

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

2875

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 24th March, 1954

The House met at Two of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3 P.M.

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS

DEMAND NO. 22—TRIBLE AREAS.

DEMAND NO. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

DEMAND NO. 24 CHANDERNAGORE.

DEMAND NO. 25—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the consideration of the Grants for the Ministry of External Affairs. Mr. Basappa was in possession of the House yesterday; he may now continue.

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): Sir, yesterday the House had the privilege of hearing our Prime Minister on the critical international situation. He was pleased to tell the House about the horrors of war and was making a powerful plea for world peace. In that context, I was just considering how far the United Nations Organisation was helpful in bringing about world peace. I was also telling this House how, unless this international organisation has within its fold all

*Moved with the previous sanction of the President.

25 P.S.D.

2876

the different countries of the world, it will not be able to fulfil its objects. If we go through the proceedings of this international organisation we see that many vital issues are side-tracked or are not fully considered. For instance, when we referred the question of Pakistan's aggression on Kashmir to this sovereign body, its verdict or solution has not yet come. They are still considering whether there was any aggression at all. I would say that in this organisation all such vital issues have not been given their proper attention. I wish to say that if this international organisation wants to fulfil its purpose, it must include within itself nations of the different parts of the globe; then only will it be able to do its duty properly.

Coming to the question of our External Services and the Embassies, we have been told that they are doing very good work and have raised the status of India in the eyes of the world. It is true that our Vice-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, when he was the Ambassador in Russia, was able to interpret India properly to that great country, though we may differ from that great country in several respects, still it is an important country in the world and it was right that our Vice-President, who was then our Ambassador, was able to interpret India to that great country.

So far as the U. N. Organisation is concerned, one of the Members of this House, Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, has enhanced the prestige

[Shri Basappa]

of this country in the eyes of America. I must think that our Ambassadors and External Services have done a good many things but yet more things have to be done, because, I feel that in most countries the propoganda that is being carried on against India should be subdued. India stands for neutrality and world peace and these things must be inculcated in the minds of those countries properly. How far the rest of our Embassies are doing this work is not completely known. Therefore, I would suggest that as we have Commerce and Industries attaches in our Embassies, we should also have Peace Attaches in all these Embassies so that they may interpret to the world what India stands for. In that way, a lot of propoganda should be carried on through our Embassies by appointing proper and capable persons, and not persons who cannot interpret India properly. Such persons as know the conditions that exist in India must be posted to the Embassies, so that they may fill their posts well.

Another point that I wish to speak about is the border security. Our Prime Minister has told us that the policy we are pursuing has been yielding very good results, because in these vital matters of security, we have to be careful, tactful and wise, and it is better to use the method of persuasion than of repression. A number of questions have been asked in the House as to what we should do about the missionaries who are doing a lot of propoganda there. I urge upon the Government that they should take serious note of the work of the missionaries there and do something in the matter. I am afraid they are creating anti-Indian feeling, and if sometimes we hear from that quarter a demand for a separate State or something like that, it is due indirectly to the efforts of the missionaries. So far as our Kashmir border is concerned, we have to be very

vigilant. Only the other day some Members of Parliament had the privilege of going to the cease-fire line on the Kashmir border, and we know what an explosive situation exists there. As America has now come forward with an enormous military aid to Pakistan, our Kashmir friends should be looked after very well by us. Again, a number of questions have been asked in this House from time to time about Indo-Pakistan border riots and border troubles, about our cattle being lifted away, our men being kidnapped etc. How long are we going to tolerate these? So far as the border incidents are concerned, Government should take stringent measures to see that such events do not occur in future.

I do not want to take more time of the House because yesterday I had spoken for a few minutes and I know that the time of the House is very valuable, but one important major issue that has given room for some controversy, though not a full controversy, is that on the military aid to Pakistan, a discordant note was uttered by Shri Jaipal Singh the other day while speaking on the General Budget and I heard it with great pain. I should repudiate it and say that after all he is wrong. What is the meaning of saying that we were wrong in protesting against the military aid given to Pakistan? We were certainly right and the whole world was behind us when we said that the military aid to Pakistan should be condemned. He wanted to argue that we have received economic aid and, therefore, we should not find fault with the military aid given to Pakistan. He has not understood what "military aid" and "economic aid" mean.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has exceeded his time and he may therefore finish his speech.

Shri Basappa: There is no objection to Pakistan developing its

military strength in the normal way. Our Prime Minister has told us that military aid in such enormous quantities given to Pakistan will certainly bring concern and fears in the people here and we also see in the world a commotion on account of that aid. Even if assurances are forthcoming from the great President Eisenhower, we know how such assurances have been kept up in the past and how difficult and impossible it is to keep them up even with the best of motives.

There is another point that I wish to mention...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot allow even a minute more. The hon. Member has already exceeded his time. I now call upon Dr. Khare to speak.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Yesterday I interrupted the Prime Minister and put the question about disbanding the army. He perhaps inferred—and inferred wrongly—that that was a suggestion made by me. It was not so. I was simply putting the question to seek enlightenment from him on the problem of the army. I remember that once on the floor of the House when the Prime Minister was speaking about the U.S.—Pakistan Pact, he said that he would welcome the normal growth of the Pakistan army, but he was against such a growth by adventitious means like the American aid. I fail to understand why a person who is welcoming the normal growth of the Pakistan army, which is our enemy country, should not take sufficient care for the normal growth of our own army! He ridiculed the idea of the army and he said they are not going to be used for digging trenches for civil defence. He said that in modern warfare of atom bombs the present army is useless.

I am sorry to find that my hon. friend Prof. Hiren Mukerjee also joined him in this matter.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): If I may interrupt my hon. friend, I did not say the present army was useless. I said we did not wish to waste them on unnecessary activities.

Dr. N. B. Khare: This does not satisfy me at all.

My hon. friend on the right, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee, also perhaps sang in tune with the Prime Minister, a very rare sight to see, by quoting the Sanskrit sloka—

चिक्वलं क्षत्रिय बलं बलं ब्रम्हविदो बलं ।

He ridiculed the idea of *Kshatriya balam*, or military power, and extolled *Brahma balam* or intellectual power or knowledge. I tell him and tell both that what I understand by *Brahma balam* is not that limited power. What I understand by *Brahma balam* is!

अप्रतः चतुरो वेदान् पृष्ठतः सशरन्वनुः ।
इदम् ब्राम्हमिदम् क्षात्रम् शापादपि
शरादपि

Even Manu has said :

दण्डस्य हि भया सर्वम् जगद्भोगाय कल्पते
(The world takes the right path only by the fear of the rod).

That sentence of Manu can never be disputed by anybody.

I ask our Government: if you stand for non-violence like this and ridicule the army, why did you take police action in Hyderabad? Why did you send your army to Kashmir to fight the Pakistani menace? Why should you call out your army in the Streets of Bombay, Calcutta and elsewhere to shoot people, anti-social elements, who gather in the streets for destruction of property and life, looting and rioting? Can you rightly do so? I am not against it. If people resort to anti-social activities,

[Dr. N. B. Khare]

they have to be dealt with in this way. But it is use of violence.

Sir, I may tell you that world lives on dualism or *dvandvam*. There is no single thing in the world; everything is *dvandvam*; light and darkness, day and night, good and evil, pleasure and pain, grief and joy,—I can give any number of instances, and also soul force and sole force! Both go in conjunction; one cannot function without the other. Knowledge without power or force is ineffective and impotent; power without knowledge is brutal. Therefore, a real *Brahman* should possess both—by *Brahman* I do not mean a limited caste or community, by *Brahman* I mean an enlightened soul, nothing else.

I, therefore, plead with our Prime Minister that he should take good care at least about the normal growth of our army, if not by American aid. The world is poised for a war and we cannot remain like this. Otherwise, we will be regarded as impotent people in history. There is no doubt that America and Russia, or the group led by America and the group led by Russia, are poised for a war—a major conflict. Portents are there in the horizon patent for anybody who cares to see. There is no doubt about the fact that both the Powers are Imperialistic. The United States of America was in the first instance established as a republic of thirteen States on the shores of the Atlantic. In the course of a century and a half it has developed into a nation of 48 States. As a result of the First World War it took the German islands in the Pacific; in the course of the Second World War it took the Japanese ones and is now using some of them for atom bomb experiments. Both these Powers have got the desire to conquer the whole world, or rule over the whole world. I feel certain that the day is not far off when these Powers will engage themselves into a

conflict for world supremacy,—God forbid—I see portents of it. In this context I absolutely agree with the policy of neutrality—I have nothing against it. I only plead that our neutrality should not be of the football type, full of air only, to be kicked by anybody who wants to kick. It should be of the steel ball type which is used in putting the shot. If that happens our neutrality will be respected; at present it is not respected at all.

The question was raised about the Christian missionaries. I asked the question; it was parried by saying that it did not arise. It does arise. If American observers in Kashmir are not regarded neutral, I certainly say on the same analogy that the American missionaries in India could not be regarded neutral. The conversions that take place are not conscientious; they are only seductions by temptations. They must be halted; otherwise it will be a danger to the State; it undermines the loyalty of the persons concerned to the State.

There is a paper, the *Christian Science Monitor* in New York and one Bishop Picket was sent by them to meet our Prime Minister. It was reported that our Prime Minister said; 'So long as I am Prime Minister, I will not interfere in the activities of these missionaries'. I hope it is not true; it may be only a Press report—I hope it is not true.

We are neutral. Holland was neutral in the Second World War. Remember Holland, remember Pearl Harbour and look at the fate of that neutrality and beware. I am saying this about the last war. In Kashmir matters, I can say with legitimate pride that all our forecasts and forebodings have come true. It is time the Prime Minister revised his policy and withdrew the question from the U.N.O. and then decide what should be done for the Kashmir State. I

would certainly say in two words: attack it and attach it, and nothing else.

I should say the same thing about Goa and Pondicherry. He expressed a devout hope that this question of foreign possessions in India will be settled peacefully. I entertain no such illusions. I know there is bound to be a conflict and there is the backing of the colonial Powers. We see the war in Indo-China which is also backed by the colonial Powers. It is futile to hope that it will end peacefully. I wish it is solved peacefully but it will not be solved peacefully. We should be prepared for the worst.

Something was said about 200 British officers in the army. Some questions were asked on the floor of the House. Some secret information was conveyed by a British army officer to Pakistan. It is very regrettable. This shows the laxity of the system and this should be remedied.

Then, I want to ask: what is the use of remaining in the Commonwealth? Even the British Government supports the Pak-United States pact and wherever we go in the Commonwealth, we are not at all respected. In Australia our position is the same; white Australia policy is continuing; in South Africa it has become worse. Ceylon, that little island that sits at the feet of Bharat Mata—is acting defiantly and trying to curtail the rights of Indians settled there. The recent Indo-Ceylon pact is nothing else but a *carte blanche* for that Government to oust Indians from Ceylon as and when they think it convenient. We are not at all happy over it. It is time that our Prime Minister revises his policy and takes stock of all these things.

In the end I must say that if any danger arises and if the country is invaded from outside, in spite of all our differences, we will stand behind our Prime Minister in a solid phalanx provided he strengthens the

army and moves in battle array. But if he does not go to battle and wants us to be murdered non-violently by the enemy forces, surely it will be a most ignoble thing, and we should oppose it.

सेठ गोविन्द दास (मंडला-जबलपुर—दक्षिण) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का सम्बन्ध है यह सभी जानते हैं कि मैं इसका आरम्भ से ही बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ ।

डा० राम सुभर्ण सिंह (शाहाबाद—दक्षिण) : यही तो खतरा है ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जिस समय कुछ कांग्रेसवादी भी इस नीति पर संदेह करते थे उस समय भी मैं इसका समर्थक था । और जब हमारे साम्यवादी बन्धु इसकी कटु आलोचना करते थे उस समय भी मैं इसका समर्थक था । इसका कारण है । हमारी वैदेशिक नीति उस नैतिकता के ऊपर निर्भर है जो नैतिकता भारतवर्ष की सारी सांस्कृतिक चेतना की नींव रही है और इसीलिये वह हमारी परम्परा के सर्वथा अनुकूल है । हम यदि पुरानी बातों को छोड़ दें और आधुनिक काल को ही लें तो महात्मा गांधी ने जिन आदर्शों को हमारे सामने रखा था, दुनिया के सामने रखा था, महात्मा गांधी के इस समय अनुयायी पंडित जवाहरलाल जी उसी का अनुसरण कर रहे हैं । उस नैतिकता का कि जो हमारी संस्कृति की नींव रही है मूलमंत्र क्या रहा है ? उसका मूलमंत्र रहा है “वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्” अर्थात् सारा संसार और सारे संसार के निवासी हमारे बन्धु हैं । हम किसी से शत्रुता नहीं चाहते, सब हमारे मित्र हैं । इसीलिये अनेक बार जब हम कुछ बात करते हैं तब अमरीका अप्रसन्न हो जाता है और अनेक बार रूस और चीन अप्रसन्न हो जाते हैं । हृष की बात है कि आज हमारे साम्यवादी बन्धु भी इस नीति का समर्थन करने लगे हैं । लेकिन वे क्षमा करें, इसके लिये मैं उन्हें

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

कोई साधुवाद देने को तैयार नहीं हूँ और उसका भी कारण है। उसका कारण यह है कि वे इस नीति का समर्थन इसलिये करने लगे हैं कि आज रूस के प्रधानमंत्री भी हमारी इस नीति के पक्ष में बोलते हैं, चीन में भी हमारी नीति की तारीफ़ होती है। वे तो अपनी मातृभूमि या पितृभूमि रूस को या चीन को मानते हैं, वहीं उनके गुरुदेवों का निवास है। इसलिये यदि उनके गुरुदेव कहते हैं तो फिर शिष्यों को तो उसका समर्थन करना ही चाहिये। इसलिये यदि आज साम्यवादी हमारी इस नीति का समर्थन करते हैं, तो जैसा मैं ने अभी निवेदन किया, मैं उनको कोई साधुवाद देने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। हाँ, इतनी बात जरूर है कि अगर दिन भर का भूला भटक़ा रात को भी घर आ जाय तो वह भूला भटक़ा नहीं कहलाता।

एक माननीय सदस्य : घर आ गये ?

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जिस समय हम पराधीन थे उस समय भी हमने इस नीति का अनुसरण किया था। आज भी, स्वतंत्र होने के पश्चात् भी, हम उसी नीति का अनुसरण कर रहे हैं। उस वक्त हमारे पराधीन होते हुये भी नैतिकता के कारण हमारी उस आवाज़ में बल था। और आज स्वतंत्र होने के बाद हमारी वह आवाज़ और बलवान हो गई है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि गये सात वर्षों में, जब से भी लड़ाई का खारभा हुआ, हमने देखा कि दुनिया के भिन्न भिन्न राष्ट्र हाथ जोड़ कर, हाथ फँला कर, कोई अमेरिका के सामने भिखारी हुये, कोई रूस के सामने भिखारी बने। हम किसी के सामने कभी भिखारी नहीं हुए। आज हमने जिन शब्दों में पाकिस्तान और अमेरिका के इस समझौते, फौजी समझौते, के खिलाफ आवाज़ उठाई, इन सात वर्षों में इतनी जोरदार आवाज़

अमेरिका के खिलाफ किसी भी राष्ट्र ने उठाने की हिम्मत नहीं की थी। तो स्वतंत्र होने के बाद हमारी आवाज़ में बहुत अधिक बल आ गया है।

आज समस्त दुनिया का क्या हाल है यह मैं अभी देख कर आया हूँ। सारी दुनिया जो दो गुटों में बंटी हुई है, एक अमेरिका का गुट और एक रूस का गुट, दोनों गुट आज भयभीत हो रहे हैं, भावी लड़ाई के डर से। उस प्रकार का कोई भय आपको हमारे देश में दृष्टिगोचर नहीं होता। हमारे देश के वायुमंडल में और संसार के दूसरे देशों के वायुमंडल में कितना फर्क है वह हमें तब मालूम होता है कि जब हम विदेशों में जाते हैं और उन विदेशों की स्थिति को देखते हैं।

हमने सदा ही ठीक बात कहने का प्रयत्न किया और हमने देखा कि हमने जो बात कही वह ठीक निकली। जिस समय हमने यह बात कही थी कि ३८वीं अक्षांश रेखा को कोरिया में संयुक्त राष्ट्र की सेनायें पार न करें, तो अमेरिका बहुत बिगड़ा था। लेकिन हमने देखा कि हमारी बात उस समय यदि मान ली जाती तो कोरिया की जो लड़ाई बाद में समाप्त हुई, इतने दिनों के बाद, और इतने खून खराबे के बाद, वह उसी समय समाप्त हो गयी होती। फिर कोरिया का युद्ध किस तरीके से समाप्त हो, जब हमने यह बात कही तो रूस बहुत बिगड़ा। लेकिन हमने देखा कि वही बात जो हमने कही थी उसी के आधार शिला के ऊपर कोरिया की लड़ाई समाप्त हुई। आज हम कहते हैं कि अमेरिका की जो पाकिस्तान को फौजी सहायता है वह न एशिया के देशों के लिये उपयुक्त है, न हमारे लिये उपयुक्त है और न पाकिस्तान के लिये ही उपयुक्त है। पाकिस्तान तक के कुछ लोग हमारे मत के हैं। आज पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में क्या हुआ ? मैं यह नहीं कहता कि पूर्वी

पाकिस्तान में जो मुस्लिम लीग इस बुरी तरह से हारी है उसका मुख्य कारण यह है, लेकिन मैं यह कहने का दावा अवश्य करता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान मुस्लिम लीग की हार के कारणों में एक कारण अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान का यह समझौता भी है।

समस्यायें, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ, दुनिया में सदा रही हैं और जब तक यह सृष्टि जिस रूप से बनी है वही इसका रूप रहेगा, तब तक समस्यायें रहने वाली हैं। परन्तु डा० खरे साहब के इस कहने से मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ कि चूँकि लड़ाई हमेशा रही है, इसलिये हमेशा रहने वाली है। दुनिया में मृत्यों में परिवर्तन सदा होता रहा है। अंग्रेजी में जिसको बेल्यूज कहते हैं, उसमें सदा परिवर्तन होता रहा है। मानव इतिहास को हम देखें और देखें कि परिवर्तन हुआ है या नहीं। यह एक ऐतिहासिक सत्य है कि एक दिन आदमी जंगलों में रहता था और आदमी आदमियों को खा जाते थे। उस समय जो आदमी सब से ज्यादा आदमियों को खाने की क्षमता रखता होगा उसका सारा समाज उस समय पूजन करता होगा, क्योंकि वह सबसे वीर माना जाता था। उसमें परिवर्तन हुआ।

कुछ मानवीय सबस्थ : ऐसा नहीं था।

सेठ गोबिन्द दास : हमारे कुछ भाई कहते हैं कि ऐसा नहीं था। लेकिन एक समय ऐसा तो अवश्य था कि जिस समय मनुष्य के शरीर को खरीदा और बेचा जाता था। उस समय गुलामी की प्रथा थी, स्लेवरी की प्रथा थी, मनुष्य को खरीदने और बेचने की। आज भी शोषण होता है। किन्तु उस तरह मनुष्य के शरीर को खरीदा और बेचा नहीं जाता। जिस समय यह गुलामी की प्रथा थी उस समय समाज में जिस के पास सब से अधिक गुलाम रहते थे, वह सब से प्रतिष्ठित व्यक्ति माना

जाता था, क्योंकि उसके पास इतना बड़ा जन सम्पन्न रहता था। आज ऐसी बात नहीं है। तो यह कहना कि लड़ाई हमेशा चलती रहेगी वरिष्ठ अब तक चलती रही है, मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ। मुझे तो आश्चर्य यह है कि जहाँ तक लड़ाई चल कैसे रही है। यदि संसार को नष्ट नहीं होना है और मानव समाज को जीवित रहना है तो लड़ाई हमेशा के लिये चल नहीं सकती। जिस समय बारूद ईजाद हुई थी, उस समय कोई नहीं जानता था कि आज के एटम बम जैसे विस्फोटक पदार्थ ईजाद हो जायेंगे। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि यदि हमारी यह लड़ाई बन्द नहीं होती है तो सम्भवतः कोई ऐसा भी बम बन जाय जिससे यह हमारा संसार हमारा प्लैनेट ही कदाचित्त टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जाय।

