

If this were to be a point of law, it is really well worth an argument; I would have liked to argue it myself.

Therefore, the Supreme Court did not go into it. Is any order even necessary when it is the Magistrate himself who arrested? That is the point. Under article 22 of the Constitution, the man must be produced before the Magistrate. This presupposes that the individual concerned was arrested by somebody else than a Magistrate. It may be that my argument is wrong. But that is the obvious point. It is, therefore, that the Supreme Court stated thus:

"Various questions of law and fact have been argued before us by Mr. Sethi on behalf of the petitioner. But we consider it unnecessary to enter upon a discussion of these questions as it is now conceded.....etc."

The question was a difficult question. Therefore, the Supreme Court got hold of another question, namely, what happened on the 9th. Nothing to do with the *Habeas corpus* petition. I do not say that they were not entitled to take notice of whatever happened. But so far as the 6th is concerned, I suggest with due humility that there was really nothing in the petition.

Now, so far as the question of the 9th, 10th and 11th is concerned, it is purely a judicial matter—purely exercise of judicial authority. Men are ordered to be hanged. Do you mean to say that this High Court of Parliament is going into those matters?

I, therefore, say, with all respect, it is not a question which we should go into. We might mislead ourselves by bringing the personality of the accused in this case into our consideration. It is just the other way. The question is that we should not act in the excitement of the moment or out of respect to the accused in this case and create a precedent which will be fatal to judicial independence. It is on this ground that I suggest that this motion should not be carried.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall first put the amendment of Shri Vallatharas to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That in the motion for the words 'and that the Government should investigate into the matter and report to the House the results of such enquiry and action taken thereon by Government' the following be substituted:

'and that a Committee of enquiry be appointed by the

Prime Minister consisting of five members, the Chairman of the Committee to be a retired High Court Judge or a retired District Judge and two nominees of the Government to be chosen by the Government, and two Members of this House to be selected by the Speaker in consultation with the Leaders of the Opposite Groups, which should enquire into the matter and report to this House the results of its enquiry and the action to be taken against the officers who may be held responsible for any illegal act and commission of excess or abuse of power'."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I will put the motion itself to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House is of opinion that there was a failure on the part of the Delhi administration in keeping in jail three Members of this House and some other citizens without lawful authority and in clear contravention of the provisions of the Constitution and Law as disclosed in the proceedings before and in the judgment of the Supreme Court given on the 12th March 1953 in connection with the *Habeas Corpus* petition by Shri Ram Narayan Singh, M.P., and that the Government should investigate into the matter and report to the House the results of such enquiry and action taken thereon by Government."

The motion was negatived.

SITUATION IN JAMMU

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the next item. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee.

Shri Amjad Ali (Goalpara-Garo Hills): On a point of order, Sir.

Shri Radhela Vyas (Ujjain): I want to know whether this discussion has arisen out of reply to any question or it is as a matter of public importance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is a procedure which has been settled by convention. For a long time I have been sensing the feeling of the House; with respect to matters of public importance, there is no specific provision except

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

by way of a resolution or a motion, in both of which vote of the House has to be taken. And further in a resolution, due notice has to be given and it has to be balloted. Regarding a motion of public importance, vote has to be taken. With respect to other matters of public importance where hon. Members only want to raise a discussion without putting it to vote, but only for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government, for want of any other specific procedure laid down in the rules, they have been resorting in many cases to motions of adjournment. But it has been repeatedly held that adjournment motions are in the nature of censure motions. Lastly, there is the other provision relating to half-an-hour discussion in the evening on two days in a week, but that is under the rules confined only to a subject matter which was the subject matter of a question, and for further elucidation that half an hour has been allotted.

In the British House of Commons where a matter is of public importance, where a vote of the House is not called for but the only intention is to draw the attention of the Government and to have a discussion on that matter, there is what is called a motion of adjournment: 'The House do now adjourn', without being a motion of censure. We have not got that procedure here. For that purpose, therefore, finding that very many matters come before the House and as and when they arise hon. Members on both sides want to have a discussion and ascertain the view of the Government on those matters. I invited the Leaders of all the groups to the Chamber a few days ago when the hon. the Leader of the House was also present. We talked over that matter and it was suggested that in the place of two days being allotted for half-an-hour discussion, three days might be allotted, and instead of the matter that comes before the House for the half-an-hour discussion being confined only to matters already answered during the Question Hour and with respect to which supplementaries have been put, the discussion may relate to matters of general importance and also that no vote need be taken on that particular motion. Therefore, as a first measure, without framing any rule, by convention, by the agreement of the Leaders of all the Groups, including the Leader of the House, I allowed Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee to raise this discussion. Hereafter all Members of this House who want to raise a discussion on a matter of public importance without.....

Shri Radhelal Vyas: May I invite your attention to rule 171? There is a specific provision in the rules.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I am answering that point.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Without a motion, no discussion can be.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am answering that point. Rule 171 relates to a motion of the kind that we just disposed of—where the motion has to be put to vote.

6 P.M.

Now, there are so many matters where it may not be the desire of the person, who makes a reference to have a discussion, to have a vote of the House on the matter. He only wants to draw the attention of the House. This is a new method of bringing matters to the notice of the House. I am only following it with the consent of all parties. I propose to give three days in a week instead of two days and allowing matters not only arising out of a question to be raised but matters of public importance. Notice has to be given to the Speaker and the Speaker, if he consents, and finds that it is a matter of public importance, and with the consent of the Government, who have to allot time, this matter may be arranged. I am applying this to all Members from any party and this is to see how it works. If the convention is established, then we shall crystallise it in the form of a rule. Under that Dr. S. P. Mookerjee wrote to me. He wrote to me that he wrote to the Prime Minister, the Leader of the House and that the latter had agreed to allot a certain time and then he made a specific point here as the basis of the discussion. Under those circumstances, it is allowed with the consent of the Leaders of the Groups and the Leader of the House.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): The subject-matter that I would like to raise for discussion is not new to this House. I know that I have no right to take the time of the House over and again on this matter but I believe it will be recognised that the situation is so developing that it may be useful for all of us concerned to have even a short debate on this very grave issue and also its possible repercussions on the country. Previously, I have gone into the details of the Jammu situation; so I do not wish to cover the entire ground. Nor will it be possible for us in the short time at our disposal to deal with all the matters, national and inter-national arising out of this controversy.

We in this city—when I say we, I refer to three political organisations, the Jan Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Ram Rajya Parishad—have started a movement in support of the Jammu movement. Let me make it clear, in the first instance, that what we have done is to give our moral support to the efforts, which, in our opinion, are being justly made in the State of Jammu and Kashmir for the purpose of vindicating the rights of the people of that State. No doubt that movement has been launched by a section of the people of that State but the issues raised in that connection are so momentous that, in our humble judgment, they affect not only that State but also the entire country. I recognise fully that in a free democratic country, it should not, normally speaking, be considered desirable for any such movement to be launched. And, speaking for myself and for others, I should like to say this without fear of contradiction that we were extremely anxious—not were, even are today—that this controversial matter should be settled amicably through a process of negotiation so that the interests of Jammu and Kashmir may be safeguarded and India's position may not be jeopardised in any manner whatsoever. Unfortunately, there have been lots of abuses and counter-abuses, vituperations, casting of motives and the issues immediately arising out of these have tended to become somewhat clouded. I do not want to refer to all these controversies because my anxiety is to concentrate on the main issues and to make an appeal to the Prime Minister and to the House, especially to the majority party, that even at this late stage, we may be able to settle this matter in a manner which will not be derogatory to Government and which will, at the same time, remove just causes of fear and anxiety from the minds of a large section of our people. The charge has been brought against us that this is a communal movement, that this is a sectarian movement, that this is a reactionary movement.....

An Hon. Member: It is.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Wait a minute; do not be in such a hurry. This is a reactionary movement, that this is a movement which is befriending Pakistan and all sorts of things. All these conclusions have been paraded by the Prime Minister himself and by others. In my humble opinion, the issues are constitutional, political, economic and administrative. The demands which have been made have nothing to do with communalism or sectarianism. The demands which

557 P.S.D.

have been made are not intended to strengthen Pakistan. I shall take that point first.

In our absence, the Prime Minister one day said on the floor of this House that we are helping the enemy. I suppose he meant the Pakistan enemy. (*Interruption*) So far as helping the enemy is concerned, as you know, we will be the last persons to do anything which will consolidate the position of Pakistan against the just rights of India. But, if the unfortunate controversy which has just now arisen strengthens the propaganda machinery of Pakistan, it devolves both on us as also on Government to see to it that the controversy is settled in such a manner that Pakistan's hands will not be strengthened in any manner whatsoever. It is a responsibility which will fall on all of us and not on us alone.

