moment one State had it, the other State wanted to have its own pact somewhere in that area and that upset the whole thing. In Indo-China they had a war for six or seven years before this agreement was arrived at and there was a cease-fire, some kind of peace, only on the basis of acknowledging some kind of a mutual agreement that we should not interfere in a military way or anything that might lead up to it. I do not say that everything in Indo-China has turned out to one's entire satisfaction since then, but I think it is true that that agreement not only stopped a war in Indo-China, a terrible war which had devastated parts of it, but also step by step has helped in keeping peace and in improving the situation. There are great difficulties still. We have to shoulder our burden there, as the House knows, because we have been and continue to be the Chairman of the International Commission there. It is a difficult and complicated task, a rather thankless one occasionally, but we could not possibly run away from it. We have been there and we have helped. As soon as we succeed in solving some small problem, others arise. Well, all I can say is that I hope gradually the situation will improve. One cannot do this by some sudden decision or sudden step that you might take. That thing which applied to the Indo-China area in a sense might be considered in other areas too. Why interfere? If you are afraid of the other party interfering, surely the safer course is not to interfere oneself and thus prevent the other party interfering. If the other party interferes even so, well the matter can be considered and dealt with; arrangements can be made to deal with it. In other words, instead of spreading the area of pacts, the way of peace lies in coming to agreement in having less and less of these military pacts on both sides. After all if the military pacts balance each other, the

lack of them also will balance each other and will not endanger any one country more than the other. I do not say these issues are simple. Of course, they are not; they are complicated and the men of goodwill in every country think about them, want to solve them and yet find them difficult,

I mentioned it previously and the House knows that we have got a force at present in the Middle-Eastern region, mostly I believe in the Gaza strip of the Egyptian territory. It was made perfectly clear at the time when this force was first of all sent that it was sent after obtaining the permission of the Egyptian Government. We did not wish to move in at all, because it was Egyptian territory. Anyhow, we did not wish to take any step in the matter without their permission. Secondly, this force was sent there on the express understanding that it was not to take the place of the invading forces, i.e. it did not go there as an occupying force for occupying other territory. It went there to help in keeping peace on the border on the armistice line and it has been serving there in this capacity. At first it was near the Canal; then it was sent to the Gaza area, where it is, and, I believe the work of our officers and men there has met with the approval of all the people concerned there. I am particularly glad that the people there—I am not talking of the authorities—have also looked upon them with favour and they are popular with them.

Since the last debate we had here, some important developments have taken place, which would have been welcome anyhow, but which were doubly welcome because of the frustration we suffer from in other parts. One of the most important developments was the emergence of the old Gold Coast colony as the independent and sovereign State of Ghana. It was my earnest wish to go there myself on this happy occasion, but it coincided with the last days of our elections and the meetings of this Parliament.

So, I just could not go, but naturally we sent our best wishes to the leaders and the people of Ghana. The emergence of Ghana as an independent State is, I think, of great importance and great significance not only because any such thing would be important, but because it is rather symbolic of Africa and the trends in Africa. I am particularly glad that a number of internal conflicts that they had in Ghana—party conflicts and others in regard to their Constitution and in regard to their other matters—had been resolved in a spirit of statesmanship and co-operation, which is of the happiest augury for their future. As the House well knows, the difficulties of a country come after independence. The real problems that they have to face come after independence; and, no doubt Ghana will be faced with those problems and is facing them today. I have little doubt that with goodwill and the wise approach that they have shown, they will overcome these problems.

The other day, only yesterday, I think, I had occasion to meet a Minister of the Malayan Government. Malaya is also rapidly forging ahead towards independence, and provisionally, I believe, it has been fixed that the date for Malayan Independence would be somewhere towards the end of August. All these are happy signs which give one some hope for the future in spite of the other disappointments that we have to experience. Then, there is Nigeria adjoining Ghana which also, I hope, is on the verge of Independence. Thus, on the one side, the colonial picture of the world is changing and yet, unfortunately, on other sides, it is getting stuck up and movements for freedom of colonies are met with the stern opposition.

Hon. Members will know that at present we have an eminent visitor from abroad, the Prime Minister of Poland, in this country. I believe Members are going to have a chance of meeting him and listening to him. We welcome him specially not only because Poland is a country with a

fascinating tradition of struggle for freedom, with a very powerful nationalism which has moved it throughout history, but also because of the terrible sufferings they had in the last war and the way they have built up their city of Warsaw and other cities which had been reduced almost to ground level. Apart from all these, Poland has been an example in the last year—a few months—of the process of liberalisation and democratisation in the East European countries which has been welcomed by us and by many others. Because, we feel that that is the natural way of bringing about changes, relaxations and less rigidly and that to bring them about by some kind of compulsion from outside fails and in fact, leads to greater rigidity. Therefore, Poland is also a symbol of certain powerful and very valuable trends in the western world which have a larger significance.

We have also in Delhi, at the present moment Mr. Jarring, who was last month the President of the Security Council, and who has come here at the instance of the Security Council in connection with the Kashmir issue. I had the privilege of meeting him yesterday and having a talk with him. No doubt we shall have further talks before he goes away. I need not say anything about our general position in regard to Kashmir because that has been made quite clear. Even in the President's Address it was made quite clear in a few sentences. In the course of the debate on the President's Address also many references were made to it. There were; I believe quite a number of questions which hon. Members put, and the Speaker was good enough to suggest that instead of those questions being answered seriatim, perhaps, I might deal with them or most of them in the course of this debate. Perhaps some of them have already been answered. However, I shall refer to them briefly presently.

There is a problem which affects all our people here very powerfully and very deeply and that is the question of Goa. On the occasion of the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

debate here a few days ago on the President's Address, an hon. Member of this House who had a good deal of personal experience of Goa and Goan Portuguese administration and Goan prisons, gave us some account from his personal knowledge and experience. I was not present in the House then, unfortunately. But, I read a report of his speech; others have, no doubt, heard or read it. No one can read that account without feeling a sense of horror as to what has been happening and is, no doubt, continuing to happen in Goa. The other day, some of our nationals were released by the Portuguese Government, and among them, is an hon. Member of this House who has spent a long time there under those very bad conditions. I want to make it clear that the fact of the release of some Indian nationals from there, welcome as that is,— we wanted them to be released naturally—brings little satisfaction to our mind. I do not want any one to imagine that we are in any sense toning down our demands and our opinions in regard to Goa and that this chapter is closed or anyhow postponed for the present. Goa is a live and vital issue. The House may criticise us for the type of policy we adopt or may wish to change it. That is a different matter. We may discuss that. But, it is for all of us, to whatever party we may belong, a live and vital issue and we feel deeply on it. I particularly want to say that,—welcome as the hon. Member is here, he has come back from prison and the others will come back—we must remember that hundreds and hundreds of Goans are in prison there and continue to be in prison and continue to be treated worse even than the Indian nationals who were there. I do not know if my voice can possibly reach them; probably not. Anyhow, I should have liked to assure them that this question and their fate are very near our minds and it is a matter of deep unhappiness to us that circumstances should be such that this problem cannot be solved easily and quickly. As with other problems, it becomes tied

up with world issues, with international problems and one cannot touch a single problem which is tied up with other issues without, may be, creating all kinds of reactions to it. One cannot isolate this problem, and therefore, we have tried to follow there the broad policy which we have enunciated before the world, the broad policy in regard to foreign affairs or internal affairs, and I do not myself see how we can depart from it basically without giving up that broad policy, and without really launching out into an unknown course of action of which we do not know the results. At the same time, I do feel—in fact, we have been feeling it for some time past—that we must give the most careful consideration to the various aspects of our policy; I am not referring to the broad approach to the problem which I believe is correct and should be pursued, but I do think that we should give the most careful consideration to the various other aspects of our policies relating to Goa. In fact, we are in the process of doing that. These elections had come and they rather came in the way,—and other matters—but I hope that in the course of the next few weeks we shall be able to consult not only our own people who have been dealing with them, but others too; I hope we should be able to consult hon. Members of the Opposition too in regard to these matters, and try to evolve courses of action which can be as effective as anything can be in the present circumstances.

May I refer to some of those questions, chiefly in regard to Kashmir and one or two other matters which the Speaker was good enough to keep over for this debate?

There were questions about Mr. Jarring's visit. I need say nothing about it. As the House knows, he is here. The resolution under which he has come here, the resolution of the Security Council, is a simple resolu-

tion,—it was passed after much debate, I need not refer to that—it is a simple one, reminding him of previous resolutions and asking him to come here and to meet representatives of India and representatives of Pakistan in their respective places and discuss this matter with them and to report by the 15th April. He has been to Pakistan, spent about a week there. He is here now. That is all I can say.

Then there were several questions about atomic weapons in Pakistan. References had been made about this matter both by my colleague, Shri Krishna Menon in the Security Council, and by me occasionally here in some connection. Both our references were based not on any secret information,—we leave that out,—but on certain official statements or speeches by the Pakistan Commander-in-Chief. We did not say,—I did not say and Shri Krishna Menon did not say,—that they had atomic weapons, but we only said what he, the Pakistan Commander-in-Chief, had said, that in their military exercises in last December, the use of tactical atomic weapons was envisaged and exercises were carried out from that point of view. That is a preparatory stage—preparation for the use of atomic weapons. I did not say they had them,—I do not know,—and since then the United States Government has denied the fact of their having given any atomic weapons to Pakistan, or, indeed, to any other country. Naturally, we accept that denial, but the fact remains that these preparations and exercises and the possible use of them are matters of some concern to us, more especially when all this is tied up with this large-scale military aid which comes from the United States to Pakistan, and which has made a great deal of difference, I believe, to many problems, between India and Pakistan. It has been my conviction,—it was and is,—that it would have been far easier for Pakistan and India to solve their problems, difficult as they were, after the partition, if other countries,

—outside countries,—had not interfered so much, whatever the problem might be, whether it is Kashmir or any other. I am not for the moment criticising outside countries because often they have acted with goodwill in this matter,—though not perhaps always,—but goodwill or not, the fact is that this interference has come in the way of these two neighbour countries solving their problems in some measure, if not with immediate goodwill, anyhow solving them.

Then there were some questions, I think, enquiring if Pakistan had annexed the area of Kashmir in Jammu and Kashmir State occupied by them. Well, the answer to that is "Yes". Even by their Constitution they have stated that all the administered area is part of Pakistan,—and undoubtedly this is one of their administered areas—so that they have for some time past, and practically speaking for a long time past, and later even constitutionally treated this as an area which is part of Pakistan. It has been surprising that little reference has been made to this annexation of part of, in so far as area is concerned nearly half of Jammu and Kashmir State area, while a great deal of discussion has taken place about what is called the annexation of Kashmir State by India. There has been no annexation. The word itself is completely wrong, inappropriate. There was accession, as the House knows, in October, 1947; the circumstances leading to it may have been different, but it was an accession in exactly the same way as was applied to the hundreds of other States in India, the same legal, constitutional way. True, the circumstances were somewhat different, but it was an accession. Nothing has happened since then to lessen that factor and nothing was necessary to add to it.

There were also questions about Gilgit and a story that was published in the press, a story emanating from Brigadier Ghansara Singh. We, of course, had known this story for a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

long time. Brigadier Ghansara Singh was sent by the Maharaja of Kashmir, the Ruler then, under an agreement with the British just prior to partition. They had handed over Gilgit to the Jammu and Kashmir Government, and this Brigadier was sent there to take charge. Some very extraordinary things happened when he went there. Soon after his arrival, after two or three days, he was arrested by the Gilgit Scouts who were under the command of British officers, and the British officers of the Gilgit Scouts informed the Pakistan Government that Gilgit had acceded to Pakistan. I am not going into the merits, but the story was a very odd and curious one. Brigadier Ghansara Singh was kept in prison there or in detention for a considerable time. When he came out, we had met him, and he had given us this story then. Now, it was given out to the public.

I should like to make clear another thing. We have been asked as to the Government of India's position in regard to the Pakistan-occupied territory of Kashmir, and what we propose to do about it. Now, it is clear that in every sense, legally and constitutionally, by virtue of the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State to India, the whole State acceded, not a bit of it or a part of it only; and, therefore, according to that accession, the whole State should form part of the Union of India. That is the legal position.

We may have, in the course of these nine years, in our extreme desire to come to some peaceful arrangement, discussed various suggestions, proposals etc. But those discussions did not lead to any result. There they ended, although, sometimes, something that we said in the course of discussion, some idea or proposal or thought that was thrown out is held up to us as a kind of commitment. Anyhow, in law, that

is part of the Jammu and Kashmir territory which is an acceded State of the Union.

But it is true that we have stated in the Security Council and outside too—and in fact, this has been our position for a long time past; we have often said—that we for our part are not going to take any steps involving the military, involving Armed Forces, to settle the Kashmir problem. Of course, if we are attacked, we shall defend, and indeed we have made it clear that if we are attacked in Kashmir, we consider it an attack on India, which it is. We have made that clear. But we have also made it clear that while we consider the Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir as legally and constitutionally a part of India, of the Indian Union territory, we are not going to take any military steps to recover it or recapture it. We have given that assurance and we shall abide by it.

There were also questions about some messages that had come to me from the Prime Ministers of Ceylon and China in regard to the Kashmir issue. As for those messages, the House will remember that the Prime Minister of China went to Ceylon; and they issued a joint statement there. In the course of that statement, there was reference to the Kashmir issue, a friendly reference saying that they hoped that this would be settled by mutual discussions or contacts between the two countries concerned, and hoping that other countries would not interfere. That was a friendly wish from two of our friendly countries. And, so far as I know, there is nothing more that followed from it or was intended to follow.

So, I have dealt with most of these questions which were put to us. One thing more I should like to refer to, which may be in the hon. Members' minds, and about which—I had not seen them—presumably some amendments may have been sent, because whenever there is a debate on

foreign affairs in this House, there are always some amendments dealing with India's association with the Commonwealth of nations. I have dealt with this matter in the past on many occasions, and pointed out....

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no such amendment now.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I hope that my suggestion need not be considered as an amendment-invitation. But whether there is an amendment or not is immaterial. The question is an important one. And I can very well understand hon. Members, not only on the other side of the House, but on every side of the House, thinking about this matter much more now than they did previously, and enquiring from me, as they have done, sometimes in writing, sometimes orally, as to why in spite of all that has happened, whether in the Middle Eastern region or whether in regard to Kashmir,—that is, the attitudes taken by some Commonwealth countries in regard to Kashmir, which were certainly not impartial or neutral, which were siding with one party, and which were siding with a party which we considered the aggressor party, we still think it is right for us to continue this Commonwealth connection. They put this question to me, and we discussed it with them, but even more so, I have discussed it with my own mind and with my colleagues and others, because this is not a matter which I can settle just because I feel one way or the other. Indeed, we cannot settle any matter that way. It can only be settled, not only after the fullest consultation, but without doing violence to public feeling. Sometimes, it may be that public feeling has to be restrained or even opposed for the time being, because people may get excited, and they may think differently somewhat later. But in the final run, public feeling cannot be ignored, much less violated. So, this was a serious matter, and is a serious matter.

But I have felt, and for the first time I felt, the first time in these many years, that it may some time or other require further consideration. But in this as in other matters we are not going to act in a huff or in a spirit of anger merely because we dislike something that had happened. I feel, as I said here, that in spite of these occurrences that have happened and that have distressed us, it is right for us to continue our association with the Commonwealth for a variety of reasons which I mentioned then, among them being primarily the fact that our policies, as is obvious, are in no way conditioned or deflected from their normal course by that association. So, nobody can say that there has been this conflict in our policies, that these policies have been affected;—affected every policy might be by consultation; that is a different matter. We consult other countries. We have close relations with other countries. But the decision is ours, and is not affected by the fact of our being in the Commonwealth.

Secondly, at this moment, when there are so many disruptive tendencies in the world, it is better to retain every kind of association, which is not positively harmful to us, than to break it. Breaking it itself is a disruptive thing. It does not add to that spirit of peaceful settlements and peaceful associations that we wish to develop in the world.

Therefore, after giving all this thought, I felt,—and I felt clearly—in my mind, that it would not be good to break up this association in spite of the painful shocks that all of us had experienced in these past few months.

But, again, no decision that we can take in these or other matters for today can be said to be a permanent decision for ever. All kinds of things happen and one has to review these matters from time to time in view of changing conditions. And I would remind the House that the Commonwealth itself is undergoing a change. Ghana is a member of the Common-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

wealth. Possibly Malaya will be a member of the Commonwealth. Possibly a little later Nigeria might be. Its inner composition and content is changing, and changing, if I may say so, in the right direction. Therefore, keeping all these things in view and well realising the strong reactions that have been produced in the country in regard to this matter, I would still respectfully submit to the House that it is desirable, in the present context, to continue this association with the Commonwealth.

That is all I have to say on these subjects now. At the end of this debate, I hope that my colleague, Shri Krishna Menon, might be able to deal with the points raised in this debate, and with questions that might be asked. He has been, as the House knows, very intimately connected not only in the Security Council with the various international questions that have arisen there, but also in our discussions with the Egyptian Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

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

There are two amendments given notice of.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon):** I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, fully agrees with and approves the said policy."

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto regrets that even in the tenth year of our freedom and the eighth year of our Republic certain parts of Indian territory are in Portuguese and Pakistani occupation, and urges Government to take speedy measures for the liberation of these territories from foreign rule".'

**Mr. Speaker:** Amendment moved:

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

"This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, fully agrees with and approves the said policy".'

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

"This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, regrets that even in the tenth year of our freedom and the eighth year of our Republic certain parts of Indian territory are in Portuguese and Pakistani occupation, and urges Government to take speedy measures for the liberation of these territories from foreign rule".'

Shri Radha Raman has given notice of a substitute motion, similar to that of Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's.

**Shri Kamath:** We have not got it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not think it necessary to allow it. Therefore, I will confine myself to the amendments which have already been tabled, that is, Nos. 1 and 2.

Hon. Members who want to participate in the discussion will confine their remarks to 15 minutes each nor-

mally; spokesmen of groups will have 20 to 25 minutes each.

**Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur):** What is the time allotted for discussion?

**Mr. Speaker:** The debate will close at 6 P.M. today. When shall I call upon the hon. Minister to reply?

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

**Mr. Speaker:** How long will he take?

**Shri Kamath:** He may reply tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no time for other work. They have got a lot of other work. Hon. Members who were present at the meeting of the Business Advisory Committee know the position. How long will the Minister take for reply?

**The Minister Without Portfolio (Shri Krishna Menon):** About 40 minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will reserve one hour.

**Shri Krishna Menon:** Thank you.

**Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes):** May I make an amendment to what the House has already accepted in regard to the recommendation of the Business Advisory Committee, of which I was a Member? I think the House would be agreeable to dispense with the Question Hour tomorrow so that we may continue with the debate till 5 P.M. The Minister might reply tomorrow.

**Shri Kamath:** I would make a different request. Looking to the business before the House, I find the business will occupy the House for about 15 hours. We have got three days more—tomorrow and the two days after. That means 18 hours. So we can easily adjust, and the Minister Without Portfolio might reply tomorrow.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** We have no objection; the reply can be made tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** Whatever other work we have to do, we will have to adjourn on the 28th.

**Shri Kamath:** That is all right. We will sit longer that day if necessary.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member wants the House to sit longer. But I have been unable to maintain quorum in the House. All the same, I will call upon the hon. Minister tomorrow for reply.

**Shri Kamath:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not anxious to make a speech, as I have done so already on the motion of thanks to the President. I would only say a few words with regard to the amendment or substitute motion that I have moved. It reads:

“This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, regrets that even in the tenth year of our freedom and the eighth year of our Republic certain parts of Indian territory are in Portuguese and Pakistani occupation, and urges Government to take speedy measures for the liberation of these territories from foreign rule.”

I am glad that the Prime Minister, in the course of his informative speech, has made it clear to the House that Pakistan regards the ‘administered territory’ of the State of Jammu and Kashmir as part of Pakistan territory. That, I think, is a categorical statement which has been made in the House for the first time, and I am glad the position has been made clear with regard to that.

I was rather baffled when I read the President's Address in the light of the answer to a question given by the Prime Minister in this House last year. The President in his Address was good enough to say that the State of Jammu and Kashmir is, and has always been, a constituent unit of India. Of course, you are well aware, and the House is well aware, that the Constitution says in article I that it is so. We have always been under the

[Shri Kamath]

impression that it has been so and it will remain so. But today, the House has been told that a certain part of that territory of Jammu and Kashmir is, according to the Constitution of Pakistan, part of Pakistan, and, according to the Constitution of India, part of India. That, Sir, is the territory in dispute.

But the Prime Minister told the House last session last year that he had made a proposal to the Government of Pakistan—to the Prime Minister or someone else acting on behalf of Pakistan—for a partition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir on the basis of the present cease-fire line. That was the statement made in the House last session and that provoked, I believe, a little uneasiness on the part of the Prime Minister himself when he came and made a statement later in the House after the question hour, when you or the Deputy-Speaker gave him an opportunity to make a fresh statement correcting the earlier statement that he had made.

Now, the position is this. The President, who has spoken on behalf of the Government categorically in his Address to both Houses of Parliament, says that the State of Jammu and Kashmir is and has been a part of Indian territory, and now Pakistan claims a part of the territory, according to the Constitution of India, a part of India, as part of her territory. The Prime Minister did go very far some time last year, or year before last—but information was given to the House only last session—when he proposed to the Pakistan Government a partition of that State on the basis of the cease-fire line. It is unfortunate that even though Government regards Jammu and Kashmir as a part of India, the Prime Minister should go, in his own discretion or judgment, so far as to suggest the partition of the State. It was unconstitutional, arbitrary and also, if I may say so, absolutely not authorized by the Constitution or by this House. Any violation of the Constitution in that respect must have been at least approved,

at least permitted by this House, by Parliament. Without any prior approval or permission of Parliament he made a proposal to the Pakistan Government. That was very bad, very unfair, very unconstitutional and arbitrary and must be wholly condemned—the proposal made by the Prime Minister to the Pakistan Government.

13 hrs.

As regards the plebiscite issue, the party to which I have the honour to belong, is opposed to the solution of this question by a plebiscite. We said, so as far back as three years ago. But the Prime Minister was not in a mood to accept this position at that time. He has woken up late. But he has woken up. That is something to be grateful for. He was pleased to say in the last session or the session before that, that the party to which I have the honour to belong, the Praja Socialist Party, passes resolutions and goes to bed. I can only in all humility tell him and tell the House that we go to bed, as human beings do, but not before waking him up. That is one of the issues on which, I hope as in the Hungary issue, he has awoken to reality. He has woken up tardily and late, but he has woken up to the realities of the situation and to the need of no plebiscite for the solution of the Jammu and Kashmir question.