दो बातों में से, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात होने वाली है, या तो इस मानव समाज का और इस सृष्टि का नाश होने वाला है, और यदि नाश होने वाला नहीं है तो लड़ाई बन्द होगी, आज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परसों अवश्य बन्द होगी और शान्ति की स्थापना हो कर रहेगी।

आज हमारे सामने सब से बड़ी समस्या लड़ाई की है। उसमें भारत की जो वैदेशिक नीति है वह शान्ति की नीति है। दूसरी समस्या हमारे सामने भारत भूमि में यत्र तत्र जो छोटे मोटे विदेशियों के अड्डे रह गये हैं, वह है। हम देख रहे हैं कि हमारी शान्तिपूर्ण नीति ने इस सम्बन्ध में कितना काम किया है। आज पांडिचेरी में क्या हो रहा है ? मुमकिन है कि अगर वहाँ या किसी जगह यह मामला न निबटा तो हैदराबाद के समान कहीं पर हमको पुलिस ऐक्शन लेना पड़े। अब समय आ गया है जब भारत भूमि में ये विदेशियों के अड्डे बहुत दिनों तक टिके नहीं

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

रह सकते और उनका भारत में विलय निश्चित है ।

दुनिया की दृष्टिसे हमारे सामने दो प्रधान समस्याएँ हैं । एक अफ्रीका की समस्या है और दूसरी चीन की सुरक्षा परिषद् में आने की समस्या है । अफ्रीका में जो कुछ हो रहा है, चाहे वह कीनिया में हो रहा हो, चाहे वह दक्षिण अफ्रीका में हो रहा हो, पूर्वी अफ्रीका में समस्याएँ हों चाहे दक्षिण अफ्रीका में हों इन देशों में जितने श्वेतांग रहते हैं उन श्वेतांगों की संख्या वहाँ की आबादी में दाल में नमक के बराबर भी नहीं है । मैं न्यूज़ीलैंड गया था । वहाँ पर मावरी एक कौम रहती है । उनकी संख्या एक लाख है और श्वेतांगों की संख्या वहाँ पर १९ लाख है । १९ लाख श्वेतांगों ने इस बात का प्रयत्न किया कि एक लाख मावरी को कुचल कर रख दें, लेकिन वे ऐसा न कर सकें और अन्त में वहाँ के श्वेतांगों को उन मावरी लोगों को नागरिकता के पूर्ण अधिकार देने पड़े । अफ्रीका में जहाँ श्वेतांग दाल में नमक के बराबर हैं वहाँ पर उनका वहाँ के निवासियों को नागरिकता के अधिकार न देना कैसे संभव हो सकता है ? आज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परसों ये अधिकार वहाँ के निवासियों को देने पड़ेंगे, नहीं तो वहाँ के श्वेतांग नेस्तनाबूद हो जाने वाले हैं । इसी प्रकार चीन को सुरक्षा परिषद् में न लिया जाना है । कल जिस प्रकार हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा, और उन्होंने बिल्कुल ठीक कहा, कि यह मानना कि फारमूसा वाले इतने बड़े चीन का सुरक्षा परिषद् में प्रतिनिधित्व कर सकते हैं, बड़ी गलत चीज है । सुरक्षा परिषद् तब तक पूर्ण परिषद् हो नहीं सकती, जब तक चीन को सुरक्षा परिषद् में न लिया जायेगा । तो ये समस्याएँ हैं और इन समस्याओं को हम शान्ति-

पूर्ण तरीके से निबटाना चाहते हैं । गुजराती और मारवाड़ी लोगों में यह कहावत बहुत प्रसिद्ध है कि : "धीरज मोटी बात छे" । यदि हमने धैर्य नहीं रखा तो ये चीजें शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से निबटने वाली नहीं हैं । जैसा मैं पहले भी कह चुका हूँ और इस बार भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ चीजें ऐसी हैं जिन में दलबन्दी को कोई स्थान नहीं होना चाहिये । भिन्न भिन्न राजनैतिक दल होते हुये भी कुछ विषय ऐसे लिये जा सकते हैं जिन में वे एक साथ रहें और काम करें जैसे भूदान यज्ञ का मामला है, देश में अन्य निर्माण के कार्य हैं और उसी प्रकार से हमारी वैदेशिक नीति भी है जिन में हम सब एक साथ काम कर सकते हैं । हमारी वैदेशिक नीति ऐसी नीति है जिसमें कांग्रेस, प्रजा पार्टी, समाजवादियों, साम्यवादियों, हिन्दू सभा, जन संघ, राम राज्य परिषद् वालों और जितने स्वतंत्र सदस्य हैं उन सब को इकट्ठा हो कर एक साथ मिलकर काम करना चाहिये । मुझे इस बात का विश्वास है कि यदि हम सब मिल कर इन बातों में काम करेंगे तो हम अपने देश में ठीक निर्माण भी कर सकेंगे और अपने देश के सम्मान को भी आगे बढ़ा सकेंगे ।

अन्त में मैं एक बात और कह कर अपना स्थान ग्रहण करना चाहता हूँ । क्षणिक और छोटी छोटी सफलताओं की अपेक्षा यदि बड़ी बातों में असफलता भी मिले तो बड़े आदर्शों पर कायम रहना यह मानवता की विशेष बात है । हमारी वैदेशिक नीति सदा इसका अनुसरण करती रही है । हम यह आशा करते हैं कि वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में तथा इसी प्रकार की और दूसरी बातों के सम्बन्ध में हम क्षणिक आवेश में आ कर छोटी छोटी बातों के पीछे न पड़ेंगे जैसे आज हम रूस से मिल जायें या चीन से मिल जायें इस तरह हम अपने हाथ गैरों के आगे फैला कर

अपनी बेबसी दिखलाने की अपेक्षा मजबूती से अपने आदर्शों पर डटे रहेंगे। और इस प्रकार डटे रह कर गीता के एक शब्द को सदा अपने सामने रखेंगे - 'अभय'। जहाँ तक इस वैदेशिक नीति का सम्बन्ध है, मैं सदा पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का बड़ा समर्थक रहा हूँ, वैसे कई बातों में मेरा उनसे काफी मतभेद भी रहा है, हिन्दी के बारे में मेरा उन से मतभेद रहा है, गो रक्षा के बारे में भी मेरा उन से मतभेद रहा है और आज भी कई बातों में मेरा उनसे मतभेद है, लेकिन जहाँ तक वैदेशिक नीति का सम्बन्ध है, मैं पूरा उनके साथ हूँ और मैं हृदय से उसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya—East): I rise to suggest that we should enter into a mutual defence pact with China and Russia. The terms of the pact should be of a very strictly limited character. We should give a guarantee that we will not invade these countries, and we will go to their help if they are attacked by Japan or America or by any other country. Similarly, we want a guarantee from them that they will not invade us and that they will come to our help if we are invaded by Pakistan, America or by any other country. It is a matter of no concern to us whether these countries namely, China and Russia, indulge in loot and plunder in other parts of the world. At the behest of the United Nations Organization, on the plea of maintaining collective security, we are not going to fight against them.

I suggest this pact because I feel that by entering into a military alliance of this character with these countries, we can nullify the value of American military aid to Pakistan. Unless Pakistan is confronted with the certainty of war on two fronts, it will not be controlled and it will not abide by our wishes. India from one side and China from the other in East Bengal, India from one side and Russia from the other in West

Pakistan—this should be our strategy. A nation that has to fight on two fronts is always defeated. This has been the fate of Nazi Germany.

There are people who think that the American military aid to Pakistan will not lead to a showdown. I do not think so. I think that within a year or two we may have to go to war with Pakistan. We must be prepared to meet that contingency. A policy of non-alignment is not suitable for that purpose. A policy of non-alignment starts with the assumption that neither of the two blocs is hostile to India. This is an assumption which has got no foundation in reality. The basic assumption of our foreign policy is that we can, by pursuing a policy of non-alignment, check both Russia and America, however much they may be opposed to India. I say that this assumption is not correct, because a policy of non-alignment can succeed only if two conditions are fulfilled; firstly, that the balance of power in Asia is not disturbed, and secondly that the cold war should continue till we have set our house in order. Unfortunately, the balance of power has been upset. American military aid to Pakistan has adversely affected our power position in Asia. And the cold war has ended. The cessation of the cold war has strengthened Russian position in Europe, and American position in Asia. Or else this Washington-Karachi-Ankara axis would not have been formed. Russia has walked out of the scene, and America has filled the vacuum. Our power position has been jeopardized in Asia, because the formation of the Washington-Karachi-Ankara axis constitutes a threat to our peace and security.

Probably, there is an assumption behind our foreign policy that the basic condition precedent to the maintenance of world peace is the permanent division of the world into three blocs, the American bloc, the Russian bloc and a third area pledged to non-involvement with either of

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

these two blocs. I say this is merely an attempt to maintain the *status quo*. History is in motion; the days of the nation-states are over; the dominant tendency of the age is towards political integration of the world. This tendency can be checked only by war, but war will lead to utter destruction, and not to the maintenance of the *status quo*.

I cannot understand the argument that if we ally with China and Russia, there will be war. We cannot ally with America or Great Britain, because if we ally with the Western Powers, there will be war. So, the argument is that the basic condition for the maintenance of world peace is the permanent division of the world into three blocs, the American bloc, the Russian bloc, and a third area pledged to non-involvement with either of these two blocs. This kind of a picture cannot be maintained for long, however much we may try to do so by pursuing a policy of non-alignment or any other policy.

There is a feeling in our heart that any collaboration with China and Russia will lead to Russian expansionism in this country. I wonder how a declaration by Russia that she will not invade this country will lead to Russian expansionism. This is what I would like to know. I wonder how a declaration by Russia that she would come and help us if we are attacked, will lead to Russian expansionism. I say that if the inner mechanism of the Delhi-Peking/Moscow axis is carefully studied, it will be found that by entering into such an alliance, India will stand to gain. I am a student of political science, and I am not moved by any ideologies. All ideologies have become obsolete in the atomic age. The restoration of the Czarism in Russia or the Manchu dynasty in China will in no way alter the validity of the proposal that India, China and Russia should come together in the domain of external affairs.

India and China together will halt Russian expansionism. India and

Russia will halt Chinese expansionism. It is in the interest of Russia to see that India does not go down under the Chinese heels, for if we become slaves of China, the power position of Russia will be weakened. It is in the interest of China to see that we do not become slaves of Russia, for if we become slaves of Russia, the power position of China will be weakened. The coming together of China and Russia has created difficult problems for us to solve. It is only from within and not from without that we can fight effectively those forces that tend to weaken our power position. India singly cannot check either China or Russia. Chinese dependence on Russia will be considerably weakened if we join hands with China and Russia. The continued existence of America as a world Power will prevent both the Chinese and the Russians from doing anything that may alienate the sympathies of the Indian people.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, speaking immediately after a speech; in which treaties have been proposed and alignments have been suggested, I find it difficult to follow the points raised. In this discussion which has been going on for hours past, I found that all sorts of unnecessary matters have been brought in. The question of India's defence has been unnecessarily mixed up with communism, anti-communism—everything. Some spoke even of international communism and my friend, Mr. Frank Anthony, raised his voice against us in this House. He said that communism is invading India. I believe he will say that communism has invaded this Parliament. We have invaded this Parliament because millions of people wanted us. Mr. Frank Anthony, or for the matter of that anybody in India cannot prevent communism coming into India if the vast millions of our people want it. Go and tell the people of India about capitalism, feudalism or, as my friend, Mr. Das, said, about the

American way of life and get the people's votes on your side. Why should you mix it up with the question of India's defence? The crucial question is whether the Soviet Union or China or any other country which has come under the Red flag is going against India. If you have got any evidence, place it on the Table of the House and let us discuss.

Everybody agrees that there is a menace coming today on our border and that is the menace of the American military aid alliance with Pakistan. What are we to do? Dr. Khare was talking about attack, attack and attack. All sorts of talk cannot help us. We have to depend mainly on the strength of our people. There I agree with the Prime Minister. We have to depend upon the sound sentiments, the healthy instincts and patriotism of our people. As the Prime Minister said, there is no fun in going about saying 'war', 'war' and creating a war psychosis; that cannot help us. That is certain. We have been looking upon Pakistan as an 'enemy' country. This we have pointed out many a time in this House. It may, of course, be made use of by some Members on the other side. But what is happening in Pakistan today? We have all seen what is happening in East Bengal. What is the implication of the events there on us? Sir, looking into the *Economic Weekly* from Bombay I found put down in their "Weekly Notes" the following passage. About the election results, it says:

"They boil down to only one, namely, a complete change in the present relations with India. The visa system will have to go. Bengali has to be recognised along with Urdu as a national Language of Pakistan. The border trade between the two Bengals has to be completely free from restrictions and a better price has to be obtained for jute by restoring the parity of the two rupees, if necessary. All these mean a complete reversal of the Muslim League's policies

and a revolutionary change in Pakistan's Central Government."

Let us see for a minute how our foreign friends are looking at the East Bengal elections. A paper like *Manchester Guardian* says: "It is especially unfortunate for Karachi that these changes are coming about at a moment when it is negotiating a series of international agreements which were to give Pakistan a new place in the world." Mark that. Therefore, what we have to remember is that we have to depend, that we have to count, upon the democratic forces in Pakistan. It is not a small matter. It is a very serious question which we should not take and behave in a way that discourages the democratic forces in Pakistan.

In the same way, we should not allow foreign agencies, no matter from which country they come—whether capitalist or otherwise—to interfere with our people and make matters muddy here. That is the whole point. If I do not want America to intervene in our matters, I do not also like the Soviet Union or China to come down here and make matters worse for us. I do not want them to make or unmake things for us. If communism is to come to India, Indians will choose it, and at the right moment it will come; it has to come. Our Prime Minister says that there shall be no war psychosis. But I ask: should not our people be allowed to have a correct appreciation of the situation? Should we allow in this country all sorts of people to go about from one end of India to the other? Can it be denied that there are in India the counterparts of those very gentlemen who are aiding Pakistan in the form of advisers or technical experts and all sorts of other guises? I can appreciate the spirit of the Christian masses when they want missionaries in this country. I cannot agree with Dr. Khare and say that every missionary should be looked upon as an alien or as our enemy. It is the

[Shri Punnoose]

belief of the Christian masses that every Christian has the right to preach the gospel of Christ to people. They may be allowed to do so, but it is very necessary, at the same time, that in the interests of India and also in the ultimate analysis the interests of the Christian community itself, that missionaries—both native and foreign—should not be allowed to interfere with the politics of India. That is what they are exactly doing, and that is what we object to.

Now, I want to place before the House a very serious matter that is coming in the public Press. You personally know that the Travancore-Cochin elections took place recently, and we had something to do with them. In the course of the election campaign, a statement appeared in the Press from Mr. Mathai Manjuran, a Member of the Council of States. He issued a statement to the Press and in that statement he said—the following is the sum and substance of the statement:—

“Mr. George Allen invited me on the 24th September 1953 for a friendly talk on September 28. I met and talked with him. He expressed intense interest in T. C. State affairs. He asked me why I was opposing the Congress.”

Mr. Allen had a friendly interest to do that.

“I explained my position. He tried to convince me of the undesirability of my joining hands with the Communists now that the Communist danger is on the increase in India and especially so since I am a Catholic.”

Mr. Mathai Manjuran is a Catholic.

“I clarified my position with regard to this also.

In the course of the conversation, I was able to understand many things regarding Brother

Vadakkan, leader of the anti-Communist front and its propagandists in Travancore-Cochin. Brother Vadakkan is receiving from American agencies an amount of Rs. 12,000 a month. American agencies supply to *Malayala Manorama*.....”

Malayala Manorama is a big daily in Travancore-Cochin—

“...newsprint at a cost of two annas per pound.”

I would not have read this statement..... (Interruption).

Prof. Mathew (Kottayam): May I enquire whether this has not been denied outright by the American Ambassador and also by the leading Malayalam paper he referred to, as an entirely baseless account?

Shri Punnoose: My hon. friend who is usually very sober is hasty in this matter. I am coming to the statement issued by Mr. George Allen. The Press report continues:

“Mr. George Allen issued a statement denying the charges. He naturally stated that the American Government has not given or has not promised to give any sort of financial help to any political organisation or paper in India. He said:

“Mr. Mathai Manjuran met me and discussed with me the general political situation at New Delhi Embassy on the 1st October 1953.”

The report continues:

“The general political situation was discussed by the American Ambassador with Mr. Manjuran and he states categorically that no observation was ever made in the course of this interview indicative of American interest in the national politics of India.”

I fear, Sir, that at this interview they did not discuss atomic energy

questions. Mr. Mathai Manjuran is no businessman and the American Ambassador did not deal with any business matter with him. Prof. Mathew will please note that Mr. Mathai was invited on the 24th of September and the T. C. Assembly was dissolved on the 23rd of September. It was therefore a very prompt invitation. (Shri Mathew: What of that?) Nothing, very ordinary. I may say that my hon. friend's name was also mentioned in this context.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Stand up and deny it!

Shri Punnoose: The only thing that I want to say is this: the people of India shall be left to themselves; the people of Pakistan shall be left to themselves. We have very serious questions, very serious differences, between the two countries; we shall settle them among ourselves. We shall decide the question of communism or no communism and all those things. But my charge against the Prime Minister is that he still allows every day these gentlemen to go about in this country with all sorts of motives.

Now, wherein lies the difficulty? I am sure the Prime Minister would resent it if he were here; the difficulty lies in our membership of the Commonwealth. You cannot be in the Commonwealth and at the same time do away with the U.S.A. That is the whole point. A long time has passed since we began to enjoy the blessings of the membership of the Commonwealth. What is the balance-sheet of our relations with the Commonwealth? I have noted down some of the points. They are: encouragement of South Africa in their 'apartheid' policy; Indians ousted from Ceylon, and the remarkable thing about it being that our friends in the Commonwealth see nothing uncommon about it—they support this act; growing restrictions on the entry of Indians in Malaya amounting to prevention; denial of elementary rights to Indians in British

Africa; support of the U.S.A. in their policy to arm Pakistan; denial of a seat for India in the Geneva Conference; influencing Afghanistan and other friendly countries to join the Turkish-Pakistan Pact; promise of support to the plan of Independent Kashmir; and non-release of Indian assets for the development of our country. These are the consequences, and therefore, I say that it is time for us to cry halt and sever our relations with the Commonwealth and follow a real, independent policy, and allow our democratic movement and our people to decide the issues. Then only our people will become strong; then only our Army will become strong; then only we will develop a national Force by which our borders will be saved.

4 P.M.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Sir, the German Attache to the Court of St. James, after the War wrote as follows:

"Men like Hitler, Goering and Goebbels could not speak two words of the English language. They had no intimate knowledge of Britain and they always claimed to be infallible when Britain was concerned."

The same diplomat mentions two essentials for a German Ambassador to behave himself in London. First, he should know that the British do not like any one to dictate to them how they should behave in their own country; secondly, they do not yield to threats.