What are the demands which have been made? I shall not go into the details; time will not permit me to do so. One is the finality of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India. I know the history very well and I know also the manner in which the question has been sought to be dealt with during the last few years. But, unless and until this sword of Damocles is removed, unless and until this question is solved, there is no certainty about the future of that State. And, it is conceded that it does give rise to feelings of fear, doubts and apprehension in the minds of large sections of the people as regards their very existence in future. Now, we have suggested a certain way out. We have said that so far as the UNO is concerned, we went there on the question of aggression and not on the question of accession. Accession is a domestic matter. From the UNO we do not expect to get any justice whatsoever so far as Kashmir is concerned. Already one-third of the State of Jammu and Kashmir is in the hands of Pakistan; and even with regard to that there is no possibility of our recovering that area because of the intransigence of the Security Council. So far as the question of accession is concerned, undoubtedly the Prime Minister held out certain assurances and we have suggested a formula that no question of plebiscite should come now. Let the matter be decided on the recommendation of the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir and so far as India and Kashmir are concerned, that matter should be treated as closed. I am not going to discuss this question in detail. Answers may be given pointing out the difficulties. This is one vital

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

matter with regard to which an anxiety has been expressed that the greater the delay in having the matter solved, the greater will be the danger with regard to the future existence of that State. I ask, humbly, is there anything communal about it? Is there anything reactionary about it, is there anything that strengthens the hands of Pakistan with regard to it because we say not only that portion of Jammu and Kashmir which is now with us but also that portion of Jammu and Kashmir which is in the hands of Pakistan, the entire State should come to India? So how can any one afford to suggest that we are doing this for the purpose of strengthening the hands of Pakistan?

Next comes the question of the applicability of the provisions of the Indian Constitution to that part of the territory. Now, there again, the formula which has been suggested is that if the entire Constitution cannot be applied immediately, at least those portions of the Constitution which are deemed to be essential and fundamental, should be applied with the least possible delay. Even the July agreement on this very vital question has not yet been implemented. It was suggested that this has not been implemented because of this movement. Now, that is no answer; that is extremely childish because so far as Jammu and Kashmir Government was concerned, it certainly proceeded to give effect to two important parts of that agreement with the least possible delay. Why should it take so many months to implement the remaining portions? They relate to certain vital matters like Fundamental Rights, citizenship, jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, Emergency Powers of the President, financial and economic integration and conduct of elections in such manner indicated in the Constitution itself. Now, there also, it has been stated by the Jammu Parishad and other people that with regard to acquisition of land, if the reforms which have been effected there are to remain untouched by the provisions of the Constitution, an exception may be made and that would be acceptable to all concerned. May I ask in all humility: is there anything in this demand which smacks of communalism, sectarianism, or anything which smacks of protecting the rights of vested interests, of re-creating feudalism in that State? That is the second demand.

The third demand has been with regard to the question of the Indian flag. Now, it has been admitted by the Prime Minister that the Indian flag

will certainly be supreme. If that is so, let that flag be put into use from day to day, as it is being used in the rest of India. I have even suggested as a compromise formula that since it touches the feelings and emotions of certain sections of the people, the State flag which has now been adopted may be used on special occasions in addition to the Indian national flag. Is there anything in this which can smack of communalism or reactionarism?

Then with regard to provincial autonomy, I find from the papers that the principle of provincial autonomy is being considered by Sheikh Abdullah's Government itself. Then, there are certain other grievances. I do not wish to go into their details, but what, in short, is the demand which has been made? That those grievances should be examined by a really independent tribunal. A tribunal has been appointed. Barring the Chief Justice of the Jammu and Kashmir State, all the other persons are administrative officers in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The Chief Conservator of Forests is there. I do not know which jungle has to be cleared so that the Chief Conservator of Forests may be considered as a very efficient adjudicator on this tribunal.

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): On a point of order.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: These are not the people who should constitute the tribunal.

Shri M. D. Joshi: On a point of order.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: These are the main demands which have been put forward.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Some hon. Member has risen to a point of order. What is the point of order?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I request that this time may be taken from the Government side.

Shri M. D. Joshi: My point of order is this. With all respect to the hon. Member, can he repeat the same arguments that were put forward by him during the debate on the Jammu and Kashmir State on a former occasion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought the hon. Member would say that it does not really arise out of the situation which is said to have arisen from the movement in Jammu. I suggest to Dr. Syama Prasad that he need not elaborate too much on the demands,

because his motion refers to the situation that has arisen as a result of the movement, and does not refer to the situation there. It is the situation that has arisen out of the movement that his motion seeks to discuss.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I referred to these points, because I thought that this might carry conviction with Members like the hon. interruptor.

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): If you will forgive me, Sir, I do not wish to come in the way of the hon. Member saying what he has to say, but I have been listening to his arguments with some surprise—I mean the subject of his arguments—because we are really discussing the whole Kashmir issue. Now, when I agreed to this discussion, I did not have the faintest notion that we were going to discuss this entire issue, which we have repeatedly discussed. I thought that we were going to discuss something that is of vital importance, viz. the movement that the hon. Member is carrying on, and to which the Government is resolutely opposed and which the Government thinks is fatal, most pernicious and objectionable, and ought to be suppressed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us limit the scope. Let us understand the scope. I thought the discussion related to the situation that has arisen out of the movement. That is what I thought. But I find the hon. Member is leading his arguments to show as to why the movement was started and is laying the greatest emphasis on the movement. But what we are discussing is the situation that has arisen on account of the movement, and not the movement itself.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: This was exactly the reason why I had requested the Prime Minister two days ago that he might initiate the discussion and tell us the exact points that I have to meet, but he unfortunately did not accede to that request. I am extremely sorry that I referred to these points, but I did not know what exactly the Prime Minister's reply was going to be.

I shall not go into the details of this Jammu movement, but I have just given the background and the purposes for which that movement has been started there.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister says that he would like me to deal specifically with the movement which has been started here. Here, what we have started is a movement for the purpose of focusing the attention of the public with regard to the urgency and the grave necessity of settling this

problem. How did we come to do it? As I said, in the beginning, normally speaking in a free, democratic country there should not be any scope for starting any such *satyagraha* movement, and from 9th January onwards, for more than a month and a half, I carried on correspondence with the Prime Minister and with Sheikh Abdullah. I tried to impress upon them the necessity of getting something done through the process of negotiations, so that the situation may not deteriorate. We did it. We did it with the best of intentions, without any reservation whatsoever. I am not going to refer to the correspondence, because many of the Members have perhaps seen it. But then when it became evident that the Government of India was not prepared to entertain this matter at all, then we started this movement. I am not saying that we have not started it. But that movement is not a communal movement. That movement is not a violent movement. It is a peaceful movement.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Question.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Question? It may be, but if the hon. Prime Minister can point out a single communal incident in any part of India, his questioning will have some truth behind it, but otherwise that questioning remains a mere question mark.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Violent, every way violent.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: If the hon. Prime Minister says that our *satyagrahis* have committed violence, let him appoint a committee of enquiry and I shall abide by its decision.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Everything violent.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: But I say this to the Prime Minister, that so far as violence is concerned, it is not these men—about 600 of them who are in jail in different parts of the country and about 50 of them who have been arrested under the Preventive Detention Act who are guilty of violence. I have seen a number of these boys in the jail. I have seen the rope-like marks on their chest, on their back, and I have also seen and heard the manner in which these peaceful *satyagrahis* have been beaten, caned, lathi-charged, dragged to the police van, and taken to the jail. We have also seen how ladies have been taken away—ladies and also men—ten, twelve miles away from Delhi and let loose near jungles or in remote areas and deprived of their belongings, just for the purpose of making them walk back to Delhi. Let the Prime Minister prove that there has been violence

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

committed by the *satyagrahis*. It is possible that crowds may have done it on one or two occasions; they may have done something; but it has been our specific instruction to avoid violence, and let me say this that we cannot possibly afford to commit any violence. That would be undesirable and that will defeat the very purpose that we have in view. We have been tied down to a situation, a situation which we ourselves do not like, but what is the remedy which is open to us.

An. Hon. Member: To get out of it.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I am asking the Prime Minister: If a situation arises in the country, where a section of the people are fighting for their legitimate rights, and everyone in authority refuses to talk to them—an attitude which is inexplicable—what can they do? I beg of the Prime Minister to answer this question. An amazing thing is that he and I never met. Four or five or six times, I said: let us trust each other. I am not doubting the Prime Minister's motives. He is of course proceeding in a manner which he certainly thinks is right and proper, but why should he question those who differ from him? It is not a question of doubting each other's motives. A situation has arisen. Certain viewpoints have been placed before the country. Can we not find out some peaceful settlement through the process of negotiations?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is the very distinguished *chela* of Mahatma Gandhi; that is the very distinguished disciple of Mahatma Gandhi—saying no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not with evil. I will have nothing to do with evil.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is the whole point—"I will have nothing to do with peaceful negotiations". The more he loses his temper, the more his inner soul comes out, and it comes out in a manner which he cannot control himself. He considers that everything is evil that is against him. That is the evil in him. That is the most dangerous thing today. Why should he say 'No'? We are all citizens of a free country. Why should he think that he and his followers are the only right people? Let us sit down together and see what the position is, and whether we can come to a settlement or not.

An. Hon. Member: Stop preaching violence.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: We preach violence? If you find that we commit violence, undoubtedly tell us. But every time do not merely say that we preach violence.