The Pakistan Government has published—I believe it appeared in the papers sometime back—certain telegrams sent to the Pakistan Government by the Prime Minister and certain statements made by the late Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar some years ago. The position has changed radically, I agree, but there was absolutely no need, no necessity for Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar—it is unfortunate we have lost him and the House has lost him—to have made a statement attributed to him that the accession is not final and even now Kashmir can accede to Pakistan. That is the telegram which Pakistan has issued to the Press. The Minister Without

Portfolio has somewhat more ably argued the case for Kashmir before the Security Council. But the Government of India's position has been compromised to that extent by the earlier statement made by the predecessor of the Minister without Portfolio.

The then Home Minister, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, in a little talk that he had with some of us, in great sorrow expressed his view that this problem of Jammu and Kashmir had been made a close preserve by the Prime Minister and Mr. Gopalswami Ayyangar and that he had no voice in it. Had he had any voice in the solution of it, or the tackling of it, he might have disposed of it a long time ago.

Be that as it may, we are faced with this situation now, and I hope Government will make a categorical declaration, as it has never made so far, that it is not in favour of a plebiscite and whatever had been said about the plebiscite by its spokesmen earlier was wrong. Let them admit the mistake they have made and let them say they are no longer for a plebiscite for a solution of this problem and that peaceful measures and other steps will be taken for the recovery of the territory occupied by Pakistan.

The other subject referred to in my amendment relates to the Portuguese territories in India. In the last few years—I have been here only for a year and a half the question of Goa, Diu, Daman and Nagar Haveli, has come up before the House again and again. It will come up again tomorrow in another connection. I asked for a statement the other day—a clarificatory statement—which has been refused to the House all these months, a statement as to how the so-called economic sanctions by India against the Portuguese Government have worked. On some ground or other that has been refused. I would ask the Minister without Portfolio to make a note—I find he has moved to the seat of the Prime Minister, I am glad—and throw some light as to how the economic sanctions imposed by

India against Portugal, against the Portuguese imperialist rule of Goa has worked. The House has raised this matter so often; it is very unfortunate that an answer has always been refused on some ground or other.

I would now briefly refer to the Commonwealth connection which has been touched upon by the Prime Minister during his speech. While I agree that India should not act in huff or in anger, it is high time that India should act coolly, carefully, deliberately with regard to this particular matter. I would only pose one question before the Prime Minister with regard to this Commonwealth connection: whether it has really not affected our attitude towards certain problems of the world? I refer particularly to the Cyprus issue. I do not know why, but so far as I am aware, India's voice has been somewhat hushed with regard to Cyprus. While it has been strident with regard to various other matters, with regard to Cyprus, a hushed silence has descended on the spokesmen of the Government of India, whether in India or outside, it is rarely referred to, rarely adverted to by the spokesmen of the Government. Why is that so? Is it because we are rather touchy about this particular issue? Does the Commonwealth tie really bind us, or tie our tongues a little on this matter? If the Commonwealth tie ties our tongues on this issue, I think it is high time that the question of that tie is reconsidered—whether it should be retained or it should be given up. Just as the question of colonialism in Malaya, Singapore and South East Asia has been very prominently taken up by our spokesmen, I expected that this question of Cyprus also would be taken up or at least the attitude of Government or the stand that we had taken on this question, voiced in unmistakable terms. But it has not been done. I hope that if what the Prime Minister said is really true that the Commonwealth tie does not bind him, it does not affect the attitude of the Government towards various problems of the world and does not tie their tongues, as I have noticed it does, if that is so,

[Shri Kamath]

the Minister without Portfolio will say so clearly. He will also tell us why he or any other spokesman of Government has not spoken very clearly, unmistakably and categorically about the Cyprus issue.

One word more and I have done. About this matter of disarmament and nuclear tests that are being carried on by various powers of the world, no,—there is another matter the Prime Minister very rightly frowned upon the Eisenhower doctrine and the approach of the U.S.A. towards the problem of the Middle East. The problem of the Middle East has partly arisen because of the creation of Israel in that region of the world—I am referring to West Asia. The attitude of the Indian Government towards Israel was anything but happy, during the first three years of its existence. When the question was raised in the past—I remember it precisely because I raised it not once or twice but thrice in the last Parliament—the reply was not happy. China was recognised almost overnight, soon after the occupation of Nanking, as soon as the Communist Chinese troops marched into Peking. Very shortly after that, the Prime Minister made it clear also in the House. When the question of Israel and Spain came up, he said that the internal regime of a country is not relevant to the recognition of that country or the Government of that country or State by India. With regard to Israel, that rule did not apply. It became an established State but for nearly 3 years it was denied recognition by the Indian Government.

It is a very tiny State and the pros and cons of earlier aggression by Egypt or first aggression by Israel has been made a point on both sides—Egypt and Israel; but, into that question, we will not go. But there is no question that the Anglo-French aggression was a condemnable affair and all the parties in India have condemned it. But the way in which the question of Israel was approached by the Indian Government in the earlier stages was not at all happy. Even now, I was

told by a member of the Socialist Party of Israel, whom I met recently in India, that the Israel Government had made approaches to India recently—even last year—for establishing diplomatic relations but the only reply the India Government gave was 'No'. I understand, if I remember aright, the Prime Minister said in the House, with regard to Gen. Franco's Spain that some sort of diplomatic relations were in the offing. Spain was a sort of an outcast in the comity of Nations for a long time and even when it was admitted, I remember, the Government of India abstained, if not voted against the admission. The Minister without Portfolio might remember it But Israel is being treated like Cinderella of West Asia. I am sorry that the Government has taken this attitude regarding Israel. If the Government had been a little more cordial towards Israel, the problem which faces the world at this time might have been rather easily tackled.

With regard to the U.N. Emergency Force functioning in Egypt under the auspices of the U.N. we read in the papers some time ago that the Indian Unit of the Emergency Force had taken some sort of charge of the Gaza strip. That was some months ago and now we find that the Egyptian Government is taking some sort of exception to the administration of the Gaza strip by the U.N. Emergency Force. Yesterday, Mr. Pearson, the Canadian Foreign Minister said in the Canadian Parliament that if the U.N. Emergency Force was not allowed to take administrative charge of the strip or the Israel-Gaza border, the functioning of the entire force might be rendered otiose and might be nullified. I do not know what the attitude of the Indian Government towards that particular matter is because the situation is still not happy on the Israel-Gaza border. I hope Government will clarify its attitude towards this particular matter.

I have moved this amendment and I hope this will commend itself to the other side of the House—this substi-

tute motion No. 2. It is self-explanatory and it is a motion to which nobody can take exception. I would only appeal to the Members opposite not to reject it out of sheer perversity or cussedness because it comes from a Member of the Opposition. I would like to impress upon them that if they vote against the substitute motion they put themselves in the wrong a false position; not merely in a false position but they will make themselves the laughing-stock of India and of world.

**Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali)** Sir, I would like to thank you for having given me this early opportunity to say a few words in this debate. I must say I was rather surprised at the approach which **Shri Kamath** made to the various issues which he has raised.  
13-19 hrs.

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

He started with an amendment seeking a solution about Goa and has plunged himself into various issues all the world over, ranging from Cyprus to Israel and to Suez Canal and so on. I think the policy which he and the party to which he belongs has always been to criticise this Government that they have been spreading their net too far, that they have not been able to solve problems nearer at home, as for instance the Goa and Kashmir issues. I thought that that was the main line of approach they have taken for many years. Overnight, there seems to be some change. The anxiety which he had shown in the case of Cyprus is, of course, welcome; because, so far as I know, this Government or its spokesmen have at no time made any distinction between one colonial territory and another, and we have always expressed our deepest sympathy with colonial peoples wherever they are. In every sphere, whether it is in the United Nations or otherwise, we have always been giving our helping hand to every country which has been struggling for freedom, and I do not think we made any exception. Again when my hon. friend talks of Israel, I do not know whether he is aware that India was one of the

earliest nations, whatever be the lag of time, which recognised Israel in spite of the fact that the situation was indeed a very delicate one. I do not know whether my hon. friend is aware that the tension in the Middle East is such and the prejudice with which countries like Egypt and other Arab countries view the state of Israel is such—I am told though I have not myself any personal experience in the matter—that if you want to go to Israel, you cannot first land in any of the Middle Eastern countries and go there. There is such intolerance between the two—Israel on the one hand and the Arab group of States on the other.

As I said a few minutes ago, the criticism has been that we have been spreading our net too far. But here is an invitation by making a special plea for Israel to overnight alienate all the goodwill which we have so laboriously and at such cost to ourselves in some cases, built in that very difficult region. In fact, in spite of the solution which the United Nations Organisation has found to the Suez Canal dispute, the main problem in the Middle East, still remains. That is the strained relations between Israel and the other Middle Eastern countries. The situation is a very delicate one, and any step which this Government will take in the direction suggested by my hon. friend, **Shri Kamath**, can only be at the peril of our friendly relations with most of the Middle Eastern countries, and more particularly, of the Arab world. I do not know whether in the present state of our own affairs, it is possible or advisable to plunge this country into such a controversial subject. Those who think that any of these problems can be dealt with in a compartmental fashion, without the one affecting the other, are under a delusion. Of course, I do not deny that **Shri Kamath** has spoken with a certain sense of responsibility. But it is as well that he should remember that we cannot afford, in the present context of events, unnecessarily to alienate every existing friends. I think we should keep this in mind when we consider problems like Israel. While

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

fundamentally our position has been made very clear and there is no doubt in any part of the world about it, we should not rush and do anything which may upset our own relations with various countries. Again I do not know where Shri Kamath got his idea of our being silent about Cyprus. With my small experience of the United Nations Organisation, I can say that the best reputation we have in that Organisation, for a matter of that in any part of the World, is that our country has always been the first to back the claims of any colonial peoples to achieve their independence. As a matter of fact, having had the privilege of working under Shri Krishna Menon, I can say that the whole atmosphere in the United Nations is that our country is the first to take the lead in anything which pertains to colonial matters. One can say that there is almost a feeling in that Organisation that if the freedom of any country is taken up or canvassed by any other country except India, then there is something suspicious about it. On the other hand, if India sponsors a resolution or supports a resolution urging the freedom of any country, then it is assumed there is great sincerity behind it and the rest of the members of the United Nations go a long way to support it. We have built up that reputation. For instance in the case of the new State of Ghana, to which the Prime Minister referred this morning, we can take great pride in the fact that we were largely responsible not only for sponsoring the resolution but for seeing that it was passed almost unanimously in the United Nations. The resolution was moved by Shri Krishna Menon. I know there was a lot of opposition there; Pakistan did not view it quite favourably and there was a good deal of attempt made to postpone the issue. But the decision of the British Government to bring it into effect on the 6th March was of primary consideration for our efforts to have that resolution passed, and we can take great pride in the fact that we played an important role in ensuring the passage of that

resolution. That is only an instance. The moment you enter the United Nations Organisation, whatever may be the criticism against us, one thing you will notice is this, that India has established a reputation as the champion of all colonial peoples in the world, and I think that is a great thing in the case of a country which has only been free for a few years and in spite of the difficulties which we ourselves have.

I would then like to say a few words about Goa, to which the particular amendment of Shri Kamath relates. It is easy to pass a resolution. It is perhaps easy to say: Why not go with our military superiority and take hold of that small bit? It is easy to suggest a solution of that kind. But these problems, as our Prime Minister pointed out, cannot be dealt with in such a light-hearted fashion. There is one point which I would like every one of us to remember. If India had been a very ordinary member of the United Nations Organisation, if India had been a very ordinary member in the comity of nations, probably such solutions would not be difficult to contemplate. But it is necessary for us to remember at any time, more particularly at this time, that India happens to be one of the most important members of the United Nations Organisation; that India is today one of the most important Powers in the world, perhaps not in the military sense, not in the sense of dollar funds but in the sense of a country which is able to effectively wield its great influence on the solution of some of the great problems facing the world. I do not want to go into the various problems that have arisen and the solutions that we have found, but I would like to say this that in any problem that arises in the United States Organization, the atmosphere there is that it cannot be effectively solved without India taking a hand in it. I do not want to say what our rank is; probably that will be too superficial an attitude to be taken but we do enjoy in that organization

a position very nearly equal to any of the so-called great powers of the world. I was myself surprised when I first went to that organization, how great is our position. We do hear about it in the newspapers sometimes.

It is rather unfortunate that in our own country, we do not seem to appreciate, or, at any rate, some people do not seem to appreciate what that position is. It is a position which imposes on us certain obligations; you cannot be a member of an important organization; you cannot yourself be one of the leading powers of the world, and yet say: "let us try to solve our own problems in a small way". There is exactly the kind of solution that probably Shri Kamath has in mind. If you want to keep up your position in the world as one of the leading powers and more than that if your policy has been one of peace and if you have been effectively pursuing that policy and preventing either the outbreak of war or spread of war in other parts of the world, if you have been playing that very important role, you cannot in the case of Goa or in the case of any other case in which we are vitally interested, make an exception and say "No, in this case, we will pursue a different policy". Whenever any criticism is made of our foreign policy, it is as well that we remember this. I have not had the opportunity even in the last debate, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, to say a few words about my experiences in the United Nations Organization, because really I was mostly out.

Now that this opportunity has come to me, I would like to pay a tribute to the very valuable work done by Mr. Menon, our Minister without Portfolio, to contribute to the great name which India has acquired. Sometimes in the consideration of our immediate problems or current problems, we may overlook that fact. I was rather pained, and I think many of our countrymen were pained during the last session when our delegation and, particularly, the Chairman and the Members of the delegation were being subjected to certain attacks in

the Press in this country. It is bad enough that other people do it. I think it is tragic, that some of our own people belittle the efforts made by our representatives abroad, especially when they are actually involved in very delicate negotiations and representations. I have already referred to the important position we enjoy in the United Nations Organization and in the world abroad. I would most respectfully submit that, apart from the policy which we have been consistently following, one important factor which has contributed to it is the personality of Mr. Krishna Menon. I notice he is here, and I do not want to say anything which might embarrass him, but I think the truth must be told. He is one of our most brilliant men who has acquired a great name in that organization. I believe that it was last year that a Gallup poll was taken in the United Nations Organization as to the men who contributed most to the effective functioning of the General Assembly, I think the Gallup poll went in his favour. I do not want to say anything further than that. I would have said probably much more, if he was not here.

I would only say that people in this country should remember that we have a great stake in the United Nations Organization, that every step we take, every policy we pursue and every statement that we make, whether inside that forum or outside, is being closely followed in various parts of the world.

The policy which this Government has been pursuing has brought us great dividends and although it might seem a little difficult for us at the moment to appreciate why the problem of Goa and the other problems are not yet solved, I have no doubt about the goodwill that we are creating in the world over—we have certainly created a lot of it in the Middle East—and I had the privilege of actually seeing that myself when I had the honour of accompanying the Prime Minister to Saudi Arabia, I could see the amount of goodwill that exists throughout the Middle East, and

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

throughout Asia and whatever step we take should not in any way affect that goodwill. This country has, I am sure, a great part to play in the years to come and whatever be the immediate difficulties, whether in respect of Kashmir or Goa, it is well that we remember those facts.

I have ventured Sir to say a few words on this occasion about my experiences in the United Nations Organization, because I thought it is as well that the House knows some of those facts.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy** (Mysore): Sir, we are all agreed that the foreign policy of our country should be a national policy and that it should not be a party policy. If we see the development of our foreign policy since Independence, we come to the painful conclusion that the Prime Minister and his colleagues have shaped the foreign policy as though it is their own. The External Affairs Ministry, in particular, is regarding the foreign affairs as its exclusive preserve. We have said more than once in this House that our foreign policy should be really bipartisan, and the Prime Minister and his colleagues should consult the Opposition Members belonging to various parties and groups. But, we have been treated in a very shabby way on more than one occasion. Except on one or two matters, the Prime Minister has not consulted the Leaders of the Opposition. We have, therefore, to think whether it would not be right and proper to have a permanent statutory committee of Parliament to review our foreign policy from time to time and offer suggestions to the Government. There is such an arrangement in certain foreign countries. There is a Committee in the U.S.A. So, we have to consider whether it would not be wise and proper for the Government to take the Members of the Opposition into confidence.

It has been our tragedy during the last few years that in the appointment of ambassadors, ministers and other dignitaries to foreign countries, a

personal decision is taken by the Prime Minister. He might have done rightly so far. But, I am afraid that such a thing should not be left to the decision of one person, however eminent he may be. In future, a person who may come in his place may not exercise the same discretion in selecting people for various diplomatic assignments. There should be a permanent committee, as in the USA, to approve of all diplomatic assignments.

We have not so far been able to discuss and give our considered approval to the various treaties entered into between India and other countries. Copies of these documents are simply laid on the Table of the House. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, know how little time is available for us to discuss them. I feel that these treaties should be discussed and approved at least by a committee of Parliament. So, I suggest the constitution of a committee of Parliament immediately.

I have on a previous occasion complained that all diplomatic assignments are going to the permanent services. Then, the Prime Minister was good enough to say that there would be a happy mixture of the official and non-official elements in future. If you go through the diplomatic assignments during the last one or two years, you would be convinced of the official trend. We find very few people coming from outside the department. This is not a happy arrangement. If a non-official is appointed as an ambassador or minister, he would bring an entirely different approach to the problems. If an official is appointed as an ambassador, it is not possible for him to bring in that kind of a purely political approach or non-bureaucratic approach.

The Prime Minister has dealt with many problems. He has said that the Kashmir issue is uppermost in his mind. But, what is the use of saying so? We went to the Security Council as a complainant. We complained against the aggression of Pakistan. Now, we have been put in the dock.

The issue of Pakistan's aggression has not been decided at all. Should we not stop and think? Would it not be wise to withdraw our complaint from the UN? I know the consequence of such a move. We have waited for a long time. Discussion has been going on in the Security Council for long. No solution has come to us. On the other hand, more troubles are being created by the Security Council. In fact, the UN is coming in the way of a settlement. In the circumstances we cannot negotiate as parties and we cannot take a decision. At every step, the interested foreign powers are making use of the UNO to malign India and create difficulties which come in the way of solving this problem. Will it not be wise and proper for us to withdraw the complaint made to the Security Council? Even Sweden has now come up with a new proposal that this issue should be thrashed out in the International Court of Justice. Some other powers also are thinking that way. We do not know what solution they would give. We are in a blind alley and we do not know a way out. We went there as complainants. We may now say that we withdraw the complaint. We can then deal with this matter on our own. We can negotiate with the Pakistan Government for a settlement by discussion around a table. This is the best remedy for Kashmir.

With regard to Goa the Prime Minister was good enough to say that he was very very unhappy at the treatment given to our nationals in Goan prisons. He also said that the question is a very important question and it is receiving considerable attention at the hands of the Government. But what is the use of all this? From the very beginning he has been saying that Goa is a very important question. Even today he is reiterating the same thing, and tomorrow also, I am sure, he will say the same thing. Who denies that? Goa is certainly an important question. Everybody says it is important and it is a very vital question. But what is the use of all this oral declarations unless we take some concrete action?

The Goa problem became very acute when satyagrahis began to go to Goa to offer satyagraha. At that time the Prime Minister was lukewarm in his attitude. He allowed satyagrahis to go to Goa. He did not take any decisive action. He never took any decision. But still he allowed satyagrahis to go to Goa. Later on he called a halt. Those who went to Goa to offer satyagraha were caught and they suffered. The whole responsibility for their suffering rests on the shoulders of the Prime Minister; he cannot forget that.

With all the suffering and after all the struggle, the position in Goa or the Goan problem stays where it was. There is no improvement, no progress. We do not know what action the Government is going to take. The Prime Minister simply assures us that he is going to take some action, some decision in the matter, but what is that action or decision?

Thirdly, there is the Commonwealth of nations, a body to which we belong. I have been categorically stating that our association with the Commonwealth is not for our good. As a result of our membership in the Commonwealth we have not achieved any single good. The treatment meted out to us, especially by the United Kingdom, during these past few days has been singularly bad, and our Commonwealth association has not in any way influenced Great Britain while taking a decision on any matter. I feel that our membership has been misconstrued, has been viewed with suspicion by other countries. We are neutral, as we say. If we are neutral, how can we justify our membership in the Commonwealth? I think by remaining in the Commonwealth we are only encouraging colonial tendencies of a few powers. We are used as mere scapegoats or instruments to further their ends. Indirectly, we are only feeding to their ambitions, we are only helping them to commit more blunders against their colonial peoples. Therefore, I think this is the time for

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

review, whether our membership in the Commonwealth should continue or not. The Prime Minister said, if the situation changes for bad, if the policy of the United Kingdom changes, then we may think of seceding from the Commonwealth. But I think this is the right occasion. The United Kingdom has committed a great blunder and I do not think that there would be any benefit by waiting for a little while more. I feel that now itself we should take a decision, and it would be better, it would be fitting to our national prestige and honour that we should cease to be a member of the Commonwealth of nations. I hope that the Prime Minister would consider our views in this matter and decide quickly. So far as we are concerned, we feel that India should not be a member of the Commonwealth.

Finally, Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the House some of the things that are being done in Kashmir. The permit system which has been imposed is not functioning in a satisfactory way. Some people wanted to go to Kashmir and participate in the elections. They wanted to canvass on behalf of our candidates. They were not given permits in time. The Secretary of the Praja Socialist Party had to wait for a long time. He was made to go from office to office for getting the necessary permit. He wanted to go and participate in the elections on behalf of the Party. Unfortunately, he was made to wait and he got the permit only after a very long time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Would that subject be relevant today?

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Yes, because the External Affairs Ministry deals with it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That may be so, but the question is a domestic one.

**Shri Kamath:** Unfortunately, Sir, Jammu and Kashmir is under the External Affairs Ministry portfolio and not under the Home Ministry.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We are not discussing the Ministries here.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** That is true; but the External Affairs Ministry deals with this subject.