I am sorry to learn and I am sorry to say that the two great accredited representatives of America and Britain to this country are blissfully ignorant of the wonders of philosophy and literature, the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayan*. Had they known the spirit of these two great epics ruling Hindustan, they would never have made the statements they have made after they have been accredited to this country. Sir, Britain did not seem to know the spirit of India

[Shri Joachim Alva]

until she vanished from the scene by force of circumstances in the year 1947. Neither does America seem to recognise the soul of India despite her great democracy. The American Ambassador said sometime after the reception, "We shall carry through this Pact even if India opposes. We have not decided anything but we shall carry on this Pact even if India opposes." The British High Commissioner to India and Ceylon said in Madras, "We support the Pact". The cat is out of the bag! The British High Command and the American High Command and the Pentagon seem to have been bent on supporting that Pakistan should be armed against the whole national will of India, forgetting that India was divided on the distinct basis that India and Pakistan shall live as brothers, as brothers of the same flesh and blood and inheriting the same traditions and that any military aid to either State would upset the balance. I think that when we committed the blunder of the Partition of India, we committed another greater blunder. You, Sir, being a great lawyer, will appreciate my argument. It seems to me that even a lawyer with the weakest knowledge was not attached to either side when the Indo-Pakistan treaty was signed. Ordinarily when two brothers separate, they separate with a great deal of goodwill and friendship. Sir, I am quoting from the Soviet-Iran Treaty of 1921, by which Persia bound herself that she shall not entertain any force from outside in her territories to the detriment of Russia and that Russia would be willing to do the same. In case of violation, Russia could invoke articles 5 and 6 of the Treaty and could enter Iran if foreigners came there to the detriment of Russia. In 1941 when the Germans were there and in 1950 when the American oil engineers were there and Russia considered it was against the security of Iran, Russia threatened to enter Iran

and actually entered at one time. If we had a clause in the Indo-Pakistan Treaty that no power shall be permitted to arm Pakistan to our detriment and similarly Pakistan should have a clause that India shall not be armed, this great blunder of U.S. aid to Pakistan would never have been achieved. Even if they tore to shreds that particular clause in the treaty, we could have fought and we would be infallible in world opinion in entering Pakistan saying that this treaty shall be annulled. This is a great loophole by which Pakistan has been armed by American aid. I wish to reiterate that both America and Britain do not seem to understand the spirit and the soul of Hindustan. If in 1947, the British High Command came to the conclusion that India shall be divided and the Army shall be divided, how is it that in the course of five years, they have come to the conclusion that Pakistan shall be armed and that we shall ignore Indian opinion whatever the ties with the Commonwealth may have been?

Now, coming to the point of U.S. Aid to Pakistan, I think the time has come in our history when perhaps, sooner or later, we shall have to reject U.S. help to us. The Finance Minister in his Budget statement mentioned a loss of Rs. 175 crores in our export trade, and the quantity of export trade has sunk by 50 per cent. with U.K. and 20 per cent. with U.S.A. We seem to have given them a *bakshish* of Rs. 175 crores of all in the export trade though the quantity is very much the same as in 1952. We have been giving assistance indirectly to both America and Britain in return for the aid we get. If an appeal is made to the people of India—and especially to the women of India (and our women have always stood by us)—they will be prepared to throw their golden jewellery in the melting pot of national economy and we shall have a fund of Rs. 100 crores by which we

shall be able to have our own armament factories, if necessary, to implement our national programmes and then this foreign aid shall not be necessary for us.

I was surprised at Shri Jaipal Singh's speech—he is not here now—when he said that 'we should accept American aid. What is wrong in Pakistan getting aid when two brothers are fighting with each other'. We know what Mr. James Burnham in his book *Coming Fight Against Communism*—a free book, particularly distributed here, has said. He has omitted a very important portion in the book that was distributed here, the Indian edition. He says:

"We shall mobilise the Islamic countries from Turkey to Pakistan to fight communism."

But, unfortunately, the passage regarding Pakistan has been omitted from the book which has come into India. We want to know why to mobilise the Islamic countries you should put one country against another on the sub-continent of India.

I would like to come to the point of Goa now. I represent North Kanara and Belgaum Districts in the Indian Parliament. My two Districts are on the border line of Goa, about a 100 miles. I put a question to Sir Stafford Cripps and to Alexander and Pethick-Lawrence when they addressed a Press conference in 1946. "What would be the attitude of Great Britain in case we demanded Goa?" I still remember, Sir Stafford Cripps, the great friend of India, tall and majestic, remaining silent for two minutes and saying, "Well, that is a question for the future Government of India." When that has been the attitude of the Labour Government which handed over power to us. I think it is high time that Britain made its policy clear, if Britain wants to be a friend of India and also wants to take a hundred crores every year by means of income. If America, which talks of democracy, wants to be a friend of India, it is

also high time that America said frankly what their attitude towards Goa is. We know that we can push out Goa into the sea. We are afraid of America making any attempt as it did in Kashmir. During the last war, the British Government had a programme, by which they said that they had got a fool-proof programme by which they could get Goa. If we start at 6 a.m. we shall be in Goa by 6 p.m. and all the resistance would go before us. If there was such a plan in the archives of the British Government in India to get Goa, we shall certainly be right and proper in getting Goa, if, however a war comes. What do the Americans say? I will read a most important passage from what Joseph Martin said when he was put a question. This is what the American Senator said in 1940:

"During the last war, Portugal aided materially in Allied victory. Its air bases in the Azores were a vital part in our offensive. To take the territory of Goa from a loyal ally and give it to a country with which it has no legal ties for 500 years would be unfortunate." (One might well ask, unfortunate for whom—for the people of Goa and India, or for some other interests many miles away?) "It is difficult to believe that India would be short-sighted enough to ask it."

"Mr. Jack McFall, Assistant Secretary of State, in his reply to Mr. Martin removed any misgivings which the latter might have held about the official stand of the U.S. State Department. In his letter he said: 'The Department is confident that India as a Charter Member of the U.N. would not undertake to absorb Goa contrary to the clear wishes of its inhabitants.'"

We are now grateful to Mr. St-Laureant, the Canadian Prime Minis-

[Shri Joachim Alva]

ter for the statement he made during his Press conference in Delhi the other day. He said that the overseas territories of Goa were not included in the NATO nor in the programme that the NATO drew up for the defence of those territories.

We have got a statement of Gen. Montgomery. In 1952, in Lisbon he said, as the Deputy Commander of NATO forces:

"The first is the absolute integrity of Continental and overseas Portugal. Secondly, and after assuring this integrity we must know for sure what contribution Portugal can make to NATO. As a result of the conversations that I have just had in Lisbon, all these matters have been studied and are now well in hand."

This is what Montgomery in his capacity as Deputy Commander of NATO Forces said in Lisbon. The Portuguese territory in Angola is being armed by the Americans. The materials are supplied by the Americans and they are even building railroads, airfields etc. there. A part of these are being shifted to Goa so that the balance can be upset to our detriment and we shall indeed be in an unhappy position. I want to stress the problem of Goa, because a time will come when this problem will be more dangerous than the problem of Kashmir. The American observers, who are over there, have not been neutral. It is strange that the public of this country have no right to talk about the neutrality of the U.N. observers. Some of the American employees of the United Nations have been fired before the Senatorial Committee as U.S.A. citizens. If the U.S.A. public have that right, have we not got the same right to say something about the neutrality of the U.N. observers in Kashmir?

Another point I should like to urge in connection with Kashmir, and that

is, across the cease-fire line there. If one set of American observers are on this side of the line, another set of American observers shall not be on the other side. We are indeed grateful for the offer made by New Zealand to send neutral observers, but we are afraid that these observers will be completely dominated by the Americans and we have no chance of any impartial observers on this point. The Portuguese territory of 1524 square miles and the French possessions of 195 square miles are indeed the black spots in our economy. I also want the House to remember the amount of smuggling that takes place in Goa border, and I urge on the Government to take steps to remove these foreign possessions in India more in the interests of humanity.

There are one or two more points I wish to say before I sit down. About the I.C.S. Ambassadors, I want to say that they are dominating the Indian Foreign Service. The I.C.S. men are fine men, gentlemen and gentlemen in creased trousers and they are wonderful men. Are they going to be the representatives of a new India? Quite a lot of them were under the British raj when the freedom fight was going on. I say that the Indian Foreign Service has to be cleaned up of these undesirable elements. I am bold enough to say that in the conference of our Ambassadors and Ministers which took place in Berne, the Prime Minister sat in the middle and there were about twelve Ambassadors, out of whom ten were men from the I.C.S. and only two from public life, like Shri B. G. Kher and Shri G. L. Mehta, and probably there was one more gentleman from the public life. Such a preponderance is given to the I.C.S. men. A bureaucrat cannot change his colour and he cannot think or appreciate what China and Russia have done for the progress of their countries. My friend, Mr. Anthony, spoke so much about Russia. I re-

member the lectures I heard from one of my teachers, in my school days, about Russia. Those days are now gone, and China and Russia are our neighbours and we have to live in terms of friendship with them. If Britain relinquished her hold on India or Netherlands on Indonesia, it was due to the emergence of Russia as a strong power, with the emergence of China also—this is a historical fact.

Retired Generals, super-annuated Generals, and old Generals should not be appointed to our Embassies. There are so many Majors and Lieutenant Colonels etc., that can be appointed to the higher military posts, but when they are retired, why should they not serve in the land of their birth? Surely, super-annuated Generals or old Generals, who should be sent off on pension, should not at all be sent abroad as representatives of our country. Where has been the failure of men from public life in the Embassies? Because there is a stray case of failure, that is in Mr. Masani's case, does it mean that men from public life will always be a failure if appointed as Ambassadors? There have been two or three notable failures of men from the Civil Service also, but I shall not name them for fear.

One more word and I shall have done. We have heard of the great Roosevelt's human touch. We have heard so much about democracy and what have we seen in the history of Roosevelt's human touch?

"Today we are faced with the prominent fact that if civilisation has to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together, and work together in the same world at peace."

This golden policy seems to have been drowned in the NATO and in the other military pacts that are being forged. The Prime Minister's

policy is a wonderful policy, I agree, but if we cannot trust the words of our representatives abroad, we surely cannot trust the words of other people who are outside Asia.

I welcome the forthcoming visit of our Vice-President to Latin American countries and we should cultivate our ties with them.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): We are having this debate today, if I may say so, more or less under the shadow of the recent military alliance between Pakistan and the United States, and it is but natural that most of the Members should have referred to this in their speeches. It is, of course, a very serious matter, but there is no reason why we should be panicky about it. If somebody builds a petrol dump near my house, I shall have to be careful, but that does not mean that I am already exploded and blown sky-high. I have to take my bearings and take every possible precaution, but certainly shall not be panicky. I have noticed in the speeches of quite a good number of Members of the House a spirit of panic. There is absolutely no reason for panic. We have to be alert, careful and watchful, but certainly not panicky. We have heard with great respect and attention the advice given to us by Members from various parts of the House. More or less, the advice has been according to the particular ideology of the Party the Member belongs to. We have had as usual a very brilliant oration from my respected friend Professor Hiren Mukerjee. His speeches are always brilliant. He has his political faith and has his pet affections for certain countries. His speech reminded me of the brilliant though a little vitriolic remark of an Irish speaker that every man loves his native land even if he is not born there. Mr. Mukerjee hardly ever changes. Again, that reminds me of a Bengali village story. In our part of the country, in orthodox families, marriages are arranged bet-

[Shri Anil K. Chanda]

ween the parents with the help of intermediaries. One such intermediary appeared in the house of a prospective bride and made enquiries about the education, beauty, etc. of the young lady and at last asked about her age, and he was told that the girl was sixteen. That time the proposal fell through. Somehow or other the particular young man and young lady were not married for three years, and again in the course of the search, this intermediary appeared at the house of the young lady and made enquiries about the identical girl, about whom he had made similar enquiries three or four years ago. After all other enquiries were made, he asked about the age of the girl, and the father said that she was only sixteen. The intermediary said that she could not be really sixteen because about three years ago he had asked the same question and got the reply that she was sixteen then. The father of the prospective bride rose to the height of his gentlemanly dignity and said "We are gentlemen and we say the same thing always." My hon. friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee also says the same thing always. But I can assure him that people who do not want to be roasted would not go either into the frying pan or into the fire. If the people of this country are not found of any military alliance with this bloc, obviously they would not be very much enamoured of a military alliance with the other bloc also.

My respected friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee in his mighty speech has gone even to the length of advising that we should scrap the Five Year Plan and divert all our money to the building up of our defence forces, etc.! I could hardly believe my ears. I shall only hope that he was not quite serious when he made that statement. But, if he was serious, I am sure he was advising us in this manner prompted by the interest of his political party. He knows the Five Year Plan project is one of the

greatest things this popular Government has done to bring into life the decaying and dying villages of India and he knows it is this Five Year Plan which brings this popular Government into closer touch with the people of this country. Therefore, he would like to break that! I have tried to analyse his speech, and the final conclusion I came to is a bit of a paradox. In fact, he has advised us to commit suicide first, so that he, at his leisure and pleasure, can come and murder us. We do not want to commit suicide, nor do we want him to murder us.

In the course of his speech in connection with the President's Address he said that America has taken this step because there has been a failure in our propaganda machine. The actual words he used were:

"I feel that our costly embassies have been more than a liability. I also feel that our propaganda machine has been seriously defective."

Now, I want to assure him, Sir, that we have no propaganda machine. This Government does not maintain any propaganda machine. We have certainly an External Publicity Section and it is the work of this Section to publicise the views of this Government in foreign countries, give objective reports about events and happenings in this country and also to report to us about the happenings and public opinion in the different countries where these agents are located. He says:

"I think if the Indian point of view had been properly presented to the rulers of America and those who are in power in the Western democratic world, this calamity could have been avoided."

Now, Sir, I think he is very much mistaken if he thinks that the publicity organisation of any foreign country can mould and direct the foreign policy of an independent nation.

There are several foreign embassies here spending lots of money on publicity. Certainly the policy of this Government is not moved one point this side or that side by the publicity organised and carried only those organisations. Similarly also, I refuse to believe that however efficient our publicity organisation might have been—in fact it is quite efficient—even if it were perfectly efficient, we could have in any way affected the foreign policy of other countries.

In so far as this matter is concerned, before a final decision was taken, the views of this Government, of the Indian people, were very clearly pronounced and proclaimed before the world. Our Prime Minister on different occasions spoke on the floor of this House as well as from outside in unequivocal terms and gave expression to his views on this matter. Therefore, it cannot be said that the American rulers came to this decision because they were not adequately informed about the views of the people of this country or of our Government.

I have noticed a lot of interest during the past one or two years with regard to our foreign publicity. It is as it should be. Criticisms have been made that our publicity organisation is very defective. In fact, I believe there are one or two cut motions even now before the House with regard to the ineffectiveness of our publicity machine. I admit that it is not a perfect machine—possibly no machine is perfect. I would however say we are certainly doing increasingly better work with the help of this organisation, but much more money is needed. We have to improve the conditions of service of our employees, of our staff, as I said in answer to a question sometime ago, we would have to spend much more money than what we are able to spend at the moment. We have nearly 72 missions scattered all over the world and for all these 72 missions and for the central headquarters organisation, we spend a little over Rs. 50 lakhs which is grossly inadequate for the

purpose of external publicity of a big country like this. We in our Ministry are discussing various schemes for making improvements in this organisation and I hope before the next Budget we would be in a position to come before this House with a new scheme with regard to our external publicity.

I shall now come to the question of Chandernagore. I find two or three cut motions tabled with regard to Chandernagore. It is one matter in which I think the Government of India have fulfilled all their commitments, from A to Z. When Chandernagore was transferred to us *de jure* we told the people that the final administrative arrangements with regard to Chandernagore would be made after consultations had been made with the people. With that idea in view, towards the end of last year we appointed a Commission consisting of Dr. Amarnath Jha and a Secretary. A general invitation was issued to the people of Chandernagore and political organisations to appear before the Commission, submit memoranda and give evidence, etc. Seventy different organisations—mind you Chandernagore is smaller than a subdivision, the total population is a little over 50,000—and public bodies appeared before this Commission and submitted memoranda. The Report of the Commission was received by us towards the end of December 1953. The Prime Minister regretted yesterday that there has been some delay in the presentation of the Report before this Parliament. But there are very good reasons for this unavoidable delay. The recommendations of Dr. Amarnath Jha have reference to various Ministries of this Government as well as the Government of West Bengal and it was not possible for us to place on the Table of the House or give publicity to a confidential report submitted by Dr. Amarnath Jha to the Government before it had been fully considered. But as soon as our Ministry had scrutinised the report and ascertained the views of the different Ministries and

[Shri Anil K. Chanda]

of the Government of West Bengal, the report has been laid on the Table of the House. Though the final decision of Government has not been made, the Prime Minister has already given enough indications to the House yesterday that Government intend in general terms to accept *in toto* the recommendations of the Jha Commission.

Now I come to the question of the North-East Frontier Agency organisation which is directly under the administration of this Government. There are several cut motions with regard to this organisation. I know some members from Assam are considerably agitated over what they consider to be dangerous developments in this area. My esteemed friend, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani in her speech the other day regretted the fact that enough provision has not been made or enough has not been done for the development of this underdeveloped area. That is not a fact. The five year development plan for the NEFA for 1951-56 is estimated to come to Rs. 3 crores. The scheme is being steadily implemented. Of these Rs. 3 crores, 1.35 crores are earmarked for roads: that is, nearly 46 per cent. of the total cost or the total amount is allotted for roads and other communications. Hon. Members of this House are not possibly aware of the geography of this area. There are areas where it costs more than Rs. 50 to send a single maund of rice. Therefore, the first need in this area is to build roads and other means of communications. This is being done under the supervision of the Roads Wing of the Ministry of Transport.

Of the remaining 1.65 crores earmarked for development, Rs. 10 lakhs were spent in 1951-52; Rs. 18 lakhs in 1952-53. During the current year the expenditure on development—that means, agriculture, medical help, sanitation, education, etc.—is estimated to be Rs. 48 lakhs leaving a sum of Rs. 89 lakhs to be spent during the coming two years. Great stress was

laid on education and in one single year in the area where there were hardly any educational facilities, we have already established one high school, twelve middle English Schools and 152 lower primary schools.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): May I know if the amount budgeted has been spent? That was my point.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I would like to explain the reason why we have not been able to spend, every year, the allotted amount. It was for the simple reason that you cannot throw the money. That is an area where there are no roads. Before you can build any schools, before you can take your doctors and put up your dispensaries, the first thing that has to be done is to build roads and road-making is something which cannot be done in one day.

An Hon. Member: Has the money been spent on roads?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I am giving all the facts if the hon. Members have a little patience.

We have awarded 185 scholarships in different categories; so far as the education in the lower stages are concerned, we believe that the basic type of education is the most suitable and we are taking steps for having all our schools converted into the basic type. Of Rs. 165 lakhs for development, no less than Rs. 65 lakhs are earmarked for medical and health departments. We have already opened 43 hospitals and dispensaries, three ayurvedic dispensaries; 33 mobile health units and eighteen anti-rabic centres and three leprosy clinics. 94 civil assistant surgeons in Grades I and II have been appointed and we have awarded stipends to 10 students for medical studies, 23 persons for compounders' course and six for the maternity course.

Similarly also considerable work has already been done in the health

centres. Modern methods of agriculture have been introduced and improved type of implements and better varieties of seeds have been supplied to the tribal people for their use.

We have one community project centre in this area at Pasighat. In spite of various local difficulties of a nature not found in the other parts of India, a steady progress is being maintained in this work. The Director, Community Projects Administration, has reported that work at this block has been substantial and significant. At the Pasighat community centre, we spent Rs. 181 thousands and odd during 1952-53 and 120 thousands in 1953-54 up till the end of November. Expenditure on the Community Projects in the area has been 23 per cent. of the total which compares very favourably with the overall figure of five per cent. for the whole of India and even more so with the figures of many Part A States including Assam. 145 miles of new roads have already been constructed and 90 miles of existing roads have been improved.

Since last year we have a new administrative set-up for the North East Frontier Area. This new organisation is comprised of the Adviser to the Governor of Assam; a new post we have created—that of the Financial Adviser of the rank of senior Deputy Secretary to the Government of India—this will enable the Governor to take immediate decisions involving Financial commitments in consultation with the principal advisers instead of waiting for a final reply from Delhi. Then there is a Deputy Adviser to the Governor; six Political Officers in the senior scale of pay of the I.A.S.; seventeen Assistant Political Officers in Grade I in the junior scale of pay of the I.A.S. and ten Assistant Political Officers in Grade II of the Assam scale of pay.

There has been some criticism that there was a systematic campaign on the part of the North East Frontier

Agency to drive away the Assam people from service in this organisation. I would like to say that nearly 66 per cent. of the Political and Assistant Political Officers are from Assam. Below Assistant Political Officers, we have officers called Base Superintendents who are also executive officers holding charge of small or large parts of districts in areas where Assistant Political Officers have not been posted...