An Hon. Member: You are responsible for it.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I can say that if there is violence, no Government should tolerate it. But when there are certain matters of grave import, they should be settled through the process of negotiation. I am amazed to hear the Prime Minister sitting there, say "NO"; he will never settle anything through peaceful negotiations. That is a matter very much for him to decide. I cannot compel him. I cannot use force.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No settlement with evil; certainly not with evil.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: But what I am saying is this, that there has been systematic adoption of violence by the Government. What violence can we commit? What force can we think of?

Shri Raj Bahadur: Is petting of stones non-violence?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: By whom? By the bullocks? Bulls? You refer to that bull story. Dr. Kallas Nath and the bull made a perfect combination, and the story came out that the bulls had come into it. (*An Hon. Member:* You brought the bulls.) We brought the bulls? Is there any evidence? Where can we bring the bulls from? There is no question of stone throwing. If there was stone throwing it was done by *agents provocateurs*.

Shri Raj Bahadur: Hence is the evidence. Has the hon. Member seen the bandaged forehead of the hon. lady Member over there?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Of course, you want evidence! That distinguished lady, the report in the papers says, got it from lathi charge by the police.

I cannot say who has done it. None of the Members of the House was present there. I have read in the papers that this was due to a lathi charge by the police.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is wrong. The hon. Member gets his facts from very peculiar sources; that is why he is wrong.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Unfortunately, the Police and the C.I.D. are not at my disposal; so I cannot get facts from the Police. So, I say, with regard to every matter, let there be an enquiry. Let an enquiry take place. I am prepared to accept the findings

of an impartial tribunal. I do not say that all the allegations that have been made are true. Some of them may be exaggerated. I was not present on every occasion. Therefore, the only way by which we can ascertain the truth is through an impartial investigation. If that investigation shows that there has been violence by our men, undoubtedly we will have to accept responsibility. But so far as commitment of violence on previous occasions was concerned, it was by the crowds, not by the peaceful *satyagrahis*. But, as I say, the Prime Minister can have it verified. A number of people have been beaten and sent to Yole camp. One of them, a distinguished man, was beaten in a merciless manner and when I met him in the jail he showed us the mark on the body. Who committed those injuries on the bodies of these individuals? Who were the people who have done it? (*Interruption*)

Now, it is quite possible for the hon. Members to say that we have beaten the crowds, we have beaten Congressmen and we have beaten ourselves. That, of course, is an argument which the hon. Members belonging to the majority party can advance. But that is an argument which will only please them; it will not convince the rest of the world.

I am sorry, the Prime Minister spoke in that strain. I am genuinely and sincerely anxious that we should be able to sit round the table and find a way out of this.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: It is all right. If it is your verdict, if the Government says that there can be no question of talk, there can be no question of negotiation and you will rule only by force, you will rule only by repression. I can say this, that will fail: that can never succeed. It can never succeed, because it has already aroused feelings. The purpose for which the agitation is going on has already aroused deep sympathy in the minds of people, not belonging to our creed alone.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I know it has not aroused any sympathy in the minds of any people who are interrupting me. What is the use of hon. Members interrupting me? I do not expect any sympathy from that quarter. When I say we have got sympathy from people.....

An Hon. Member: From which quarter?

An Hon. Member: From Pakistan!

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Of course, the hon. Member who is quoting Pakistan has left his seat there and has gone there. He has made Pakistan for himself there.

Now, so far as this point is concerned, if the Prime Minister says that his only weapon is force, his only weapon is repression, then it continues—let it continue. Of course, we are prepared to suffer the consequences. But whatever provocation may come from his side, however much he may lose his temper and threaten us, I can assure him that our instruction has been from the very beginning, is today, and will be till the last, that we shall not commit violence, that it must not take a communal turn, because I know they are most anxious that it takes a communal turn.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Of course they are anxious. Otherwise, his whole theory goes. The biggest thing he does today is to find out communalism where it does not exist, thereby creating communalism in this country. Wherever he goes, whenever he has to hide his own inefficiency, his incapacity to deal with the vital problems facing this country, there is one thing—communalism, communalism—whereas he knows in his heart of hearts that so far as surrender to the worst type of communalism is concerned none is guilty in India today more than he is. There can be no question about that, but he will not think about it. I would appeal to him that it is not a question of our talking about the past. We love the country as much as they do. We want the good of this country.

An Hon. Member: You do not.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Well, if the hon. Member says that we do not love the country, he discloses his own perverted mind. If that is your theory, let it be so. But we are not prepared to accept that position. There may be honest difference of opinion. In all these matters, where it concerns the vital rights of the people, the liberties of the people, where a section of the people have put forward certain demands, which according to my humble opinion are capable of adjustment through negotiations, they must be carefully considered. That is the tragedy of the situation. In one day's time we can settle this, if all of us, view it not from a particular angle of vision, but from the interest of Jammu and Kashmir, of India as a whole. If

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

we proceed to examine the matter from that point of view there is no difficulty.

I make this offer in spite of these interruptions, in spite of the Prime Minister losing his temper. Whatever he may say, at any time if he feels that this matter could be settled, we can coolly sit together and settle it. I am not saying that it should be settled by arbitration, but you should take steps which will remove the main causes of fear and suspicion, which will create peaceful conditions, so that democracy may thrive. If that is so, at any moment he will only have to make a decision and our co-operation will be at his disposal. If on the other hand he feels that he can go on as he likes and only utilise force, he may do so and be responsible for the consequences.

Today section 144 is being applied. The Prime Minister was in Meerut three days ago and he made a terrific speech, even probing into our intentions. I do not know how he entered into my heart. He has probed into our intentions and has said a lot of things. I wanted to go to Meerut day after tomorrow. Today I have been informed that I can go there, provided I do not speak anything about Jammu and Kashmir. You are talking of democracy! What is democracy?—that all those who support Government policy will be allowed to go and make speeches and anyone who opposes Government policy will be gagged and will not be permitted to open his mouth. You call it democracy! You think that this democracy will continue in this country? We are asking that democracy may be really established, that there may be give and take exchange of views. But if Government considers that by reason of the majority that it commands, today, it is going to force its will on the people of this country, it will not work, it will not work, it will not work. Do not bring disaster to the country by following old British methods.

I tell the hon. the Prime Minister and the Government that these matters we should consider dispassionately on their merits. I am not infallible: I am not saying that we have not committed any mistakes. Mistakes might have been committed. But we must trust each other. The question is not one of motives. But we must sit quietly and try to solve this problem. The Prime Minister says that a peculiar situation has come which is not only imperilling the interests of this country, but may

jeopardise the international situation. So, you cannot just overlook the position. My offer is let us sit round the table and discuss the matter and try to arrive at a settlement which will be fair and honourable to all. The answer is for the Prime Minister to give.

Shri B. Shiva Rao (South Kanara—South): In the very limited time that I propose to take I shall deal with only two or three points. When I first read the terms of the motion which was put down by my hon. friend Dr. Mookerjee, it was not clear to me—and judging from the speech which my hon. friend has just delivered, I think it was equally not clear to him—what the precise scope of the motion is which he wants the House to debate this afternoon; because, the situation arising out of Jammu may mean many things to many people. In an attempt to solve my perplexity, I read the pamphlet which has just been published and to which my hon. friend made a reference—a pamphlet which contains the correspondence which took place between him and the Prime Minister and also with Sheikh Abdullah. I do not know how many Members of this House have read that pamphlet. But I found in it a good deal of light in respect of the standpoints which the Prime Minister and my hon. friend Dr. Mookerjee take in regard to the Kashmir dispute.

My hon. friend is impatient that no solution has yet been found for this dispute. May I say that he is not the only one who is unhappy about it? I think everyone in this House is impatient for a satisfactory solution of this dispute. But I would add, if I may say so, that Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee in his impatience, as is only too clear from the terms which he has used in his various letters to the Prime Minister, has yielded to despair and to a spirit of defeatism, and he has urged the Prime Minister to adopt courses which can bring neither India nor Kashmir any good but only disaster in the end.

I said a moment ago that we are not the only people who want a solution of the Kashmir dispute which is now before the Security Council; there are others, outside this House and outside this country, who are equally impatient to seek a solution, a quick solution. My hon. friend said in the course of his speech with some warmth: Am I trying to help the enemy by trying to suggest that certain courses be adopted by the Prime Minister? I venture to suggest to my friend, with all respect to him, that perhaps he is helping not exactly

the enemy, but he is helping, unconsciously, some Powers who are not particularly our friends in regard to the Kashmir dispute. At a meeting of the Security Council—I think it was in November of last year—Britain and the United States jointly sponsored a resolution for a very quick solution of the Kashmir dispute. And the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government, authorised the Leader of the Indian Delegation who presented the Indian case before the Security Council, to reject the terms of that resolution politely but firmly. These Powers look at the Kashmir dispute, not as we see it but somewhat differently. Last week, when the estimates of the External Affairs Ministry were under debate, I devoted a good deal of my time to analysing the implications of the establishment of a Defence Organisation known as N.A.T.O. I read out certain passages from a book which has recently been published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs and for which a group of distinguished British authors was responsible. There is one other revealing passage in that book which refers to the Kashmir dispute, and which may be of interest to the House and also to my hon. friend opposite. Discussing the problems of Asia these writers say:

“Pakistan’s military strength is pinned down by the Kashmir quarrel; and engrossed in rivalry with India she cannot play the leading role in the Muslim world to which her population and position may seem to entitle her. Neither India nor Pakistani forces can be counted on to join the Commonwealth forces for the defence of the Middle East so long as the Kashmir problem remains unsettled. And even if it were settled, it is by no means certain how extensive would be the military co-operation offered to the Commonwealth from Karachi.”