**Shri Kamath:** That is the unfortunate, anomalous part of it.

**Th. Lakshman Singh Charak:** (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, I think it is the Defence Ministry which deals with the permit system, and not the External Affairs Ministry.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** I am only making a suggestion, that the permit system should not in any way act as a hindrance to *bona fide* visitors. It should not prevent people who want to go to Kashmir for doing *bona fide* political propaganda on behalf of a particular political party. If such restrictions, such hindrances are placed, I am afraid it will create bitterness in the minds of many and it will not in any way be conducive to the purpose in hand. On the other hand, our foreign enemies may take advantage of it and say, here is a case of gagging, here is a case of arbitrary rule. They may say that what is going on in Kashmir and what is going on in India is not democratic. Therefore, I say, Sir, with all humility, that the permit system should be revised, it should be made more liberal and no political party in India should in any way be put to trouble for doing their party work.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad** (Gaya East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, let me at the outset make a few suggestions to the Government. I hold the opinion that there is a political vacuum in the Middle East. I hold the opinion that there is a political vacuum in South-East Asia. I hold the opinion that there is a political vacuum in Africa. It is no use shutting one's eyes to realities. The danger is not averted by saying that the danger does not exist. The only solution to the problem of Western Asia, Africa and South-East Asia is a federal one. This plan can be pursued, and successfully pursued, by the Government of India. If our Government do not take up this

question in right earnest and do not pursue the federal plan, the only alternative is the domination of South-East Asia and the Middle East and Africa by foreign powers. Let there be no mistake about it. I say that the Government of India can successfully pursue this plan if we make an offer of a federal union to Egypt, to Syria, to Afghanistan, to Indonesia and other countries of South-East Asia and Western Asia. They will all consider this plan seriously. They know that both Russia and America are trying to fill the vacuum in these regions. They will not go near Russia and America if they think that India, honestly and sincerely, is prepared to co-operate on the basis of equality and democracy and socialism. But, if we reject this plan and think that this is a utopian scheme, then disaster will overtake. South-East Asia, Africa and the Middle East, and India in particular will also stand to suffer. Hence, I suggest that the Government of India should make an offer of a federal union to Russia and China. If these countries accept the federal plan, then *ipso facto*, in one long jump, all the countries of South-East Asia and the Middle East and Africa will join the federal plan

14 hrs.

The Prime Minister has been the first man in the country who has been talking about a world federation since the past 20 or 30 years. If a world federation is ever to come into being, then India and China and Russia will have to collaborate and become constituent units. If this plan is a humbug, what will you say to the Prime Minister's dream of a world federation?

I have been suggesting to the Government of India since the last six or seven years that we should enter into a military alliance with China and Russia. Let us make a distinction between alliance and alignment. There is a clear difference between the two. America entered into a military alliance with Russia during the time of the second world war. It did not lead to alignment. It did not lead to communism in America or capitalism in Russia. In 1939, there was a military alliance between Germany and Russia.

It did not lead to fascism in Russia or to communism in Germany. Alliance is only for a limited purpose. The purpose is to ward off certain dangers.

Today this country is standing on the brink of a volcano. We are being daily threatened by our neighbour. At such a juncture, we have committed the mistake of supporting Hungary and opposing Russia. Who will come to our help if Pakistan attacks India? Hungary or Russia? I pause for an answer.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member can continue without pausing.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** Let me put on my spectacles. My sympathies are with Russia and not with Hungary. America is our enemy. If we alienate Russia on the question of Hungary, India's position will be in danger. What will happen to Kashmir today if Russia adopts towards Kashmir the same attitude which we have adopted on the question of Hungary? I am loyal to all noble principles in politics, but above all, I am loyal to mother India. If the military alliance which I am suggesting is formed, there will be no conflict between India and Pakistan. Pakistan must be confronted with the strategy of war on two fronts. I am not in favour of the principle of self-determination for Hungary or for Formosa or for any other country, because I am not in favour of a plebiscite in Kashmir. I am not in favour of self-determination because I do not believe in nation States. Nation States have outlived their utility. The days of the nation States are over. A world federation is the only alternative.

Why do I support Russia and not Hungary? There are many reasons. One main reason is this. If Russia withdraws from Hungary, a political vacuum will be created in Hungary, and this vacuum will be filled by America. Will Russia ever withdraw from Hungary knowing fully well that by so doing they will be facilitating the advent of Americans in Hungary? We seem to be living in a land of lotus-eaters. We seem to ignore realities. By withdrawing from Hungary,

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

the danger of the outbreak of a third world war will increase and not decrease. There is bound to be conflict between Russia and America, if Russia, by any means, any stratagem whatsoever, is compelled to withdraw from Hungary.

There is another reason why I am not in favour of the withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary. What is the lesson of history? The lesson of history is that whenever Russia is check-mated, whenever Russia is frustrated or prevented from expanding in Europe, it expands in Asia. This is the lesson of history. Power expands, it cannot be kept within bounds. If Russia is prevented from expanding in Europe, it will expand in Western Asia, and in Africa. There are no other areas where it can expand. Now, do we want Russian expansionism in Western Asia and Africa, or, do we want Russian expansionism in Europe? This is the only choice before us. If we think that Russia must be made to withdraw both from the east and the west, then, we are not talking something which is political. We are living in a dreamland. May Russia remain involved, may Russia remain entangled in the affairs of Europe for all time to come so that we may have some breathing-time to build up our economy and so that the nations of Asia may grow strong and powerful and become capable of withstanding both Russia and America.

As I said, there are many reasons why I am opposed to the withdrawal of Russia from Hungary. I want to think aloud so that all Members of this House may follow my line of thinking. If Russia withdraws from Hungary, it may be compelled to withdraw from the whole of Eastern Europe. If Russia withdraws from the whole of Eastern Europe; it may be compelled to withdraw from the whole of Asia from Central Asia from Soviet Asia. What will happen to us if Russian power shrinks? I hold the opinion that the condition precedent to our very existence is the mainte-

nance of the independence and the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union.

Three things may follow if Russia is weakened. Tadjikistan, Khirgistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakistan will break off from the Soviet Union and the days of Chengiz Khan, Timur, Ahmed Shah Abdali and Nadir Shah will come back. A political vacuum will be created in this region. India has suffered much at the hands of the invaders from Central Asia—from Mongolia and Turkestan. China and Russia have kept these barbarians under their control and any weakening of the Soviet authority in this region will spell disaster. Hence I support the view that Russia should remain in Hungary and that there should be no withdrawal.

Suppose there is no chaos in Central Asia as a result of the withdrawal of Soviet Russia from Asia; then there is another possibility. The States from Morocco to Indonesia may form one pan-Islamic State. I am not in favour of the establishment of any pan-Islamic State. I am in favour of the political integration of Asia on the basis of secularism, democracy, socialism and federalism. I am opposed to Islamic rule as much as I am opposed to Hindu rule, but I cannot conceive with equanimity the prospect of a pan-Islamic State emerging in Asia.

There is a third possibility, namely, the establishment of American hegemony over the whole of Asia and Africa, if Russia is weakened. I do not stand for the establishment of Russian hegemony or American hegemony, I stand for a world federation, but the danger is lurking. Let us support Russia, so that American hegemony may not overtake us. The coloured races of Asia and Africa will suffer immeasurably if Russia is weakened and American hegemony is established. The establishment of American hegemony will mean the reversal of the process of history. If integration is to be brought about, it can only be brought about by the

collaboration of India, China and Russia. I love the people of America as much as I love the people of this country. I stand for a world federation. I cannot betray my own cause by making any distinction between any two peoples. We are living in a world of realities and I have to function from the platform of the National State. I cannot shut my eyes to realities. It is because of geographical reasons, because of political reasons and because the goal of political integration of Asia is dear to my heart that I support Russia and China and not because of any ideological sympathies. I do not believe in ideology. There is very little difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. Ideology is meant for college professors and students; my outlook is pragmatic. Since we have to function under the present conditions, we have to analyse the political situation correctly.

I hold the opinion that America is not only the enemy of this country, but it is the perturbator of the Age, though it lacks the savings grace of a classical perturbator, which stands for the establishment of a new order. America, on the other hand, stands for the maintenance of the *status quo*. America upholds the cause of the nation State, a cause which has outlived its utility. We are living in the nuclear age in which only a world federation is possible.

**Shri T. K. Choudhury** (Berhampore): I was privileged to address this House a few days ago about the internal conditions in Goa. I spoke facts from my personal experience. As you know, I had been privileged to take part in the freedom struggle of Goa and I had the further privilege of being a prisoner of Dr. Salazar for 19 months.

I am deeply thankful to the Prime Minister for the welcome he has accorded to me and my satyagrahi colleagues, who have come back after our release from Goan prisons. I am still more deeply thankful for the assurances that he has held out

today to the Goan people and to the Goan patriots and freedom fighters that he has not forgotten their case.

I propose today to deal with some aspects of our international policy so far as it relates to Goa. To avoid any misunderstanding, I want to repeat once again my conviction that I do not think it necessary that to solve the Goa problem, Police action or some kind of military action is the only way in which we can move. I made it quite clear the other day when I spoke and I repeat the statement again today. But my complaint against the policy pursued by the Government has been that we have not done all that could be done short of war or military action to secure a peaceful and just solution of the problem of Goa. I know that the mind of the country and the mind of the Government is today very much full of the problem of Kashmir. Certainly the Kashmir problem as it stands today is a far graver problem, so far as India is concerned. But let us not deceive ourselves by thinking that Goa is just a small part of India, a foreign enclave, and that the small problem of small Goa will solve itself automatically, will get resolved in due course, and that we need not worry and exert ourselves very much about it. As matter stand, and as I have been able to study things, of course from inside the prison, it is very clear that the problem of Goa and the problem of Kashmir have become inextricably bound up with each other. With regard to Kashmir, we have to contend with Pakistan. With regard to Goa, we have to contend with Portugal. As the logic of real politics would have it, as the compulsion of real politics would have it, these two countries, Pakistan and Portugal have entered into an open alliance almost so to say, against India. It would be instructive to trace the course of events which led to the formation of this alliance. Perhaps it is not known that the present Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Suhrawardy went on a sort of

[Shri T. K. Choudhury]

health tour or pleasure tour to Goa early in 1955. Of course, he was then the Leader of the Opposition in the Pakistan National Parliament. Some time after that, Mr. Suhrawardy was commissioned by the then Government of Pakistan—it was then being led by Chaudhury Mohammed Ali who was the Prime Minister of Pakistan at that time—although he was the Leader of the Opposition, to undertake a tour of Europe to canvass support for Pakistan with regard to the case of Kashmir. One of the European capitals that he visited in that connection was Lisbon. He held a Press conference in Lisbon and we were privileged to receive Portuguese language papers in the Goan prison, we read what Mr. Suhrawardy said at that time with regard to the problem of Goa. In this way things began to proceed. Recently, the Pakistan Government has opened its embassy in Lisbon and has sent a Trade Commission to Goa. Very soon, it would not be a matter of surprise if a Consulate General of Pakistan is opened there. It is more or less an open secret that Pakistan and Portugal have been supporting each other on a *quid-pro-quo* basis.

I may refer you to the Little Bandung. You know, early last year, various student organisations of Asia and Africa held a meeting in Bandung and perhaps they wanted to revive in some way the Bandung spirit amongst the youth of Asia and Africa. There, the Pakistan student body was represented and that body was sponsored by the Pakistan Government. When the question of Goa was raised there, it could not be discussed because the Pakistan student delegation which was sent there, sponsored by the Pakistan Government, opposed the raising of that matter in that conference. From these indications, you can easily draw your own conclusions. Let us not deceive ourselves into thinking that only Kashmir is important to-day or that only our quarrel with Pakistan is import-

ant, and that so far as Goa is concerned, it is a small matter and we can somehow or other keep it in cold storage and then see if in God's good time we can find a solution for it.

I have often wondered why our great information and Broadcasting machinery and the Press missions which are attached to and which work in close collaboration with our overseas diplomatic missions, have failed to bring certain plain facts before world public opinion. You will read it in the Portuguese press and in the Latin American press Goa being often referred to as a Catholic Christian country. The fact remains that out of the population of Goa of 6½ lakhs, nearly 4½ lakhs are Hindus and nearly 1½ lakhs are Catholic Christians. The fact also remains that of the political prisoners now undergoing sentences in Goan prisons, nearly one-half are Catholic Christians. There are leaders, Catholic Goan patriots, Goan nationalist leaders who, even in their families, do not talk except in Portuguese. Even then, these people have come and joined the movement. These facts should be known to our Government, and to our propaganda department and to the Information and Broadcasting department. May I ask the Government what they have done to bring these facts before world opinion? I know, because British and American papers were allowed to us after lapse of some time in Goan prisons, there is a large volume of public opinion in Britain itself and in America to support the case of India with regard to Goa. What have we done to brief the spokesmen of these sections of public opinion in Europe and America? I have sometimes, while in prison in Goa, tried to compare the attitude of Greece with regard to Cyprus. Mind you, Cyprus is 600 miles distant from the Greek mainland. You know what type of movement is going on there. And yet, Greece, a very small power in Europe, one of the smallest powers in Europe, has shaken the whole fabric of the N.A.T.O. alliance because of Cyprus. What have you done? May I ask Shri

Krishna Menon, who is sitting there, why his incisive diplomatic genius has not been brought to bear upon the solution of this question,—not even upon the solution of this question—I do not ask that much even—why he has not brought to bear the weight of his influence at least in bringing this question before the forum of public opinion? He knows British public opinion. Nobody in this country is more closely and more intimately acquainted with the trends of public opinion in Britain than he is. Our Goan compatriots are looking on with a feeling of helplessness. Even with regard to black Africa, you find a Father Trevor Huddleston or a Father Michael Scott standing up before the world forums and arguing their case. Can we not appeal to the world conscience, that here is a case of six lakhs of unarmed people being crushed under the jankboots of feudal imperialism? I have had the privilege of describing some of the conditions inside Goa. My only regret is that the time at my disposal did not permit me to describe everything that I saw. The Prime Minister was very correct in saying that the sufferings undergone by the Indian nationals are much less and much lighter compared to what the Goan political prisoners have suffered and are suffering. So, what is the use, I ask, simply reiterating that our stand with regard to Goa remains unchanged, that there has been no modification or change. Can we not do something about it? Can we not do something to bring this whole case before world public opinion? There is, I believe, an ample fund of goodwill for India and for India's case with regard to Goa in the world today which can be utilised provided we can place our case intelligently, with cogent facts and figures before world public opinion. As far as I know, up till now only two pamphlets have been published under semi-official sponsorship, one by Dr. Gaitonde and another by Shri A. D. Mani. There was also one article by Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit in the American "Foreign Affairs" to which Dr. Salazar wrote a rejoinder, and there the matter has ended. What

does our delegation in the United Nations do? Why were they not briefed to canvass support at least so far as this matter is concerned, and to bring it before world public opinion? Is it so small a matter that we can sleep over it? That is all that I want to say today.

As I have already said, I do not charge the Government with having failed to take police or military action. Every question in this world is not going to be solved by military and police action, but there are ways and ways of doing things. Unfortunately, I am not able to share the high opinion of our friend Shri Raghuramaiah that because our position in the United Nations is a very important one, we can do nothing about problems like Goa. I think and I believe that, whether our position is an important one or an unimportant one, there are more than one ways of doing things and getting tangible results therefrom. We have neglected those avenues. We have, of course, imposed certain economic restrictions against Goa, against the Portuguese territories, but take it from me—I know the internal conditions—those economic restrictions have not affected their economy in any way, except in so far as the restrictions on monetary remittances from India to Goa are concerned, because many Goans live here and about 30 to 40 thousand families in Goa are dependent on this income. We have succeeded so far in making those poor people who are dependent on money sent from India, suffer, but so far as the over-all supply position of the Portuguese Government is concerned, so far as the over-all supply position of the Goan economy is concerned, we have not been able to do anything because they have an open sea line. There is Aden nearby. They get everything made in India from Aden which is a free port, and Goa is almost a free port, you get things cheaper there. So, let us not delude ourselves that with the idea that we have done all that we could, or that it is a small matter, and therefore it is beneath our prestige or dignity to raise this question every now and then.

[Shri T. K. Choudhury]

before world forums, that we will solve it in due course, that as the French have gone and the Portuguese will also go, so let us sleep over it. I appeal to this House that we should not forget that some 300 political prisoners are undergoing savage sentences on the basis of the assurances that we held out from the floor of this House. The Leader of the House himself gave those assurances when he said that the struggle for freedom for Goa was primarily a concern of the Goan patriots, of Goan citizens and that we shall stand by them in that struggle. The Goan patriots took it up as a challenge. They marched out in the streets with the tri-colour flag in hand, with the Indian National Flag in hand demanding the independence of Goa. Those people have been put in prison. Twenty-two youngmen, who were your own citizens, your own nationals, were shot. Their corpses were not allowed to be brought back. Petrol was poured down over those corpses and they were burnt. Are we simply to sit silent over all this and say that we have not forgotten Goa? That is all that I want to ask today.

I again appeal to the conscience of this House, and to the moral conscience of the country. The Goan people have done their duty by India. I appeal to this House and I appeal to the people of India; let us do our duty by our Goan brothers and sisters.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad):** My hon. friend Shri T. K. Chaudhury has dealt at length with the Goa question, and I have no doubt that the whole House has full sympathy with what he has said, but there is one thing which he has mentioned in his speech regarding the work done by our U. N. delegation regarding Goa. With all respect to my friend, I do not think that what he has said, namely that our delegation at the United Nations did not canvass support for the question of Goa, is correct.

First of all, I feel that it is not the duty or the function of the delegation

to canvass support on such an issue, but when such an issue did come up we all know that our representatives did all that they could.

As far as publicity regarding Goa is concerned whether in the United Nations or outside or through our representatives in other countries, I entirely agree that there has been dearth of publicity with regard to our viewpoint, and it has also been pointed out earlier by other friends that our viewpoints, whether they were on Goa or on Kashmir, have not been properly put across to the other countries, they have not been properly understood by the peoples of other countries—not at the United Nations. So far as our publicity in foreign countries through our missions is concerned, I entirely agree with my friend Shri T. K. Chaudhury, because those of us who have had the opportunity of travelling in foreign countries, or have had the opportunity of meeting people coming from other countries—journalists and others who travel a lot and who have an opportunity of studying things—find that there is a complete misunderstanding or lack of understanding about our viewpoints on such issues as Goa and Kashmir, and therefore I would suggest that there is definitely a great deal to be done in this regard. Our viewpoint has to be put across not only at the United Nations where, of course, it has been done by our representatives so ably, and every one knows about it, but something more should be done by way of sending journalists, delegations or parliamentarians, or by adopting any other means to put this across.

It has also been said, and I think quite rightly, that one of the reasons why we have failed in putting across our point of view through our missions with regard to Kashmir and Goa is our social tradition, the Hindu social tradition if I may say so with all respect. I refer to our narrow social traditions and our habit of not associating ourselves with people in other countries. That has been one

of the complaints which many of us have received.

**Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar):** I object to the use of the word 'narrow' for Hindu social traditions

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If that be his opinion, how can I help it? There is freedom of speech here, and everybody can express his opinion. The hon. Member, when he gets his opportunity, may contradict it.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** I do not wish to offend the Hindu religion which is also my religion. But what I would like to point out is that there are certain aspects of our religion which are certainly narrow and which have been recognised as such, and I was only trying to point out the narrowness of those aspects.

**Shri Nand Lal Sharma:** I am certain that the hon. Member has not tested enough of the religion.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** I do not wish to enter into this controversy over religion. But what I would like to say is that this matter has been dealt with in our press and also outside. The foreign press has also dealt with this question fairly at length, and some of the foreign journalists who have come to our country have also referred to this matter. When we discussed this question with them and we asked them why our viewpoint had not been understood, they told us that it was because of our narrow outlook, the narrow outlook of the Hindus, owing to which there was the difficulty of our associating ourselves freely with the foreigners. It is a recognised fact that long ago, the orthodox Hindus did not allow their people to go outside India, and if any persons who had gone outside India returned to India later on, they were considered as polluted, and so on. This is one of the reasons why our viewpoint has not been understood properly. That is why I say that something must be done as far as our publicity outside India is concerned.

There is a charge made by the Opposition Members that we pay more attention to the far-off countries rather than nearer home, that is, that we pay more attention to international affairs rather than to affairs nearer home. I feel that that is inevitable in a way, as has been repeatedly pointed out by our Prime Minister, on account of our concern for world peace and co-operation, on account of the most basic principle of our foreign policy, namely that we have to be the champions of anti-colonialism, that we have to be the champions of anti-racialism, and that we have to try and establish peace and co-operation in the world. If we go away from this, then naturally it is not possible for us to carry on the work within the country very peacefully and improve the condition of our people.

So, it is a wrong charge to say that we are thinking too much of foreign countries, that we are thinking of Korea, we are sending our missions to Korea, or that we are trying to solve the problems in Korea, Indo-China, Egypt or the Suez or Hungary.

While referring to Hungary, one of my friends here mentioned that he did not want Russian troops to withdraw from Hungary because that would result in the withdrawal of Russian troops from all over the world, from Asia and from elsewhere. In the same breath, my hon. friend, who belongs to the same party as mine said that America was our enemy. I was very sorry to hear him say that. He further went on to say that there should be a federal union, and in the same breath he added that we should have a military alliance. And he made a very fine nuance between military alliance and military alignment. I really do not understand how a Member of the calibre of Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, who has made a deep study of foreign affairs, could make such an unfair statement, because the whole basis of our foreign policy, as has been repeatedly pointed out by our Prime Minister,

[Dr. Suresh Chandra]

is against pacts, military alliances and military alignments; on the other hand, our policy is to seek co-operation and friendship from every country in the world. So, I fail to appreciate his argument that we should have a military alliance with China or Russia or any other country because we have some imaginary fear from Pakistan.

As our Prime Minister has pointed out time and again, we should not have any fear at all. Neither in home affairs nor in international affairs need we have any fear. That is the one lesson which has been taught to us by our leader, by the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi. So, though there is some kind of danger, and there is also the cry of *jehad* and war in the neighbouring country, yet we need have no fear. We should be prepared, and we are, I think, militarily and otherwise, prepared to meet any challenge from any country.

Therefore, I feel that the policy which has been pursued by our Prime Minister is a policy which is admirable not only for us but which is also admired by other countries and followed also by other countries. I feel that the foreign policy which is now being pursued is the ideal policy which is suited to the conditions of our country.

It was stated by Shri M. S. Guruswamy and one or two other hon. Members previously that foreign policy is not a party policy but a national policy. Shri M. S. Guruswamy himself has stated that it is a national policy, and it being so, he has urged that the Opposition Parties also should be consulted in the framing of this policy. I do not know how far I can agree with him on the question of consultation with the Opposition on a matter like this. It is for the Prime Minister to frame this policy, whether it be the Prime Minister of this Government or any

other, whether it be our Prime Minister or a Prime Minister from the Opposition, if ever that opportunity comes. It is for the Prime Minister to decide the foreign policy. As far as consultation is concerned, I think it is being done already. I think my hon. friend is not unaware of the foreign affairs consultative committee which the Prime Minister had set up on his own and also on the suggestion of the Opposition leaders. That committee has functioned properly.