An Hon. Member: We cannot follow the percentage of Political Officers.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Nearly 66 per cent. I will give all the details. Nearly 66 per cent. of the Political and Assistant Political Officers are from Assam. We have Transport Superintendents of the same rank. The total number of Base Superintendents and Transport Superintendents is thirty-one and all of them are from Assam. Of these thirty-one ten are tribals. Under these Transport and Base Superintendents we have the Area Superintendents, sixteen in number and they are all from Assam. Of these five are tribals.

I should mention that contact with the public at large is usually by the officers at the lower level and therefore, through all these predominantly Assamese officers the necessary contacts between the plain's people and the hills' people inside the Area is being maintained apart from contact on various occasions outside the North East Frontier Area.

There was a special recruitment board for political officers consisting of the Foreign Secretary, Defence Secretary and the Home Secretary and a tribal expert, the Director General of Anthropology in India, Shri B. S. Guha and for the recruitment of Assistant Political Officers, the Board consisted of various representatives of the Ministries but at the level of Joint Secretaries.

Applications were invited from serving officers in the North East Frontier Agency; in Assam and in the

[Shri Anil K. Chanda]

All India Services such as I.A.S., I.F.S., I.P.S., Indian Foreign Service and Defence Services. Altogether 825 applications were received. Of this 107 candidates for the post of Political Officers and 205 for that of Assistant Political Officers were interviewed. Special experience in border areas was given special weight. These officers are on probation for a year and will be treated as being on deputation for three years. It is proposed within that period to take a final decision about forming a separate cadre to include all the administrative posts in this Agency and also perhaps a few posts in Manipur and Tripura.

Of a total strength of 31 Political Officers and Assistant Political Officers, Grade I and II, twenty are from Assam, twelve being tribals and eight being non-tribals of Assam whereas eleven are from the other parts of India.

With regard to the Political Officers' posts, I may mention here something rather interesting. Assam has got five autonomous hill districts, under its own administration.

Shri Joachim Alva: I want one point of information from the hon. Minister as to how over hundred officers from the different parts were called to Delhi spending such enormous sums of money when Government did not seem to have a dossier whether they were able officers who could be picked up and sent away to the Frontier.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: The total number of applications were nearly 2,000 and if we do not choose officers after interview then the hon. Member himself would have come and said that there has been jobbery and nepotism.

It is interesting to compare the figures of the Assam Government with regard to the five autonomous hill districts under their charge. The Deputy Commissioner of United Khasi and Jaintia Hills is a Khasi tribal. The Deputy Commissioner of

Naga Hills comes from South India. The Deputy Commissioner of Lushai Hills is also from South India. The Deputy Commissioner of Garo Hills comes from Punjab. They are all from the I.A.S. And the Deputy Commissioner of United Mikir and North Kachar Hills is an Assamese. So out of these five autonomous hill districts of Assam under the direct control of the Government of Assam, the Deputy Commissioners of only two are from Assam (one is an Assamese tribal and the other an Assamese plains-man), and the other three are from outside Assam. You can see the proportion of the officers from outside Assam taken by the Assam Government and by us in the N.E.F.A. and that it does not show what Mr. R. K. Chaudhuri hinted at the other day, namely a "systematic driving away of the Assamese from the Services".

Then my friend, a respected Member of this House, Shrimati Khongmen said that it was unfortunate that in the selection of these officers and others the tribal people themselves were not consulted. I do not know how they could have been consulted. After all we had to put up a sort of Public Service Commission for the recruitment of these officers.

She also regretted that though there are Tribal Members in the House their co-operation is not sought in the affairs of N.E.F.A. But I think she clean forgot the fact that a Tribal Member, Shri J. N. Hazarika, is a Parliamentary Secretary of this Ministry. And during every parliamentary recess Mr. Hazarika has been deputed by the Ministry to go to these areas and contact the people. He has always given us very valuable suggestions and his reports have been very useful in the work of this organisation.

Complaints were made with regard to the appointment of Dr. Verrier Elwin. It has been said that he has

a particular theory with regard to the Tribal people and that it is dangerous for us to have given him employment. I, in my own way, have been a student, an amateur student, of social anthropology, and I do not know of many men in India who have done a more intensive and sympathetic study of the Tribal people than Dr. Elwin. After all we have employed him not in any executive capacity.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Nobody has any objection against Dr. Elwin's work. It is considerable and laudable. But the objection is to the opinions he holds about Tribal people being brought nearer to the plains people.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: We have not employed him in any executive capacity. We have employed him to give us technical advice with regard to the problems affecting the Tribal people. It is for us, as Government, to take decisions. We may accept his advice or throw it into the waste paper basket. Moreover, I personally feel—I am fairly familiar with his books—that he does not advocate a theory of the nature that the Tribal people have got to be kept as a sort of museum and not brought into contact with the plains people. On the other hand, we do not want to apply the bulldozer of standardisation over all these people.

I will end up by quoting a few lines . . .

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Has the hon. Minister enquired into the antecedents of Dr. Elwin in Mandla where he was working?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I am not quite sure if my friend has read the life history of the gentleman.

So far as our attitude towards the Tribal people is concerned, I shall read a few lines from a secret note which the Prime Minister prepared for the guidance of officers of the Ministry. Even though it is secret, I

am sure he would not mind my quoting certain lines from it:

"The effort should be in retaining their individual culture, much of which is certainly worth retaining. They have an innate sense of art and are a strong and virile people. It would be a great pity if in this respect they were brought down to a lower level, even though they might advance in some other ways."

Then he says:

"I would say that all this North-East border area deserves our special attention, not only of the Governments, but of the people of India. Our contacts with them, will do us good and will do them good also. They add to the strength, variety and cultural richness of India. As one travels there, a new and vaster picture of India comes before the eyes and the narrowness of outlook which sometimes obsesses us, begins to fade away. One feels that India is not just one particular part which we might know intimately, but something infinitely more—a meeting place of all manner of races, languages and cultures. Rabindranath Tagore wrote in one of his famous poems about India:

'No one knows at whose call so many streams of men flowed in resistless tides from places, unknown and were lost in one sea: here Aryan and non-Aryan, Dravidian, Chinese, the bands of Sakas and the Hunas and Pathan and Mogul, have become combined in one body.'

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Will it be laid on the Table of the House?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: These few lines I am prepared to lay on the Table of the House.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat): I was sitting with the patience of a monument, but I did not

[Shri Debeswar Sarmah]

hear the shortfalls in last two years' budgets for road-making.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: We want the figures.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister will circulate the figures. I am not giving him any more time now. Dr. Sinha. There are a number of speakers. He will therefore finish early.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): I consider that the Foreign Affairs debate brings us one occasion when we should speak without any undue emotion or excitement. This is an occasion when we should consider the broad aspects of our foreign policy calmly and with a cool mind. From that point of view I find that under the present growing tension of the cold war one feels like crossing a choppy sea. The world-wide tension which had shown a downward tendency since 1951, has changed its course. Now it seems to have gained a fresh momentum and begun to show an upward tendency again since the beginning of this year. In this changed atmosphere our Asiatic arenas are becoming, for the time being at least, more and more vital focal points of conflict. One Power block speaks about a war of liberation, liberation not only from the imperialist or colonialist yoke but also from all institutions which are known as democratic institutions. Another Power bloc speaks about liberating Asia from its would-be liberators. They speak as if the Asiatic countries were something like a pawn in their hands which they have a right to barter, share or dispose of in any way they like, or even to grab it at their free will. This is one thing.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, perhaps you are leaving the Chair. Before doing so could you kindly give me an idea if I would be given a chance of having my say on this? I have been trying to speak from yesterday. And in

respect the North-East Frontier, except the Deputy Minister, nobody has spoken till now. Perhaps few people know anything about it. So I beg of you to give me a chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All applications will be considered.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: That is an area from which nobody has spoken and few people know anything about it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These two minutes are taken away now. Hon. Members will try to give opportunity to others also.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I won't take much time. I will speak only about some broad aspects of our foreign policy.

I was saying that the two blocs speak about Asiatic countries as if these countries and the people there were something like pawns in their hands and they could dispose of them at their free will, as they chose.

So far as we are concerned, due to our geographical position and several other considerations, we are forced to play a leading role in the Asiatic countries, and we have to give a correct lead to the countries so far as the preservation of security, freedom and peace is concerned. In this case, without elaborating this point further, I cannot do better than read a portion of what Mr. Malenkov said a couple of weeks ago. It was the headline in our newspapers, and every one of us would have read and appreciated his statement. He said:

"A great contribution to the cause of strengthening peace has been made by the great nation of India. We welcome the vigilance displaced by Indian leaders in connection with attempts of forces of aggression in Asia."

This is quite correct, Sir, but I do not agree with the latter portion of his speech—and I think it is factual—

ly incorrect—where Mr. Malenkov said:

“The peoples of Asia under the banner of peace are full of determination to convert Asia from a hotbed of war into a bastion of peace. In this struggle they are led by the people of the Chinese People’s Republic.

With great joy the Soviet people stand side by side the Chinese people in the front ranks of those who fight for peace and international security.”

[SHRI PATASKAR in the Chair]

If you go to Middle-East, Far East or any country outside China you will find that everybody in Asia looks towards India and its leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who has the correct leadership. Nobody looks to China, perhaps at least in the Middle-East and neighbouring countries.

Our Prime Minister has made it clear when he said that the countries of Asia, and certainly India, do not propose to be dominated by any country for whatever purpose it may be. This is the keystone of our present foreign policy. Of course, our Prime Minister has fully realised the dangers which confront us today, and he is acting just like an expert skipper. What does a skipper do? Whenever there are signs of outbursts of storms, an expert skipper clutches more closely his rudder. The same applies today to the correct handling of our foreign policy by our Prime Minister under the present turbulent international situation. Secondly, experience has proved that the best course to adopt in a choppy sea is to direct one’s ship straight ahead facing the storm. Our Prime Minister is handling our foreign policy in the same correct manner.

Well, Sir, one thing which is disturbing the minds of our people and also of our neighbours is the Pentagon-Pakistan Pact. According to some reliable information the United States of America will grant

Pakistan about 200 million dollars to purchase American arms to re-organise the Pakistan army which will be increased to 900,000 men. The United States of America will send Pakistan 400 tanks and 700 aircrafts including 150 jet planes. Some of our friends have seen this morning one such tank and they can calculate what it means by 400 tanks. Each tank costs Rs. 4.5 lakhs and then there are aircrafts and so many other things. Naturally, this change which is going to come in Pakistan, is going to change not only the economic structure, but also the military structure, the structure of security and so many other things in the whole of Asia. This change will come not only in India, but the whole of Asia, not to speak of the degradation of political morale to the country which accepts the aid. This is the reason, we are supposed to observe very closely and to calculate its exact implications.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already taken about ten minutes.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I was disturbed, Sir, and I have actually taken only seven minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will realise that there are many more speakers. As a matter of fact, the hon. Member must have heard that there are people from North-East Frontier, Kashmir and everywhere who want to say something. I think it would be better if the hon. Member can exactly finish in ten minutes.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Well, we have nothing to be afraid of this Pact so far as the military aspect is concerned. The same thing happened in China a few years back. If the armament of Chiang-Kai-Shek can fall into the hands of Chu Teh’s guerrillas, there is no guarantee that the armament that Pakistan is getting today will not fall into the hands of Pakhtoon guerrillas or somebody else and that

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

will mean the disintegration of Pakistan, as in China it meant the disintegration of Chiang-Kai-Shek from the main land. Some signs of this weakening of Pakistan are quite obvious. We have seen the results of East Pakistan elections. Before that election, in order that the Muslim League should win, the Prime Minister of Pakistan had said that this Pact was going to strengthen the Muslim world. But, in fact, it has proved something which is anti-Muslim and this is also going to still further disintegrate Pakistan itself. It has created greater insecurity, in the words of our Prime Minister, and greater tension. We may add with full justification that the Pact means aggression towards India, and we have to get prepared from every point of view. So far as diplomatic channels are concerned, of course, our Prime Minister has taken great courage, but realistically looking we have also to prepare ourselves from several other points of view. One of them is, what is called today—not piling up of armaments; that is not the remedy today—"new look strategy" which has come out after great care and which the most modern countries have evolved.

So, our foreign policy is very clear on this point that we are not going to play a second, third or fourth fiddle of any bloc politics. We will remain separate. On the other hand, we shall see to it that our voice, which is the real voice of Asia, prevails. At least so far as the affairs of this Continent are concerned we have an obligation to see that no country in Asia falls a victim of bloc politics. We have gained national independence after hard fight, and must maintain it at all cost. This leadership and policy of neutrality will lead us and the whole world towards security, peace, liberty, and a bright future.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): I am much disappointed with the speech of hon. Dr. Sinha.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I do not want to deprive my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee of his time and I would only touch upon only two or three points. My idea is that our foreign policy should not be measured or judged by seeing how many missions we have opened, how many delegates we have sent, how many dignitaries we have received and what reception we have given to them. My measure is of seeing whether there have arisen any disputes or conflicts with different countries and whether at that time we have been able to solve them in the best interests of our country; and whether we have been able to canvass and create public opinion in our favour at that moment. So far as that standard is concerned and that measure is applied. I think our foreign policy has completely failed, our diplomacy has collapsed and we have not succeeded even in one event that arose when there was conflict with other countries.

5 P.M.

I might mention that the main issues that have arisen during these years were regarding evacuee property, recovery of persons, repatriation of Hindus and Sikhs, the Indus basin water dispute, the Kashmir issue, foreign possessions in India, and the racial policy of *apartheid* in South Africa. These were the questions that have arisen during this period and if we look into them and find out whether we have succeeded in resolving them or creating any public opinion in the UNO or elsewhere in our favour, then only we can say that our foreign policy has succeeded and we can thank ourselves. In my opinion that is a failure.

I got time simply to mention one of my grievances and therefore, I come straight to that question. This is about the publicity about which I gave a cut motion as well. I got a

letter which I will read just now. One man in Teheran writes:

"Attached is the title page of No. 51 of *Hind Naveen* a weekly magazine issued by the Indian Embassy, Teheran (Iran). No. 51 was issued on 18th August 1953.

Just near the photo of Gandhi Ji you will see red pencil marks on few lines which mean that Sikhs joined the Britishers and brought the end to Muslim rule etc....." this editorial note is by Mr. Nazir who is the Press Attache to the Indian Ambassador here.

"Though Sikhs are in a majority among the Indians in Iran, yet they are not able to raise their effective voice here. I request you to see Panditji or any other dignitary there and place this before them.... This article has ruined the whole business of the Indian community here because the Pakistan Ambassador is carrying on propaganda and quotes this as documentary evidence."

When I got this, I sent it to the External Affairs Ministry with my letter on 4th November, 1953. What to say of any action on that, I did not even get this much of reply that my letter has been received. I have been waiting from that date. I have received another letter also asking whether I had done anything. I could not convey to them that I had received no reply. My grievance is this. I wrote in my letter that if any action is taken, or if the Ministry decides to move in the matter, at least I should be informed so that there might be some consolation for these people that our Government is doing something in the matter. So far no reply has been received, not even an acknowledgment of the receipt of my letter. I place this before the hon. Prime Minister to see whether there is any justification for such a propaganda against Indian nationals in such countries where the Muslims

are in a majority, and if such propaganda is carried on, what would be the fate of those Indian Nationals that are residing there? This is not the sole instance which I am quoting here. There are other instances which have come to our notice at other places also. Therefore, this external publicity is to be taken care of and those men who feel interested in certain things should be pulled up so that our Indian interests in foreign lands may be protected. This has not been done so far. I would not proceed further because you gave me only five minutes.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): It is rather interesting to see our Deputy Minister who is versatile and who is an understudy not merely of the Prime Minister, but of practically all other Ministers. He has indulged in a language of declamation and invective and it was more intense when the Prime Minister entered this Hall. Anyhow, I want to tell him this. If your Five Year Plan was such a wonderful thing, why did you come to Parliament last August and demand Parliamentary sanction for Rs. 38 lakhs for propaganda purposes to enthuse the country? That shows to a large extent that the Plan was looked upon as a Party propaganda Plan. The damp squib failed to rouse public enthusiasm. There is a good deal of waste in the Plan. The only thing that I appeal to the Treasury Benches is this. There is no use of the Prime Minister coming to this House and telling the country in solemn words, be united. India is facing a "grave situation" after the Pak-American Pact. There should be tangible evidence of your doing something to prepare the country for meeting the danger. I said: there is room for economising in that Plan, don't waste public money; divert money for the purpose of building up India's defence, specially expanding our armaments militarising the youth of the country, and mobilising the morale of the nation. That has been misunderstood. But, I think the hon.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

House realised the sanity of my appeal and I maintain that it was a proper and patriotic stand that we took, not actuated by party motives at all.

It is some comfort to find that at last, after some years, Government has decided to do something about the old French possession of Chandernagore. I hope and I sincerely expect the hon. Prime Minister will have time to pay some attention to Chandernagore and that the people there will be given the right to elect a Member to Parliament and also to elect a Member to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly. I represent here the District of Hooghly. The Hooghly District surrounds Chandernagore on three sides and on the other side there is the river Hooghly. I had occasion to discuss the problem of Chandernagore with leading citizens last month when I happened to be there and it was a tragedy to find that there was a rather intense feeling among the citizens of Chandernagore that they were not being dealt with fairly. I had a discussion with ex-Mayors and also with the leading Members of the old Administrative Council which had been constituted under the Free City Constitution of Chandernagore. There was a feeling that they had not been dealt with fairly and that the Members of the old Council had been punished because the Members had been returned giving a crushing defeat to the Congress candidates who stood there for election. A big anomaly which was created has to be removed. The anomaly is this. I was shown by the citizens of Chandernagore documents or conveyances for which double registration fees and stamp fees had to be paid, one under the French law inflicting notarial fees and the other under the Indian law levying registration and stamp fees. Therefore, they were under a double penalty. When we took over Chandernagore, we said that the Indian law will be promulgated there and will be enforced there. At the

same time, there was no order or notification repealing the old French law. Therefore, it has been a lawyers' paradise; I am saying this much against the interests of my profession. At the same time, the poor people there were harassed by the double system of the laws and they want relief from that. I hope that that city will be given special consideration and that Dr. Amarnath Jha's recommendation for an autonomous corporation will be accepted. For years together, the city of Chandernagore under the French regime had enjoyed special privileges and special consideration and it was governed more or less like a city state. They want a certain amount of autonomy which ordinary District Boards and ordinary City Councils do not possess. That has been the recommendation. I hope the hon. Prime Minister will be good enough to see that the people of Chandernagore will get administrative, financial and cultural autonomy to develop themselves. I hope that a special subvention will be made for the purpose of putting that City Corporation on its legs and that the people would be able to develop their city in a proper manner.

With regard to Indo-China, I was rather surprised to note in the Prime Minister's speech really a cry of despair. I thought that the people and the Government of China would react favourably to his appeal for cease-fire. I thought that the French Government will react favourably, and I expected that the people there would react more favourably. But I do not know what is going to happen. I would like to know something more about it. But I think that the French hesitation is due to the peculiar insecurity of all French Cabinets. You know, Sir, the French Cabinets last barely a week, sometimes less than that, and the continuous changes of Cabinet bring a sense of insecurity and they cannot take a forward step.

We also want to know what is happening with regard to Tibet. We

understand that some negotiations are afoot and something is being done, but we want to know exactly how things stand. If there are difficulties, it should not be left to smaller people. It should be tackled at a higher level. And it may be high-ranking non-officials may be consulted, or may be engaged in that task which will be fruitful, and that may lead to better understanding too.

Honestly, dark clouds are hanging on the horizon. The atmosphere is tense due to this unfortunate Pak-U.S. pact, and especially the Prime Minister's repeated caution—timely caution—that the situation is grave. I repeat that President Eisenhower and the American Government have completely failed to appreciate the psychology of the Indian people. The hon. Deputy Minister was saying that everything has been done to convey to them our point of view. I doubt that. I doubt whether everything that could be done to convey to the American people and the American Government the Indian point of view, our national attitude, has been done. I think they have not been told, they have not yet appreciated, that if there is any nation in the world which will resent to be a stooge or a slave of a totalitarian power, that is India. We are not going to accept that position in any way or form. There are some speeches, as Mr. Anthony was saying, delivered by our Prime Minister and by some of our Ministers, and some American people think that some of our leaders, some of our big men, are fellow-travellers, but they do not appreciate the real Indian mind. And I want to know whether at the diplomatic level everything that should have been done has been done as to impress upon the American Government and the American people the real attitude, the real mind and the real psychology of the Indian people.