I shall read one more sentence from this book which also throws additional light on the point of view of some of these Powers which are working so hard in the Security Council to obtain a quick solution of the Kashmir problem:

“The position taken up by India towards the cold war and her dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir are serious embarrassments to Britain’s Atlantic policy.”

Britain and the United States and some of the other Powers are anxious, for their own reasons, to see this dispute settled as soon as possible. But

in that anxiety they overlook certain vital points in regard to this dispute, just as from another standpoint, I venture to suggest, my hon. friend opposite too overlooks certain vital points in regard to this very dispute. And may I say that the Prime Minister is absolutely right in refusing to be stampeded into a hurried or an unwise decision by yielding to pressure tactics, whether they are from one extreme outside India or from another extreme inside India?

Apart from the merits of this dispute, is it wise. I ask, with all respect to my hon. friend, is it wise when this dispute has reached a somewhat critical stage before the Security Council and the United Nations, when wisdom dictates that we should all join together in support of the Prime Minister’s policy, that we should confuse the issues and divide the forces inside?

My hon. friend spoke very eloquently about the peaceful nature of the movement which has been inaugurated by the three organisations which he mentioned. May I ask him, if he reads the newspapers, how is this agitation maintained and sustained in Delhi? Many colleagues of mine in this House and in the other House have been, during the last several days, visiting different mohallas in Delhi City and obtained not only valuable contacts but valuable information; and they have come back, all of them, with reports that the movement is languishing in Delhi itself for want of local support.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Then it is solved!

Shri B. Shiva Rao: No. You are trying to find a remedy for it. Groups of volunteers have been pouring into Delhi from various centres in U.P., Rajasthan and Madhyabharat, particularly from Lucknow, Kanpur, Sitapur, Kheri, Faizabad, Meerut, Allahabad, Dehra Dun and Gonda.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is part of the scheme.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: That is a part of your scheme. And my hon. friend has been further afield during the past few days; he has visited Bombay, Bangalore and Calcutta. And there are other centres which are providing recruits for this peaceful agitation, from Indore and Gwalior, from Patna and Gaya in Bihar, from Hissar and Rohtak in Punjab, and from PEPSU. And I am told—I have not had any verification for this report—but I am told there is a transit camp in Ghaziabad where these recruits

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

can refresh themselves before they enter the City of Delhi.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is not correct.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: I am told Punjab has been divided into two zones. Rohtak and Jullundur; Rohtak to feed Delhi with volunteers and Jullundur for sending volunteers to Pathankot. Probably even this outside support would begin to languish, as local support has languished, if the truth were known in these far off places.

And here I come to the writings in a section of the Delhi Press. And I say it with a good deal of humiliation and regret as a newspaper man myself. From time to time a section of the Press in Delhi seems over-powered by a wave of hysterical violence and fanaticism. We saw one outburst of it in January 1948 which culminated in the murder of the Father of the Nation. And today, at any rate during the last few weeks, we have witnessed a similar outburst on the part of a section of the Delhi Press. I know there are many honourable exceptions. Some papers, Urdu papers particularly, with large circulations, I regret to say, have been publishing alarming and provocative headlines. I will give the House just a few examples of the kind of headlines that are published. There is one paper—edited the 10th of March—which says "Police resort to lathi charge, over half a lakh persons involved, without giving them any warning. Tear gas used ruthlessly". Another paper says "Peaceful *satyagrahis* lathi charged several times in Delhi".

An Hon. Member: A fact, Sir.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: "Police gives severe beatings to several persons after forcing them out of their shops". I have batches of headlines. After that some very leading Urdu papers say...

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East *cum* Ballia Distt.—West): Have they large circulation?

Shri B. Shiva Rao: I am afraid they have substantial circulations. Another headline: "Some disgraceful examples of heart-rending atrocities on peaceful *satyagrahis* in Delhi" and so on. "A Muslim Superintendent of Police has been directly responsible" for many of these so-called police atrocities! Not only have they been giving provocative and inflammatory headlines featuring this news on their front page ignoring news of world significance, but they have also been writing in their editorials in a similar strain. I

will give the House only two or three examples to indicate the type of writing.

This is a passage from the editorial of one newspaper:

"Today the police resorted to a very severe and ruthless lathi charge under the command of D.S.P."

and they give the name of the Muslim D.S.P. who has recently been brought to Delhi from U.P.

"Tear gas was used against 60,000 people for full one hour and further lathi charge was made all of a sudden under the orders of the same D.S.P."

I will read one more passage to indicate the kind of writing in these papers. "Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee wanted to settle the Jan Sangh dispute by peaceful negotiations but Pandit Nehru's dictatorial attitude stands in the way. Sheikh Abdullah too refuses to have any talk with the R.S.S. as, in his opinion, the hands of this organisation are stained with the blood of the Muslims."

I do not want to give more advertisement to these newspapers by reading more of these samples of violent and unbalanced writings. I shall now conclude by referring to one or two passages in one of the several letters that Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee wrote to the Prime Minister. He put down several points for consideration. After Pandit Prem Nath Dogra had been released, this is what Dr. Mookerjee says:

"Naturally I cannot commit the Praja Parishad but knowing as I do their minds to some extent, I can make some suggestions to you for your consideration".

And then follows a number of suggestions which must be accepted by the Government of India and the Government of Kashmir. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has also suggested in one of his letters that the withdrawal of this movement of *satyagraha*, as he calls it, should be followed by a conference with not only the agenda prescribed before the withdrawal of the movement, but even certain tentative decisions to which the Government must give effect.

I will not take more time of the House but I think it is important, indeed it is a matter of fundamental importance, that the Prime Minister's interpretation of the basic attitude which Dr. Mookerjee has adopted

throughout his correspondence should be placed on record. The Prime Minister said in one of his letters:

"In effect this agitation challenges the authority and supremacy of our Parliament in a vital matter. It also seeks to interfere in international affairs which have far-reaching consequences. I am indeed surprised that you should expect me or our Government to countenance any such attempt which strikes at the root of democratic Government and accepted canons of policy."

And the Prime Minister goes on to conclude:

"The larger good of India as well as the people of Jammu and Kashmir State with which we have been entrusted is more important than the wishes of a group of persons who could only think in a narrow and bigoted way and who do not hesitate to do deep injury to India's well-being for the sake of some fancied group advantage."

I would like to make one comment: no Prime Minister and no Government, whether it is the Congress Government or any other Government, can afford to abdicate its authority in response to the defiance of a group which persists in breaking the laws of the country.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): A little while ago, I rose in my seat to vote in favour of a motion which wanted a Government enquiry into the arrest and detention of certain leaders of the movement whose activities we are discussing at the moment but I have no hesitation in saying that as far as the Jammu agitation is concerned, it is a basically reactionary and an actively counter-revolutionary movement which it is the duty of every patriotic citizen of this country to counter. I know—I hear laughter from a certain section of the House—there is no love lost between us and the ruling party. I know that even today, a Congress Chief Minister from the Punjab of all places, a gentleman who goes by the name of Mr. Bhimsen Sachar, said on the 23rd March at Ambala that "the real fight today is not between the Congress and the Praja Parishad, Hindu Mahasabha or the R.S.S. but between India and the Communists". I make a present of it to the Prime Minister. In fact, there are in the ranks of the Congress today people in very high positions—perhaps also in the Cabinet of this country—who have

a very soft corner in their hearts for what is going on under the aegis of my honourable and formidable friend to the left. I know it is a fact.....

An Hon. Member: In the present Cabinet?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee:.....and I want the Government of India to come forward—Yes, I have my suspicions about some in the present Cabinet—the Government of my country should come forward and say that as far as this particular agitation is concerned, they are going to see that its nefarious activities are not permitted to continue. I say this because when I first heard Dr. Mookerjee speaking, he began as if he was throwing out a sort of compromise suggestion; he said he had only lent "moral support" to this movement and then he said that throughout the agitation and even now he was anxious for a settlement. He ended also on a note which suggested that he was anxious for a settlement. I do not quite know how to read his mind. I am not very familiar with the workings of his kind of mind. I do not understand how he could go to Calcutta and make the kind of speech which was referred to by Mr. Shiva Rao just now. I have got a cutting here. I also belong to Calcutta. He went to Calcutta, to my constituency, and he made a speech which was reported in the Calcutta edition of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of the 23rd of this month. There he said that he wants people from all over the country to join this movement and go to Delhi. The slogan was raised at a meeting in Calcutta in Wellington Square, *Delhi Chalo*, let us go to Delhi. I am as proud a Bengalee as any other. But, I hate Bengalee patriotism being exploited and mutilated in this way.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I did not exploit.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: These are the words. I am quoting from the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* report of what Dr. Mookerjee said. This is a paper which boosts Dr. Mookerjee.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Not at all now.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: He said:

"This demand should receive popular support from all over India. It should not be treated as a movement of a section of people, and all patriotic citizens irrespective of party and religion must assist in developing it into an all-India movement. He announced that people from different parts of the country expressed their readiness to go to Delhi and take part

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

in the *satyagraha* and hoped that Bengalees who were always in the forefront of any national movement would take their part in it."