My hon. friend has also suggested that there should be a permanent statutory committee in regard to the appointment of ambassadors and others. I feel that there is some reason to accept this suggestion. I think it would be a good thing if we have some kind of a committee which could review foreign affairs, and also be of some help to the Prime Minister in the appointment of ambassadors.

My hon. friend has attacked the present mode of appointment of ambassadors. He has urged that there is need for more appointments from outside the services. I also feel that it is not the absolute monopoly of wisdom and intelligence of our services to represent our country outside, though I do agree that we should really be proud of some of our men in the services who have very ably represented our country abroad. At the same time, I feel that the services of persons who are not officials but who at the same time are eminent in public life should also be utilised for this purpose.

With regard to our relations with the Commonwealth, the Prime Minister has said today that there is reason for us to review them and he also has said that he feels that it is good for us to continue these relations with the Commonwealth. At the same time, he mentioned new countries—very great countries—of Africa and Asia which are becoming members of the Commonwealth. Ghana, former Gold Coast, is now a member. We hope that Malaya, Nigeria and some other

countries also will become part of the Commonwealth. When these countries become part of the Commonwealth, naturally it will be a very good thing for India to be there, and I am sure that our relations with the Commonwealth will also improve.

I certainly agree that there have been stresses and strains in our relations with the Commonwealth, especially Britain. I feel the time has come when we should review and seriously think what we should do in regard to this. We admit that we should be in the Commonwealth, but something should be done, because there is a strong public opinion in this country after what has happened on the question of Suez and the debate on Kashmir in the United Nations. When India, which had been under British rule for two centuries, achieved its independence by peaceful means and established the friendliest of relations with Great Britain, we expected that Great Britain would also reciprocate these feelings of friendliness. But unfortunately during those discussions and on certain other occasions—in the United Nations and elsewhere—we have seen that Britain has failed in her duty to India to show friendliness. Therefore, there has been great justifiable resentment against Great Britain.

So I would urge the Prime Minister to review and reconsider our ties with the Commonwealth and with Britain so that we may not be left in the lurch at a time when we think that because of our relationship and our connection with the Commonwealth, we can count on Great Britain.

I feel that we should pay a great tribute to our Prime Minister for having pursued the foreign policy of this country in a most admirable manner. At the same time, on behalf of this House, I feel that we should also pay a very high tribute to Shri Krishna Menon who had very ably led our delegation and who had in the most able manner presented our case on Kashmir and other issues in the United Nations. In spite of jealousies raised by some interested people and interested countries, we

are proud of our Prime Minister, and we are proud of our Krishna Menon, whose activities were observed and whose speeches were listened to and whose speeches were listened to fore, I am sure that the House will join me in this.

**Th. Lakshman Singh Charak:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are today discussing at the fag-end of the first Parliament, the foreign policy of our Government. We are discussing not only the foreign policy of the last few months when we had a debate in this House but the foreign policy that has been pursued by our country ever since independence.

The foreign policy of our Government is based on the first resolution of the All India Congress Committee passed in 1921, in which it was proclaimed that the foreign policy followed by Britain did not in any way represent the interests of the Indian people and India, and apprised the neighbouring countries that they should have nothing to fear from India. As soon as India became independent, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, our Prime Minister, made it clear that independent India would continue to follow the great moral principles enunciated by Gandhiji. That policy further put into action meant the peaceful policy of non-alignment with any power bloc. In the modern western ways of thinking, this policy sounded strange to everyone in the western world. The western world, during the first and second world wars, had got used to alignments and pacts to such an extent that the isolationist policy followed by the United States of America had to be abandoned, and America was dragged into the first and second world wars.

But the architect of our foreign policy thought of it in a different line altogether. He felt—and he feels even now—that wars would not solve any problems, but would create fresh problems. Therefore, wars have to be eliminated and humanity has to be saved from destruction, since with present nuclear research, modern war has been put on entirely new bases, where

[Th. Lakshman Singh Charak]

one atom bomb can kill millions of people. War, in the present age, would mean complete annihilation of the human race. In spite of the experiences of the second world war in which two atom bombs used by the U.S.A. completely destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan, still the western world could not understand our point of view. They misunderstood us as visionary people with no experience, forgetting that although India is a young nation as far as freeing ourselves from the British yoke is concerned, it is a nation with a great past, where the ancient sages of India believed in peaceful co-existence.

The great emperor Ashok did not send armies to conquer people, but missionaries to preach love and goodwill. Our Prime Minister followed in the footsteps of the great ancient Indians of the past to build up our modern foreign policy. Although we were misunderstood in the beginning, under our wise leadership, the political stature of India has risen year by year. Now we have come to a point where our views and criticism are respected in the comity of nations. But the fact remains that this is a very difficult path. As we have noticed during the last ten years, at times even our best friends have often misunderstood us.

We are proud that under our wise leadership, we have been able to contribute quite a great deal for fostering world peace. In the Korean war, for the first time in the history of the Indian army, our troops were used for peaceful purposes. It was a very difficult task, and a thankless task at that. But I must say that under our wise leadership, our soldiers and officers behaved in a very admirable manner, of which we are all proud. This fact will always be remembered with admiration in the modern age.

In Laos and Cambodia, our representatives from the civil side and from the army performed, and are still performing, very good work, about which we are happy indeed.

15 hrs.

During 1956, Egypt took a momentous decision in nationalising the Suez Canal Company, which brought about a major crisis in the Middle East. Egypt as a sovereign nation had every right to nationalise any business within its territory which she thought to be in her own interest. On the other side, this was, of course, very much resented in France and Great Britain, who were the chief shareholders of the Suez Canal Company. India took a leading part in trying to settle the dispute between the users of the Canal and the Egyptian Government.

But unfortunately no agreed solution could be found to the satisfaction of both the parties. The situation deteriorated day by day and Israel started a small-scale war against Egypt on some border dispute, which was followed after a few weeks by an attack by Great Britain and France after an ultimatum of 24 hours. This naked aggression by two powerful European countries on a small country like Egypt shook the conscience of the whole world. There were protests even in Britain and there was resentment among all the parties there. A resolution was moved by Cuba, India and U.S.A. in the Security Council calling upon Great Britain and France to desist from further aggression. India and U.S.A. took a prominent part in it. Our representative Shri Krishna Menon spared no time and energy in helping to stop further war, which might have developed into a world conflict, but unfortunately the British diehards felt that India had overdone her part in the U.N.O. against Britain and in the Conservative papers it was clearly stated that India should be taught a lesson. No one in India took this matter seriously because everyone had faith in the British goodwill towards India. For after all India had no personal axe to grind, but only wanted to help in the cause of peace. It was even suggested by many Conservatives in Great Britain that in the Kashmir matter, Britain should sup-

port Pakistan against India. To the surprise of everyone in India, Pakistan politicians once against started the propaganda of hatred against us. The cry of 'Jehad' was raised once again and an application was made to the Security Council by Pakistan stating that India was finally going to close the Kashmir issue, because the Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly was finalizing its constitution. Sir Feroze Khan Noon, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan was chosen to represent this view in the Security Council. Following in the foot-steps of the former Foreign Minister, Sir Zafrullah Khan, Sir Feroze made all sorts of allegations possible against India. It did not surprise the students of history in India, when Sir Feroze Khan spoke in those terms, for it was he who used to condemn in season and out of season the stalwarts of the Indian independence movement in the British period. With the help of the colleagues of the Baghdad Pact, Sir Feroze was able to get a resolution passed very hurriedly in the Security Council, as if something extraordinary was going to happen in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

Our Prime Minister had always been saying that the formation of power blocs and the signing of pacts does not improve the situation, as far as war is concerned, but rather creates cold war. But as I have said before, this was not paid much heed to and the U.S.A. promised to give military aid to Pakistan. Our country has been getting economic aid from the U.S.A., for which we are no doubt grateful, but with the military aid that was being given to Pakistan the balance of power has much changed. We do not want to divert most of our money like our neighbour, Pakistan, towards armaments. We wanted that money to be spent in the building of dams and community projects, and to raise the standard of living of the average person in India. As I said the balance of power has been upset and we are in a quandary as to how to meet the situation, in order that we may defend our frontiers very well. Although military aid was given to Pakistan, we

were given an assurance by the President of the U.S.A. that they would not be used against India. We accept that with all due respect to the great President of the U.S.A., but immediately contradictory statements were being made, and are even now being made by the Pakistan politicians that they have joined the Baghdad Pact and other Pacts to safeguard themselves from the neighbouring country, i.e., India. What our Prime Minister has been often saying, i.e., that the pacts do not improve the world situation but creates cold war, has come very true.

When the resolution on Kashmir was being implemented in the Security Council, Sir Feroze with the help of his friends of the Baghdad Pact, made the Members of the Security Council believe that something extraordinary was going to happen in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. We in Jammu and Kashmir have now a feeling that with the American aid, Pakistan wants to take over Kashmir and many a time it has been confirmed by the irresponsible speeches made by Pakistan politicians. India registered a case in the Security Council in 1948, for the act of aggression, Pakistan has committed against the territory of Kashmir which had in fact and law acceded to India in 1947. The people of Jammu and Kashmir cannot be bartered for one interest or the other, but have clearly through their chosen representatives, confirmed the legal accession of Jammu and Kashmir by the Maharaja, who had signed the Instrument of Accession on the 26th October, 1947. The Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly on the 26th January, 1957, dissolved itself and thus completed her task of framing a Constitution declaring Kashmir as an integral part of the Republic of India. Sir Feroze unnecessarily created some panic before the Security Council in making the Members believe that something extraordinary was proposed to be done on the 26th January, 1957.

I may also mention here that the National Conference was returned in Jammu and Kashmir by an overwhelming majority in the general elec-

[Th. Lakshman Singh Charak]

tions in 1951, on the mandate of accession to India and its chosen representatives in the Constituent Assembly formally confirmed the accession on the 17th November, 1956.

Elections have been ordered recently in Jammu and Kashmir State under the new Constitution of the State on the basis of adult franchise. Many of the representatives of the National Conference, which has been the spear-head of the liberation movement during the past decades, have been returned unopposed. The polling for the other seats to the State Assembly will be over by the end of this month. I have no doubt that the Conference nominees would be returned with an overwhelming majority.

Anyone who has any doubt as to how the elections are being held in Kashmir is free to go and see for himself how impartially the elections are being held. He will also see the progress that has been made during the past decade with the aid generously given by the Central Government and look at the condition of our people in the so-called "Azad Kashmir" by way of contrast. Then he would understand the demand of the people for the liberation of the Pak-occupied part of Jammu and Kashmir. Our only plea to the Government of India is that efforts should be made through the good offices of the Security Council, to liberate the area occupied by Pakistan as early as possible. The condition of our brethren there, economically, politically and socially is as bad as that of slaves, and our hearts go out to them in their sorrow and suffering. We are prepared for the maximum sacrifice required to liberate our people in the so-called "Azad Kashmir Area", so that they can also come back to our country and live there as free citizens of India.

In the end, I may mention that vile propaganda is being carried on by Pakistan on the "Azad Kashmir Radio" and efforts are being made once again to create that feeling of provincialism and communalism in Jammu and Kashmir. I may inform the House that

in 1947 young volunteers of the National Conference took upon themselves to safeguard the City of Srinagar when the raiders were within seven miles of the city. They were ill clad, ill fed and ill armed but they fought side by side with the Indian Army as soon as it landed in Kashmir.

Now, we are better organized everywhere and in every respect. Dogras and Kashmiris are united under the banner of the National Conference and the Indian National Congress. These old dogmas will not stir us the least. I might say that if—God forbid—Pakistan by any chance makes the mistake of attacking Jammu and Kashmir, we will one and all fight for every inch of our soil and safeguard it.

One point raised by Shri Gurupadaswamy from the Opposition was about the permit system that exists in Jammu and Kashmir. May I take the opportunity of mentioning here that it was at the express desire of the Jammu and Kashmir Government that the Ministry of Defence took upon themselves the issuing of permits for people going there. I agree with him cent per cent, that if everything is normal in Jammu and Kashmir there would not be any need for this permit system. But, let us not forget that the cease-fire line is there and half of our territory is with Pakistan and that the cease-fire line is not a natural boundary. It is just an artificial boundary created for a specific purpose and for a particular time. Infiltration one way or the other is very easily possible. We see raids everyday happening there. Let our friends here in this House and outside understand that as soon as normalcy is restored, at the earliest opportunity, the Jammu and Kashmir Government will cancel this permit system. They would not like to keep this permit system when it is not required. After all, how can the Jammu and Kashmir Government check people going there? Even last summer we had more than 50,000 visitors there. We do not stop anyone from going there. But the permit system is the only system by which we can know who can be allowed and who

ought not to be allowed. It might have been a misfortune that the Secretary of the P.S.P. might have had a delay of one or two days in getting this permit. But, I can assure the House that it must have been a mistake or oversight. Otherwise, I do not think anybody would like to stand in the way. (*Interruption*). If the *bona fides* are correct, I do not see any reason why anybody should object to anyone going to Jammu and Kashmir.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi** (Chittor): Mr. Chairman, the first thing that should strike all of us is this that when all is said and done we must not forget the day when our prestige was at stake in the U. N. Security Council. On that fateful day the bankruptcy of our international policy became patent to the world when they passed the Pakistan resolution against us by 10 votes to zero. It is with that background we must judge where we stand before the world to day. It is quite true that we do not want to enter into a war; it is quite true that we do not want to take any police action. But, there are smaller States from which we have to learn many things. We have had the example of Greece cited by my friend Shri T. K. Chaudhuri. We have the example of Egypt kicking out the British, a very powerful nation. We have the example of Iran kicking out the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company.

**The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of External Affairs** (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): What about India kicking out the British?

**Shri U. M. Trivedi**: Let Shri Sadath Ali Khan know that we did not kick the British. We wanted to keep them and kept Lord Mountbatten until June 1948. India got freedom not because we kicked the British out but because they wanted to go and they went. Do not take too much pride in it.

Somehow or other we see in this world there are people who know how to tell lies and tell them very well and succeed. Even when the truth is on our side, we have miserably failed to place the truth before

the world. Pakistan which has unabashedly practised genocide in Pakistan against the Hindus was the first to sponsor the resolution on genocide in the United Nations. Today Sir Feroze Khan Noon comes out with a statement that we practise genocide in the Naga Hills. We have not got the courage to expose these people who have carried on genocide at all places. Even in Azad Kashmir they have not hesitated to do it and they are not hesitating to do it in East Bengal which is under them and even in Pakistan where few Hindus are still left. We make no exposure of these men. We try to fight a very defensive game. Even an ordinary lawyer knows that possession is nine-tenths of law. Notwithstanding that position, we went to file a suit for a declaration that we had some right. Instead of the court before which we went declaring that we had some right, it found that we had done something wrong. (*Interruption*). You do not know history. The difficulty is this. If we are going to close our eyes and do not appreciate facts we can talk anything like that. But, we have still to remember that we did go to the United Nations Security Council. And, the result was that the aggression by Pakistan which we wanted to be declared was not declared and has not been done so far. On the contrary, we have been faced with the issue, 'What about the plebiscite which you promised?' Things have been so shaped that though we had the right we have been put in the wrong. There must be a limit to our patience, to tolerate such things.

**Shri B. S. Murthy** (Eluru): Yes.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi**: We must tell them that this is no business of theirs, plebiscite or no plebiscite. What kind of plebiscite is wanted? Did the whole of India have a plebiscite whether Pakistan should remain with India or not? We never held such a plebiscite. We allowed Pakistan to go; we allowed our country to be divided. We were not allowed to take a plebiscite in Karachi where

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

more than 60 per cent were Hindus. All that is past history. We should do away with the question of plebiscite once and for all. Let us say so. Accession is there; historically, (Shri B. S. Murthy: Constitutionally) constitutionally and otherwise Kashmir is part of India. Is it the people living in Azad Kashmir which has been invaded by them who are to decide? Are not the people living in Kashmir on this side going to express their opinion? They have decided it. They have freely decided to unite with India. They are the people for whom we have spent large sums of money, crores and crores of rupees. Once they have decided, are we going to have a plebiscite? We must tell the world as loudly as we can that there is no question of plebiscite now.

It is really our weak policy that has unnecessarily driven our friends like the United States and the United Kingdom to the other extreme. I do not know whether there are any friends with us—in the United States or in the United Kingdom. There are some; but it is our policy which has been responsible for not creating the atmosphere favourable to us. Do we lack in lawyers who put our cases properly? Is that the drawback from which we are suffering? It is up to us to say that we are in the right. We are in the right; and if a truthful case cannot be presented by us forcefully, God help us if we had a weak case.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** It is not enough to be in the right but we convince others.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** That is what I want to say.

Here, there is the question of Goa. Our Prime Minister says he is optimistic about it; that within a short time—he would take some Members of the Opposition also into confidence and consult them and tell them what he will do—something will be done. That 'soon' has been happening for the last ten years; it is not

going to happen and I am not going to believe in it. We must take stock of the position that Goa is not part and parcel of Portugal although Portugal claims that it is part and parcel of Portugal, but it is part and parcel of India, geographically, historically and factually. Portugal, which is such a small country, not even as big as one of the native States of India before their integration with India, has the cheek to tell us from that distance that Goa is part and parcel of Portugal. We see that Greece can say that Cyprus is part and parcel of Greece. Cypriots are crying for their own independence, the independence of the type that the Greeks are enjoying. It is the Greek patriots who are carrying on the struggle. But we have not got a weak case like that: we have a strong case, Goans being Indians. In regard to our advertisements calling for applicants for posts in India, the nationals of Goa are allowed all the facilities to be treated as nationals of our country. We treat them as our nationals and nothing is denied to them. But one thing that we are denying to them is the strong force of India which can within one day, even within one hour I should say, drive out the Portuguese into the seaboard. Just at the borders of Goa we are not using that force, and that force we will have to use. We cannot sit tight and allow our countrymen there to rot in prison. Enough suffering has been undergone by my hon. friend, Shri T. K. Chaudhuri, by Shri Jagannath Rao Joshi and Rajya Bhau Mahankar, who were held in prison and so many others also have suffered. We cannot allow these things to go on like this. To have a satyagraha you do require a civilised nation; but are the Portuguese a civilised nation? These are the people who held inquisitions and who destroyed human beings. It is from such people that we expect that they will value satyagraha! They are not the persons who value it. They are persons of the sadistic type who must be taught a proper

lesson by beating, and they do deserve a beating at our hands and we must drive them out. The sooner we do it the better for our prestige; the sooner we do it the better for our countrymen who are behind bars. It may be considered as impolitic, but what I say is not impolitic. What did the Egyptians do overnight? They said: agreement or no agreement, we will not allow your ships to pass through the Suez Canal as it is nationalised. A small country like Egypt which resented was able to do so. Are we not in a position to do that much? If we could do this with Hyderabad, what prevents us from doing it in Goa? We are allowing the opportunity to grow in favour of Pakistan on account of this, and Pakistan is taking advantage, full advantage, of this position.

There are some friends who say that the whole question of Pakistan being an aggressor is imaginary. I do not know of any such thing where, having known the facts, we are still able to close our eyes and say that it is all imaginary. We are suffering; forty lakhs of our people have been driven across the border into our territory and they are not being kept in their own places. We all forget what took place at the time of the partition of this country—*inimical to the core*—and everything that is being uttered by Pakistan is of that type. I do not think that anybody can be a greater friend of the Muslim of Pakistan than our present Prime Minister; he is the best friend that they have. Yet against this gentleman, they have risen as one man to cry against him and burn his effigy. And we have tolerated it. Only two days back, there was a big uproar in the Pakistan Assembly because Pandit Nehru's name was uttered—a great blasphemy because Pandit Nehru's name was uttered there. It is with such people that all that we are saying is imaginary. There is nothing imaginary; concrete facts are placed there. Goa and Portugal are being pushed and backed up by Pakistan, and by nobody else. It is on this question of Pakis-

tan that the whole question revolves. The question of Kashmir and the question of Goa, both are today interlinked, and we must wake up to the position and should not tolerate this aggressive attitude of anybody, whosoever it may be, against India.

We must not forget that in this world, as the Prime Minister was remarking, there are two big powers, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Republic. Both are very powerful, but everyone in the world is afraid today of atomic warfare and the small nations have taken stock of the position. That is why they have done what they want to do so far as their own personal interests are concerned. Now we are being counted as a big nation. No doubt, we have not got big guns, big atomic weapons, a big army consisting of millions and millions of people. Yet we can rise to the occasion if the country demands it, and millions and millions of people here will be ready to sacrifice their lives. After all, human beings do count. This factor counted in the Korean War, and the human factor is always the determining factor so far as war is concerned. It cannot be forgotten that for all times to come, the human factor will count. The human factor is there in India and it is our greatest bulwark.

What we demand is justice. We want that justice should be done. We do not want to be dishonest. At the same time, we should not tolerate any injustice to be perpetrated against our country.

**Acharya Kripalani** (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): The foreign affairs debate comes in this House so often that there is very little that remains to be said. I have often said that I am in complete agreement with the basic principles of our foreign policy and these are that we stand for peace, that we are against colonialism, whether it is of the old trans-oceanic type or of the new type by which some countries nibble at their neighbours and put them behind the iron curtain. We have also often said that

[Acharya Kripalani]

in the cold war that is going on between two big powers, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., we do not align ourselves with any party. All these are very nice principles to which even our opponents can have no objection. Often our Prime Minister has said, he has repeatedly said, that war under present circumstances solves no problems, that it creates more problems than it solves. This is a general proposition which, on the face of it, cannot be denied. But, if we go a little deeper, we shall see that these abstract general propositions do not apply to concrete situations.

Take for instance the example of Pakistan and India. Suppose Pakistan was mad enough to invade India on the Kashmir issue or on any other issue, I am sure we will be able to defend ourselves and our country. But there will be war. Will that war decide any question or not? I am afraid that it will decide a question. It will decide a very big question that it will throw out the Pakistan armies. We shall retain our independence.

It is absurd to say in the world today that war cannot solve any problems. It may afterwards create new problems but that often happens in the world. The world is always full of problems. You solve one problem and another problem comes up. I humbly submit that only Mahatma Gandhiji could say that war solves no problem because he had a substitute for war. He had discovered a substitute for war. When we have not discovered a substitute and are not willing to utilise the substitute, that Gandhiji placed before us can we say that war solves no problems? We did not use this substitute in the case of Goa even when our people were willing to try the experiment. Now, it does not lie in our mouth to say that war solves no problems. We may be invaded at any time and there will be war. We will go into that war in the expect-

tation that war will solve certain problems.