The whole country—there is one silver lining in the dark cloud—has

said in one voice that if there is really any crisis, we shall sink all our differences and stand shoulder to shoulder and support the Prime Minister and our National Government. That is the stand which we are going to take. It is not a question of party. When I said "militarise the youth", when I said "be realistic", when I said "make an objective approach", when I said "divert something of your funds from your Five Year Plan and do something for building up the defences", I was doing so because I wanted this country not to dissipate its energies, but be thoroughly prepared for all contingencies. This is the time for this Parliament with united voice to tell Pakistan—and if I may say in the context of things that happened recently, in Western Pakistan—that whatever be their policy, if there is any menace, if there is any danger, if there is any threat, India will meet it, counter it and defeat it, and India will be prepared for any emergency to safeguard her frontiers and her independence.

I hope that after the new elections in East Pakistan, the victory of the United Front will lead to better understanding and better collaboration. I know, if anybody knows, the leaders who have won the elections. I do not want to rake up old memories. They are still fresh in our minds. But we hope as that election has been fought not merely on a linguistic issue but on grave constitutional issues and on economic issues, demanding that all barriers between East Bengal and West Bengal,—economic barriers, barriers which impede free flow of trade—should be checked and put down, we hope in the new set-up that will be made possible. The average mass on both sides who are suffering from common distress still feel that in spite of political differences, there is not merely the great cementing force of culture, the great cementing force of language, but also other factors, social as well as economic, which bind them together. I hope in

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

the new set-up the barriers will be put down and it will be possible for the statesmen on either side of the frontier to come together and devise means so that the passports and visas may go and all economic restrictions on the free flow of trade and commerce may be completely liquidated in the near future.

I hope something will be done also to deal with the evacuee problem which, to a large extent, makes bitter the lives of so many millions of people. I hope something will be done about it in the new set-up. I hope, I wish, and I pray that this victory, which is really a victory of democracy, will lead to a better understanding and a better atmosphere. I want to say on behalf of the people of West Bengal—it is my duty to say that—that the propaganda which is going on in the Pakistan Press, that this election in East Bengal was in any way helped by the people of Calcutta or by the people of West Bengal, is absolutely false. That is a complete misstatement. This triumph is an organic evolution of the popular mind in that part of the country. It has nothing to do with any other party or any organisation outside East Bengal. It is an indigenous, spontaneous growth of the popular mind, and that is why there has been a rout of a very big entrenched party which thought that it was invincible. There has been a complete rout and that should administer a good lesson to all power-intoxicated politicians, who think they have got a permanent settlement, wherever they are.

There are one or two other things I want to say. With regard to Kashmir, I want to know: is anything going to be done in the near future? We are very much heartened that the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir has passed a Resolution practically in terms for which Dr. Mookerjee and myself struggled fought and agitated. We wanted the Constituent Assembly

to declare in clear and unequivocal terms that the accession of Kashmir to India was "final and irrevocable". Even today I find that Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed in clear language says: "I am not going to tolerate any interference from any quarter. Let this be clearly understood by all people all around, that this accession is final and is not going to be revoked." Now, Pakistan should be told at this juncture that they cannot have both the American Pact and raise the question of plebiscite. The plebiscite should be forgotten completely. It is not open to them when they take American military aid to throw Kashmir again into insecurity, chaos, confusion and uncertainty and at the same time think of a plebiscite. I hope that that position will be made clear. Otherwise, it will be paying scant courtesy to the deliberate decision of the Constituent Assembly, which, I take it, is the unequivocal declaration of the popular mind of the people of Kashmir, and on that basis, our stand should be made clear.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Debeswar Sarmah. I hope the hon. Member will try to put forth only his particular point regarding N.E.F.A.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: I hope and trust I may be given a little time to deal with the subject, as the subject has not been dealt with by any Member till now.

Pandit Fotedar (Jammu and Kashmir): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: The only point I suggested to the hon. Member was that as he was so very anxious to put forth the grievance of that particular area he represents, viz., Assam, should try to imitate what Sardar Hukam Singh did, because in that way I can accommodate more people who want to speak.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: I can appreciate it. I will bow to the wishes of the Chair. I am coming straight to the point.

Pandit Fotedar: I want to make a submission. I hope you have not forgotten Kashmir.

Mr. Chairman: Certainly not. Let the hon. Member Sarmah proceed.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: Before I come to the North-East Frontier Agency question, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not join my voice with those of the millions of Indians disapproving the United States-Pakistan Arms-aid Pact. I have to do justice to those whom I represent in condemning it in no uncertain terms. It is said that the United States of America, with a view to collective security, are giving arms aid to Pakistan. We are not prepared to swallow this explanation. Some of us believe—a large number of Indians believe—that the United States of America, with its capitalist economy, cannot carry on with the present tempo of employment if there is no trouble somewhere. If there is no war somewhere, the American capitalist economy cannot be sustained, and their employment cannot be maintained. That is the real and genuine policy behind this. Anyway, I submit that we feel that India, under the able leadership of our Prime Minister, is following the correct policy. However much I tried to follow Dr. N. B. Khare, I could not follow his argument. I suppose that India has a right to call upon him not to encourage fissiparous tendencies. Let us stand solidly behind the Prime Minister, and there is no fear for India. We of this generation know it well.

Coming to the NEFA question, I feel that the hon. Deputy Minister of External Affairs unnecessarily generated heat into this subject. The NEFA is an important pivotal area. I want to disarm the House of any suspicion that we from that side of the country are interested in a few

extra jobs of a view Political Officers, or a few Assistant Political Officers. That is not the case. What Assam is interested with is the policy to be pursued in respect of NEFA. The hon. Deputy Minister, towards the latter part of his speech said that in 4 out of 5 autonomous areas, the district officers are non-Assamese, and that cuts the argument which he advanced in the earlier portion, namely we are trying to have a few more jobs. That is not at all the case. Assam has placed the right man in the places named whether he is Assamese or not.

The NEFA has been treated as a unit of area for administrative purposes. But for a well thought out long-range policy whether in peace or war—or for the purposes of the development of the region or other internal purposes, one has to take an over-all perspective of the adjoining territories, I mean the adjoining hills and the plains. In these hills and plains including the NEFA, there inhabit many tribes, the Akas, the Dafas, the Miris, the Mismis, the Abors, the Singfos, the Nagas, the Mikirs, the Garos etc., whose total population is estimated to be something like 27 lakhs.

In this pivotal area, three great countries, China, Burma and India meet, and it is in respect of this pivotal area that India has been called upon to formulate her policies. We are to take the lesson of the last great war. In this area, India as a whole is confronted with most complex and important problems. One is that of bringing these primitive people in touch with the benefits of civilisation without at the same time destroying what is good in them, I do not want to use the word 'uplift', because it has been poohpoohed by Mr. Verrier Elwin, who is appointed our Adviser for this area, in his book *Aboriginals*. Of course, he has got his own theory on such matters. As regards defence, the lesson of the last war was that the invasion of India

[Shri Debeswar Sarmah]

was being conducted from that corner, and the relation of those living in these areas with the advancing and retreating INA and the Japanese should be fresh in mind.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): It was liberation.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: Let us call it liberation then. Now can it be said that this area is getting the attention it deserves? I submit it is not. It is not that sufficient amounts have not been allotted for this area. In fact, our Prime Minister is very keen on the speedy development of this area....

An Hon. Member: Carry on.

Mr. Chairman: Not carry on, but please hurry up.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: Quite sizeable sums were budgeted for NEFA during last few years. A sum of Rs. 65 lakhs has been allotted for the economic uplift of this area, in addition to a sum of Rs. 8,26,000 for community projects for the coming year. But if you look closely into the working in NEFA areas, you will find that a big chunk of these amounts is either not used, or misused or wasted. I do not mind the representative of the Government of India, who is also the Governor of Assam, and his Adviser staying in Shillong. But if the other officers, like the superintending engineer, the medical officers and others are to live in the salubrious hill station of Shillong, at a distance of about 350 miles from NEFA, as they do, how can they properly look after the work in these areas? That is one of the reasons why proper administration has not been carried on in this area.

We were very happy to hear from the hon. Prime Minister yesterday that the tragic episode of killing and capturing of so many people by the Tagins has now ended happily. We are all happy to learn it, but certain

important questions present themselves in this context. Did the Government of India have knowledge or suspicion of the hostile attitude of these Tagins? If they had, did they brief the Major who was commanding the Assam Rifles platoon? If he had been briefed, presumably we would not have had this tragic incident at all. We have not heard anything on this, from the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, or the press statements on the matter. It is quite probable that if he had been briefed, this tragedy would not have occurred.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: On a point of information. We have detailed instructions about officers going into the tribal areas.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: We have no means of knowing what these detailed instructions are. But it is quite probable that this episode would not have occurred, if he had been properly briefed.

An Assistant Political Officer had been to this area some months back, and he found certain symptoms of trouble. But after this, were any patrol parties posted in these areas? Was the murdered Assam Rifles Platoon Commander briefed about it? We have not been told. Did the Political Officer go with the Assam Rifles patrol platoon and if not why not? If the platoon commander was not briefed, then it must be said that our intelligence system is inadequate and faulty. This incident and so many other things should set us rethinking.

Money has not been spent on the construction of roads, and other measures of economic development, and every year, the sums allotted are lapsing, because of the fact that the administration is inefficient and the senior officers do not stay there. I am not talking about the Representative and the Adviser who stay at Shillong, but I am talking of the others.

Now I come to the new cadre created for the N.E.F.A. I must say that

the Government of India will not be acting wisely if they ignore the history and geography of this area. The geography is that the N.E.F.A. hills border on the plains of Assam and in past centuries there were good relations and trade between the hills and plains people. Broken Assamese is the common language in most parts of the hills even now. The history is that independent sovereign kings of Assam for nearly six hundred years, prior to the British occupation, were having the best of relations with these people, in politics, trade as well as commerce and placed the hills tribes in their proper place. We have got recorded history of this, and I wish I could read it out, but I do not have the time for it. This has been recorded by foreigners, as well as by the Assamese historians. During all these years of recorded history, never has a tragic occurrence on such scale taken place. But now this setting up of a separate cadre for N.E.F.A. virtually means segregation of these people from the plains people. Grant all necessary protection by all means to the primitive people in the hills, but segregation is to be carefully avoided. I do not know what stand the Assam Government took about it. But the public of Assam are unequivocally clear on this matter, and the Assam Pradesh Congress Committee has also made it clear that this question of creating a separate cadre, and segregating these areas will not be to the best advantage of India. They all strongly resent it and protest against this policy of a separate cadre for N.E.F.A. The Britishers had their own reasons for doing so, but we should not ignore the past history of this area and commit a grievous error by preventing Assam from playing her rightful and proper part in the development in this region. Assam never had nor has any tendency for exploitation. Government of India will be well advised to take note of this.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. Member Pandit Fotedar will finish in about five or six minutes.

25 P.S.D.

Pandit Fotedar: No, you told me ten minutes.

Mr. Chairman: I would advise hon. Members to mention only the special points, without going over the same general ground.

Pandit Fotedar: We have assembled to discuss the foreign policy of India and the affairs connected with it at a time when the world tension is mounting, when a stage has been reached in the history of the world when events with a bewildering rapidity and of great consequences are fashioning themselves suggesting a course of action on our part as well.

We cannot afford to toy with small things and things of a miscellaneous nature at a moment which, I feel, is a moment of national emergency for our country. No doubt, our foreign policy is one of non-alignment. No doubt, I have not lost faith in the foreign policy of India which has, in fact, made India emerge on the world stage as a power and a nation to be reckoned with. It is because of that foreign policy that today the war-weary world and the fear-scared humanity, millions of people, multi-millions of people in all climes and countries of the world, look up to India as the only bright star of hope in the otherwise dismal horizon where you find ominous clouds of war.

So I do not agree with my friend, Mr. Chatterjee, or with another colleague, Sardar Hukam Singh, that our foreign policy has failed. Our foreign policy has not failed, but our foreign policy has so energetically demonstrated itself in the counsels of the world. They feel that here is a nation intransigent, here is a nation growing up in the big sub-continent of India; somehow, they feel that if this nation also grows up and asserts itself, it will become a power to be reckoned with and then it may become a menace to the West. Somehow, I feel that at the present moment they are

[Pandit Fotedar]

seized with this fear. It is not so much the failure of our foreign policy as their own fear which has manifested itself in their course of action, in a way, of giving military aid to Pakistan. I am very very sorry that a democracy like America should be indulging in a sort of policy which eventually will not yield that result or achieve that end which it is proclaiming; rather the result may be the reverse. Perhaps the idea is to force India into submission. Perhaps the idea is to have a sort of greater military power, a rival to India, in the north and to compel India to toe the line of a certain particular nation in the world. India is not going to be cowed down. India has a policy and that policy must be followed. I feel that there has never been such a cynical, insistent inconsistency in professions as there have been in the case of America. For the last seven years, I find that America would not give arms either to Pakistan or to India even on the basis of trade, always suggesting that since these two countries are on a war path they are not going to give any aid, any military equipment, ammunition, arms etc. either to Pakistan or to India. I do not say that it is correct or incorrect. But today what has happened? All of a sudden, after seven years, they have broken the Indian neutrality. This is something unethical, something unmoral—all at once to have a somersault and give aid to Pakistan. Since the time we took up a very bold and courageous stand against this sort of thing—the American aid to Pakistan—both the American friends and the Pakistan friends have been at pains to explain it to us as purely a sort of mathematical problem. 'It is a book adjustment. You get economic aid; they get military aid'! Then Mr. Robertson, the Assistant Secretary of State says before the House Appropriations Sub-Committee of the Congress that they want to dominate. But all the same, the Pakistan Prime Minister says that there is no question of domi-

nation. The latter says: 'Ours is a free country; there are no strings attached to the aid'. I will also read out here what Mr. Allen has said the other day that if economic aid had been given to Pakistan and Pakistan had released funds for the purchase of arms, then America could not have any sort of control over the activities of Pakistan in the case of aggression, but that today they are giving direct military aid and therefore they could control it. So where is the argument of Mr. Mohammed Ali, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, saying that there is no question of domination or there is no question of strings? Also Mr. Eisenhower while sending that letter to our hon. Prime Minister says that in case this aid is diverted in any manner in the form of aggression against India, then the President of America with all the might that he commands both inside America and outside would see that such action is thwarted. Unless you have reduced a certain country to the position of servitude, how are you going to do it? That has been our greatest fear, that this aid would increase tension, that this aid would mean the reversal of history, this aid would mean the revival of colonialism against which we stand today.

Since the time at my disposal is very short, I would like to refer to Kashmir for a little while. Excuse me for that. I would like to utilise this opportunity by referring to the decision of the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir which is a decision of final accession adopted and taken unanimously by the representatives of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly, for which here on the floor of this House I offer them my congratulations—for the most determined and the most factual sort of decision that they have taken. In this connection, I would like to submit now that the representatives of the people forming the sovereign legislature of Kashmir have adopted a certain stand and

any action, any sort of attempt in any direction to by-pass that decision would be tantamount to a violation of the sanctity and the sovereignty of that democratic institution. I can assure you on behalf of my countrymen, the Kashmiris, that we will resist that sort of attempt with all our life and with our blood. We, Kashmiris, have just as the entire Indian nation, applauded the declaration and announcement of our hon. Prime Minister on March 1st in which a certain definite attitude—and a courageous one—has been adopted by the Government of India *vis-a-vis* American aid to Pakistan, with particular reference to the American Observers in Kashmir. In fact, subsequent events have showed that before the constitutional crisis in Kashmir, the American Observers were not above-board. Therefore, it is imperative that such a decision must be taken and if it is not taken, I am afraid that there will be fissiparous tendencies and certain mischievous and insincere elements will be allowed to have a sort of play in corroding and mutilating the entire political system in Kashmir and then we will rue the day when we did not take a firm stand.

Once again, Sir, I support the demands for grants and also the foreign policy of India.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I am glad I have come on this debate immediately after my hon. friend, Pandit Fotedar, who, I am convinced—and I am sure the House is convinced, too—has raised the tone and added urgency to this debate on foreign affairs.

During the course of these two days, several hon. Members have touched upon a variety of subjects into which it is not possible for anyone, with the limited time given, to go with any sense of competence or exhaustiveness. I have heard a number of times, almost every day, many speeches, but I must confess that I was never more sorry than when I heard the day before yesterday the

speech delivered in this House by my hon. friend, Mr. Jaipal Singh, and also yesterday by my hon. friend, Mr. Frank Anthony. I felt very much pained to hear these two hon. gentlemen make statements which only do credit to the enemies of this country. I have got here the record. My hon. friend Shri Jaipal Singh used the words, "I welcome it (the military aid to Pakistan by the U.S.A.) advisedly." Here is the record of yesterday's proceedings, and my hon. friend Mr. Anthony said, according to the record, "the Government of India represents the greatest propagandist of communism in India." I regret that my hon. friends are not here. I regret to say that my hon. friend Mr. Anthony, whom I know for a number of years, should have allowed himself to make statements of this character. If these statements came from, shall we say, the American lobbyists who have been prominent in this Parliament House during the last fortnight or the Democratic Research Service, I would not have any quarrel. Apparently, my hon. friends—unfortunately for me, they come from my side of the house and belong to the Opposition Benches—apparently they seem to suggest that we are inviting the Soviet Armies or the Chinese Army across Ladakh to attack the security of Pakistan or something like that. I consider that this House should put beyond any shadow of doubt, beyond every shadow of doubt, that these statements of my hon. friends will not be endorsed by any hon. Member in this House, because they are dangerous, mischievous and completely disruptive of the national unity of the country. This is the reason why, you would recall, Mr. Chairman, that when the hon. the Leader of the House made his historic statement on the 1st March, I stated promptly that he should put down a motion on the Order Paper and ask for a complete and unanimous endorsement of it. I am afraid my hon. friends have said things in a moment of unthinking confusion really, with the result that

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

even now it will not be too late for them to recant. I am glad that the hon. the Leader of the House has stated yesterday that he would agree to a foreign affairs debate at a later stage, and I hope he will ask for a vote of confidence, although I believe that such a vote of confidence is not necessary because there is such a complete unanimity between the Prime Minister and the House in regard to the U.S.-Pakistan Pact.

There is a plethora of statements from across the Atlantic as to the intentions of the United States of America in regard to this military aid to Pakistan and also in relation to the proposed Pact between Pakistan and Turkey. You would recall that President Eisenhower has assured India that the U.S. would use all its might to prevent Pakistan from utilising such of the armed assistance as is now proffered to be given, against India. Similar assurances were given before President Eisenhower with reference to the assistance given to General Chiang-Kai-Shek in China and also to Dr. Syngman Rhee. It has happened that the verdict of history for the past ten years have been that these two estimable gentlemen in the Far East have not only received military aid from the United States worth several billion dollars, but they have also dictated their policies to the Pentagon in Washington.

Yesterday's papers carried a story about a statement made by the American Ambassador in India, Mr. Allen, in Bombay, in which he said that America has put Pakistan on oath not to use this proffered military assistance or aid against India. I would like to know whether really this is a proposition worth taking notice of seriously in this country. Does it mean that every Pakistani, our neighbour, would swear on the Koran that this aid would not be used against India? Does it mean that the American Government today pins its faith in Mr. Mohammed Ali,

the Prime Minister of Pakistan, to carry out this assurance on oath that such proffered assistance to Pakistan would not be utilised in any eventuality against India? I consider these to be statements which are not only fatuous, but also statements which will lead us to fantastic conclusions. Finally, I would like to ask the U.S.A. from this House, in the name of this country as a citizen of India, whether that country has seen the writing on the wall—the recent revolution in East Pakistan? Has that country read the meaning of the developments in the North-West Frontier Province, or the statements of Badshah Khan and the statements of the accredited spokesmen of Sind and Baluchistan? Has the U.S.A. considered all these and then seen who are going to carry out the assurance given on oath or sought to be given on oath by Pakistan in the event of certain developments taking place in this sub-continent? These are the real issues involved and I wish this debate had focussed attention on them.