It was a 12-year-old lad who got up first in the meeting and said, "I am a volunteer for this movement". This is the kind of thing that stinks in our nostrils; it nauseates. He is trying here and now to get up an all-India agitation over this issue.

I shall refer to another matter which, to my mind, is equally poisonous. I was reading in the papers a letter by an hon. Member of this House, whom I do not see here now—I do not know for what reason—to another hon. Member who is here, who is the President of the Hindu Mahasabha, saying that perhaps they could call off this movement. He gives the reason for it. And what is the reason? In Pakistan, he says, there is a slogan for *jihad*. They are going to fight India. And so he suggests, they might call off this movement. Look at the dangerous character of the game which these people are playing: keep up the war psychosis between India and Pakistan, tell the Indian people that in Pakistan they are talking of war with India and only on that issue, these friends are magnanimously coming forward to withdraw the movement. This kind of suggestion shows how there are wolves in sheep's clothing; and they talk about the non-violent character of the *satyagraha* and their agitation! These are the people who flourish on the maintenance of a communal atmosphere in the country. Their occupation will be gone the moment our people can really rise to the full stature of their being, the moment they can see how irrelevant and how subordinate is the communal canker which they are utilising for purposes of their own political advancement.

If I am told that I may be exaggerating, here is a booklet which I just specially wanted to bring to this House. It was sent to us by Dr. Mookerjee's own people. It is not a Government publication, extracts from which were read out by Mr. Shiva Rao. I have also got a copy of that. I brought this because it is Dr. Mookerjee's own thing. On page 63 of the document called, *Integrate Kashmir*, I have a list of the demands of the Praja Parishad movement, on the basis of which Dr. Mookerjee wanted the Prime Minister to have an agreement. Items I to IX: there is not a single reference to the living conditions of the people of Kashmir; there is not a single reference to the land

reforms question. On the contrary, there is a reference to the constitutional provisions; there is reference to the effective enforcement of the Indian Constitution in Kashmir, which means that the compensation clause would apply, which means that the land reforms already there would not be implemented. There is not a word about the real living demands of the people of Kashmir; nothing about employment which has to be found for the unemployed soldiers in Kashmir; not a word about the bureaucratic way in which the agents of this Government are trying half-heartedly to implement the niggardly, inadequate land reforms which have been instituted there. There is not a word about Dogri, nor a claim that the Dogra people are entitled to use their own language and that against their will Urdu should not be imposed on them. There is not a word against the Maharaja and the tribe of Rajpramukhs on whose favours they seem to thrive and flourish throughout the country. There is not a word about the real live problems of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Wherever it may be, they have nothing at all to do with the living conditions of the people of the country. This is why their movement has fallen flat. I can say, with a full sense of the facts that their movement does not appeal to the people. It is only in so far as they can poison and inflame communal passions that they can have a movement of any sort. That is why they are trying all sorts of subterfuges to have a movement of this kind. This is a thing of which the Government have to take note.

This is the point of view from which I would like the Government to tackle this problem: not merely to say that we are not going to do a thing about the people's real grievances. I quite understand the Prime Minister saying, "I will have a Round Table Conference with you". I understand that. But, I do want to tell this to Dr. Mookerjee, if he is at all conscious of his responsibility, about which sometimes he mouths glib phrases—he often says he is a responsible person and the likes of us on these benches are mischievous characters from the streets. If he is at all serious, why does he not unconditionally withdraw the movement? He knows he is in a position to deliver the goods if he wishes to do so. After having unconditionally withdrawn the movement, why cannot he, or anybody else for that matter, have a discussion regarding the live problems which the people of Jammu might have, which the people of Kashmir might have? There are so

many things about which, we know, the people want to agitate their grievances. He does not do it. He is not interested. He wants to keep it up. That is why he went to Bombay as he went to Calcutta and he had a Press conference.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: No Press conference at Calcutta.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: There he said we do not want another Pakistan in Bharat, referring to Kashmir. This is wonderful. In regard to Kashmir we had a discussion last year; we have occasionally discussions about Kashmir. Kashmir is in a very special position for certain very concrete, historical reasons. We all know that. If we wanted to dub Kashmir as Pakistan in India because Kashmir is indubitably a Muslim majority State, what is the kind of mentality that we are encouraging to develop in the mind of our people here? Why should we tolerate this kind of hate? Why should we allow these people to keep the minority in India and the minority in Pakistan in the tenterhooks of agony? That is the exact purpose and object of these people. Why should we allow these people to keep Kashmir as a running sore, a perpetual apple of discord, a factor for continuing the war psychosis between India and Pakistan, so that at another level this Kashmir question might continue to be utilised and exploited by these Anglo-American worthies who sit in the Security Council?

I know that he does make from time to time reasonable suggestions. Let us consider those suggestions. Let the Prime Minister come forward, for example, and consider very seriously, and not merely dismiss it as an airy ejaculation, the question of the withdrawal of the Kashmir case from the United Nations. This is a matter about which we expect the Prime Minister to give some really serious thought. Let him also come forward and say that there are certain grievances of the people of Jammu and Kashmir relative to their living conditions about which he is shortly going to have a real investigation. Let him come forward and say at the same time that he is not going to tolerate any nonsense about this flag question, about the Constitution question, about the Rajpramukh question, which are the very foundations of the movement which is led by Dr. Mookerjee.

I also say this. I would expect Dr. Mookerjee, if he has an iota of responsibility, to say, "I withdraw the movement unconditionally." He can

get my hon. friends over there who may be laughing as I speak, to agree to withdraw this movement. Actually sometimes I have a feeling that possibly they have bitten off much more than they can chew. If these people were prepared to come forward and say, we withdraw the movement, and if the Government puts forward certain suggestions and approaches the problem, not in a huff or temper, but say, we shall go into the real grievances relative to the living conditions of the people, as far as Jammu and Kashmir are concerned, I am sure, the whole thing can be settled.

I would add, as far as this movement is concerned, Government should give no quarter to this kind of communal counter-revolutionary movement. There should be no shilly-shallying over the implementation of the land reforms. Today, in the papers I read about the evidence given before the Wazir Commission by a Parliamentary Secretary of the Kashmir Government, who says that many bureaucratic mistakes are being committed and there are many lacunae as far as the land reforms are concerned. Let there be no shilly-shallying as far as land reforms are concerned. Let there be no truck with outmoded bureaucratic methods as regards the treatment of the common people. Let there be provision for popular peasant co-operation in the implementation of the land reforms, and let there be a serious effort to mobilise the democratic progressive forces, for whatever they are worth, that we have got in our country, in Kashmir and elsewhere, and then we shall be able to throw into the dust bin of history those absolutely reactionary forces which, I am sorry to say, my hon. friend on the left represents.

7 P.M.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): I am amazed at the unlovely alliance between the Congress and the Communists. I do not know whether I shall congratulate the Prime Minister or offer my condolences.

Shri Anu Rai Shastri: Sometimes, you yourself have alliances with those people.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Honestly, there is a complete, persistent, cruel, malignant misunderstanding of this movement. I say so with a full sense of responsibility. Why have we started this? I am not going into details, but, I think, I owe it to the House and hon. colleagues here to explain why a responsible citizen should start a movement like this. I take the House into the fullest confidence, and I am

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

perfectly candid. With the fullest sense of candour and responsibility I say we thought that the people of Jammu, our unfortunate brothers and sisters who are being oppressed and tortured, who have been subjected to a reign of terror and ruthlessness (*Interruption*).

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: That is my honest conviction, and we can prove it to the hilt—not by shouting they can stop the voice of truth. By a campaign of misrepresentation, you can befog the people for some time, but you cannot convert untruth into truth by merely shouts and propaganda.

What is the offence that these poor, tortured brothers and sisters of Jammu have committed? (*Interruption*). What is the crime they have committed? Please do not laugh at this serious matter.

Here is a printed memorandum which the President of the Praja Parishad of Jammu submitted to the Rashtrapati, the President of India. The first sentence is:

"The people of Jammu are particularly anxious to ensure their State becomes firmly and finally a permanent unit of the Indian Union, and they are prepared to pay any price for it."

That is their demand—"for Heaven's sake, do not keep us on tenterhooks". The Prime Minister of India, rightly or wrongly, has sent the matter to the U.N.O. The U.N.O. is playing with it. There is an offer of plebiscite. Do you not realise, have you not got the sense to appreciate that so long as that plebiscite is there, naturally these poor people are labouring under a justifiable apprehension as to their future? They, as sons and daughters of Mother India say: "Whatever may happen, let there be no consignment of us into perdition, into hell". They hate Pakistan. What is the good of the Prime Minister standing up and saying: "You people are friends of Pakistan and enemies of India"? That is absolutely an unfounded charge. His ranting is based on moonshine. They are saying, we are saying: "For Heaven's sake, withdraw this Kashmir issue from the U.N.O. and if you have got courage, if you have got patriotism, if you have got sincerity, if you have got strength, take away that portion of Kashmir which the Pakistanis have illegally, unlawfully trespassed into and occupied". That is our stand. That is what the Jammu people want. Instead of discussing

with them and trying to appreciate their demand, what is happening there? A reign of terror has been let loose.