I say it is no use merely enunciating abstract principles to which few people can object. Unfortunately we go on repeating these abstract propositions from day to day as if that is the essence of our foreign policy. I have said on a previous occasion that foreign policy is not concerned only with the enunciation of abstract principles but also with proper strategy and proper tactics. If these are wanting, the general propositions, however well-meant and however pious, do not carry us far. And I am afraid that our tactics and our strategy have not been such that have given us any advantage. A country that stands for peace, that stands for neutrality, that does not take sides in the cold war, would be the country whose policy would be appreciated by all concerned.

15-34 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

There are neutral countries in Europe. Nobody says anything against them. Nobody misunderstands them. They have made no enemies. Why is it that, when we take no sides, when we are neutral and when we stand for peace, when we stand for disarmament, it is often said—I hold rightly said—that we have no friends. Our friends here, those who had been to the United Nations, tell us that we occupy a very honoured and very powerful position in the counsels of the world. What is the result of that powerful position? We are appreciated. People honour us. But, when it comes to brass-tacks, what is the result?

In the case of Kashmir, we had no friends at all. Also in the case of Goa, we have not been able to convince the members of the UNO that our demand is right and legitimate. I really do not see how this happens, when we stand for peace, when we stand for no alignment with power

blobs, when our intentions are so good and aboveboard? Why should there be so much prejudice against us?

May I submit that we have taken upon ourselves too big a job? We speak as if we are the only country that stands for peace, that we want to bring about and establish this peace and that we are pioneers in this movement. This is arrogating to ourselves too much. All the people in the world—I suppose all the Governments—want these things. What is it that prevents them from acting in a way which would bring about these things? It is, may I submit the situation in the international world. Every nation has to safeguard primarily its own interests and also to save itself from any possible danger. There is no other objective in international diplomacy. People are not out like Gandhiji or Buddha or Christ to establish peace on earth. They think that it is too much for them and it would be sufficient if they are able to safeguard their interests and see that there is no danger to those interests.

It is from these points of view that they enter into military pacts outside the UNO. We denounce these pacts and I think rightly too. Having had our say, I think we must remain silent because the countries that go into those pacts go with open eyes. Especially, the small European countries and the Asiatic countries go with open eyes. They know that these military pacts curtail some of their sovereignty. But, why do they do it? We must appreciate their reasons. It is because they are afraid, because they want to safeguard their own interests. It is enough for us to point out to them that if they are going to have these military pacts, the greatest injury is done to the UNO. That organisation cannot gain strength which it ought to gain, if these military pacts are formed. But, even then, we cannot even blame these because we ourselves know to our own cost that the

UNO is not a very impartial organisation. As our Prime Minister has said several times, it is riddled, as was its predecessor, the League of Nations, with power politics. If it is so, naturally people cannot rely merely on the UNO and the result is military pacts.

But, we have made our position quite clear about these pacts. I do not think it is necessary on all occasions to repeat that people who enter into these pacts are cursed and that they have some vicious design and so on. We may not enter into those pacts. We should make our point clear and leave it at that.

I have said that the enunciation of abstract principles does not carry us far. We have seen that we have not gained anything so far as our immediate interests are concerned. Whether it is in Goa, or in Pakistan, or Kashmir, or any trouble on our borders, wherever our interests are concerned our diplomacy has failed. Far be it from me to say it has suffered because of any fault of ours, because between India and Pakistan I do not believe we have been at fault. I believe that Pakistan has been at fault. So also, in the case of Goa it is the Portuguese that have been at fault. But what is the meaning of successful diplomacy, if having a case that is as clear as daylight we are not able to put it through to the nations of the world? The nations of the world do not accept our point of view though it is clear. Diplomacy means that when you have a case you are able to put it through, at least for the neutrals, at least for those who are not very much prejudiced and are able to appreciate the truth. I am afraid that our diplomacy has failed to show to the world the rightness of our cause wherever our own interests are concerned. I remember, a great English politician once said that "England has no friends but only interests." I am afraid we seem to have neither interests nor friends in spite of our good wishes all round.

[Acharya Kripalani]

Another thing that I would like to mention is why do not other nations as often repeat the general principles of peace and of goodwill as we do. I have an idea that each one of them has some skeleton in the cupboard. They do certain things that are good and, yet, the next moment they do certain things that are doubtful. Therefore, perhaps they cannot mouth like us repeatedly these general principles and when we do they think we are hypocrits. Take for instance America. America did very well in not supporting the invasion of Egypt by England and France. Having done that good deed it wanted to occupy the position that England occupied in Western Asia, and it has enunciated the Eisenhower Doctrine of some vacuum in West Asia which America is to fill. Take England. England did the most foolish thing. It did the greatest injury to democracy when it joined France and invaded Egypt. Take the other side of the picture. Half of England, the whole Labour Party repudiated that action. Afterwards England has liberated a colony of their's in Africa. Take Egypt. We were quite justified in extending our support to Egypt, in condemning the aggression of France, England and Israel. But then, if we look at Egypt itself, what has it been doing? It has repudiated in the past the resolutions passed by the United Nations Organisation. It refused to recognise, recognise the existence of Israel. It always said that it was at war with Israel even when there was cease-fire. It has continued to be at war. It organises the Arab world. Against whom? Principally against Israel. There is no doubt that the way in which Israel was established in Palestine was a great injustice done to the Arabs. In 1946 Gandhiji said: "The Jews err grievously in seeking to impose themselves on Palestine with the aid of England and America". But now it will be politically unwise to question the existence of Israel.

Thus you see that each nation has some skeleton in the cupboard; and therefore the nations of the world think that we too have something to conceal. They feel they have found what we have to conceal. They have found it in Kashmir. Why do they think that they have found that in Kashmir we have something which does not accord with the principles that we have been loudly proclaiming? Is it because the western countries are in a malicious league against us? If there is a conspiracy against us I believe it is an unconscious one. I do not believe that the western nations are deliberately ranged against us. However I believe that certain of our own utterances have given a wrong impression. The emphasis has been put sometimes on one aspect and sometimes on another aspect of the issue. Sometimes we said as if, whether we meant it or not, the Kashmir question would be decided by a plebiscite, and often we put only a portion of our case and did not put the whole case before the world.

We have been at fault. Today we say we have no doubt that Kashmir is a part and parcel of India. But what do we do here in India? There are two Prime Ministers, one is Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and the other is Bakshi Gulam Mohammed. I do not know of a country where there are two Prime Ministers. I do not know—I stand to correction—if there is any country in the world where there are two Prime Ministers, two constitutions, and in certain essentials....

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** Is it not a fact that Northern Ireland is associated with the United Kingdom and has got its own Prime Minister?

**Acharya Kripalani:** The hon. Member's knowledge may be more than mine; I humbly said that I want to be informed. If you say that in Ireland there are two Prime Ministers .....

**Shri Joachim Alva:** Not in Ireland, in Northern Ireland associated with the United Kingdom.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am yet to learn that in the United Kingdom there are two Prime Ministers.

**Shri Krishna Menon:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there are seven Prime Ministers in Australia.

**Acharya Kripalani:** There are seven Prime Ministers in Australia, but they are all Prime Ministers. Here all others are Chief Ministers and only one is a Prime Minister. That is, we ourselves make a distinction so far as Kashmir is concerned.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** It is a distinction in degree.

**Acharya Kripalani:** It is a distinction always in degree, degrees make kind. What I want to say is that you may be justified in having two Prime Ministers but a foreigner is likely to get a wrong impression. You cannot blame the foreigner if he thinks that as yet India is not quite sure whether Kashmir is a part and parcel of India as other States are. I do not say that they are right, but I say the appearance is given, by having two constitutions and having two Prime Ministers, to an impartial foreigner that there is some *Dal me kala hai*, that there is something fishy about it, something not quite straight.

Another point is that even when as representative of my party I have said that the question of plebiscite does not arise, our Prime Minister has emphatically said: "Yes it does". Even after the Constituent Assembly was established in Kashmir, he kept on saying that. Then, all of a sudden, we say that the accession of Kashmir was complete, absolute, and that Kashmir is part of India. All right. But, when it is part of India, why then did we order cease-fire? I cannot understand a country going to war, using its army—call it police action or whatever you like—and not completing the job which it began. If it did not really complete it, was it left for the UNO to complete it. The question was taken to the UNO

and there was cease-fire. It is curious. I think this thing is not done. Not only it is not done, but, when you go to war, you not only free your own country but you invade the invading country. The Allies (in the last war) were not satisfied with having freed France and other parts of Europe from the Nazi yoke but they took possession of Germany itself. Here we are; when our armies are successful, when we are marching, when our troops are joyous and want to proceed further, some political reason comes in the way. What reason, God alone knows. Lord Mountbatten may be responsible for it. I do not know.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Lord Asoka.

**Acharya Kripalani:** What is cease-fire, I cannot understand. I have been a student of history. An army that is successfully marching, stops its march even when a portion of its own territory is in foreigner's hands! This is a very peculiar position on which, I am afraid, the foreigners may be excused if they do not understand. Either we wanted to the UNO to decide and give us one-third of the territory which has been occupied unjustly, I believe, by Pakistan, or, we thought that our forces would not be sufficient? What was at the back of it, I have never been able to understand. I hope our Minister without Portfolio will explain to me why this cease-fire was ordered, on whom was he relying and on whom our Government was relying. These things took place before he was Minister without Portfolio. But he must have, I suppose, read the files and he will be able to inform us.

This apart, I do not believe that even plebiscite will give any advantage to Pakistan. Supposing, tomorrow there is a plebiscite with the consent of the Government or without the consent of the Government in East Pakistan, and East Pakistan decides that it wants to join India, does that fact of the decision of East Pakistan give us any right? It does not give

[Acharya Kripalani]

any right but it gives a right to the people of East Pakistan to leave Pakistan. When they have left Pakistan and when they have joined us, then our right begins. I think in international law that is the position. No part of a country can, by plebiscite, give a right to another country. It can only express its wishes and if the country of which it is a part, does not accept those wishes, there can only be a revolution. Plebiscite decides no issues. Even if there is a plebiscite, and if it goes in favour of Pakistan, Pakistan does not get any right whatsoever over Kashmir, except that Kashmir has the right to have a revolution and make itself free or attach itself to Pakistan. Even if there is a plebiscite, nothing is lost. Nothing is gained by Pakistan. We cannot lose anything.

Anyway, the question of plebiscite should not have been raised. But it is an old story. I am often told that it is very easy to be wise after the fact. But I am afraid in some cases our Government is not even wise after the fact. That is the trouble with us.

Another thing that I would suggest is this. Our Minister without Portfolio has got many compliments. He will not mind if I strike a contrary note. It is not enough, especially for our star diplomats, that they should be very intelligent and clever people, conversant with international politics. I have no doubt that our Minister without Portfolio is a very well-informed person and an intellectual person, and he has very great knowledge of international affairs. But I humbly submit that it is not enough. There must be a certain amount of very robust discrimination. If he would not mind my saying it, I would say that a case that requires seven hours' pleading before politicians, not before a magistrate or a judge, who is bound to listen does not make good publicity. It is hard to expect from foreign journalists

that they would fill their columns with a speech of seven hours. If a case cannot be stated in an hour and a half, I think it speaks against the case. It is a bad case. A good case or the man who handles a good case must be able to finish it in time so that the audience do not feel bored and so that the papers have also an opportunity to write.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** Do you not want the points to be answered?

**Acharya Kripalani:** I want the points to be answered as briefly as possible, because, I believe if any man made a speech of seven hours in this House, I would find the House empty. We get tired even with a speech of one or one and a half hour. This is our personal experience. The hon. Member's experience—the hon. Member who put the question—may be different. This is my personal experience. The most eloquent speaker cannot keep my attention bound for seven hours. I must tell you that in the UNO, there are good speakers among the audience. Good speakers get very fidgety when another takes enormous time. I say from the publicity point of view that if our case could have been stated more briefly, it would have been very advantageous. I may be wrong, but I feel like that, and I hope that with all the compliments that our Minister without Portfolio has got, he will not mind this little criticism of mine.

I also believe that our diplomats should not only be clever but also must have a very persuasive personality. It is a very great qualification in those who handle our foreign affairs.

16 hrs.

One thing more and I have done. I can assure my friends of the Congress that so far as the foreign policy is concerned, whether we in the Opposition are consulted or not, whether the thing is done with our consent or not, we are absolutely one with the Government, because we believe that

in foreign policy the nation must act as one single whole. We might have differences in home affairs and it is natural that we should have differences, because every one's ideas of reconstruction of the country may not be identical. But so far as the safety, security and independence of a country is concerned, there are no different parties in this land. Therefore, I would again plead that there should be a little more consultation between those who sit on the opposite benches and those who belong to the ruling party and this is in the interests of the ruling party itself, because then we know the reasons behind a particular policy. After all, it is the government that will decide the foreign policy. It is not we who have to decide the foreign policy. But if they take us into confidence, we may be able to defend that foreign policy better with more knowledge and with more information. I may be told "there are so many splinter groups in the opposition". That is true; this was the argument given by the Viceroy's before independence: "Whom are you to consult? There are so many of you" It is for the Government to choose; it can choose those whom it will consult. Even the Election Commissioner finds out what are the important parties and declares them. So, the Prime Minister can find for himself what are the significant parties or party which need be consulted and in whom he can have confidence. I do not say he should consult people in whom he has no confidence. Such people in whom he can have some confidence should be consulted and then the national policy would be truly a national policy. It will be of help to the Prime Minister and to the party in power. It will help the Government. It will not take away one jot of the final authority that rests with our Government and with our Prime Minister to order their foreign policy as they like. It will help the Prime Minister. We want to be helpful and the times are critical, not only internationally, but otherwise also. Internally even the Finance Minister says that our economic posi-

tion is a 'continuing crisis'. These are my words, but he also has given similar indication. In the international world, the situation is very critical and anything may happen at any time. We have got to be united and speak with one voice. Therefore, I would humbly suggest that in foreign affairs, there should be more co-operation and more exchange of views than is at present.

We know what happened recently in England. Let us take a lesson from what happened there. For the first time in some centuries, the foreign policy of England was the policy of one party only, the Conservative Party. Even when the independence of India was to be granted, Churchill was consulted by the Labour Party. This time the foreign policy of England was the policy of the Prime Minister and some of his Conservative friends. Labour was not consulted. If Labour had been consulted, things would have been different. It was a great mistake that was done by England, which adversely affected democracy throughout the world. It is a great tragedy that England by its foolish action has taken the world a few steps behind. It made it possible for Russia to do what it liked in Hungary. It was a great and tragic event that took place; but it could have been avoided if the Prime Minister had not thought that he was all wise and that he could decide everything. I would humbly submit that this example of England, which is an experienced country, is before us; we should see that we avoid the pitfalls which made England commit this great blunder, which has revived the cold war which was slowly dying away.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** It is sometimes my misfortune to follow Acharya Kripalani as speaker in the foreign affairs debate. I think he made two important points, firstly, that sometimes war solves problems and secondly, plebiscite does not solve any problems.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Let me take the first point. If I am not mistaken, in the year 1950, when there was a possibility of a very strong armed conflict between India and Pakistan and when the late Liaquat Ali Khan came here on Easter Sunday, Acharya Kripalani advocated the use of force or war against Pakistan.

**Acharya Kripalani:** If the hon Member quotes, I would like to know wherefrom he quotes.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** I do not want to refresh his mind; it was a closed meeting of our party. It was five years ago and five years is a long long time; things can be forgotten.

**An hon. Member:** It was seven years ago.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** Correct: anyhow, my contention is that Acharya Kripalani seems to have forgotten the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi. He was the foremost disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. War cannot solve any problems between India and Pakistan. War is not an easy thing. If there is war between India and Pakistan, at least 10 million young men will perish.

**Acharya Kripalani:** What I said was this. Gandhiji could say that war solves no problems, because he has found a substitute for war. We have not found a substitute for war.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** This same forum of Parliament from which he is speaking may fall down if war is to be waged. I feel that he is a distant cousin of Mr. Dulles, who is advocating massive retaliation. Mr. Dulles is advocating massive retaliation, a theory with which we in India at least do not agree, because we have been the followers of the principle of Mahatma Gandhi, namely, non-violence, and we shall stick to it to the end.

Periodically we examine the objectives, instruments and the persona-

lities that are displayed in our foreign policy. There is no doubt that this House will endorse whatever the Prime Minister has advocated since the days of our independence. We believe in a foreign policy not siding with any block and not advocating any instrument of war or fear or hatred. We shall always go on championing the cause of truth and justice, without siding with any block.

Acharya Kripalani himself mentioned—unfortunately he is going away; I wish he sat here—that we have lots of enemies and no friends or something to that effect. In advocating the policy of Mahatma Gandhi, which is the foundation—the foundation was not laid in a day or two—the foreign policy of India was initiated down the ages based on the finest principles of Hinduism and Buddhism. Unfortunately, the Christian West which claims to follow Christ does not practise what Christ spoke. The West has the finest destructive instrument of the hydrogen bomb. Even in the year 1957, in Capetown the blacks are not permitted to worship in a Church where the Whites are found and when America and the powers of the west want to advocate nuclear weapons, we stand for peace in this vast land of India, which has stood down the ages on the principle of non-violence and the philosophy of tolerance; and, as such, the idea of war is intolerable for us. But, if war is over forced on us, if Pakistan takes up the weapons and is going to have a shooting war, then I am sure our men and women, our youth, will not fail us in that hour of peril. Our manhood is devoted to the cause of our country and to the ideals of justice and patriotism and it will do us a lot of good; if ever war is forced on us, we will not be found wanting. The Prime Minister has repeatedly stated that we shall not wage war, but if war is forced on us, we shall not be found wanting.

There is the old philosophy of the Muslim League, a philosophy which

was nurtured in British days under the auspices of the Raj. They believed in the Communal triangle of the Hindus and Muslims and the British being there. Now that triangle seems to have been transferred on the side of Pakistan and we have the triangle of Pakistan, and India with the British and the Americans stepping on it by turns.

Let us be clear on one point. India did not agree for partition so that Pakistan can sit on us and threaten all the time. Today, one question that I want to put to the hon. Prime Minister is, whether in the armoury of the Pakistan Air Force, there are guided missiles. We want to know whether the U.S.A. is going to arm Pakistan with guided missiles. The dividing line in aerial warfare between atomic weapons and guided missiles is very thin. We were told that the U.S.A. was arming Pakistan to fight the U.S.S.R. Pakistan has also been telling people that it was not arming against Russia but arming against aggression. When the hot war has come to our very door, is it not right for us to ask the leaders of American democracy whether the arms supplied to Pakistan today include guided missiles. If such weapons are not going to be supplied today, they will be supplied in the near future, six months or one or two years hence. The U.S.A. may supply Pakistan with this dreaded weapon of guided missile in the name of arming them against the U.S.S.R. or China. That is very dangerous. These guided missiles have revolutionised aerial warfare. Your jets are out of date. Your anti-aircraft guns are out of date. Britain has abolished them. A very serious defence debate recently took place in the House of Commons in which they stated they have done away with all their old weapons. In all seriousness, I want to ask the Government to take the House into confidence and send out our best men to find out whether Pakistan will be armed with guided missiles, if not today, in the near future. That would be a most dangerous weapon in the hands of our

neighbours. It is a pilotless machine, a small machine which will destroy Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi. In the event of an armed conflict, these guided missiles will reduce many of our cities to ashes. I want to bring it to the notice of the House seriously. I was the only speaker in the last Foreign Affairs debate, you may remember, Sir, who said that by July 1957, Pakistan will have the largest Air Force of Asia qualitatively and quantitatively. I repeated that statement in the Indore Congress when I had the honour of supporting the Foreign policy resolution moved by Dr. Roy and Shri Morarji Desai. When there is talk of guided missiles, a sort of companionship between Britain and the U.S.A. is developing. The U.S.A. and Britain have openly said that there will be consultation regarding guided missiles, one party assisting the other. Today, we read of an Australian Trade Mission. It has been said in the Times of India that Australian people manufacture guided missiles. They have come for trade and they want goodwill. They may show goodwill openly in the Kashmir case. But, when the question of guided missile comes they will give them to Pakistan and not to us and also back the Pakistan case on Kashmir. However unpleasant, I must speak the truth. Truth sometimes becomes a possibility in times of danger. Britain and the U.S.A., in the recent conference of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. MacMillan, have agreed to share the secrets of guided missiles. Not long ago, over five years ago, we had a plane flying over this city. The nation was not taken into confidence as to what type of plane it was and whose it was. The warring nations of the world are brushing aside the other types of aerial warfare and are hugging the guided missile. The guided missile, whose father was the V.2 German rocket, landed in Britain and it would have been developed by them but for the war coming to an end. These are real dangers. I want the Defence Ministry, which is now in the hands of the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister also to take serious notice of this, because, a people who are not

[Shri Joachim Alva]

politically mature, a people who are not politically wise, a people who are not bound down by courtesies can take the weapon in their hands and throw it across the borders of India and destroy the economic and political life of the country. Unfortunately, Mr. Dulles thinks that, what Hitler failed to do with the U.S.S.R., what Napoleon failed to do with the U.S.S.R., he and some others in the West will succeed in doing with Russia. Let us face the facts of history. No amount of weapons, no amount of aerial warfare or atomic weapons can destroy the will of a people. Now, let me go back to my theory. Even if we are invaded and aerial rockets come, the massive manpower and woman-power and the youth of India will be strong enough and we shall be able to hurl our invaders from our country. They may destroy some of our cities. This is a possibility. But, the man-power and woman-power and the youth of India will ultimately triumph and keep our home fires burning. We shall not rest until that.