In order to test or to put the professions of the U.S.A. to the touchstone, I would like to mention to this hon. House two or three propositions. Why should American publicmen and the Press always blackguard Indians by saying that we belong to or that we have been satellites of the Soviet bloc? Why should they consistently try to besmear the fair name of the Prime Minister by saying that he is a fellow-traveller, if not an actual communist? I am a fairly keen student of international documents and the hon. House will give me some credit for that. Only today, *Pravda*, the paper from Moscow, for the first time in seven years has supported India in her protest against the activities of the U.S. observers in Kashmir! Where is this partisanship, where is this fellow-travellership, about which Mr. Anthony said so many things yesterday in debate?

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I never said that.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There may be no difficulty at all about unity in the Cabinet. I am prepared to accept the statement of our Prime Minister yesterday. But, I must warn him that there is an attempt at high quarters in other countries to build up people from this country as potential Generals Zahedi let there be no mistake about it—in order that, in certain given contingencies, even during the life-time of the Prime Minister, they would make these potential Generals Zahedi to succeed to power in this country. I would like to warn the foreign powers concerned that India is not such a country that we shall see what we saw in Iran, Iraq or even Pakistan for the matter of that, where people get built up into seats of power. We have seen recently what happened in Pakistan, and how people were made overnight the rulers of the country. It is time that the world understands this point that there can be no Trojan Horse built up in this country to play the game of their power politics.

Finally, I would tell the U.S.A. from this rostrum that for 7 years they have done what they wanted to do with reference to Kashmir. I am glad to take part in the debate immediately after Pandit Fotedar. It is the Americans who have succumbed to the wiles of the British in their game regarding Kashmir. I am here to declare it with no qualms of conscience, without any reservation at all, that it is the Shawcrosses, Gladwyn Jebbs that shaped the policy of America towards India in Kashmir. If America really wants to establish friendly relations with India, if she has friendly intentions towards us, peaceful intentions towards us, in the light of the proposed military aid to Pakistan, why can't she settle this question? She can hold over aid for some time. She can do it without any difficulty at all. Why can't she solve the questions relating to Pondicherry and Goa? Why can't she use her good offices in solving this? These are the acid tests

to which the United States of America should be put. All the protestations of President Eisenhower, Allen and others will be of no consequence to us unless these issues are solved.

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : सभापति जी, कल से हमारी वैदेशिक नीति पर यहां बहस चल रही है। उसको कुछ में ने खुद सुना और कुछ मुझे सुनाया गया।

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

और मैंने सोचा कि इस बड़े मजमून पर कहां तक हमारी निगाहें पूरी तस्वीर की तरफ हैं और कहां तक उसके इधर उधर एक छोटे कोने पर। अक्सर बातें कही गईं जो कि जरूरी हैं और माकूल हैं

Shri Punnoose: Will he give a summary of his speech in Hindi? Otherwise there is no use of our being here.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member will remember that I spoke in English yesterday. If there is anything if I may say so, new, certainly I shall see to it that the hon. Member gets it. Apart from any attempt of mine, presumably, our friends of the Press will help him in getting it.

मैं किसी कदर आपका मशकूर हूँ कि छोटी छोटी बातों का जिक्र करके आप ने उधर ध्यान दिलाया या पूरी तस्वीर की तरफ ध्यान दिलाया। वाकया यह है कि जब से हम आजाद हुये, हम भी इस दुनिया के बड़े तमाशे में एक खिलाड़ी हो गये। उसके पहले हम तमाशबीनों में थे, देखा करते थे और अपनी राय देते थे, इधर या उधर। अब भी राय देते हैं, जाहिर है लेकिन अब फर्क हो गया है क्योंकि हम खुद थियेटर के स्टेज पर आ गये हैं और और जोग अभी हमारे खेल को देखते हैं हमारे मल्क के और दूसरे मल्कों के। और आप जानते हैं

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

कि जमाना ऐसा है कि दुनिया में अजीब खतर-नाक खेल हो रहे हैं। मालूम नहीं कि उनका नतीजा क्या हो और असर क्या हो। बार बार मैंने आपसे कहा और याद दिलाया कि हमारे हाथ में एक बड़ा मुल्क है, हमें अपने मुल्क पर गुर्र है। लेकिन आखिर में हमारे हाथ में कोई दुनिया की किस्मत का फंसला करना नहीं है और यह बात समझना कि हम उसको उलट पुलट कर सकते हैं अपने को घोखा देना है। हो सकता है कि हम कभी कभी तराजू को इधर या उधर झका सकें और उससे भी कुछ न कुछ फर्क हो जाय जब कि तराजू में दोनों तरफ बराबर वजन हो। बहरसूरत, फर्क हो या न हो, हमें तो इस बात की कोशिश करनी है कि हम अपनी राय में सही रास्ते पर चलें।

कहा जाता है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति न्यूट्रैलिटी की या निरपेक्षिता की है। यह शब्द बहुत अच्छा तर्जमा नहीं है, इसलिये मैंने दोनों शब्द कह दिये। यह अनुवाद है इम्पारशियलिटी का जो कि एक दूसरी चीज है। लेकिन मैं ने यह भी कहा है कि यह सही नहीं है। यह शब्द तभी काम में आता है जब कि दो मुल्क लड़ाई लड़ रहे हों और तीसरा मुल्क उससे अलग हो। इस शब्द के प्रयोग से ही मालूम होता है कि लोगों के दिमाग में सिवाय लड़ाई के और कोई बात आती नहीं है। हमारी नीति तो खाली यह है कि जो हम किसी समय उचित समझें उसको करें और किसी दूसरे के दबाव में आ कर दूसरी बात न करें। यह नीति है। इसको आप निरपेक्षिता कहिये या कुछ भी कहिये। मैं तो उसको कहूंगा एक स्वतंत्र और आजाद नीति और कुछ नहीं। उसमें यह ही सकता है कि कभी किसी नीति का साथ देगा और कभी किसी

नीति से अलग रहना, कभी अपनी तरफ से कुछ कहना। अब अपनी तरफ से कहना तो बहुत ठीक है। लेकिन किसी देश का इस तरह से काम चलाना कि वह सारी दुनिया से अलग हिमालय की चोटी पर बैठा हुआ है यह भी कुछ ठीक नहीं है। दुनिया के कारो-बार से कुछ सम्बन्ध तो होना चाहिये, और वाक्यात को देख कर कुछ अपनी नीति को भी झुकाना चाहिये नहीं तो वह एक हवाई नीति हो जाती है। अब इस सम्बन्ध में मोटी बात यह है कि दुनिया में दो बहुत ताकतवर और बड़े देश हैं जिनको आप जानते हैं और उन में एक दूसरे से यह कहना कि मित्रता नहीं है, यह कमजोर शब्द है, अजीब शक है। दुश्मनी की नज़र से एक दूसरे की तरफ देखते हैं, एक दूसरे से डर है और एक दूसरे के खिलाफ तैयारी है। मैं इसमें नहीं जाना चाहता हालांकि इसमें बहस हो सकती है कि कहां कौन सही है और कहां कौन गलत है। यह बहस दूसरी है। लेकिन जो बात हमें समझनी है वह यह है कि सही या गलत दो बड़ी ताकतें एक दूसरे के खिलाफ हैं और एक दूसरे से डरती हैं और एक दूसरे के खिलाफ लड़ाई की तैयारी करती हैं, और अजीब हालत यह होती है कि हर एक कहता है कि हम तैयारी कर रहे हैं दूसरे के हमले से अपने को बचाने के लिये। और उस तैयारी का नतीजा यह होता है कि दूसरा समझता है कि यह हमला करने के लिये तैयारी कर रहा है, और दोनों तरफ यही बात है और दोनों को डर है। वह कहते हैं कि देखो वह बढ़ते आते हैं, कुछ खुल्लमखुल्ला, कुछ खुफिया जासूसों के जरिये से बढ़ते हैं, गड़बड़ पैदा करने के लिये। दूसरे कहते हैं कि नक्शा देख लो, हमें चारों तरफ से घेर लिया है, हमारे चारों तरफ एटम बम वगैरह फेंकने के लिथ अड्डें बना लिये हैं, और हम खतरे में हैं। तो दोनों के दिलों में यह ख्याल

हैं कि हम खतरे में हैं और दूसरा फरीक हमें खत्म करने की तैयारी कर रहा है और इस डर से वह तैयारी दोनों तरफ बढ़ती जाती है। नतीजा यह होता है कि तराज दोनों तरफ करीब करीब बराबर होती है, या इधर उधर थोड़ा बहुत कमोबेश हो और हल्के हल्के दोनों खतरे की तरफ बढ़ते हैं। तो इस तरह से लड़ाई का खतरा बढ़ता है। आजकल की लड़ाई एक अजीबोगरीब चीज़ है जिसका मुकाबिला नहीं हो सकता। आपने देखा होगा कि चन्द दिन हुए कि ब्रिकनी टापू पर एटम बम या हाइड्रोजन बम छोड़ा गया था और उसका असर लोगों पर ५०० मील के फासले पर पड़ा, फौरन नहीं बल्कि चार दिन बाद असर पड़ा और ५०० मील के फासले पर कुछ लोग बीमार हो गये और कुछ अन्धे हो गये। तो हालत यह है कि ऐसे शस्त्र निकले हैं जो हज़ारों को इस तरह से तबाह कर सकते हैं।

हमारे दोस्त डा० खरे फौजी बातें करते हैं और श्री चटर्जी कहते हैं कि पांच बरस का नक्शाबंद बना करके तुम अपने मुल्क की हिफाजत की फिक्र करो। सही बात है। मुल्क की हिफाजत तो पहली चीज़ है। अगर मुल्क की हिफाजत न रही तो वह पांच बरस का नक्शा कहाँ रहेगा। लेकिन मुल्क की हिफाजत कैसे हो ? फर्ज कीजिये कि एटम बम का खतरा है, तो उससे हम और आप कैसे बच सकते हैं। हम किसी ऐसे शस्त्र से नहीं बच सकते। चाहे हमारे पास भी एटम बम हो तो हम भी उससे नहीं बच सकते। हम उससे दूसरे को बरबाद कर सकते हैं, लेकिन हम खुद नहीं बच सकते। हां, इसके मानी यह नहीं है कि हम अपनी हिफाजत न करें। गवर्नमेंट का काम है कि वह मुल्क की हिफाजत का इन्तिजाम करे। आखिर ऐसे मौके पर बुनियादी हिफाजत दो

तरीके से हो सकती है। एक तो इस तरह से कि मुल्क का दिल तगड़ा हो, मुल्क में एकता हो, दूसरे इस तरह से कि मुल्क की आर्थिक शक्ति बढ़े क्योंकि उसी से और सिर्फ उसी से हमारी फौजी शक्ति बढ़ सकती है। हवा में फौजी शक्ति नहीं बढ़ती है। हम बड़ा जोर लगाते हैं इस वक्त और किसी दूसरे मुल्क से हवाई जहाज़ खरीद लेते हैं, जैसा कि हम करते हैं। इससे थोड़े दिन के लिये हमारे पास हवाई जहाज़ हो जाते हैं। लेकिन असली शक्ति तो तब बढ़ती है जब कि हम खुद पैदा करें। हम अपनी आर्थिक शक्ति बढ़ायें, हम अपने शस्त्रों को स्वयं पैदा करने की शक्ति बढ़ायें उसी से देश की बुनियादी ताकत बढ़ती है।

G. P. M.

यह भी कहेंगे कि यह भी एक ताकत है कि हम दूसरे से फौज मंगा लें, लड़ने के लिये। उसको भी ताकत कहेंगे। यह ताकत नहीं है। जब दूसरों पर छोड़ दिया तो वह तो हमारी आजादी नहीं रही। वह तो उन के हाथ में चली गई। हमारी आजादी दूसरे मुल्क के हाथ में चली गई। हम दूसरे मुल्क पर हथियारों वगैरह के लिये भी मरोसा करें, जो कि अभी हमको मजबूरी दरजे पर करना पड़ता है, वह भी कुछ आजादी को कम कर देता है। खर, वह लाचारी है, हमको कुछ न कुछ करना पड़ता है। लेकिन आखिर में मुल्क की ताकत बढ़ाने के लिये वही तरीका है कि हम मुल्क की आर्थिक शक्ति, इक्तसादी शक्ति और उससे जो बातें निकलती हैं, जिसमें शस्त्र बनाना भी है, कारखाने वगैरह हों, वह सब बातें उससे बढ़ें। यही एक तरीका है। चनांचे पांच वर्ष के नक्शे को, योजना को, बदलें, इधर उधर कहीं बढ़ायें, कहीं घटायें लेकिन बुनियादी चीज़ वही है, मुल्क की ताकत बढ़ाने के लिये जो मैं ने अभी कहा है।

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

एक बात इस सिलसिले में मैं अर्ज कर दूँ। डाक्टर खरे न एक बात कही। वह कोशिश भी नहीं करते कि बहुत जिम्मेदारी की बातें करें। लेकिन उन्होंने बाज्र बातें ऐसी कहीं जिन से मुझे बहुत ताज्जुब हुआ, आश्चर्य हुआ, यानी हमारी फौज के निस्वत कहा कि गोया हम अपनी फौज को निकम्मा समझते हैं या उसकी काफी कद्र नहीं करते। बहुत एक अजीब बात है। मुझे तो जो हमारी फौज में नौजवान हैं, या जो हवाई जहाज में काम करते हैं, समुद्री जहाजों पर काम करते हैं, उन से बहुत मिलने का मौका रहता है और मुझे उनका बहुत गुरूर है, वह बहुत अच्छे हैं, तगड़े हैं। खाली तगड़े ही नहीं हैं, बल्कि मेरा ख्याल है कि लियकत में भी वह किसी और ऐसे फौजी अफसरों का या जवानों का मुकाबिला दुनिया में कर सकते हैं। यह बात है, लेकिन वाकआ यह है कि हमारा मुल्क दूसरी बातों में पिछड़ा हुआ है, आदमियों में नहीं, बल्कि औजारों में, हथियारों में, इंडस्ट्री में, इस तरह की बातों में पिछड़ा हुआ है। वह इन बातों में बड़े बड़े मुल्कों का मुकाबिला नहीं कर सकता। हमें इसमें उसे आगे ले जाना है, लेकिन यह एकदम से नहीं हो सकता। हलके हलके इमारत खड़ी होगी। इसीलिये यह जो सवाल उठते हैं कि हम उषर ज्यादा तवज्जह दें या आरजों तौर पर दिखाने के लिये हम कुछ बन्दूक तलवार वगैरह से आदमी खड़े कर दें, तो आजकल के जमाने में वह चीजें मुल्क को बहुत दूर नहीं ले जाती।

डाक्टर खरे ने कुछ नानवायलेंस और अहिंसा की चर्चा की। अब मैं इसके बारे में क्या अर्ज करूँ? लेकिन मैं आप से यह कहा चाहता हूँ कि मेरा यह विश्वास है कि अगर हम में उस रास्ते से चलने के लिये पूरे और से दम होता तो हमें कोई हरा नहीं सकता।

यहां हम से मेरा मतलब सारे मुल्क से है। आखिर में कोई गवर्नमेंट या कोई पार्लियामेंट महज एक कानून बना कर या रिजोल्यूशन पास कर के करोड़ों आदमियों के दिल व दिमाग को नहीं बदल सकती है। हमें जो सफर करना है उसमें हमें और आपको कहीं किसी मंजिल पर नहीं पहुंच जाना है, बल्कि करोड़ों आदमियों को साथ लेकर चलना है हम सब इसमें हमसफर हैं। मुल्क में जितने आदमी हैं उन में अहिंसा के रास्ते पर चलने की जितनी ताकत है उतना ही चल सकते हैं। वरना सब हवाई बातें हो जाती हैं और हिमालय के पहाड़ पर अलग से बैठ कर बात करने की सी हालत हो जाती है।

इसीलिये हम फौज रखते हैं। लेकिन फौज रखते हुये भी हम खाली फौज पर भरोसा नहीं करते, और बातों पर भी करते हैं और बातों को बढ़ाने की कोशिश करते हैं। हमारा जो पिछला जमाना बीस तीस वर्ष का गुजरा है उसने हमें यह सब सिखाया है। और अब आखिर में आज वह जमाना आ गया कि कोई भी दानिशमन्द आदमी, वह अहिंसा को माने या न माने, कोई भी दानिशमन्द आदमी, समझदार आदमी, देख सकता है कि अब लड़ाई के माने कोई जाती ताकत के नहीं हैं, तबाही के माने हैं। लड़ाई के जब यह माने निकल आयें तो मजबूरी से, कोई चाहे या न चाहे, लेकिन मजबूरी से भी सोचना पड़ता है कि कोई इस तरह का रास्ता निकल आये।

बाज्र साहबों ने, मैं तो उस वक्त नहीं था, लेकिन मैंने सुना, कि श्री एंथुनी साहब ने और एक आष और मेम्बर ने इस बात को जोरों से कहा कि हम बहुत कहते हैं कि हम बीच में हैं, लेकिन वाकआ यह है कि हम एक तरफ, यानी साम्यवादी दुनिया की तरफ,

बहुत झुकते हैं और उसका प्रचार करते हैं। खैर, यह तो जिस ढंग से उन्होंने कहा, वह तो एक बहुत जिम्मेदारी की बात नहीं थी। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इसको सोचें। अभी मेरे दोस्त डाक्टर लंकामुन्दरम् ने इस बारे में कुछ कहा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इसको सोचें और देखें कि इसके माने क्या हैं और यह दिमाग क्या है जिससे इस किस्म की बात निकलती है। यह तो आजकल एक बेमानी सी बात है कि हम बहस करें कि क्या सिद्धान्त है साम्यवाद का और जो दूसरे वाद हैं उनका। इस वक्त आज तो इसका मौका नहीं है। लेकिन हमारी राय क्या है? अबल तो हमारी राय है कि नहीं, इसको छोड़ कर साफ बात है कि जिस रास्ते पर हम चलना चाहें, या हमारा देश चलना चाहे, पार्लियामेंट चलना चाहे, उस रास्ते पर हम अपनी राय से चलें, न कि दूसरे के कहने से या दबाव से। पहली बात तो यह है। अगर हम साम्यवाद के रास्ते पर चलना चाहते हैं तो हम चलेंगे, किसी के रोकने से तो नहीं रुकेंगे, या किसी की घमकी से नहीं रुकेंगे। अगर नहीं चलना चाहते हैं तो नहीं चलेंगे, किसी की घमकी हो या दबाव हो। हम खुद इसका फैसला करेंगे। मैं इस वक्त आर्थिक बातों के लिये कह रहा हूँ। आर्थिक नीति जो हमारी है उसको हम कोई इस तरह से नहीं देखते कि जैसे कोई शास्त्रों में लिखी हुई चीज है, जिसकी कोई आदमी निन्दा नहीं कर सकता, कोई उसकी नुक्ताचीनी नहीं कर सकता, बस उसी रास्ते पर पत्थर की लकीर बना कर चलना। जैसी हमारे मुल्क की हालत है, जैसी हमारी शक्ति है, जितनी हमारी अकल जाती है, उस रास्ते से हम चलेंगे। उस रास्ते को जब हम चाहेंगे बदलेंगे और चलेंगे।

और लोग जो इन बातों की चर्चा करते हैं, वह इस ढंग से नहीं करते, बल्कि इस ढंग से

करते हैं कि इस शास्त्र को मानो या दूसरे शास्त्र को मानो। अब वह शास्त्र चाहे अमेरिका का हो या रूस का हो, जब दोनों तरफ से शास्त्र आते हैं, और यहां अब और मानो में भी वह शास्त्र आते हैं, तो हम इन नये शास्त्रों को अपने शास्त्रों से अलग हो कर पकड़ें, एक नये बोझ को पकड़ें, तो यह सही बात मुझे मालूम नहीं होती। तो यह बात है। नीति में मैं नहीं जाता। जाहिर है कि जिस नीति पर हम चल रहे हैं कुछ इसका जिक्र हमारे विधान में लिखा है, कुछ यह नीति हमारे रोज-मर्रा के काम में पार्लियामेंट के सामने आती है। अगर पार्लियामेंट चाहेगी तो उसको बदलेगी, सोच विचार कर उसको कुछ बदलना चाहेगी तो बदलेगी। तो यह तो एक तरह से हुई बात राजनीतिक तौर पर। अब जो आर्थिक बात है उसमें आपकी राय हो सकती है कि वह एक तरफ ज्यादा बढ़ना चाहिये या कम बढ़ना चाहिये। मैं इस बहस में नहीं पड़ता, यह उसका मौका नहीं है। दूसरे मौके हो सकते हैं। लेकिन हमें इसको निश्चय करना है कि हम किधर जायें।