Why are people facing lathi-charges and bullets there? It is not our movement. They have started the movement three months ago. During these three months they have been facing lathi-charges; they have been facing firings; they have been facing bullets. What for? Two thousand people went to jail. Men and women are suffering all sorts of indignities and torture and cruel repression. What for?—because, they want integration, complete, unconditional and irrevocable accession with India. Is that a crime? Is that communalism? Now, my friend Mr. Hirendra Nath Mukerjee stands up and says: "These are reactionary communal forces operating". What is the communalism there? They are fighting for integration and the establishment of the citizenship rights which you people enjoy here. When the Supreme Court released me and Dr. Mookerjee, our Kashmir friends came to congratulate us. We said: "Now, we realise, my brothers, why they do not want the Supreme Court's jurisdiction to be extended to Kashmir". There are hundreds of people there who are kept behind prison bars, not for days, not for weeks, but for months. Responsible men have been denied all liberty; no charge, no trial, no accusation, no opportunity of vindicating themselves, no opportunity or chance of proving their innocence—and they have been kept there in jail for months and months. They want the same Fundamental Rights which Indian citizens enjoy. It is an absolutely wicked untruth which the Communist Member says, that we are supporting them because we want the Rajpramukh to come back. Nothing of the kind. Our grievance was: you have kept the Nizam as Rajpramukh, and you have weeded out this man; that is not fair. We have pointed out that was unfair, but nobody wants the Rajpramukh to be back. Nobody wants it. What we say is this: that their essential civil liberties have been denied, there is cruel suppression, and basic human rights have been denied to these people. There is no democracy really functioning, and they, therefore, are perfectly justified in demanding the application of the Indian Constitution. They say: "Give us the Fundamental Rights". What is wrong there? Instead of giving them that, you are talking of false charges of communalism. This is a bogie you are raising—a false bogie, a misleading charge.

Mr. Shiva Rao says we are impatient. No, the electorate is impatient

with your policy of vacillation and drift. (An Hon. Member: Question). Therefore, election after election is going against them, and they know it, and therefore they are impatient, they are unhappy, they are carrying on this so-called anti-communal propaganda. Is this democracy or a mockery of democracy? You do not allow one Member of Parliament to go to Lucknow and put forth his standpoint. You do not allow a Member of Parliament to go to Punjab and make his standpoint clear. But you invite the stooges and flunkies and toadies of Sheikh Abdullah and allow them to propagate their views in Punjab and in other parts of India. Is this democracy? You have been committing violence. Government has committed organized violence on our people which is unworthy of any civilized Government. A Member said: "We are not going to express any sorrow or regret at the detention of M.P's. It is not we, Members of Parliament are concerned—it is a question of denial of Fundamental Rights and of basic human rights which we have incorporated in the Constitution. And not only that. You have written a false document in order to dress up the case that there has been a compliance with the demands of Fundamental Rights. That is what has been done.

What they are demanding is this—I told Sheikh Abdulla myself, when I had the privilege of discussing the matter with him: "Why do you not accept the Fundamental Rights?". The difficulty was only the clause regarding land-holding. We are perfectly prepared, the Praja Parishad is prepared, to make some reasonable compromise with regard to that. We are not saying: "bring back the old feudal regime there". We are not saying that. We are saying that the fundamental basic right which is enjoyed by over 32 crores of human beings in this country should be conceded to them. What is the Fundamental Right?—Freedom of speech and freedom of expression. You know that pre-censorship, or banning of newspapers is illegal in India. But so many newspapers are banned in Kashmir. The Opposition Press is gagged. No independent Press is allowed to function. The anti-Abdullah Press is gagged and smothered. Their demand is: "For Heaven's sake, at least give us these things, freedom of speech and expression and other freedoms which you people enjoy. Give us these freedoms".

It is a wicked misrepresentation to say that the demand for Fundamental Right is to instal the Rajpramukh back. It is a perversion of our stand. Who in

his senses can say that we want to get the Maharaja back, if once you give them the Fundamental Rights? They are perfectly prepared, and we are also perfectly prepared not to demand the Maharaja back. I myself assured Sheikh Abdullah 'For Heaven's sake, finalise the Fundamental Rights, barring those things to which you object'. He said 'I will do that'. We are not asking the Prime Minister to do anything against the declared wishes of Parliament. Is it the declared wish of Parliament that the Fundamental Rights will be enjoyed by everybody except the brothers and sisters of Jammu? Is it the declared wish of Parliament that there should be financial integration with every State, but not with the State of Jammu and Kashmir? Is it the declared will of Parliament that the Supreme Court shall be the final tribunal for the enforcement and vindication of basic human rights for each and every citizen in India, excepting these poor people of Jammu and Kashmir? Is that the declared will of Parliament? Parliament has never said that. Our charge was this that the Prime Minister has allowed his friendship for Sheikh Abdullah or his weakness for Sheikh Abdullah to be exploited by him. He has not compelled him to play the game. Sheikh Abdullah has implemented only those parts of the July Agreement with the Prime Minister, that suited him. He abolished the Rajpramukh. He drove out the Maharaja, and had a Sadar-i-Riyasat, and his flag. He has got what he wanted. But what about the other things? What about the Supreme Court? What about financial integration? What about the other Fundamental Rights? Why have they not been implemented? I asked the Prime Minister, I think, towards the end of November, 'Has Sheikh Abdullah's Government implemented the other things?' I got the reply 'No', and the charge was made that our movement was responsible for the non-implementation of the Prime Ministers' Agreement. It is not a fair charge. It is an unfair charge, an untrue charge. What had he been doing for the last six months? He has not implemented anything, excepting those parts which suited him and his vanity.

Now, can anybody stand up and say 'Never talk to the Praja Parishad leaders, never talk to those people who have been supporting them or have been lending them support'? Our movement is a non-violent peaceful movement for the purpose of focusing public attention on the reign of terror which was going on, on the ruthless repression which was going on in Jammu and Kashmir. You do not send any dispassionate observers there, only

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Sheikh Abdullah's men can go. Only those who are friendly to him can go there. But we cannot go there. Those Members of Parliament who are critical of his administration cannot go there. One commission was appointed consisting of the Members of the Legislature. But they were refused entry there. Why? Because there was something ugly there, which they could not possibly expose, and which they could not venture to place before the public eye. Therefore they did that. What we are saying is this. And I am saying it with the fullest sense of responsibility that I owe as my duty to my fellow-citizens of India. When lakhs and lakhs of my fellow-citizens are in danger in Jammu and Kashmir, when the Government of Sheikh Abdullah is pursuing a tragic policy of obduracy, when our Government are adopting a policy of indifference or vacillation, then it is our duty, when we are satisfied that their demand is just, fair and reasonable that we should do our best to focus public attention on this, and mobilise public opinion, so as to put pressure upon our Government and upon Sheikh Abdullah so that justice can be done to them. It is not a 'Quit India Movement' that we are having. We are not saying that you people should quit India. We are saying simply this. For Heaven's sake, try to understand us. Do not be misled by prejudices. Do not be misled by persistent propaganda. Do not think that there is anything communal, or selfish or sectarian or narrow. If this movement had been sectarian or narrow or communal, this would not have gone on in Jammu for so many months. I was most distressed to hear that there were daily and nightly raids on village after village in Jammu and there was molestation of men and women. It was very disgraceful. I wrote to the Prime Minister, on the 4th, before our movement started, that I was getting very distressing messages, and I sent him two telegrams. I wrote a letter on the 4th of March:

"My dear Prime Minister,

We are receiving distressing news from Jammu. It seems that repression is going on in full swing; people in authority are resorting to extreme methods. . ."

And I sent him two telegrams, which I received on that day, from the Jammu people, and I appealed to him to look into the matter. A very kind reply came on that very day, within a couple of hours, and he has written:

"I am afraid that the messages that you are getting from Pathan-

kot have little relation to facts. I have been getting messages, and invariably I enquire. The result of the inquiry does not bear out the message at all."

How can the Prime Minister who receives the letter at three o'clock or so, make an inquiry within a couple of hours, and write to me by five or six o'clock? How can he do it.

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur): Science has advanced too far. (*Interruptions*).