There is another danger about Pakistan. They are never content with demands. Mr. Jinnah's demands started with 14 points, one-third representation, then 50 per cent representation in the Interim Cabinet. I was one of the half a dozen or a dozen journalists that were present when the Prime Minister and others took the oath of office on the 2nd September, 1946 at Rashtrapati Bhawan. I had the honour or pleasure of accompanying Mr. Feroze Khan Noon in the plane from Bombay on the 1st of September. I remember his saying, let the Government of India run, let the Congress party run it. Mr. Feroze Khan Noon was the man who, in Delhi, in 1946, under Mr. Jinnah's auspices said, if Britain did not grant their demand, they would go to the U.S.S.R. Public memories are very short. Unfortunately, even if the Pakistan question is settled, do you think that Pakistan's demands will cease? They will ask for a corridor

and so many other things. Will they make a public declaration that with the settlement of the Kashmir question, the question of corridor will not be kept open? The question of corridor will come. If the question of corridor comes, we shall have to fight to the last man. We shall then fight to the last man whether the war is unarmed or non-violent. We cannot allow that because the boundaries of our nation have been settled. Acharya Kripalani raised an interesting point which the late Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee used to raise: even if East Pakistan wants to join us, we cannot permit it without the willing consent of Pakistan itself. East Pakistan may say we will leave Pakistan and join you. But we as the followers of Mahatma Gandhi, have to honour the word that we shall not invade Pakistan or take an inch of that territory. Even if East Pakistan tomorrow joins to a man under the progressive leadership of Shri Bhashani or others and says, we shall join you, we cannot take them over unless Pakistan says, you can take them. In that same spirit, I mentioned to Shri Ghazanfar Ali Khan, the last Pakistani Ambassador in India, even if all of you intend to join us, cent per cent, the foreign powers will not permit you to do such a thing, I mean Britain and America. This is the reality of the Pakistan question.

They are our brothers and sisters who have lived with us. They got freedom automatically as a result of the fight put up by the Congressmen. It is the Congressmen and their wives and sisters and sons who suffered. They automatically got freedom without a stone being thrown, without a scar being felt on them. They have won freedom. Yet their demands have never ceased. With Britain and America with them, they will never cease. It is time to think of our own security. The new Parliament is going to be convened. It may have to face this serious problem. This last problem that this old Parliament is facing, the new Parliament will have to face.

I may not have referred to Shri Krishna Menon at all today. But, because so many have referred to him and as Acharya Kripalani has definitely mentioned his name, in a derisive spirit I shall also refer to him. Fifteen months ago, I had the honour of being present in the Indian Council of World Affairs. The membership is not open to everybody meeting in Delhi. It was a closed door meeting. About 100 people were present. The press was not permitted to report these meetings. Shri Krishna Menon then spoke on Kashmir. After he concluded his speech, I walked up to him and said, you have put a new hope, you have put a new cheer in a situation that was drooping, in which all seemed to have been disappointed. I said, you will turn out to be the greatest propagandist for India in regard to Kashmir. I am happy that the impression that he gave us on that occasion stands more than fructified. He has become the greatest campaigner of Kashmir for India throughout the world. He spoke with a voice of eloquence and determination before that world Assembly which he has so much influenced. He has had his triumph in the United Nations, and the whole country is indebted to him. I saw yesterday when the Polish Prime Minister arrived. The third person who was cheered most at Palam airport by the crowd was Shri Krishna Menon. First was the Prime Minister of Poland, second the Prime Minister of India, and the third was Shri Menon, not because of himself but because he put up a great, gallant fight in the forum of the United Nations. Women and children came to salute him; all that gave spontaneous joy to the people. Acharya Kripalani also referred to Shri Krishna Menon. He is sarcastic many times and has got lots of vinegar in his ton of honey. He declared that Shri Krishna Menon is not so sweet and persuasive. The Acharya was a wrong person to lecture to and say: "You must be sweet-tempered". But he has a better side, I mean his better half Shrimati Kripalani who has come over to the Congress, who I am sure will never share his view.

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, Foreign Secretary of U.K., when he was here, said in a lecture to the Indian Council of World Affairs at which I was present, that the Baghdad Pact was meant for upstairs, that is Russia, not against us! We now find the U.S.A. is planning to link Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Pakistan (not Afghanistan) by a railway. In these four Baghdad Pact countries there is great hysteria and agitation. When our Members of Parliament were in Turkey they found that the Turks did not like our policy of non-involvement. It was sad to find the Turks and Russians were involved in a deadly war of nerves. It is Mahatma Gandhi's India that can bring the Russians and the Turks into terms of friendship. However when the Turks are given implements of war to fight their neighbours, they will try to pounce upon Russia and Russia will try to pounce upon Turkey. Thus the circle starts from Ankara, and comes through Karachi right unto our borders. A Railway has now been openly announced, for the purpose of passage of troops.

We must hug the Arabs to our hearts, the Arab consisting of Christians and Muslims. The continent of Africa is very rich and very vast, and we must hug the Arabs to our heart with hooks of steel. They are sound men, men of the desert. The Arab territories comprise Morocco, Tunis, Algeria, Libya and Egypt, right down to the Sudan. These are places to which we should send out our best men to see that this territory is within the sphere of our friendship.

I wish to refer to Latin America consisting of 20 countries, mostly speaking the Spanish language. The U.S.A. wields a lot of influence there. When it comes to Gautemala, they stand by the Monroe Doctrine, but when it comes to the question of Goa, they take up a different attitude altogether. When it comes to Goa, U.S.A. and Britain have a secret understanding that if Goa went out of India, it will be a base against the throat of India, although in the case of Latin America they say: "Keep your hands off".

[Shri Joachim Alva]

In regard to these Latin American countries I want to put forward a proposition. I want the hon. Minister without portfolio with his intelligence, incisiveness and knowledge, and the Prime Minister to go to Latin America to visit these 20 countries. Unfortunately the race of Indians who formed the old Latin American civilisation has been exterminated. Whatever it may be, most of them speak the Spanish language. The Spaniards are friendly towards us. I met the Spanish delegates to the UNESCO conference. The delegates from Brazil would not talk to us about Goa, but the Spaniards were willing to discuss Goa. The Prime Minister was then very busy and could not meet them, but the Spanish delegation was prepared to discuss the question of Goa because they have got Gibraltar. When one has a pimple in one's eye, one will sympathise with the other person who has also a pimple in his eye. We must carry on intense publicity in those countries, and send delegations, and depute men of courage, patriotism and character to represent us in the Latin American countries. We must not neglect them. The Vice-President and Shri Krishna Menon have visited Latin America. The majority of them are dominated by the Spanish language and do not speak Portuguese as in Brazil. Once they are roused to the point of moral consciousness, I think Goa must fall into our lap.

We must explore every possibility and put this Goa front right. Today we cannot march our army into Goa as some people advocate, as we will only raise a hornet's nest. We are wedded to non-violence and must take every possible step short of war. Shri T. K. Chaudhuri feelingly referred to Goa and said there are lots of people there in prison. We do not put forth their case. The case must be kept on the anvil. It must be as a result of propaganda and not hot war, as a result of truth and not violence that we should thus achieve the result. Goa's case must be put before the nations of the world, especially before the United Nations.

Now a word about Indonesia. How sad we are that Indonesia is today in trouble and distress. I would like to call Indonesia one of our elder sisters. Their troubles and sorrows are ours. We find that foreign powers are angling there, that people there have openly said that one power, whose name I shall not mention, has been taking interest in Indonesia and saying that it will recognise the rebels. If that power with all its might and courage says that it will recognise the rebels, what is left? We do not want that kind of thing to spread to other countries, because the next will be Burma and India may also come later. When Egypt was invaded by Britain, France and Israel together, nothing becomes improbable. So, let us offer a word of sympathy to them. Even if they have done anything to our nationals there, let us forget that little damage because in their anger they were misguided. Let us be warned against misunderstanding. Even if a few slaps were administered to our nationals there, we should have patience, and we should send a word of cheer to Indonesians that we stand by them, and we hope that their independence will be cherished just as India's is cherished.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava** / Before I proceed to speak on the motion, I would, with your permission, just prefer a complaint before you.

Three days back, I made a speech here in this House about rural housing. I can understand if Shri Asoka Mehta did not understand the purport of my speech. He thought that I wanted the Government to fritter away money on rural house planning. Similarly, the hon. Finance Minister very probably did not understand my speech as I spoke in Hindi. I can certainly pardon both of them. They assumed that I was speaking on a particular point, and under that assumption they condemned me and criticised my speech. I do not find fault with them, as it is very possible that my Hindi may not have been understood,

but when representatives of the press make a mistake like this, I am bound to bring this complaint before you.

In the press also I find that they ascribed to me certain things which I never said in my speech. On the contrary I had said that to take up rural housing was not a practical proposition, that the Finance Minister would just jump up in his seat if I asked him to have recourse to rural housing, whereas in the press I found that I was advocating nothing but rural housing. I have therefore, decided today to speak in my broken English, and I would beg of you to kindly warn the press to report the proceedings of the House in the right manner.

Coming to this matter, the matter before us, I have tabled an amendment which I have already moved. It is not a formal amendment so far as I am concerned. I verily believe that the Government has adopted, so far as foreign policy is concerned, the right policy in all spheres in which it has to work. I have been listening to the debate for the last several hours and I have not found a single item of policy which has been criticised by the Opposition so far as the foreign policy of the Government is concerned.

Acharya Kripalani, when he spoke, said that he stood by all the principles by which our Government stood. He said that all our policies were right. Then, what was wrong? What was wrong was that when our case came up before the Security Council, we had no friends.

Then again, he said that very probably, the representatives of the foreign nations there had not understood the problem at all, and had they understood, the rightness of the policy would have been confirmed by them also. So, I feel that there has not been a single speaker so far, including my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani, who has pointed out any mistake in the policy. So, my proposition stands absolutely confirmed even by the Opposition.

I would very much have liked if any Member would have told us where we were mistaken. Acharya Kripalani, when he referred to our Minister who advocated our cause at the United Nations, said that he took seven hours; and that was the one fault which he was able to find. That is quite true. I can also appreciate that the length of a speech sometimes bores people. I myself know it. But, at the same time, in a House the position is quite different. The judges and magistrates are quite different. In the United Nations, as you know very well from our past experience, people go on speaking without any person hearing them. They have to make out a case. They have to convince the broader audience of people of the world as well as the representatives of the various countries. But what happened in this case? Did they consider our case on merits? Even before the case was considered, even before the case was closed or finally presented before them, they had got ready with a resolution. I understand also that there the questions are not decided in the manner in which they are decided in a court of law.

As Acharya Kripalani himself pointed out, the facts of our case were very complicated. First of all, we said we wanted a plebiscite. Then, we said that we did not want a plebiscite. Then, we said that there should be cease fire in a territory, a part of which had not yet been taken over from the invaders. Acharya Kripalani himself pointed out that there were these complications. All these facts could only have been explained when a full debate took place, and, therefore, our Minister took that much time. And I feel that the country must feel indebted to Shri V. K. Krishna Menon for his able advocacy and presentation of our case.

The main point that I understood some of my hon. friends who spoke from the other side to say was that we had no friends, and that proved that our policy was wrong. Looking at it from the right standpoint, I should think that if any person gets

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

angry at me, without my being at fault, it cannot be said that I have erred. Whatever Acharya Kripalani said was to the effect that our policy was perfectly right and yet we had no friends. Now, who is to blame?

I think the blame must be given to Acharya Kripalani himself, or else the blame should be given to Mahatmaji, to Mahatma Buddha, to all those from whom we have inherited the noble traditions that we are following.

Further, what did we say in our Constitution? Article 51 in the Chapter on Directive Principles of State Policy says:

"The State shall endeavour to—

(a) to promote international peace and security;

(b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations;

(c) foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another; and

(d) encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration."

May I humbly ask, when Egypt was invaded by France and England, what was the role that we had to play? According to Acharya Kripalani, we ought not to have spoken; we ought to have said, 'All right, they have done a wrong thing', and we ought to have done nothing else.

सीख वाको दीजिए जसको सीख सुहाय  
सीख न दीजिए बानरा, घर बने का जाय ।

This is the proverb. But does Acharya Kripalani believe in it? Silence or indifference on our part on account of fear of displeasing aggressors will certainly not be a faithful discharge of duty towards the world.

On 20th November last, when we were considering the international situation and the policy of India in relation thereto, what happened? At that time, the Indian Government condemned England and France for their invasion of Egypt. But so far as the

facts about Hungary were concerned, they had not come in good time, and there was some time-lag before our Prime Minister was able to judge the facts and call a blade a blade or a spade a spade. On 20th November last, in this very House, Acharya Kripalani himself stood up and condemned Government, saying 'Why has Pandit Nehru not condemned Russia, so far as her action in Hungary was concerned?'. If you want to condemn other countries, if you want to say the right thing, and you want to protect the people from the invasion of those who believe in aggression, well, your fate must be this. I am not one of those who deplore that on the day when the voting in Security Council took place, we could not secure a single vote from any of the countries there. But the fault was theirs who did not exercise their votes rightly. In fact this is the price of the sacrifice of our moral stand. X

If we take the right policy and the result is that people get angry, then we have either to reverse the policy, or we should not complain. My humble opinion is that if any flaw is found in any of our policies, we can certainly say that Government have gone wrong. But if I find that there is no flaw and I find that when we take a particular attitude because we want to go to the protection of weaker nations, we are condemned and people take prejudicial views against us and just decide our case without hearing us, the fault does not lie with us

Our motto is:

सत्यमेव जयते नानृतं

After some time we shall see that people will understand that as a matter of fact they were mistaken and not we. If we place before ourselves our past policies, we are bound to come to the conclusion that India has acquired a very important position in the United Nations. My hon. friend Shri Raghuramaiah told us that all the weaker nations look up to India,

and she has acquired this position after several years. So, it is but right that we cannot follow a course which a nation with no past, with no past commitments and with no reputation to lose can adopt. Obviously, we cannot do that.

Acharya Kripalani himself gave us the reasons why these nations are against us, and why America and England cannot themselves reiterate those principles which sometimes they adopt and which sometimes they do not. He said that the other nations had got interests, and they looked to their interests also. But, so far as we are concerned, we really have got no interest. So far as India is concerned the history of the past few thousand years tells us that India never waged a war of aggression against any country, India never invaded any country. At the same time, we did not believe in colonialism, we did not believe in displeasing other countries. We wanted to live in peace and wanted others to live in peace as well. This has been our policy for several thousands of years. If, for the sake of truth, we want to go out of our way and condemn people, then naturally they get angry because we say the right thing. This is bound to happen to any good man, if he wants to keep his morals.

Our Prime Minister, certainly a rare genius for judging international affairs understands the histories of many countries very well; he understands people of other countries very well. And so far as his policy is concerned, nobody has said anything so far against it. All that has been said is that his policy has resulted in such and such a thing. I do not want to see the result. Lord Krishna has told us,—and Lord Krishna was being followed by Mahatmajji and Buddha Maharaj; and the heir of Mahatma Gandhi, namely our Prime Minister is also following it—

कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन

'Do not look to the fruits of action. Look to the action itself. This is what we have to do.'

If any person in this House can tell me that our Government have erred on this particular occasion in this particular manner, on account of greed or anything of that nature, then I can understand that the policy may be wrong. But I could not find a single occasion on which we have erred.

When our Prime Minister pointed out to the Americans, 'Do not cross the 38th parallel', was he wrong? When he predicted in this House the right principles on which Korean peace could be established, was he wrong? Again, when we sent our forces to Egypt, or Viet Nam or to any other country, did we go wrong? If we had gone wrong anywhere, let it be said before our very face. In the course of these four or five hours, I have not been able to see even a single thing attributed to our Prime Minister or his Government, which can be taken exception to.

I can understand that so far as Pakistan is concerned, our policy towards Pakistan has been soft. I have been saying from my place here that our Government have not adopted the right policy towards Pakistan because it is a soft policy. We know that no other country would tolerate a position where 30 lakhs of Pakistani nationals are sent to India, and without any retaliation from India Pakistan entered into treaties with us, but broke all those treaties. I always said that our Prime Minister was soft towards Pakistan. He himself told us one day in this House that he wanted to apply the healing balm, whereas we were saying in this House that he was not right. I was always saying that our Government were adopting a soft policy. But what is the result? The result has been that there has been no war. Otherwise, there would have been war on the question of the exodus from East Pakistan. No country would tolerate such a position as we are tolerating. But at the same time, there has been no war.

Similarly, what does our Prime Minister say to Pakistan? Still he says—when his effigies are being burnt in

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

Pakistan—that 'we are your friends; we are your neighbours; we do not want to injure you.' It is quite true we cannot make an offer of Kashmir to Pakistan when Pakistan has got no right to Kashmir. It is the British Government which divided us and created Pakistan. At that time, if they liked, they could have made over Kashmir to Pakistan. But that was not done. After they had given every Indian State the right to do as it pleased, to join whatever Union it liked, Kashmir acceded to us. What was wrong with it? How does Pakistan come in? What is the right of Pakistan in Kashmir? Kashmir has been with us for thousands of years. Many of our sacred places are there. There is no difference between our people and their people. If Bhatti Rajputs had been converted in Kashmir several hundred years ago by force that does not show that, as a matter of fact, Pakistan has got a better right. There is no moral right, there is no legal right, there is no just right which Pakistan can claim for Kashmir, and yet Pakistan is fighting for it.

My submission is that today, so far as the Kashmir policy is concerned, there is not a single Member in this House who is against it. After the 20th November, 1956, when we debated our policy in relation to the international situation, what has happened? The only thing is about Kashmir. In the elections, various parties have been saying that the Congress is taking wrong advantage of the situation in Kashmir. This may or may not have been true, but it is perfectly true that every party in this House—we heard Shrimati Renu Chakravarty the other day—stands by our policy with regard to Kashmir. So far as the Kashmir policy is concerned, it is the same for all parties. Today Acharya Kripalani said the same thing.

So may I humbly ask what is this point, what is this discussion every session regarding the international situation when all persons from Op-

position parties say that our policy in regard to Kashmir is the same? Has Shri Jawaharlal Nehru done anything wrong in saying that no foreigner will be allowed to put his foot in this sacred soil of India? Is he wrong in saying that the question of plebiscite does not arise? What do these gentlemen say? They say that plebiscite should not have been promised. All right. Supposing it was wrong to promise it, has the right thing not been done now? The present policy is to be seen. I do not admit that the offer of plebiscite was wrong. It is very easy to be wise after the event. They say that though the accession was complete, yet we wanted to confirm it. It may be so, but, at the same time, so far as the present policy is concerned, so far as the present stand is concerned, is there a single Member here who does not stand by that policy?

So far as the policy of America in the Middle East is concerned, our Government have taken exception to that policy. Is there a single Member here who says that our stand in regard to the policy of America is wrong? So far as the policy is concerned, everybody is agreed. Shri U. M. Trivedi is laughing; perhaps he does not agree.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I agree:

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am glad he says he agrees.

He says that one hour will be taken to liquidate Goa. This is his argument. It is very unfortunate that I do not agree with him. He should read article 51 of the Constitution. So far as war is concerned, the Government of India do not believe in war. It may be possible to liquidate Goa in one hour. But it will be absolutely wrong to do so. It will be a policy which will bring nothing but ruin to this country and to other countries in the world. This is the policy of sheer violence in world politics.

So far as Goa is concerned, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has said that he is as anxious as any of us to

find a solution. Today I heard Shri T. K. Chaudhuri. Previously also we heard him. He himself says that he is the last person to advocate what my hon. friend, Shri U. M. Trivedi, has advocated. He has said that he does not want military action. Nobody has talked of military action so far. I am sorry that I myself stated in the House when we saw the Hindu exodus from Pakistan and other things, that other methods were not adopted. But I know that I was mistaken. I know that in the heat of the moment, Shri U. M. Trivedi is saying something in anger and indignation—and right indignation—because Goa is not with us.

At the same time, the policy of the Government is not momentary and should not be decided in haste. So far as our policy is concerned, it is perfectly right and I do not find any single item of policy in which we have erred. After the 20th November, 1956, this is the first occasion when we are discussing the international situation and only new policies which happened after this date should be gone into. Previously we had taken a decision about other matters. I see no alternative for the House except that this House should accept my amendment and approve the foreign policy of the Government.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir:

Once again I have no difficulty whatever, no mental reservation of any kind, in congratulating the Nehru Government on their overall admirable performance in the international sphere.

In the past, I have pleaded, it has been a matter of gratification to me that my humble advice has been accepted by this House, that when any discussion takes place on foreign affairs, it should be above party politics. Indirectly, most hon. Members have tended to accept this, but on this occasion I have discovered that there has been a deviation from this very healthy convention. There have been some hon. Members who have been

having flings at the Treasury Benches from party angles. I deeply regret this because we should be responsible enough to realise that anything we say, even by way of a joke, reaches the four corners of the earth.

So while there may not be many here just now, I would like to repeat that any debate on foreign affairs is a concern of the entire country and not of any political party. And it is because of this that I do not have any hesitation in repeating my faith in the conduct of the Prime Minister, who happens to be also the Minister of External Affairs, in the way he has bravely conducted us in the international sphere. He is not infallible, nor is the Minister without Portfolio infallible. They would be fools if they were to arrogate infallibility to themselves. Mistakes have been made. There was a certain amount of reluctance over the Hungarian episode. We know that. But we are debating something which has to be taken in the overall perspective and we forget that we must not get lost in little wells, taking one little item here and there and condemning the overall picture.

I am not platitudinous by nature. You know it. I do think that we have been right in choosing the hard path, because that is what we have done, something that is not spectacular, something that does not produce quick results, something that the world does not understand and, therefore, the world laughs at us—non-violence.

I regret that many hon. Members invoke the name of Gandhiji. I would rather that only those hon. Members who are true disciples of Gandhiji invoke his name. He is quoted here again and again by way of screening ourselves in our behaviour, in what the rest of the world should do and what we should do. I do think that when we are talking about international affairs there should be less of the sanctimonious smack about it. Let us be realistic about it. We are living in a world that was not the world of Gandhiji. He was thinking of a world he was trying to bring about, a world that was his. Whenever we try to in-

(Shri Jaipal Singh)

voke some of his utterances we forget that we are not living in the world that he had desired, the world to be. But, living in a world of reality, once again I repeat that the Nehru Government have served us well. They may have hesitated every now and then. The world has not been as warm-hearted for them as it might actually be. But, in the light of information that they had, I think, the guiding principle that they had and which they have tried to follow against very very heavy odds has been the right thing for this country. I have no doubt whatever about it.

I am, I dare say, not very non-violent. There have been occasions when, somehow or other, intuitively I have felt, perhaps a little bit of push on our part, a little bit of violence might have solved the problem for us. I have felt that in regard to Goa. I have certainly felt that in regard to our eastern frontiers and I had felt that in regard to certain other things. But, when I come down to facts as one must, I come back to the conviction that, perhaps, the path of patience, the path of non-violence which I do not understand very much but which I do admire even distantly is the correct way for this country. So, when people talk of quick results, quick results really translated mean nothing but violent action. The very people who have been criticising the Nehru Government in regard to, maybe, Kashmir, in regard to, maybe, Goa, all these so-called disciples of Gandhiji forget that it is exactly what has been preached by Gandhiji.