अब यहां पर मैं एक बात आपको और भी कह दूँ। आखिर में वह आर्थिक नीति हिन्दुस्तान में ही नहीं, बल्कि दुनिया में चलेगी, जिससे कि दुनिया को लाभ होता है। यही उसका एक इम्तिहान है। आप बहमें चाहे जितनी कर लीजिये, शास्त्रार्थ कितना ही कीजिये, लेकिन जिससे जनता को लाभ होगा आखिर में वही चलेगी। लाभ नहीं होगा तो जनता उसको छोड़ेगी दूसरी को लेगी। सीधी बात है। तो यह तो आर्थिक बात हुई।

लेकिन यहां पर अब दूसरी बात हो जाती है कि जब यह सवाल उठता है कि साम्यवादी देश और जो उसके विरोध में देश हैं, जब इस तरह सवाल उठता है तो फिर वह आर्थिक नहीं रहता है, वह सवाल राजनीतिक हो जाता

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

है या और किसी ढंग का हो जाता है। इस वक्त दुनिया में दो बहुत जबरदस्त आलीशान मुल्क हो गये हैं। अब मैं इसमें नहीं पड़ना चाहता कि मेरी क्या राय हो या आपकी क्या राय हो कि हम बैठ कर इसको बुरा कहें या उसको बुरा कहें या इसको अच्छा कहें या उसको। यह दूसरी बात है। लेकिन उनके इतने बड़े हो जाने से और इतनी जबरदस्त ताकत रखने से अलावा नीति के, साम्यवाद की हो या उसकी विरोधी हो, अलावानीति के कुछ और माने हो गये हैं। उनका एक दूसरे का दुनिया के मैदान में मुकाबला हो गया है। जब बड़ी ताकतों का मुकाबला है तो वह चाहती हैं और मुल्कों को घेर कर अपनी अपनी ताकत को बढ़ाना। तो इसमें उनका यह चाहना गलत बात नहीं है। अब उसे घेर कर अपनी ताकत बढ़ाने में फिर दबाव भी चलता है और तरह तरह की और बातें भी होती हैं। घेर कर लाने में लालच भी देते हैं और सब तरह की बातें होती हैं, डराना भी, दबाना भी और लालच भी। इस तरह से और मुल्कों को अपने दायरे में ले आने की कोशिश होती है।

अब इस मामले में और मुल्क चाहे बड़े मुल्क भी क्यों न हों, इस वक्त किसी मुल्क की बड़े से बड़े मुल्क की, असल में कोई खास गिनती इन दो के मुकाबले में ताकत के लिहाज से नहीं है। लियाकत के हिसाब से गिनती हो, लेकिन ताकत के हिसाब से क्या गिनती है? चुनावे नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि छोटे मुल्कों की कुछ भी राय हो हलके हलके वह इधर या उधर खिसकते जाते हैं। इसमें कोई बहुत ज्यादा साम्यवाद की चर्चा नहीं है, इसमें और ही बातें हैं। साम्यवाद की इस वक्त बात नहीं है। दुनिया में जब भी इस तरह की बात होती है, दो बड़े मुल्कों का

मुकाबला होता है तो यह हालत हो जाती है। इसको आप देखिये।

इस सिलसिले में एक दूसरी बात और देखिये कि लड़ाई के तरीके आज कल क्या हो गये हैं, यानी यह एटामिक बम्ब वगैरह। इसका नतीजा यह निकलता है कि अगर यह सिलसिला चलता गया तो यकीनन आधी दुनिया या एक तिहाई दुनिया को बिल्कुल तबाह करने की और नेस्तनाबूद करने की कोशिश की जायेगी। और शस्त्र ऐसे हैं कि बाकी बची हुई दुनिया पर असर पड़ेगा, तब हम और आप इस बहस में पड़ें कि कौन अच्छा और कौन बुरा, हम पड़ सकते हैं, लेकिन इससे असली मकसद पर कोई खास असर नहीं पड़ता है। अगर उनमें से किसी फरीक ने भी यह तय कर लिया है कि दूसरे को बिल्कुल खत्म कर देना है तभी अमन होगा, तब या तो आप इस बात को स्वीकार करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं। यानी स्वीकार करने के मानी यह है कि हम मंजूर कर लें कि कोई रास्ता नहीं है सिवा बड़ी लड़ाई के। अगर आप इसे नहीं मंजूर करते, और अगर आप समझते हैं कि बड़ी लड़ाई से कोई मसला हल नहीं होगा बल्कि और तबाही आयेगी तब और रास्ता ढूँढना पड़ता है उन से निकलने के लिये, और दूर बड़ी लड़ाई को रोकने के लिये। यह सवाल आता है। फिर एक दूसरे की तरफदारी और एक दूसरे की शिकायत करना बेमानी हो जाता है, इसलिये जो नीति हमने रखी है, वह बुराई भलाई करने की नहीं, बल्कि जिन चीजों को हम समझते हैं कि वह लड़ाई की तरफ ले जाती हैं, उनके खिलाफ अपनी आवाज उठाने की, चाहे वह कोई भी हो, और जो चीजें आजकल की तनातनी को कम करती हैं उनकी तरफ अपना वजन डालना, यह नीति लड़ाई को रोकने की होगी,

और इस सिलसले में जो कुछ आये उस के घेरे में, उस पर हम चलते हैं। जहाँ तक मुम्किन होता है हम मुल्कों को बुरा भला नहीं कहते।

एक बात और कि और मुल्कों में जो कुछ होता है, बहुत सारी बातें होती हैं जो हमें पसन्द नहीं है, बाज पसन्द भी है, उन पर भी हम बहुत ज्यादा राय नहीं देते क्योंकि मुन्किल यह हो गई है कि यह बड़े बड़े मुल्क और उनके साथी इस कदर गुस्से में हैं एक दूसरे से कि वह किसी बहस को सुनने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं और अगर आप उनको समझायें, आप उनको बुरा भला कह कर समझायें, तो आप उनको और चिढ़ाते हैं। नतीजा हासिल नहीं होता। आखिर हम नतीजा चाहते हैं या अपने दिल को ठंडा करना चाहते हैं, खाली आवाज करके। मुम्किन है कि इस से दिल ठंडा हो, लेकिन अगर हम नतीजा चाहते हैं और यह चाहते हैं कि हम दूसरों पर असर डालें तो बेहतर यह है कि हम अपनी राय न दें और शान्ति के तरीके से असर डालने की कोशिश करें इसलिये बहुत सारी बातें दुनियां में हैं, हम उन पर राय नहीं देते हैं। कभी कभी राय दे देते हैं लेकिन ज्यादा नहीं देते हैं। अक्सर शिकायत आती है कि यह कोलोनियलिज्म जो है वह अच्छी चीज नहीं है। बहुत जमाने से हमारी राय है कि कोलोनिअलिज्म गलत चीज है। हम अपनी राय देते हैं और हर तरह से देते हैं, कभी कभी खुल्लमखुल्ला और कभी कभी और और तरह से भी दिया करते हैं। लेकिन एक एक सवाल को ले कर एक बड़ा आन्दोलन उठायें, यह हम नहीं करते। हां, पब्लिक उठाये अगर उचित समझे। क्यों? हमें कुछ नतीजा हासिल करना है या महज आन्दोलन उठा कर हुल्लड़ उठाना है? बाज बातों पर आन्दोलन उठ सकता है, जब किसी बात का हम पर सीधा असर पड़ता है तो हम खामोश नहीं

रहते। कोई बात योरुप में हो, या एशिया के किसी दूसरे हिस्से में हो, तो हम राय देते हैं, लेकिन ऐसे देते हैं जैसे गवर्नमेंट दिया करती है, अपने राजदूतों के जरिये से या अपनी पार्लियामेंट के जरिये से। लेकिन आज्ञादा राय होती है और जहाँ तक हो सकता है घीभी आवाज से देते हैं, चिढ़ाने की आवाज से नहीं बल्कि समझाने की आवाज से। लेकिन अगर किसी बात का हम पर सीधा असर पड़ता है, तो जाहिर बात है कि हमारी जिम्मेदारी होती है कुछ न कुछ करने की। इसलिये जब ऐसे मसले उठते हैं, मसलन अमरीका की तरफ से पाकिस्तान को फौजी मदद दी गई, तो वह हमारे लिये एक दूर की चीज नहीं हुई, वह एक चीज हो गई जिसका असर हम पर पड़ता है, हमारी सारी नीति पर पड़ता है, एशिया पर पड़ता है, तमाम बातों पर पड़ता है, जिसका जिक्र आपके सामने हो चुका है। इसलिये इस बात को हमने ज्यादा जोरों से ज्यादा सफाई से कहा क्योंकि इस मामले में हम मुब्तला हो गये, हम तमाशबीन नहीं रहे। इसी तरह से इन्डो-चाइना है, बाज मेम्बरान ने कहा कि हम उस पर काफी जोरों से नहीं कहते और ढील हमने दे दी। बात सही है, लेकिन हम उसको ज्यादा गुल शोर मचा कर कहें तो इससे वहाँ कोई सीज फायर तो हो नहीं जायेगा, लड़ाई तो रुक नहीं जायेगी। हम ने गुस्से से नहीं बल्कि घीरे से, समझ कर, उनको एक सलाह दी कि इस मौके पर सीज फायर होना चाहिये। हम इसमें न कोई नेकनामी हासिल करना चाहते हैं और न दखल देना चाहते हैं, लेकिन जब जोर ज्यादा हो जाता है, जब इस तरह से मुल्क एक दूसरे के खिलाफ खड़े हों, तब कोई भी कोई बात स्वीकार करने को तैयार नहीं होता, लेकिन अगर कोई दूसरा एक इशारा कर दे तो इससे लाभ हो सकता है, यह समझ कर हमने इशारा किया, फिर भी हम इशारा करेंगे, अगर मौका

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

हुआ तो। लेकिन हम इसके लिये एक आन्दोलन उठाये कि इन्डोवाइना में सीज फायर हो, यह बेमानी बात है। हम वहाँ थोड़े ही लड़ रहे हैं कि हम आन्दोलन उठाये कि वहाँ चीनों फरीकों का क्या हो। इस ढंग से आप सवाल को देखें जो दुनिया के सवाल हैं, और यह बात हमेशा याद रखिये कि हालत यह हो गई है कि जो कदम एक मुल्क उठाता है अपनी हिफाजत के लिये तो दूसरा यह समझता है कि यह हमले के लिये है, और जब दूसरा अपनी हिफाजत के लिये कदम उठाता है तो पहला समझता है कि वह हमले के लिये है। यह पंच पड़ गया है।

इस नुकते से जो यह अमरीका की तरफ से पाकिस्तान को मदद देने का इकरार हुआ है, वह कदम हमें ऐसा नजर आया कहा गया, और गालिबन ईमानदारी से कहा गया, हम किसी की नियत में शक नहीं करते, कि हम अपनी हिफाजत के लिये कर रहे हैं, मान लीजिये कि ईमानदारी से कहा गया, लेकिन इसका असर दूसरा हुआ, और होना ही था, कि वह एक नया कदम है हमले के लिये, नया कदम है और मुल्कों को खतरे में डालने के लिये। चुनावों के लिये भी हो, इसका नतीजा गलत हुआ। हमारे मुल्क में आप देख रहे हैं कि क्या नतीजा हुआ। और एशिया के और मुल्कों में भी। इसलिये यह कदम दुनिया में अमन बढ़ाने के लिये नहीं हुआ बल्कि और खतरा बढ़ाने के लिये, लड़ाई के लिये हो गया। इसलिये यह बर्नियारी तौर से गलत है, चाहे इसका खतरा हमारे लिये हो या और जगह के लिये। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस नक्शे को आप सामने रखें और इसके साथ आप यह सोचें कि जितनी हम में ताकत है उसी से हम

अपनी हिफाजत कर सकते हैं। किस कदर औरों की मदद हम लें, तरह तरह का मतलब होता है, यह शिकायत की गई और ताना दिया गया कि हम ऐतराज करते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को फीजी मदद दी गई और हमने अमरीका में जा कर टेंक्स खरीदे, कुछ हवाई जहाज खरीदे और कुछ इस किस्म का सामान खरीदा। बहुत मुनासिब नहीं थी इस किस्म की शिकायत और ताने देना। और इससे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था, अलावा इसके कि जो कुछ हमने लिया उसको पैसा दे कर लिया और जैसे हम दूसरी चीजें खरीदते हैं, वैसा खरीदा। कोई सवाल भी नहीं उठा था और इसमें कोई गोल-माल की बात नहीं थी, जो मामूली खरीद फरोस्त थी, वह किया, और कोई बात नहीं। हाँ, यह बात सही है, श्री मुर्कजी ने, अमरीका का कोई कानून है म्यूचुअल सिक्योरिटी ऐक्ट, उसकी चर्चा की। यह बात सही है, मेरे दिमाग में यह नहीं था, लेकिन आज लोगों ने याद दिलाया। तो जब वह कोई हथियार बेचते हैं तो इसकी बिक्री के लिये गवर्नमेंट से इजाजत लेनी पड़ती है। क्यों उन्होंने रखा है, गालिबन इसलिये कि उनका कोई हथियार जिन को वह दुश्मन समझते हैं उन के हाथ में न चला जाय। जो भी इसकी वजह हो, चूँकि उन की गवर्नमेंट इस कानून से इजाजत देती है कि वह जाना चाहिये, चुनावों के लिये इस कानून से उन्होंने इजाजत दी कि हाँ, यह बिक सकते हैं हमारे हाथ। यह सही बात है कि उनके यहाँ यह कानून है, उन्होंने इजाजत दी और उनकी इजाजत की बुनियाद पर हमने सामान खरीदा, वह आया। इसका मुकाबला करना इस किस्म की फीजी मदद से जो पाकिस्तान को दी जा रही है, यह नामुनासिब है और इससे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। अगर इसमें या आइन्दा किसी चीज की खरीदारी में जरूर भर भी कोई शर्त हो, खुली हुई या छिपी हुई जो हमारी नीति

में या हमारी आजादी में खलल डालती है तो, आपसे पहले भी कहा जा चुका है और मैं फिर भी कहता हूँ कि हम कभी भी इस बात को स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे, न उस चीज को लेंगे। और क्यों? आखिर हमारा ख्याल यह है, और जाहिर है कि हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी फौज के पास अच्छे हथियार हों, हम चाहते हैं कि हम जहाँ तक हो सके खुद बनवायें, और नहीं बना सकते तो और जगह से लें जब तक जरूरत हो, लेकिन फौजी हथियारों से ज्यादा जरूरी बात, मैं समझता हूँ, अपने मुल्क की ताकत को बनाये रखना है। अगर एक दफा भी हमारा खयाल हो गया कि हम दूसरे पड़ोसी से ज्यादा अपनी ताकत रखते हैं या रखेंगे या अपनी रक्षा करेंगे तो फिर हम कमजोर हो गये चाहे आपके पास कितने भी हथियार आ जायें।

फिर आप अपने लोगों के पास जायें कि वह तकलीफ उठायें, मुसीबत उठायें और अपनी जान मरने के लिये दें, वह कहेंगे कि आपने इन्तजाम दूसरा किया है, कारण मुल्क की हवा और फिजा बदल जाती है। दूसरे पर भरोसा करना हम नहीं चाहते कि यह बात हो।

खैर, मैं ने आप से आम बातें कहीं, कुछ खास बातों का जिक्र हुआ और मैं कुछ उनका भी जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ। गोआ का जिक्र हुआ और गोआ के सिलसिले में शायद यह भी कहा गया कि एक एंग्लो पोर्चुगीज सुल्हनामा है, बहुत पुराना है, और यह नेटो का जो सुल्हनामा है, उसका गोआ पर क्या असर पड़ता है। इसके बारे में तो मेरा खयाल है कि कई बार जो लोग नेटो में हैं बड़े देश उन्होंने बहुत सफाई से कहा है कि उससे गोआ से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है और न मैं समझता हूँ कि उस पुराने एंग्लो पोर्चुगीज सुल्हनामे का गोआ से कोई ताल्लुक है। गोआ का सवाल उनसे बिल्कुल जुदा है। बहरसूरत जहाँ तक हमारा

ताल्लुक है, यानी हिन्दुस्तान का और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया का, हम न नेटो को इसमें दखल देना चाहते हैं और न कोई और सुल्हनामे से ताल्लुक है। गोआ का तो एक सीधा सादा सवाल है, और आपसे यह कहने की जरूरत नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान से १५० वर्ष के शासन के बाद यहाँ से अंग्रेजी हुकूमत हटो, अब हिन्दुस्तान के एक छोटे से कोने में कोई एक बाहरी योरुप की बाहरी देश की हुकूमत रहे, यह किस तरह से किस कानून से या किस दिमाग से भेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस चीज को सही समझा जा सकता है। यह एक निकम्मी बात है और यह नामुमकिन बात है कि हिन्दुस्तान इस बात को बर्दाश्त कर सके, क्योंकि एक तो हमारे आजाद हिन्दुस्तान की शान इस बात के लिये तकाजा नहीं करती, दूसरे यह कि किसी दूसरे बाहरी मुल्क का हमारे यहाँ अड्डा बना रहना जिससे हर वक्त खतरा बना रहे कि न जाने किस वक्त उससे एक बेजा फायदा हमारे मुल्क के खिलाफ उठा लिया जाय। इनके अलावा हमारी रोजमर्रा की दिक्कतें हैं ही, इन विदेशी बस्तियों के कायम रहने से पचासों दिक्कतें हमारे लिये पैदा होती हैं, मसलन् स्मगलिंग होती है और कितनी ही दूसरी परेशानियां पेश आती हैं। गोआ के निस्वत शरू से हमने कहा कि हम इस मसले को शान्ति से और बअमन तरीके से हल किया चाहते हैं और उस पर हम कायम रहे। कुछ लोग नाखुश भी हुये कि हम कमजोरी दिखाते हैं, फिर भी हम उस पर कायम रहे और हम आइन्दा भी उस पर कायम रहना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि आप फिर दुनिया के बड़े नक्शे को देखें, यह सवाल उसका नहीं ही जाता है, ये चीजें बड़े सवालों में अटक जाती हैं और हम कोई एक ऐसा कदम उठायें जिससे हम एक दलदल में फंस जायें तो वह बहुत अकलमंदी की बात नहीं होगी। गोआ या पांडिचेरी हमसे जा कहाँ सकते हैं, कहीं हवाई जहाज