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Are we Members of Parliament to be treated as children? It may be telepathy! are we nincompoops? I may tell you this is not the way to deal with people. I am sorry that men and women have been molested, and we are getting distressing reports. We wanted to put an end to this. We wanted that those ugly scenes which happened during the British regime should not happen in free and independent India. At that time the Britishers puffed up with power, and suffering from power intoxication told Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the fighters of freedom, 'You people are traitors, we shall not have any Round Table Conference or any talks with you'. What is the good of Mr. Shiva Rao talking in that way? You will have to come down from your giddy heights. I am appealing to you, 'Do not play the role of Linlithgow, do not play the role of Hallet, and other British Imperialists'. You have got to come down from your heights. You have to shed your prestige. Shed your hauteur and settle this thing in a spirit of compromise. I think, with a little bit of forbearance, understanding, patience and charity, this thing can be settled, honorably, fairly, justly and with benefit to both Kashmir and India, and also to the lasting benefit to the people of Jammu.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have been trying very hard at least to understand the point of view of some hon. Members opposite, the hon. Member who initiated this discussion, and the one who has just spoken. It is not for lack of trying, now or previously in the course of our correspondence, that I failed to understand that point of view. Indeed I came to the conclusion that there must be something radically different in our mental approaches to this or other problems. One can understand a difference. One can understand an opponent's viewpoint. But it is something deeper than that. It was a completely different way of thinking or mental approach or mental climate

in which I live and the hon. Member lives, which made us inevitably I suppose, to arrive at entirely different conclusions. Here is the hon. Member Mr. Chatterjee talking in melodramatic tones of what is happening in Jammu and elsewhere, and asking for our sympathy. Asking what? Just have a talk around a table. We will settle it in the course of discussion. It seems so simple. They are very simple demands! Non-communal! There is nothing communal about these demands. I can accept them; at any rate why not I give some indication of accepting them.

Now, what appears to the hon. Member so simple and so obvious appears to me a highly pernicious and malignant thing. I do not wish to use weaker words, because I think that the whole approach to this problem on the other side has been malignant—nothing short of it. I do not say it is deliberately malignant—not that. But it is a whole 'make-trick' and out of this a thing comes out; and comes out from time to time, occasionally in a semi-inoffensive way, occasionally in a nationalist way, occasionally in a way of advancing the culture of India, occasionally in this way or that way—to the better glory of India! But somehow in that 'make-trick' there is that poison which has injured us in the past many a time, which has brought down India, which has split India, which has led India to civil war, which has degraded India and which has humiliated India. And it comes out again and again. So I wonder in what century I live? Am I wrong? Have I no understanding of this era, of this middle of the 20th century when these things come to me from some medieval age—this way of thinking—in terms of 500 or 300 years ago? Are they right or am I right? There must be some mistake somewhere. Obviously I can hardly—try as I like—come to the conclusion that I am wrong and the other party is right. Naturally, I consider that it is more likely that I am right.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But there is this vital difference and I want this House to realise it. It is not a question of what I might call a superficial political difference of approach in the matter—one may have a different viewpoint here and there—but it is a vital thing which goes down to the very roots of things. When I say—the hon. Member may deny it—something about the communal approach, he says I have got communalism on the brain,

and, I repeat it. Maybe—I do not say who is right—I have got it on the brain, but I am not afraid of that. Not in that sense; we have dealt with it in the last thirty or forty years adequately and repeatedly. But I am not afraid of this as I am not afraid of this particular movement or any other, from the governmental or from any other point of view. But what I am afraid of is this attempt, this repeated attempt, to rouse up certain passions in the people, to rouse up certain prejudices in the people, to play upon them, to exploit them in the name of the country, in the name of nationalism, in the name of various good things and thereby turn the country's mind or the minds of many people in an utterly wrong direction, in a dangerous direction, which not only stops progress, but, what is more than that, may bring great danger in its train. I have no desire to make the flesh of people creep. It is not necessary. But we can never forget what we have seen five years ago in the City of Delhi and other places round about. It is the identical approach that brought and may well bring about great disasters. We will overcome them, but it means a throw back, it means going back. Look at this matter. So simple—the integration of Kashmir. Now, who is against it? What have the Government—what have I, if I may in all modesty speak about myself, because I have been concerned with this Kashmir problem—wanted for the last five years and a half since the Kashmir problem came up? Surely this House and every one of us has wanted to finalise the Kashmir problem. Surely we have wanted to bring Kashmir into the closest association with India. Has there been any difference of opinion here? None. We have wanted to do that. Why then have we not succeeded? If you like, you may say 'You made this mistake or that mistake'. But surely the urge, the desire, the wish to do that is here. Something came in the way. Maybe a mistake. Something has come in the way all the time.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: How to get out of it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How to get out of it? The hon. Member suggested that we get out of it by talking to the Praja Parishad people. That is an extraordinary suggestion.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is another piece of dramatic performance. I never said that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sitting round a table with the Praja Parishad leaders.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is not the solution.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Withdraw from the U.N.O.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Withdraw the movement.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have in the course of the last five years discussed the Kashmir issue on many occasions in this House. About nine months ago or less, we discussed it very fully—on the occasion of this agreement that we had with the Kashmir Government. And that agreement was, in a sense, ratified by this House. In the course of this session, twice we have discussed this matter at some length: first on the occasion of the President's Address, and secondly, when the External Affairs estimates were being discussed. So there has been no lack of discussion in this House in this matter. Because it has been an important matter—the whole Kashmir issue—we have tried to keep the House in touch with developments. And now after it has been discussed and after the House has agreed to a certain policy, I put it to the House for its consideration—because this point has troubled my mind—here is this matter, a policy which this House has decided definitely, deliberately—leave out even its international implications. How far any Members of this House are entitled—every Member is entitled to agitate for the change of that policy; I am not saying that—but how far they are entitled to encourage, participate in and make others break laws in regard to a policy, involving a change of policy which Parliament has approved of? I do not wish to pursue this thing, but it is something which the House should consider. It is an extraordinary position, as far as I can see—this approach to this matter.

Then, we discussed it only less than a month ago or two months ago. Repeatedly we discussed it. The House obviously knows. Therefore, in order to bring pressure on this House something is done in the City of Delhi, something is done in the town of Pathankot; and while the way it is done is another matter. I think it is rather a curious way, a rather fantastic way.

Hon. Members talk about people coming from Gorakhpur and elsewhere. What is more, they come with garlands in their pockets and come out on the streets as *satyagrahis*; nobody else garlands them. Is anything more artificial than what is happening in Delhi in the course of this Jan

Sangh agitation? I cannot for a moment consider it in the shape of an agitation. It is completely artificial; it has no roots and I should like the House to consider this.

Take these matters over which Mr. Chatterjee grew so eloquent. Now just think about it—a mass agitation for Fundamental Rights. I can agree. The House may want them and I want them, but the urgency of Fundamental Rights becomes so much in Jammu and Kashmir that people perform *satyagraha*, 'We must have Fundamental Rights'. Now, I regret to say my own knowledge of the various forms of agitation and *satyagraha*, which may not be as great as Mr. Chatterjee's or Dr. Mookerjee's, has not led me to the conclusion that this type of thing can be called a mass agitation. They may have other reasons—that is a different matter—but here again some demands are made upon us and we are asked to discuss them. What are those demands? Hon. Members referred to one or two suggestions given in these letters and booklets circulated. Now, I put it to this House that some of those demands are such—I am a modest individual—that this Parliament cannot give effect to them, even if it so chose, for the very simple reason that this Parliament's writ does not run outside India. Obviously when you have to deal with an international question, well, then you have to deal with it either diplomatically or by war. There is no third way of dealing with an international question; either by friendly diplomacy or unfriendly diplomacy or by war. You do not pass a law in your Parliament to impress upon somebody outside your country, who refuses to acknowledge the authority of your Parliament. May I give you an example? Here is this woeful war going on in Korea. Great countries are involved in it and I have no doubt that every one of those countries would like it stopped. These great countries cannot stop it by passing a law in their Parliament or Congress. It is something beyond them. Even if they want to do it they cannot do it, however great or powerful they may be. It is beyond the authority of their Parliament to do that. Therefore, when a question becomes an international question like the Kashmir question, this Parliament can take many steps, of course, but it cannot solve the international part of it.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Is the Prime Minister suggesting that the accession of Kashmir to India is subject to the approval of some international body?

Is that the point he is developing? I cannot quite follow.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The accession of Kashmir to India, as the hon. Member knows, was in that sense complete, not subject to anything except subject to the goodwill of the people of Kashmir.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is a different matter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a very important thing and by that declaration we are going to stand. It is left to their decision. The hon. Member also knows that this question has been before the Security Council. For the moment, let us leave out whether it was right or wrong to send it there. Now it is before an international forum and how can I or this Parliament take it away? Some may say that the question is already decided because we passed this law or resolution. It is beyond my understanding. I can take a succession of steps if you like, which steps should involve, first of all saying, no more Security Council, no more United Nations. If you are prepared to do that and take the consequences of it, we may do it. We may not do it because the consequences are very serious. The consequences are not the withdrawal of the Kashmir issue; it may be withdrawal possibly of India from the United Nations. You may be prepared for that if you realise the consequences, the very serious consequences.....

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Does the Prime Minister suggest that the withdrawal of the Kashmir case from the United Nations means necessarily the withdrawal of India from the U.N.O.?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not say, necessarily. I said we have to take into consideration the possible developments. I do not say it necessarily means that; it may mean that or it may not mean that. It is not such a simple issue as you suppose it to be. It has got all kinds of consequences in regard to our relationship with a large number of countries and other nations. Any question which has far-reaching consequences is a complicated issue. It is an issue, which, with all the goodwill in the world, we cannot solve suddenly by our wishing to solve it. I repeat, here is a thing we want. We wanted for the last five years the Kashmir issue to be finalised, and finalised in a particular way. In that there is no difference of opinion. Now, what is the good of a person going to Chandni Chowk and doing some kind of so-called *satyagraha* for something that I have been trying to do for the

last five years and have not been able to do?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Strengthen your hands.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Strengthen my hands!