I was very pleased that our Minister for External Affairs made a reference to Ghana. I had the privilege of living in Ghana for nearly 4 years. The present Prime Minister of Ghana happens to be a pupil of mine and I have followed with great interest the movement for freedom in the whole of West Africa including Nigeria, where also there is going to be freedom and I can imagine who is going to be the future Prime Minister, if Nigeria should get freedom. It has been very

gratifying to note that the visit of Charlie Andrews, when I happened to be in that part of the world, has borne fruit, and that Dr. Khavarné Nkrumah today, when he has unexpectedly come to the top, has not refrained from giving credit to the lesson Charlie Andrews taught him, and that the future conduct of that part of the world, the effect of which is going to have tremendous repercussion on the whole of Africa and, because of the whole of Africa, on the rest of the world, should have its roots in the teachings of Gandhiji. It is a great thing.

I am glad that our Prime Minister did want to go there. It was only this month that they celebrated their independence. He could not go; he had to struggle here like the rest of us. But there is one suggestion I might make. I have lived there. (*Interruption*). I would very much appreciate it if the Nehru Government could send a team....

**Shrimati Sushama Sen** (Bhagalpur South): With you in it?

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** I have already been there; and the hon. Member may want to go. I can go there on my own and the Nehru Government will never have me in any of their delegations. It has happened in the past. There is no doubt. However, Shrimati Sushama Sen might be very welcome. (*Interruption*). These cheap jibes do not help Shrimati Sushama Sen.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. We have had enough of it.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** Please forgive me, Sir. I thought I was talking seriously.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** And so did I.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** I would submit that a team, a good team might be sent, of Members of both Houses of Parliament, a team of friendship not only to Ghana but to Sierra Leone to Nigeria and go further south to the Congo, because, as you know, in the Security Council we have been attack-

ed in the past. I think it would be a very good thing if our representatives were to visit Congo to see things for themselves, for the authorities there to realise that we also have eyes and that they were not the only people who criticise us in the United Nations Organisation which they did some years ago.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I know whether the hon. Member has been suggesting that Members of Parliament only should go there or others also? On some occasions we have sent people there previously.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** I would not like to restrict it to the sitting Members of Parliament because Shrimati Sushama Sen would be out as she would be an ex-Member. So, I would leave it to the hon. Prime Minister. I think he knows what I mean.

But what I was trying to say is this. The Golden Shores—that is the old name for Ghana or Gold Coast—are going to be the spearhead of freedom for the races of Africa and I am very glad that we have been directly giving a lead, for there has been inspiration from our side. What I was trying to suggest was that we have been grossly misrepresented in the United Nations over untouchability and the like and I would very much like if a team of friendship could go to that part of the world—it would not be welcome in South Africa; I know that—but certainly it can go to Ghana while we are visiting West Africa, we can go further south, south of Nigeria, so that we can see things in Belgian Congo with our own eyes and we could show that people are different in independent India. I am very glad that this reference has been made by the Prime Minister about Ghana, and I am glad to hear that perhaps some time soon we may have the privilege of receiving the Prime Minister of Ghana in this country.

17 hrs.

There is one other thing. Now that the Prime Minister himself is

here, if I may say so, it is something that might surprise but something which I wanted to say often before, though I have never had an opportunity, and it is that there is something, from my point of view, far more important than Kashmir. Kashmir has loomed large; it is large. But to my mind, Kashmir is no longer a problem. If it were at all possible, the sooner we withdraw this particular case from the UNO the better it is—to me it seems so; I do not know what the technicalities are. Kashmir is our own regardless of what anybody else may say. But there is one other problem at the other end of India, that is, the Chittagong Hill Tracts. I do not know whether my right hon. friend remembers that about ten years ago, I had pleaded with him—this was a little before partition—that he should on no account give away the Chittagong Hill Tracts. He wrote back to me saying that whatever happens happens, but if some other changes had to be made, they could be made by negotiations. The Chittagong Hill Tracts still contain 99 per cent of non-Muslims, most of them Buddhists. I do not understand why the Chittagong Hill Tracts were consigned to Pakistan....

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** We don't understand it either.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** But may I just again ask the question?

In the letter by my right hon. friend, which pacified me for the time being, I was told that it would be settled by negotiations. May I know whether any negotiation has ever taken place during the last ten years? When are the negotiations beginning? Is it only Kashmir that is the problem of India?

I am not talking only of the Chittagong Hill Tracts. What about all the tribal people on the other side, north of Mymensing, in the Garo Hills? Why did we betray the tribal people? Where is this national principle? How is it operated? Are they Muslims? On what basis have we consigned these people to the other

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

side? This is only by way of providing logistics. While we are talking of this, I want to give him something that will imbalance the other side. And it is a serious thing.

I am not talking in terms of the general elections. That we will talk of when some of us have the fortune to be in the next Parliament, but it is a very important thing.

Let us not be led astray either by our neighbours or by other people who floodlight one of the items. There are plenty of other items that have to be decided between us two neighbours. I think he is quite right that this is an issue between us two which has been made complex by all these pacts and various other things. But the real issue is torn away from the correct context. I would suggest to him and his colleagues—I do not think his colleagues have ever heard of the Chittagong Hill Tracts or of the Garo Hills or of the other side of the so-called line—that these things too have a bearing as far as our survival is concerned in these international forums. I do think that as far as the outside world is concerned, they seem to think that Kashmir is the only thing. What about all the other things?

I think we should pursue this with a certain amount of advantage.

I am very glad that the Leader of the House is going to consult Members of the Opposition in regard to some important matters that have to be taken up hereafter for reconsidering a certain position we have already taken. I hope he really means that, because as I have already said at the beginning—everything I have said in every foreign affairs debate—this is not a party issue; this is where we have to carry the entire House; it has to be a united opinion and there should be no party angles about it. I do hope he will continue it, and particularly in the next Parliament, a better *modus operandi*, if I may put it this way, will be there, because certainly during the life of this Parliament I do not think I can honestly congratulate him on the method of

the consultations. We should be a little more serious, that is to say the Opposition should be a little more serious in appreciating the fact that in matters of foreign policy, they cease to be the Opposition or anything of that kind.

I have no hesitation whatever in repeating my endorsement of the overall policy of the Nehru Government. I would like to congratulate the Government; they have done very well indeed.

**श्री श्रीमन्नारायण (वर्धा) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कुछ दिन बाद लोक सभा का यह अधिवेशन समाप्त होगा और मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि मुझे वैदेशिक मामलों पर चल रही चर्चा में बोलने का अवसर मिला।

पिछले दो महीनों में काश्मीर को लेकर सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में जो चर्चा हुई और जिस तरह से विदेशी पत्रों में हमारी सारी विदेश नीति और जिस तरह से हम काम आज तक करते आए, इसकी आलोचना हुई, उसको पढ़कर बहुत दुःख हुआ। यह कहा गया कि जब हम दूसरे देशों के बारे में बात करते हैं, तो ऊंची ऊंची बातें करते हैं लेकिन जब काश्मीर का सवाल आया तो हमारा नैतिक पतन हुआ है और अखबारों में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के बारे में कार्टून निकाले गए, चर्चाएँ की गई और तरह तरह की निन्दा की गई। आश्चर्य होता है कि नौ दस साल पहले जब काश्मीर पर हमला हुआ तो हम यह समझ कर कि लड़ाई लड़ना ठीक नहीं, अगर कोई दूसरा गलती करता है तो हमें अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संघ में जाना चाहिये, हम वहाँ गए। आज नौ, दस साल के बाद अचानक फिर यह सवाल खड़ा किया गया और कहा गया कि हिन्दुस्तान ने काश्मीर को जबदस्ती अपने कब्जे में ले लिया और एक ऐसा काम किया जो नैतिक दृष्टि से ठीक नहीं था। हमारी गलती अगर कोई हुई तो इतनी ही हुई कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संघ के जो सिद्धान्त थे और जो उसकी नीति थी उसमें हमने विश्वास रखा और यह खयाल किया कि हमें न्याय

मिलेगा। लेकिन आज तो कुछ ऐसा ही हुआ कि जैसे हिन्दी में कहावत है कि "उल्टा चोर कोतवाल को डांटे"। गलती तो कोई करे और सजा देने की कोशिश किसी और को की जाये।

एक और हम को बहुत ताज्जुब हुआ जब कि सिक्कीमिटी कौंसिल में यह प्रस्ताव रक्खा गया कि काश्मीर के मामले को मुलझाने के लिए और वहां के लोगों की राय ठीक तौर से ली जाए, इसकी व्यवस्था करने के लिए अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय फ़ौज भेजी जाए। इसका जवाब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बहुत साफ दे दिया यद्यपि हम चुनावों में फंसे थे, लेकिन उन्होंने साफ कहा कि जो विदेशी फौजें आती हैं या जो बाहर के लोग इस देश में आये, पहले भी आये तो थे ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी का व्यापार करने के लिये फ्रांस के लोग और इंग्लैंड के लोग, लेकिन जिस तरीके से यहा फौजें क़ायम की गईं, जिस तरीके से फौजों के द्वारा कभी एक राजा को और कभी दूसरे राजा को मदद दी गई और सारे देश को बर्बाद किया गया, वह इतिहास हमारे सामने ताजा है और उसका जवाब यह दिया गया कि कुछ भी हो लेकिन इस देश में विदेशी फौजें पैर नहीं रख सकेंगी क्योंकि नौ साल तक तो यह मामला इस तरीके से लटकाया गया और बढ़ाया गया जब कि दूसरे की गलती थी, एक बार विदेशी फौजें आजायें तो वह फिर कब हटेगी, कोई कह नहीं सकता है और आज सारी दुनिया में जिस तरीके से पावर ब्लाक का खेल खेला जा रहा है उसमें हम साफ कहना चाहते हैं कि हमारा विश्वास नहीं है कि जो शान्ति के लिये फौजें आयेगी वह यहां शान्ति के लिये रहेगी या यहां अपने हाथ पर फैलायेगी और झगड़े पैदा करेगी, क्योंकि अगर आप देखें तो काश्मीर के मामले को फिर उठा कर जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था फिर टूनेशंस थ्योरी या 'डवाइड एंड रूल' की बात शुरू की गई और हमसे कहा गया कि हिन्दुस्तान ने हैदराबाद भी ले लिया, काश्मीर भी ले लिया।

17.12 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

जहां तक टूनेशंस थ्योरी की बात है हिन्दुस्तान ने कभी भी इस टूनेशंस थ्योरी को स्वीकार नहीं किया था। यह एक परिस्थिति थी, हालात ऐसे हुए कि हिन्दुस्तान का बटवारा हुआ, सही हुआ या गलत हुआ, आज चर्चा करने का कोई मौका नहीं है, लेकिन यह बात बिलकुल साफ है कि हमने कभी भी टूनेशंस थ्योरी को नहीं माना और जो हमने अपना विधान बनाया है उसमें साफ कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान एक सेकुलर स्टेट है, एक ऐसा राज्य है जिसमें सब मजहब के लोगों का बराबर का दर्जा है। इसलिये इसमें कोई आश्चर्य की बात नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान में हैदराबाद भी शामिल हुआ और काश्मीर भी शामिल हुआ और उसमें हिन्दु और मुसलमान का सवाल आज उठाना देश में फिर एक झगड़ा पैदा करना होगा। यह देख कर अफसोस होता है जब कि फिर अंग्रेज सरकार का उसमें हाथ हो, अमरीका का हो और और देशों का हो। तो यह अच्छा है कि हम साफ कह दें और यह संतोष की बात है कि तमाम दूसरे पक्ष भी इस बात को माफ कह रहे हैं और इस मामले में हमारे बीच म दो राये नहीं हैं और काश्मीर का मामला लेकर एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय खेलवाड़ खेला जाय, तो इसको हम कदापि सहन नहीं करेंगे।

एक और ताज्जुब होता है जब कि पाकिस्तान के नेता लोकशाही की बात करते हैं और कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान वहां राय नहीं लेता। जहां तक राय लेने का सवाल है, पहले भी यह बात कही गई थी कि जिसकी पहले गलती हो वह अपनी गलती सुधारे, पहले पाकिस्तान की फौजें वहां से हटें, जो गलती थी उसके लिए माफी मांगी जाए और उसके बाद हम चर्चा करे क्योंकि हम तो नहीं चाहते कि किसी की राय के खिलाफ कोई बात हो। जहां तक काश्मीर के लोगों की राय लेने की बात है, राय तो ली गई थी, वहां की कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली ने राय दी और उसके बाद अब

## [श्री श्रीमन्नारायण]

वहाँ पर नये चुनाव हो रहे हैं और अब दुबारा काश्मीर के लोगों की राय का पता लग जायेगा। लेकिन पाकिस्तान जब लोकशाही की बात करता है तो हंसी आती है, जहाँ आज तक बड़ी पुराना १९३५ का कांस्टीट्यूशन चल रहा है, नया विधान लागू नहीं हुआ, चुनाव नहीं हुए और यह मालूम नहीं कि कब तक चुनाव होंगे, वह पाकिस्तान लोकशाही की बात करे, यह एक आश्चर्य की बात है।

एक और बात जो बार बार छेड़ी जाती है और वह है हिन्दुस्तान का कामनवेल्थ का मेम्बर होना। हिन्दुस्तान ने कामनवेल्थ की सदस्यता स्वीकार की इस खयाल से कि दुनिया में शान्ति स्थापित करने के लिए कुछ आसानी हो। हम इसलिये शामिल नहीं हुए थे कि हमारी आजादी में कमी रह जाय। अंग्रेजों का जो डेढ़ सौ वर्ष का सिलसिला था वह तो टूट गया है और हम पूरी तरह से आजाद हुए लेकिन हमने सोचा था कि कामनवेल्थ में रहने से काफी देशों से हमारे सम्बन्ध रहेंगे और दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रखने के लिए कुछ मददगार दोंगे और मैं समझता हूँ कि पिछले नौ, दस वर्ष में जो कुछ हमने किया, जो हमारी विदेशी नीति थी उसमें कामनवेल्थ का सदस्य रहने से कोई हमका दिक्कत नहीं बल्कि हम यह साफ तौर पर देखते हैं कि आज हिन्दुस्तान की राय का असर विदेशों पर पड़ता है, जो कामनवेल्थ के देश हैं उन पर पड़ता है, इंग्लैंड पर पड़ता है और कुछ हद तक हमको सफलता मिली कि हम दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रखवाने की व्यवस्था करे। लेकिन यह भी समझ लेना जरूरी है कि इन बातों में एकतरफा काम नहीं हो सकता, यह वन वे ट्रेफिक नहीं हो सकती। पिछले कुछ महीनों से इंग्लैंड का जो रवैय्या रहा है और जिस तरीके से हमारी नीति पर, हमारी सरकार पर और प्रधान मंत्री जी पर बौछार की जाती है, तुक्ताचीनी ची जाती है, जिन तरीके से कोशिश की थी है काश्मीर को लेकर कि फिर हमारी

आजादी में कुछ खलल डाली जाय, यहाँ फिर झगड़े खड़े किये जायें हिन्दु मुसलमानों के, तो यह रवैय्या ठीक नहीं है। यह एक नाजुक रिश्ता है कामनवेल्थ का हमने पूरी तौर से आजाद होते हुए भी उसके साथ एक सम्बन्ध रक्खा है और मैं आशा रखता हूँ कि जो इंग्लैंड के नेता हैं वे यह समझेंगे कि यह रिश्ता तभी निभ सकता है जब दोनों तरफ से सद्भावना हो। सिर्फ एक तरफ से हम सद्भावना दिखायें और दूसरी तरफ से बिल्कुल एक गलत प्रचार दिन हमारे नेताओं के खिलाफ किया जाय, यह उचित नहीं है और मैं उम्मीद रखता हूँ कि उनका रवैय्या बदलेगा। हमारे कामनवेल्थ का मेम्बर रहने का केवल एक ही उद्देश्य है जैसे मैंने कहा कि दुनिया में शान्ति हो। आज जो हालत है दुनिया की वह कुछ अच्छी हालत नहीं है। आज तो हम यह देखते हैं कि दिन रात लड़ाई की तैयारियों की कोशिश हो रही है। दोनों ब्लाक अच्छा बनना चाहते हैं और बड़ी बड़ी बातें करने हैं लेकिन एक ब्लाक दूसरे ब्लाक के खिलाफ मिलेटरी पैक्ट्स करना जाता है और हम तरह सारी तैयारी चलती जाती है। हम नहीं चाहते कि दुनिया में लड़ाई हो क्योंकि लड़ाई से कोई समस्या हल नहीं होती और अगर दुर्भाग्यवश लड़ाई हुई तो सब की बर्बादी होगी। हमने इस स्थान से कि दुनिया में लड़ाई न हो, अपनी नीति कायम रखी और हमेशा यह कहा कि हम पावर पालिटिक्स और सुपबाजी में नहीं पड़ेंगे। हमारे कई अपोजीशन माइंड के नेताओं ने कहा कि आपका तो कोई मित्र नहीं है लेकिन वे यह भूल जाते हैं कि आज की इस पावर पालिटिक्स में मित्रता गुलामी है। अगर एक भी पावर के साथ हम चले जाते हैं तो क्या हमारी आजादी बनी रहेगी? क्या पाकिस्तान की हम हालत नहीं जानते, क्या हम और देशों की हालत नहीं जानते कि वहाँ पर क्या हो रहा है? यह ठीक है कि नाम के लिये वे आजाद हैं लेकिन हर एक चीज फंस जाती है उस पावर पालिटिक्स में और हमारे जो आजादी

है, वह एक नाम की आजादी रह जाती है। तो आज मित्रता का मतलब क्या है? क्या अगर हम अमरीका, इंग्लैंड के ब्लाक में या रूस के ब्लाक में चले जायें तो वह क्या उनकी मित्रता लेना होगा?

आज तो पावर ब्लाक्स एक ही भाषा बोलते हैं कि अगर आप उन के साथ हैं पूरी तरह तो आप के मित्र हैं, अगर आप उन के साथ नहीं हैं तो आप उन के दुश्मन हैं। इस तरह की मित्रता हमें नहीं चाहिए, और यह हमारे लिए बहुत बड़े खतरे की बात होगी कि हम कभी भूल कर भी कोशिश करें कि किसी एक पावर ब्लाक से दोस्ती हो जाए। यह बहुत बड़ा खतरा है। सब मिलिटरी पेट्रॉस जो होते हैं वह एक तरह से गुलामी की जंजीर कसते जाते हैं देशों के चारों तरफ, और हम भले यह समझ कर बैठें कि हमें सहायता हो रही है, हमें मदद मिल रही है इस या उस ब्लाक से, लेकिन वह आजादी कम करने का एक क्रम होगा। इसलिए आज यह जरूरी है कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति पर पक्के रहें और हम पूरे इन्मीनान के साथ कह सकते हैं कि हालांकि इस तरह के मित्र आज हमारे नहीं हैं, लेकिन फिर भी हमारी कोई दुश्मनी नहीं है किसी देश से, और यह सफलता हमारी नीति की है क्योंकि अगर लड़ाई हुई, हम नहीं चाहते कि हां, लेकिन अगर हुई तो जो देश आज इस मुपबाजी में फंसे हैं उन की बरबादी ही बरबादी है, चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो या और कोई हमारा एशियाई देश हो। अगर इस तस्वीर को हमारे लोग साफ न देखें और किसी भुलावे में आ जाएं, किसी परेशानी में पड़ जाएं, तो यह खतरा इतना बड़ा होगा, जो सदियों तक हमें उठाना होगा।

हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, वह कोई निगेटिव चीज नहीं है, नकारात्मक चीज नहीं है। अक्सर यह कहा जाता है कि हम न इस से दोस्ती करते हैं, न उस से दोस्ती करते हैं, सिर्फ वहीं कहते हैं कि हम निष्पक्ष रहेंगे। लेकिन जो हमारी विदेश नीति है

वह कुछ मुख्य सिद्धांतों पर आधारित है, और वह सिद्धांत, जैसा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने हमेशा कहा है, पंचशील के ऊपर निर्भर हैं। जहां तक विदेशों का सवाल है, पंचशील के वह पांच सिद्धांत आप जानते हैं : हम एक दूसरे पर आक्रमण न करें, एक दूसरे को मदद करें, हमारा भाई चाचा हो इत्यादि। यह नीति कोई आज की नई नीति नहीं है। यहां सदियों से वह हिन्दुस्तान में चली है। अशोक ने, या उस के पहले भी जो राजा हुए, उन्होंने यह कोशिश की थी। यद्यपि बाहर के देशों ने हमारी कमजोरियों का पूरा फायदा उठाया, लेकिन हमारी नीति रही है कि हम खुद सुखी रहें और दूसरों को भी सुखी करें। **लिव एंड लैट लिव**। उस को चाहे आप अहिंसा कहें या पंचशील कहें, लेकिन उस नीति पर हम कायम रहे और खारः तौर से आजाद होने के बाद हम ने उस नीति को हमेशा अपनाया। कुछ सन्ताप होता है जब कि विदेशों के प्रधान मंत्री यहां आते हैं और हमारी सरकार से बात चीत कर के वह भी यह घोषित करते हैं कि हम भी पंचशील स्वीकार करते हैं, मानते हैं, और आज दुनिया में पंचशील के जो सिद्धांत हैं वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति की एक बुनियाद बन गए हैं। लेकिन एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर पंचशील को दुनिया में सफल देखना है तो पहले हमें अपने हिन्दुस्तान में खुद भी पंचशील को कायम करना होगा। अगर हम विदेशों में पंचशील की बात करें और अपने देश में हिंसा का वातावरण बनाएं और एक दूसरे के विरुद्ध नफरत फैलाएं तथा एक पार्टी को दूसरी पार्टी के खिलाफ, या एक धर्म को दूसरे धर्म के खिलाफ, एक जाति को दूसरी जाति के खिलाफ करें तब फिर हिन्दुस्तान विदेशों में पंचशील सिद्धांतों का प्रचार नहीं कर सकेगा। हमें दुःख होता है जब हम देखते हैं कि अपने देश में ही हिंसा का वातावरण फैलता जाता है, जब हम देखते हैं कि भाषा के नाम पर या धर्म और जाति के नाम पर कई पार्टियां कोशिश करती हैं कि झगड़ा हो। ऐसी हालत