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

में बैठ कर हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर उड़ थोड़े ही जायेंगे, हिन्दुस्तान में हैं और यहीं रहेंगे, इसमें कोई शक किसी को नहीं हो सकता और ये सारी बस्तियां हमारे रिपब्लिक का एक जुज होने वाली हैं। अब किस वक्त क्या क्रम उठाया जाय, शांतिमय तरीके को अपनाते हुये, यह गौरतलब बात है और हर वक्त गौर होता है, मुमकिन है कि कभी जरा तेज क्रम हो और कभी क्रम हल्का हो। अभी आपने देखा कि पांडिचेरी में क्या हुआ? एक अजीब नज्जारा और तस्वीर वहां देखने को मिली, क्या आपने उस पर झोर किया कि यह कितनी बड़ी जीत हमारी नीति की है? इसके मानी यह नहीं कि वह जीत हमने करायी, वह तो जीत होती नहीं थी, लेकिन इसके माने यह है कि हमारी शांतिमयी नीति की जीत हुई उन लोगों को अगर ठीक से अपनी राय देने का मौका मिलता, रेफ्रेंडम और प्लेबिसिट का चर्चा हुआ था, अगर वह ठीक तरह से होता तो वह उस पर अपनी आज्ञादाना राय देते, लेकिन वह बात नहीं हुई, क्योंकि फ्रांसीसी हुकूमत ने जो वहां इंतजाम किया था उसमें कोई भी रेफ्रेंडम सही तौर से नहीं हो सकता था, उसमें बहुत दबाव था, लूटबाजी थी गुंडेबाजी थी, यह चीज हमने नहीं बल्कि जो, बाहर के अफसर वहां पर भेजे गये थे उन्होंने कही। तो अब रेफ्रेंडम का क्या सवाल, जब वहां के जितने चुने हुये लोग हैं, आम लोग हैं सबों ने इस बात को एक आवाज से कहा। आज के अखबारों में चर्चा है कि फ्रेंच गवर्नमेंट ने इस बारे में हमें कोई एक नोट भेजा है, उसके बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अभी तक वह नोट हमारे पास नहीं आया है, अगर आयेगा तो उस पर गौर किया जायेगा। लेकिन ज़ाहिर है कि अब वक्त आ गया है और फ्रेंच गवर्नमेंट को भी समझना है कि इस बात को लम्बा करने से किसी को फायदा नहीं है और

उनको तो इस से सबसे कम फायदा है। इसलिये जो बात हमने पहले कही थी यानी यह कि वाक्याती तौर से उसका अखित्यार गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को दे दिया जाय, कानूनी तौर पर बाद में उस पर सोच विचार होता रहे और फिर वह कानून बदलते रहें, कांस्टीट्यूशन फरसत से बदलें।

कबल इस के कि मैं भूलूँ नहीं, मैं एक बात याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि आजकल किस क्रम गलत बातें फैलायी जाती हैं, गलत किस्से और कहानियां गढ़ी जाती हैं? अभी चन्द रोज हुये एक अखबार में एक अजीबो गरीब खबर छपी थी, शायद कोलम्बो से निकली थी, या कहां से निकली थी, कि ऐन्टी कम्युनिस्ट सम्मेलन सीलोन में होने वाला है जिसमें चन्द बुजुर्ग मुख्तलिफ़ मुल्कों से बुलाये गये हैं और उसमें श्री राजगोपालाचार्य का नाम था। कोई भी आदमी जो उसको पढ़ता तो देख सकता था कि यह कितनी निकम्मी बात है और यह कोई एक चंडूखाने की खबर मालूम देती थी।

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): Will the Prime Minister kindly give the gist of it in English, so that we could also understand the humour?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was referring to a news item that appeared in the press a short while ago from Colombo, which stated—I have not got that news item with me just now—more or less that an anti-communist conference was going to be held in Ceylon in December 1954, which would be attended *inter alia* by Senator McCarthy, Mr. Chiang-kai-shek, Dr. Syngman Rhee...and a number of others, and finally Shri Rajagopalachari. On the face of it, this was so fantastic that it was not necessary for anyone to place the slightest reliance or credence on this story. Nevertheless, I enquired about the matter as to whether anyone had heard about anyone else. Shri

Rajagopalachari replied to me as follows:

"I have absolutely no knowledge of it, nor have I received any such invitation. I entirely agree with you that it is an outrageously foolish conception which can only be traced to the genius of some journalist."

शायद कल हमारे कुछ दोस्तों ने हमारी सरहद का जिक्र किया था, खास कर उस सरहद का जो कि तिब्बत की तरफ है और जो कि मैकमोहन लाइन कहलाती है। मझे मालूम नहीं कि उन के दिल में इस बारे में क्या शक पैदा हुआ था क्योंकि यह मैकमोहन लाइन तो एक माकूल चीज है, कोई हवाई चीज नहीं है और इस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान की सरहद है, जिस पर कि हमारे काफी चेक पोस्ट वगैरह कायम हैं, और जहां तक हमारा ताल्लुक है वह सरहद है और रहेगी। कोई किसी मुल्क से बहस की बात नहीं है, न हम उसके बारे में किसी से बहस करने वाले हैं। तो फिर यह शक किसी के दिमाग में उठने के कोई माने नहीं हैं। इस सरहद के सिलसिले में मेरे दोस्त शर्मा जी ने कुछ ऐतराज किया कि वहां नार्थ ईस्ट फ्रॉंटियर एजेंसी ने जो एक नया कदम उठाया है और अफसरों का एक अलग काडर बनाया है वह उनको पसन्द नहीं आया। मुझे अफसोस है कि उन्हें पसन्द नहीं आया। लेकिन हमने इसको बहुत सोच समझ कर किया है और मेरी पक्की राय है कि इस रास्ते पर हमें चलना है और जोरों से चलना है और अगर जरूरत हुई तो और भी चलना है। बनियादी बात क्या है? जो उनको खतरा है वह शायद यह है कि हम इसको आसाम से अलग करना चाहते हैं। मैं नहीं चाहता कि हम इसको आसाम से अलग करें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सब हिस्से एक दूसरे से ज्यादा मिल कर रहें। लेकिन अब्बल बात देखने की यह है कि वहां के लोग खुशी से आगे बढ़ें।

यह जो उस तरफ के हिन्दुस्तान के सरहदी हिस्से हैं वह हिन्दुस्तान में किसी कदर नये आये हैं और बहुत सही ढंग से नहीं आये हैं। मेरा मतलब यह है कि अंग्रेजी जमाने में सही ढंग से नहीं आये हैं। उन के ऊपर खास तौर पर कोई असर नहीं हुआ। हमारे यहां जो आजादी की तहरीक हुई उसका उन पर कोई असर नहीं हुआ। हम उनके पास नहीं जाने पाते थे, वह हमसे अलग थे। अब हमें उनको अपनाना है। तो सब से बड़ा सवाल है उनको अपनाने का, कि वह महसूस करें कि वह हमारे हैं और हम उनके हैं, और उनका भविष्य, उनका मुस्तकबिल, इसी में है कि हम हाथ में हाथ मिला कर आगे बढ़ें। यह अब्बल बात है जब यह बात उनके दिमाग में आ जाये तो और आगे रिश्ता बढ़ाया जाय। अगर शुरू में उन के दिल में यह असर हो जाता है कि हम जबरदस्ती रिश्ता बना रहे हैं तो कोई रिश्ता नहीं बनता है बल्कि उसका उल्टा असर होता है।

मैंने सुना कि मेरे साथी डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक मजमून की चन्द लाइनें पढ़ कर सुनाई। डेढ़ दो साल हुये मैंने एक मजमून लिखा था। जब मैं सीमा प्रान्त में गया था उस समय लिखा था। वह मजमून मैंने अपने अफसरों वगैरह के लिये लिखा था और वह एक खुफिया पर्चा समझा जाता था। असल में उसमें कुछ खफिया नहीं है। उसमें मैंने जो वहां देखा उसके बारे में मेरी राय का इजहार है। लेकिन चूंकि उसका कुछ हिस्सा पढ़ा गया है इसलिये मैंने सलाह दी है सिर्फ वही हिस्सा नहीं बल्कि वह पूरा पर्चा मेज पर रख दिया जाय ताकि जो साहिबान देखना चाहें देख सकें। उसको पार्लियामेंट की ल.इ.ब्रेरी में रख दिया जाय या यहां पर मेज पर रख दिया जाय। उससे वह नीति जो हम सरहद में चलाना चाहते हैं वह सामने आ

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

जायेगी। वह नीति यह बिल्कुल नहीं है कि यह हिस्सा आसाम से अलग हो जाय। हम तो चाहते हैं कि सब मिल कर साथ साथ चले। लेकिन वह नीति यह है कि उन लोगों की तरक्की तेजी से हो और उन के मन में यह विचार न आये कि उन पर जबरदस्ती से या दबाव से कोई बात की जा रही है। यह काफी कठिन सवाल है। यह काम जल्दी से नहीं किया जा सकता बल्कि इसमें दस बीस वर्ष लगेंगे तब हम इन जातियों को अपनी तरफ ला सकेंगे।

अक्सर भाषा का सवाल उठता है। उन की भाषायें बहुत पिछड़ी हुई हैं, कोई बहुत भाषायें हैं। हर दस बीस गांव के बाद एक अलग भाषा है। फिर भी हम उनको प्राथमिक शिक्षा उनकी ही भाषाओं में दे रहे हैं। इसके अलावा वह और भी भाषायें सीखते हैं। लेकिन आप देखिये कि उनकी कठिनाई क्या है। मेरे पास एक खासी आया और कहने लगा कि आपने जो यह प्रबन्ध किया हम अपनी भाषा में शिक्षा प्राप्त करें यह तो ठीक है, हमें पसन्द है। इसके अलावा यह भी आवश्यक है कि हम आसामी भाषा सीखें, आसामी लिपि में। इस वक्त वह जो अपनी भाषा सीखते हैं वह पुराने जमाने से, मिशनरियों के जमाने से, रोमन लिपि में लिखी जाती है। उसी में उन की ग्रामर है, किताबें हैं और उसी में वह सीखते हैं। तो एक रोमन लिपि में वह खासी भाषा सीखते हैं। आसामी भाषा उन्हें आसामी लिपि में सीखनी है। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे लिये हिन्दी भी सीखना आवश्यक है, नागरी लिपि में, और उन्होंने कहा कि हम अंग्रेजी भी सीखना चाहते हैं। तो उन्होंने कहा कि चार भाषायें और तीन लिपियाँ हमको सीखनी पड़ती हैं। इस तरह से उन बेचारों पर काफी भार पड़ता है। वह ट्राइबल लोग हैं और मेरी राय में उनका यह बात कहना बहुत उचित ही था। उन्होंने

कहा कि कम से कम एक बोझा तो कम कर दीजिये। आसामी भाषा जो हम सीखना चाहते हैं उसे नागरी लिपि में कर दीजिये तो इससे एक लिपि तो कम हो जायगी। मुझे तो यह मनासिब बात मालूम हुई लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि इन बातों में फूँक फूँक कर चलना चाहिये नहीं तो लोगों पर उसका एक उल्टा असर होता है।

मैंने सुना कि हमारे एक साथी ने इस बात पर एतराज किया कि हमारे राजदूत, एम्बसेडर वगैरह सब पुराने आई० सी० एस० के लोग होते हैं, और एक वर्ल्ड कानफरेंस हुई थी वहाँ, मालूम नहीं, बीस बाईस आई० सी० एस० थे और सिर्फ दो और लोग थे। यह बात सही है। लेकिन उन के दिमाग से कुछ अभी स्वराज्य के पहले की हवा नहीं गई है। वह अभी उसी वायुमंडल में हैं जिसको हमने सात आठ बरस हुये खत्म कर दिया था। हमने एक इंडियन फारेन सरविस बनाई है, उस इंडियन फारेन सरविस में हम अपनी राय में काबिल से काबिल लड़कों को लेते हैं, सख्त इन्तिहान लेते हैं, उसके बाद हम उन्हें डेढ़ दो बरस काम के शुरू करने के पहले सिखाते हैं, ट्रेनिंग देते हैं, इस देश में और दूसरे देशों में। उनको विदेशी भाषायें सिखाते हैं। उसके बाद वह एक पहला कदम लेते हैं और एक एपरेंटिस हो कर कहीं काम करते हैं। नयी भाषायें सीखते हैं। हलके हलके वह सीखते हैं। वैदेशिक सवाल उनके सामने आते हैं। वह और देशों का इतिहास पढ़ते हैं और यह जानने की कोशिश करते हैं कि वहाँ की संस्कृति क्या है, सभ्यता क्या है और हमारे देश की क्या है। इस तरह वह दस बीस बरस में अपने को तैयार करते हैं। किस लिये? इसलिये कि जितने ज्यादा वह तैयार होंगे उतने ही ज्यादा जिम्मेदारी के ओहदे उनको मिलेंगे। बहुत पेचीदा

दुनियां हैं। उन लोगों का काम बहुत पेचीदा होता है और वह इसके एक्सपर्ट होते हैं। अब कहा जाता है कि यह लोग तो आई० सी० एस० के हैं। वह सब आई० सी० एस० नहीं हैं। हां, पुरानी सरविस के कुछ लोग इसमें आते हैं। बाहर से भी हमने लिये हैं। जो लोग फारिन सरविस लिये हैं उन में से कुछ आई० सी० एस० लिये हैं, कुछ फौज से लिये हैं और दूसरी सरविसेज से लिये हैं। कुछ लोग बाहर से लिये हैं, यानी जो कि पहले गवर्न-मेंट सरविस में नहीं थे, कहीं प्रोफेसर थे, या कहीं बैरिस्टर थे, कानूनदां थे, उनको लिया है। वह सब मिल कर एक फारिन सरविस बनी है।

अब उसमें हर किस्म के लोग हैं। यह बिल्कुल जाहिर सी बात है। मैं तो नहीं कहता कि हर एक उसमें से बहुत ही ऊंचे दरजे के लायक है। लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि उसका स्टैंडर्ड काफी ऊंचा है, काफी अच्छा है और कोशिश करते हैं उसको बेहतर करने की। आम तौर से किसी मुल्क की फारेन सरविस के बनाने में पचासों वर्ष लगते हैं। यह महज किसी को चुन लेना नहीं है। हलके हलके किसी सरविस का, दफ्तर का तजर्बा बढ़ता है। आप जानते हैं कि हमने यह सब पांच सात वर्ष में किया। अब कोई साहब इसके लिये कहें कि इस में से तो एक बू आई० सी० एस० की आती है, पबलिक मैन लेने चाहियें, तो हमने पबलिक में से भी लिये हैं। लेकिन आपके गौर करने की बात है कि क्या पबलिक मैन महज होना ही एक माफूल बात है। पबलिकमैन भी होते हैं जो लायक होते हैं, लेकिन ऐसे भी पबलिक मैन होते हैं कि जो लायक नहीं होते हैं। माथे पर पबलिक मैन लिख देना ही लियाकत की निशानी नहीं है। हां, बड़ी जिम्मेदारी के जो काम होते हैं वह पबलिक मैन करते हैं, चाहे आपकी गवर्नमेंट

बने या कैबिनेट बने। यह ठीक है, इस तरह से हमारे उसूल के मामलों में हमारे लोगों का कंट्रोल रहे। लेकिन जहां आपको कोई एक्सपर्ट का काम करना हो उसके लिये भी क्या आप पबलिक मैन ही को लेंगे। इस तरह की बात हो तो क्या आप कहेंगे कि फौजी अफसरों को क्यों भरती कर लिया, पबलिक मैन को जनरल्स बनाना चाहिये, तो पबलिकमैन कितने ही लायक हों, बहुत मुमकिन है कि वह जनरली में कामयाब न हों। क्योंकि यह एक पेशा है, जिसको बीस पच्चीस वर्ष तक लोगों को सीखना पड़ता है। हां, डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री में पबलिक मैन हों, यह ठीक है, जहां सिद्धान्त की बातें तय करनी हैं, नीति की बातें तय करनी हैं, पालिसी की बातें जहां होती हैं।

तो फारेन सरविस में ज्यादातर आदमी जो एम्बेसेडर वगैरह होते हैं, राजदूत वगैरह, उस में पबलिक की तरफ से भी लेते हैं और पबलिक की तरफ से भी हमने आदमी लिये हैं। इस तरह वह हमारी फारेन सरविस में हो गये हैं। उनका भी वह करीब करीब पेशा होता जाता है, फारेन सरविस का या राजदूत का पेशा होता जाता है। और ज्यों ज्यों वह एक्सपर्ट होते जाते हैं हमें उन पर भरोसा होता जाता है।

अब जो सवाल चन्द्रनगर का उठाया गया तो मैंने आप से इस बारे में कहा था। मुझे उम्मीद है कि जल्दी वहां का कुछ फंसला हो जायगा। जो कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है कमी-बेश हमें उम्मीद है कि उसी ढंग पर फंसला होगा।

अब आखिर में एक बात में आपसे कहूँ कि यह वैदेशिक नीति एक बहुत पेचीदा चीज समझी जाती है और एक माने में है

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

भी। आम तौर से समझा जाता है और एक पुराने अंग्रेज राजदूत ने लिखा था, आज नहीं दो ढाई सौ वर्ष की बात है, कि एक एंबेसेडर का काम है कि अपने मुल्क की तरफ से जाकर दूसरे मुल्क में झूठ बोलना। यह उन्होंने बताया था कि राजदूत का यह पेशा है। खैर, जहां तक वह सही है या नहीं है, मैं नहीं जानता। लेकिन फिर भी यह समझा जाता है कि इसमें वैदेशिक नीति में, विशेषकर घोखेबाजी से काम चलता है। एक बहुत पुरातन, बहुत पुराने नहीं, जर्मनी के बहुत मशहूर आदमी बिस्मार्क, आप लोग उन के नाम से वाकिफ होंगे, जिन्होंने बहुत जोर दिखाया और अपने मुल्क के लिये बहुत घूम घाम की लड़ाई में फतह हासिल की। यह समझा जाता था कि वह बहुत ऊंचे दरजे के स्टेट्समैन थे। तो उन से किसी ने पूछा कि आपकी कामयाबी ऐसे क्यों हो जाती है। उन्होंने कहा कि बात यह है कि हर एक आदमी हमेशा समझता है कि इस में फारैन पालिसी में, वैदेशिक नीति में, हर एक आदमी झूठ बोला करता है। चनांचे जो कुछ वह कहता है उस पर कोई भरोसा करता नहीं। मैंने यह किया कि मैं हमेशा जो करने वाला था सच सच कहा। लोगों ने चूँकि उस पर भरोसा ही नहीं किया इसलिये वे गड़बड़ा गये। वह समझे कि मैं घोखा दे रहा हूँ। जो कुछ मैंने कहा वह सच कहा था, लेकिन वह घोखे में पड़ गये, क्योंकि वह समझते थे कि मैं घोखा दे रहा हूँ।

तो, खैर, इस पेच में तो हम नहीं जाना चाहते। लेकिन वाकजा यह है कि हमारी जो कुछ वैदेशिक नीति है वह बिल्कूल सीधी सादी है। उस में कोई पेच नहीं है। हाँ, यह सही बात है कि हम सरे बाजार उसकी चर्चा नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि इस में और देश का भी सम्बन्ध है। लेकिन इसमें कोई छिपी बात

नहीं है कि हम किसी मुल्क के खिलाफ कोई चालबाजी कर रहे हैं या किसी और मुल्क को घोखा दे रहे हैं। सीधी सी हमारी पालिसी है जिसको हजार दफा हमने दोहराया है। लेकिन अक्सर मैं पढ़ता हूँ, यहाँ तो शायद किसी को घोखा न हो, लेकिन और मुल्कों के अखबारों को मैं पढ़ता हूँ तो सोचता हूँ कि वह क्या लिखते हैं। वह कहते हैं कि यह जो हिन्दुस्तान की नीति है, इसके पीछे क्या बात है। सीधी बात है लेकिन उस पर वह भरोसा नहीं करेंगे, लेकिन समझेंगे कि इस के पीछे कोई बड़ी गूढ़ नीति है घोखा देने की। चनांचे वह सीधी बात को सीधे तौर से नहीं देखते और इसलिये वह खुद गड़बड़ा जाते हैं।

ज्यादातर आदमी इस मजमून पर बोले। उन्होंने कुछ थोड़ी बहुत नुक्ताचीनी की हो, लेकिन अधिकतर ने इस हमारी नीति को मंजूर किया। आप लोगों ने जो हमारी नीति को मंजूर किया तो इस बात के लिये मैं हाउस का बहुत मशकूर हूँ। इसमें थोड़ी बहुत छोटी मोटी बातें कहीं वह हमारे बहस करने की हो सकती हैं, उन के बारे में मुझ से कहें, अलग आ कर कहें, तो उन बातों पर विचार कर सकते हैं। लेकिन जो हमारी मोटी नीति है, उस पर हमें सब को एक दिल से कायम रहना चाहिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shall I put all the cut motions together to the vote of the House, or is there any cut motion which any hon. Member desires that I should put separately?

I shall put all the cut motions together.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the demands to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,00,54,000 be granted to the

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,36,94,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,17,000 be granted to the

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of Chandernagore'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,51,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Thursday, the 25th March, 1954.