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: God save you from such friends!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So I do submit that nothing more in the way of agitations—both in regard to the objective aimed at and, if I may say so, to some extent, even the methods pursued—is really difficult for me to conceive.

Now, look at it from another way. If it is admitted that accession or no accession we are not going to hold on to Kashmir against the will of the people of Kashmir, it just does not matter whether there is accession or not. I make it perfectly clear that I am not going to hold on by force of arms against the wish of Kashmir. We are there because the people of Kashmir wanted us to be there, or a majority of them. If they do not want us, out we come, whether the accession is legally binding or is complete or incomplete. That follows naturally not from what we said there but from our liberal policy in such matters. Now, therefore, adopting a policy which weakens our position in the minds of the people of Kashmir, which is not for strengthening our hands or strengthening India's position anywhere outside India or inside India, is for you. It is patent that the policy of the Praja Parishad, as pursued there, weakens our cause nationally, and internationally, in Kashmir and everywhere. How to strengthen anybody's hands? It is as obvious a thing as you can have it.

Then again it has been proposed—nothing has been said about it at this moment—'Well, if not Kashmir, let Jammu become completely inter-related with India'. That obviously means that the Jammu and Kashmir State is disrupted. And we support this famous process of integration by disruption and by throwing away inevitably the rest of the State into somebody's laps. But a little logic will show that all these things lead to something which is entirely opposed to the so-called demands of the Praja Parishad or Jan Sangh. Every step that they are taking or have taken leads them away from India, away from the very things that they demand. That is why I say it is a most amazing agitation because, consciously or unconsciously they go on injuring the very cause they pretend to have at heart.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Mr. Chatterjee referred to some telegrams he sent me and my reply; and he said that it was amazing how rapidly I have enquired into them in the course of two or three hours. Mr. Chatterjee will appreciate the rapidity with which I reply to letters from him.

Dr. S. F. Mookerjee: There I agree entirely.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What I wrote to him was this; that every day and sometimes twice a day the Praja Parishad representative at Pathankot sent me, and him as it appeared subsequently, telegrams. And in fact, his previous telegrams, every one of them, I have sent them there and made some enquiry. I do not say that I instituted a Commission presided over by a High Court Judge to enquire into them. I have made some enquiry and invariably I have found that those telegrams were an amazing concoction of things that had not happened, or exaggerations. It was astounding. Yes, these things were not even on sight at Pathankot—may be queer concoctions or rumours of some things that happened somewhere and not where he was. So, I point out to Mr. Chatterjee that I have enquired into these matters and have found most of them to be complete falsehoods and, I should like to say, lies. Because it is entirely beyond my possibilities to find out what is happening there. I have tried to keep in touch and I have tried to enquire and I have seldom come across a more amazing collection of concoctions of falsehoods and lies than are contained in some of the publications of the Praja Parishad and it is much more astonishing the way they pile up thick falsehood upon falsehood and if they get hold of an atom of truth they make a mountain of falsehood. These are repeated in some of the Delhi papers to which Mr. Shiva Rao referred here and really it is a matter of deep regret to me: the type of newspapers we are developing in this country, some of them, of the type specially of the Urdu newspapers in the Punjab and in Delhi, is a painful thing. Because, apart from a complete departure from veracity, the vulgarity of it, the indecency of it, the lowness of it amazes—this kind of thing, if it is published degrades their minds.

An hon. Member, who is not here, yesterday or the day before issued some kind of a statement—I have not seen it; but I have heard about it—saying that because of *jehad* in

Pakistan or something, he should withdraw his movement. It is up to him and to his colleagues to withdraw it or not, but I would like to assure him and other hon. Members that there is no *jehad* in Pakistan at the present moment. There is no difficulty, and we are not worried about that in the slightest degree, so that that need not be considered in this particular connection. As a matter of fact, as the House knows, Pakistan is facing very severe troubles of its own—internal troubles; very grave difficulties. But *jehad* or no *jehad*, it is true that the activities of these organisations in Jammu which are carrying on this agitation have attracted a tremendous amount of attention and publicity in Pakistan. It would have been much greater but for the fact of their own troubles suddenly coming to the front. Because, this is just the thing which—if I may say so—some of the minds in Pakistan fully understand. That is how their minds function. They understand it, and they like it, because it feeds their own bigotry. It does not matter what cloak it wears on either side. Here, the hon. Member says that it is not communal. He asks: what is there communal in asking for a greater integration of Jammu and Kashmir? There is nothing communal, but everything from A to Z behind this movement is communal—from the beginning. There is no doubt about it. The whole approach, the whole mentality and if I may say so, the whole past of the gentlemen behind it, are communal and their past is a witness, not only during a year or two, not only five years ago, but ten or twenty or thirty years ago, to the disruptive activities of these organisations. One of them is, of course, a new organisation.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): That charge is denied absolutely.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Not one, but two.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I apologise. Two organisations have no past, no long past anyway.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): Nor any future.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But the people belonging to them have a very long past.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: So have you also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: A wonderful past—Pakistan etc.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So that you need not worry about words or terms.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Nor remember the past.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Here is a definite approach to our political, our social and to our economic problems and I have no doubt that what I consider—with apologies to the hon. Member opposite—the communal approach is a limited, narrow, bigoted approach. It is a reactionary approach. It is to some extent a revivalist approach, and I think that this movement of the Praja Parishad is a communal one. Every hon. Member must know that the Praja Parishad suddenly came into existence a short time ago, say, two or three years ago, when the R.S.S.S. or its branch in Kashmir was banned. The very same gentlemen suddenly became the Praja Parishad, so that you will appreciate that that does not change their background, or their way of thinking, or their way of functioning in the narrowest way. It is true and I am prepared to admit it, that other people in Jammu have no doubt economic and other grievances, which I hope are being enquired into. A committee has been appointed, and it has enquired into them, and I hope more will be done towards that end. These people have been exploited by this agitation. We should consider those matters no doubt, but if I am asked to discuss these high constitutional matters, international matters, with the Praja Parishad or any other Parishad like that, I regret I wholly and absolutely am unable to do so. I am unable to do so for a variety of reasons. Number one is that I cannot discuss these matters in this way, discuss international matters in this way, with any outside movement. Secondly, I am not prepared to discuss them with any organisation which has functioned in the way this organisation has functioned during the last three or four months. I think it has done a grave disservice to India and all those who have encouraged it have done and are doing a very grave disservice to India, to India's position internally, to India's position externally and internationally, and I am not prepared—I should be completely frank and speak with complete candour to this House—I am not prepared to do anything which adds to their prestige by one iota, because they will utilise that for future trouble. I am quite sure of it. If it is

a question of struggle with them, well, it is a misfortune, but we have to face it and we shall face it. We are facing it and we will face it, because if that movement by any mischance gains any elements of success, it means a black night for India in the future. It means disaster and ruin for India. Therefore, we shall fight it with all our strength.

So, I would have this House to consider this matter in all its aspects, and not in the sense that this movement is strong enough to upset anything or create any grave results. I would like it to consider the mentality lying behind it, the way it is being carried on. I am not referring to the facts of the movement—how the whole thing, as I said, is completely artificial, and how people coming from elsewhere are carrying it on. Shopkeepers and others come to us and complain: can you not put an end to this mischief round about us? can we not lead our ordinary lives and do our business? They come to us, and everybody knows that the shopkeepers and most of the residents of Delhi have nothing to do with it and are entirely opposed to it. No doubt, some young boys come and shout slogans etc. and occasionally throw stones. But the whole conception of it, the whole purpose of it, is mischievous. Some people may be led away. They may not realise it. But there can be no doubt that this movement is harmful and mischievous, and it is because of that—and not because of any particular significance of this movement; it is because it comes under false colours; because it talks about nationalism; because it talks about high ideals; of the Supreme Court; of Fundamental Rights and so on—it is because of these things I say that the average person may be taken in by it. We have to explain this to them, and tell them that this movement has nothing to do with them. We shall consider the question of the Supreme Court or Fundamental Rights. Certainly, Kashmir—remember this carefully—has been in the course of the last five years a war area. We have fought our first war there, and even now it is a period of truce and we have not finished it. Even now, our troops stand sentry on the borders there. And there, where our troops remain within ten or fifteen miles of the border, the Praja Parishad goes, and does *satyagraha*. Just try to think of it. Just think of this idea of doing *satyagraha* on the cease-fire line, or almost on the cease-fire line. Can that be a *bona fide* thing to achieve any results? It is mischievous, I say. It is mischievous to go and make our troops

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and soldiers think, to infect them, to make them feel that there is something wrong with them and that the *satyagrahis* are sympathising with them. The whole thing is wrong from beginning to end, and I hope that this House will therefore fully appreciate

and agree with the policy that the Government has been following in this matter.

The House then adjourned till two of the Clock on Thursday, the 26th March 1953.