## [श्री श्रीमन्नारायण]

में पंचशील की बात करना बेकार हो जाता है क्योंकि जो हम पहले खुद अपने घर में नहीं कर सकते उस की चर्चा बाहर करना बेकार है। इस लिये मैं अपनी कलिंगा कि आज की हालत नाजुक है, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय हालत, और अगर हम उस का मुकाबला करना चाहते हैं तो यह जरूरी है कि अपने देश में हम एक बात निश्चित करने की चाहे कुछ भी हो, हम हिंसा नहीं करेंगे। तभी हमारी आवाज बुलन्द होगी और हमारी आवाज का असर दूर-दूर देशों पर पड़ेगा, नहीं तो उस का असर कम होगा। विदेशों में हमारी शक्ति घटेगी और खुद हमारे अन्दर की शक्ति भी घट जाएगी।

एक और बात है पंचशील के लिए कि देश में आर्थिक और सामाजिक समता जब तक हम न लाएं, जब तक गरीब अमीर कत जो फर्क है उस को हम तेजी से दूर न करें, तब तक हिंसा का वातावरण भी हम दूर नहीं कर सकेंगे क्योंकि अहिंसा सिर्फ एक कोरा सिद्धांत नहीं है। उस को पूरा करने के लिए जरूरी है कि हम कुछ काम करें, हमारी आर्थिक और सामाजिक व्यवस्था बदले। यह मैं इसलिये कह रहा हूँ कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और राष्ट्रीय समस्याएं मिली जुली हैं। जब हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं की चर्चा करें तो राष्ट्र की जो बुनियादी बातें हैं उन्हें हम भूल जाएं, अगर हम तेजी से अपने देश में आर्थिक सुधार न कर सकें, तो पंचशील विदेशों में भी कायम नहीं रह सकेगा और जो हमारी आवाज है वह आवाज धीमी पड़ेगी। तो मैं ऐसी आशा करता हूँ कि हमारी कोशिश जारी रहेगी, जो हमारी पंच वर्षीय योजना है, या सरकार की ओर से जो काम होते हैं वे और तेजी से होंगे और खास तौर से जो सब से पिछड़े लोग हैं, गांधी जो अमट्ट बिस वास्ट कहा करते थे, वह जो सब से पिछड़े लोग हैं, खाह एक गड़वा है, जब तक उस को हम नहीं भरेंगे, तब तक हिंसा और अहिंसा,

पंचशील और लड़ाई की बातें कोरी सिद्धांत की बातें रह जाएंगी, उन का कोई असर नहीं होगा।

एक आखिरी बात कह कर मैं अपनी बात पूरी करता हूँ। गांधी जी कहा करते थे कि हमारा स्वतंत्र देश एक बड़े मकान की तरह है जिस की खिड़कियां और दरवाजे खुले हों और चारों तरफ से साफ हवा आए। लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो जाय कि इन खिड़कियों और दरवाजों से इतनी जोर की हवा आए कि उस की छत उड़ जाए और नींव ढह जाए। यही हमारी विदेश नीति का बुनियादी सिद्धांत रहा है। हम ने किसी देश से नफरत नहीं की। हर एक से बात चीत करने की कोशिश की, हर एक से दोस्ती करने की कोशिश की, हम ने चाहा कि दूसरे देशों से शिक्षा लें, अगर कोई गलती हो तो हम उसे सुधारें, लेकिन यह हम कभी भी नहीं सहन करेंगे कि उन के तूफान हमारी खिड़कियों और दरवाजों में घुस कर हमारे सारे मकान को ही गिरा दें। यह नीति, जो हमारे राष्ट्र पिता ने हमारे सामने रखी थी, उस को हम हमेशा याद रखें और यह कोशिश क कि हम अपने देश में एक ऐसी नीति चलाएं जो कि हमारे लिए भी फायदे की हो और दुनिया के लिये भी फायदे की हो। हमारी बुनियाद सुरक्षित रह सके और अपनी बुनियाद पर हम इस देश में और दुनिया में एक ऐसा नक्शा बनाएं जिस से कि सारे मनुष्य मात्र का कल्याण हो।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि अगले वर्षों में, खास तौर से इस १९५७ के साल में, क्योंकि यह ५७ का साल एक अजीब साल आता है, १९५७ जब आया तभी लोगों ने खयाल किया कि इस साल में जरूर कुछ न कुछ विघ्न पड़ेगा, सन् १७५७ में हम परेशान हुए थे जब कि प्लासी की लड़ाई हुई फिर सन् १८५७ में यह स्वतंत्रता की लड़ाई लड़ी गई, जिस को गंदर कहते हैं, उस वक्त भी हम में कमजोरी थी, और अपनी कमजोरी

की वजह से हम असफल हुए। अब यह १९५७ आया है और इस शताब्दी को हम मना रहे हैं। सारे देश में १९५७ की शताब्दी मनाई जाएगी, लेकिन इस शताब्दी के मनाने के सिलसिले में हम भूल न जाएं कि हमारी सब से बड़ी कमजोरी एकता की कमी रही है। जब कभी हम छोटी मोटी बातों में पड़ गए हैं, जाति की या धर्म की या भाषा की या अलग अलग प्रांतों की, तो हमारी बरबादी हुई है। हमारे सामने जो खतरा आए इस साल में, हमारे अपने देश में या शायद दुनिया में कोई तूफान आए, तो उस का मुकाबला हमें एकता से करना है, जितने भेद भाव हों। उन को मूल कर करना है। मैं आशा रखता हूँ कि हमारे महान नेता के मार्गदर्शन में हमारा देश प्रायः बढ़ता जाएगा और हमारी सफलता हमारे आर्थिक और सामाजिक विकास की दृष्टि से और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दृष्टि से बराबर होती जाएगी।

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall be calling three more hon. Members. If each hon. Member confines his speech to ten minutes, it will be better. I am sorry I am putting restrictions. Pandit Fotedar will now speak.

**Pandit Fotedar (Jammu and Kashmir):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, after the speech of my learned colleague from Kashmir, Th. Lakshman Singh Charak, I was not inclined to participate in the debate, but for certain observations made by my learned friend Acharya Kripalani which made it imperative for me to speak a few words.

Before I refer myself to certain observations which I may be called upon to make in the course of my speech, I take this opportunity of offering my heartfelt congratulations and grateful thanks to the Minister without Portfolio, Shri Krishna Menon, for the admirable representation and purposeful exposition of the Kashmir case, perhaps for the first time before the Security Council. At the same time, I take this opportunity of recording my wholehearted support, which means support of all the four million Kashmiris living in Kashmir, when I

have the honour to represent in this Parliament, for the policy adopted by the Government of India with regard to the solution of the Kashmir case, and in their stand now taken before the world, in this behalf. There cannot be any question of any negotiation anywhere regarding Kashmir unless two basic factors are accepted. One, that Pakistan opened aggression against Kashmir in the year 1947 and that Kashmir, in law and in fact, is an integral part of India, continuing from 1947 right up-to-date and shall continue to be so for all times to come. It is not only I who say it, but it is the spontaneous expression of the popular mind in Kashmir. When Shri Krishna Menon adopted that attitude there and the Government of India here, there were cheering crowds, hundreds of thousands of people, who marched in processions through the streets of Srinagar and Kashmir expressing their jubilation over the meaningful and effective representation of our case in the Security Council and the Government of India stand.

Shri Kripalani's observations regarding Kashmir, to say the least about it, exhibits a colossal ignorance of the provisions of the Constitution of India under which Kashmir enjoys a special status, in certain matters. Such observations are bound to come in the way of the very objective that we pursue.

Without taking much time of the House, I would proceed to refer only to certain salient facets involved in the Kashmir dispute. It is said by the prominent, powerful nations in the Security Council that India preaches non-violence, preaches peace and peaceful co-existence, so far as other countries and other disputes in the world are concerned but that so far as the Kashmir question is concerned, it does not allow the people of Kashmir the right of self-determination.

In this connection, I am very much intrigued to feel that although Kashmir is not being discussed in the SEATO, in the Baghdad Pact and at the Ministers' Conferences, but the manner in which Kashmir is smuggled in their references and pronounce-

[Pandit Foteadar]

ments suggests a world of thought and that shows how these big powers, including U.S.A. & U.K. who adjudge our case, who sit as impartial judges, are insidiously becoming a party to the Kashmir affair. They are fast losing their character and complexion of impartiality. Yet, they have the temerity and character to tell us that they could give an impartial verdict regarding the Kashmir case. This sort of attitude on their part smacks of constitutional impropriety. It is an outrage against international code of political morality and, at the same time, is an outrage against the United Nations which still seems to be seized of the Kashmir question in one way or the other. It is an insult to the dignity of Kashmiris, to their feelings and to their sentiments who, time and again, from 1947, have demonstrated energetically before the world that they are an integral part of India. The Kashmiris have been doing it, and they have acted up to it time and again. Everybody says that Kashmiris are supreme, that the Kashmiris are the masters and arbitors of their own destiny. Everybody says it. But unfortunately, nobody seems to mean anything definite about it. And every-time the question comes up, there is huge noise here, there and everywhere. What is wrong? Who has to decide? I am the sole master of my destiny. I have to decide it. I have decided; the Kashmiris have decided. What greater proof there can be than the verdict of the Constituent Assembly, and the resolution passed in the Constituent Assembly?

I may, in this connection, draw the attention of the House to one most important fact. When the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, lawfully constituted and which was the representative Assembly of the people, was disbanded and arbitrarily dismissed and some sort of Assembly was smuggled in, which appeared not from the front-door, not from the back-door, but which suddenly came in from a trap-door, bewildered the whole world into acceptance as the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, that it had the competence to decide the administrative

set-up of Pakistan, could pass the future constitution of Pakistan, when Pakistan could do all these things, with what cheek can Pakistan say, that "whatever decision that the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir has taken is not valid"? When the Kashmir Constituent Assembly was a regular, lawful and constitutional body, I cannot understand what has happened to the mentality of people on the other side who put up such fantastic, amazing things before the world. Their own friends on the Security Council did not even laugh at them.

Take, for instance, the question of Sudan. Sudan previously wanted to have some sort of a referendum under the auspices of the International Supervisory Commission. India was also invited to be a member of that Commission and after some time, they felt that it was enough for the Parliament of Sudan to make a declaration about their independence; and they did declare Sudan as independent. If that could be regular and constitutional, what is wrong about Kashmir?

I would like to say something about the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Feroze Khan Noon and other Foreign Ministers that came before him. All of them have been saying, perhaps actuated by considerations of generosity and sympathy for the 40 lakhs of Kashmiris, so kind of them that they are only trying to see that the right of self-determination is conceded to Kashmir. May I put it to them: Is the type of self-determination they are going to give to Kashmir the same as they gave them when Pakistan inspired Titanic hordes of medieval barbarism were let loose on Kashmir, when sin and perdition were carried into the homes of innocent hillmen, when huge areas of land were devastated, when hundreds of thousands of buildings were reduced to ashes, when thousands of Hindus, Muslims were put to the sword, when sisters, mothers and daughters were taken away forcibly and sold for a pittance in the bazars of Rawalpindi and Kisakhani? Is it that kind of self-determination that the Prime

Minister and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan are going to give to Kashmir? Let them and let their Imperialist masters understand that Kashmir is not a no-man's land and can be gambled about with impunity. Kashmir is a land of people with a resolution. They are the people who, in 1947, when the hordes of medieval barbarism, inspired, tutored and controlled and commanded by the Pakistan army opened aggression against the Kashmiris, stood up like a rock in defence. At that time, what happened? The Maharaja of Kashmir ran away. The administrative machinery collapsed from within. Not a patrol by police was to be seen anywhere. The Mohara power house was damaged. But remember that the Indian troops had not touched the soil of Kashmir then. The National Conference rose up and, under its auspices all the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs, burst like a dynamite and with slogans, hurled the enemy back beyond Uri. That was what the Kashmiris did for the temples of their Gods and the ashes of their Sires, the preservation of the hard gotten freedom and the progressive secular ideology. Now, if any power on this earth tries to by-pass the decision taken by Kashmiris or even if this Parliament or Government or any future Government tries to make any modification, or any sort of revision or modification in the arrangement that we have made, such an attempt would be resisted by the Kashmiris, with their lives. It will be fraught with dangerous consequences not only for Pakistan and India and not only for Asia but there will be tremendous danger to world peace. Anybody is welcome to go to Kashmir and see things for himself. I say it with an air of confidence, that Kashmir during recent years has firmly set itself on a path of peaceful and constructive progress. There is no instability, nothing like an idea of insecurity in Kashmir. If I were to say it, the interested world-powers will say that I am a Kashmiri, a Hindu and therefore, I say like this. I would like to refer this House to what has been said, after visiting Kashmir personally, by the creator of Pakistan; I am

referring to Lord Attlee, the ex-Prime Minister of U.K. This is what he has said:

"I gather that the tension of a few years ago has relaxed and that everyone in Kashmir and Jammu, apart from the territory occupied by Pakistan, is convinced that the present division of the country has come to stay.

Certainly they are very busy with development plans which were badly needed in this formerly backward State. We visited a girls college with 600 students. We have also seen hospitals and have detailed statistics as to the social progress, which considering the difficulties are very impressive.

We attended a meeting of the Constituent Assembly which is engaged in putting into final form the new constitution. I was assured that nowhere in India is there less communal tension. Certainly at the reception given to us, there were more than 1,500 guests who seemed representative of every community.

Altogether my impression or, judging by results the present regime is successful. It is also thoroughly democratic with local self-Government all the way up from village. I think that Kashmir has definitely opted for union with India."

It is Lord Attlee saying; it is not a Hindu, a Muslim, a Sikh, a Kashmiri or an Indian. It is the creator of Pakistan saying like this, in whose time the Kashmir trouble started.

Unfortunately, some powers in the world deliberately or otherwise are obsessed with a certain megalomania that Muslims everywhere are religious fanatics and believers in two-nation theory, and as there is a Muslim majority in Kashmir, therefore if the votes are taken, the votes will go over to Pakistan. In this connection, I would like to refer this House, and through this House I would like to

[Pandit Fotedar]

submit to the wisdom of the world, certain instances that took place from 1939 right up to 1947, which world conclusions prove the way of life that a Kashmiri Muslim had chalked out for himself. Since I have very little time at my disposal, I would like to refer to only one instance out of so many that happened in Kashmir. In 1944, when there was no question of independence of India, no question of Pakistan and no question of Kashmir. When the great Muslim potentate of undivided India—I am referring to Mr. Jinnah—visited Kashmir, we offered him the traditional hospitality; but, actuated by his old habit and by his urge which had in fact carried him to Kashmir, while addressing a big mammoth meeting, where there were tens of thousands of Muslims, he started telling them: "Look here; it will do you no good to align yourself with the Hindu Congress of India, because the National Conference is working under the influence of the Congress. It would be well for the Muslims of Kashmir to come under the banner of the Muslim League". What I am telling the House is no joke or exaggeration. There was tension and pandemonium in the meeting, stones were hurled at Mr. Jinnah. With the greatest difficulty, he was rescued by the police from the onslaught of the angry mob, put into a car and delivered at Kohala beyond the frontiers of Kashmir.

Many other things happened in Kashmir. There is only one thing now which can be done about Kashmir and I submit that this Parliament should pay serious attention to it. There is no question of Kashmir, no problem of Kashmir. There is only one problem and that is the part which has been forceably occupied by the Pakistanis has to be released. I am a believer in the non-violent policy of India; but, all the same, some measures have got to be adopted; some solid strong constitutional attempts have got to be made to release that part, because it is a standing shame on the name of India and Kashmir, which cannot be

tolerated. Once again I say to this House: Whatever may happen in the world; but, one thing is certain. Kashmir shall remain as an integral part of India and Kashmiris will lay down their life for it.

With these words, I support the foreign policy of India and congratulate Mr. Krishna Menon once again for his admirable handling of the Kashmir case.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore):**  
For the last five years, I resisted the temptation of taking part in any debate on foreign affairs partly because I never thought I was capable of improving upon the policy of the Indian Government and partly because I never believe in having an open debate in this House about foreign affairs. If I rise today to take part in this debate at the fag end of the present Parliament and at the fag end of this session, it is only to repeat what I said five years back, namely, that as far as possible the Government of India must resist the temptation of bringing the foreign affairs too often before this House. In fact, we are having almost every session a debate on the foreign affairs.

You are aware that even in the Business Advisory Committee, the Members in the Opposition were not very anxious about frequent debates on foreign affairs. When that is the case, I do not really appreciate the intention of the Government that this question should be brought before the House and discussed publicly. As a matter of fact, the hon. Prime Minister has been convening meetings of the External Affairs Consultative Committee, where while he ignored ignorance, he was appreciative of intelligence. I am sure every Member who took part in the discussions about the external affairs went with the satisfaction that all was right and nothing more to be improved upon.

Now that I have been given an opportunity of speaking on this occasion, I would like to touch on one or two points which are of general

interest. Time and again we have been hearing on the floor of this House the expression of opinion coming from certain sections that we should cut off from the Commonwealth. Today, and always I think, the hon. Prime Minister has been pursuing a very good policy of not thinking of cutting off from the Commonwealth. It is not a mere political dissatisfaction here and there that should weigh with the Government of India to take a decision in the matter of cutting off our relationship with the Commonwealth. There are several other things which require our close contact and which are beneficial to our country. Mere sentimentality should not play against the spirit of cordiality among the several nations of the Commonwealth.

In the recent debate about Kashmir, opinions have been divided about the part played by the hon. Member, Shri Krishna Menon. Even Mr. Kripalani, my esteemed friend, the leader of the P.S.P., has criticised the attitude and the time taken by the hon. Member, Mr. Krishna Menon. But, I am sure any other Member or any other deputy of the Government of India would not have done better. He put our case fairly nicely with all the details at his command before the Security Council and won the appreciation of entire India. If, today, there are certain sections which do not appreciate him, it is because of the prejudice that has been engendered in their minds and lack of political acumen that would encourage them to say a few words of appreciation. Even if our representatives in whom we have the greatest confidence are not appreciated internally, it is unfortunately a very wrong policy for any section of the House to engender feelings of deprecation and feelings of animosity.

The Kashmir question has become, of late, the most difficult question to be dealt with. While every one in this House has been anxiously waiting for a decision of this matter, it has not been possible for the Government of

India to get a decision as quickly as was expected. Naturally certain things do take some time; especially when you deal with cantankerous people, a long time is bound to be taken. We have to wait and see how our policies would be able to succeed. What amazes me and amuses me sometimes is the way in which the Pakistani leaders are trying to patronise and protect certain sections of the people of India. Does it mean that they want to create feelings of distrust between one section and another in India, or does it mean really that they want to create a fifth column in India so that their projects may have a fair-play here? Anyhow, it behoves certain section of the people in India which are supposed to be protected and patronised by Pakistan or the leaders of Pakistan, to be more vocal and publicise their intentions and show to the world that they are one with India and the policies of India and that they can't share the opinion of the Prime Minister of Pakistan. In this view, the Government must be a little too careful to see that all those sections in India that have got sympathy towards Pakistan do come forward and declare themselves that they are one with India and they are not anxious about Pakistan. In that way, they would be able to clear the suspicions or expectations of the Pakistani leaders to have a hand on Kashmir.

Very often, it has been said on the floor of the House, of course when the late Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee was here on the Opposition side, that a careful policy has to be adopted with regard to Kashmir and that the lukewarm policy that was adopted in 1952 and 1953 was not the policy that should have been adopted by the Government of India. Unhappily, these words have come too true now. It is, even now, not too late to adopt a policy of strength and confidence in our own capacity and also confidence in our demands. In that view, I would only suggest that the Government of India must make itself more strongly felt

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

so that all the countries of the world may appreciate the policy of India.

I would like to point out that the policy of Panchsheel, that has been so much spoken about, and publicised by our Prime Minister is not appreciated by all the countries with the spirit in which it has been given. Perhaps a few countries around us like China and Russia have expressed appreciation and probably have signed an agreement of Panchsheel. I doubt whether the other western countries have fallen in line with this spirit. So long, the concept of Panchsheel has been acceptable to India and a few other countries, not to all the countries of the world. The idea of the Prime Minister is that every country must accept this spirit of Panchsheel. The propaganda that has been carried on, I should say, for a couple of years about Panchsheel seems to have fallen on deaf ears and a spirit of separatism seems to be dogging their footsteps. Therefore, I say that too much of confidence in their reliance upon us, is a spirit on which we should not always depend. We have to be careful about ourselves and the words that we use. There should be no excitement or over-doing in our speeches especially on the floor of the House. Fortunately today, we heard our Prime Minister's speech marked by an amount of restraint and moderation unlike his speeches on previous occasions. If he wants a vote of confidence about his policy, a short and sweet, brief and bold statement of his would be able to secure for him any amount of votes of confidence more than long-winded speeches running into one hour in the beginning and one hour in the end. However, I appreciate the policies of the hon. Prime Minister. I would only repeat that in the future, at least in the next Parliament, care should be taken by the Government of India and the Prime Minister himself to avoid as far as possible discussion of this matter. At the same time, we should have frank discussions in the External Affairs Committee meetings.

With these suggestions, I support the policy of the Government that has been given out today and that has been followed all along.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Mr. Speaker, after going through the statements of Shri Krishna Menon in the Security Council, one thing that occurs to my mind is this. After such a long period of nine years when the first proposal or statement was made in the Security Council, after all the conditions that existed at that time have been altered, what is the justification now for the Security Council to stick on to the proposal of plebiscite? Plebiscite means expression of the will of the people. With half the portion of Kashmir remaining under the domination of Pakistani forces, and not a few, but five or six lakhs of the population of that area having migrated from that territory, what is meaning of plebiscite, when you have not restored the old order that existed at that time. The Pakistani forces are there. More than 5 lakhs of people have vacated that territory and certainly it must be now occupied by people who were not Kashmiris at that time. Unless and until, the *status quo* is restored, it is absolutely meaningless to talk of plebiscite. Whatever may be the justification of that statement that India is committed to a plebiscite one way or the other, I think that by this time India should withdraw this statement made nine years ago in the Security Council. Whatever may be the technical objections to it, whether the Security Council be in seisin of it or not, at least from the side of India, when we find that our complaint about aggression is not attended to, but a resolution is being sprung against India and in favour of Pakistan to agitate the matter in favour of Pakistan so that the old settled fact of accession may be upset, it is high time for us to withdraw from the Security Council which can give us no remedy to the matter on which we went to the Security Council. I think the stand taken up by Shri Krishna Menon at

the Security Council that with the altered situation and lapse of time, whatever commitments there might have been do not stand any longer and that Pakistan or the Security Council cannot have any ground to make India stick to the statement she made long ago is correct. We should withdraw the case from the Security Council and try to find out a solution mutually with Pakistan if that is possible.

With these words, I commend the motion to the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I will call the hon. Minister for reply tomorrow.

13-02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 26th March, 1957.