

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Sir, before you put the motion to vote, may I make a submission? Is it not a fact that the Report of the Joint Committee will have to be presented to the House when the House is in session? If so, will it not be proper if it is indicated that the time may be extended till the last day of the next session? I say this because there is a likelihood that the next session before Parliament is dissolved may not last till the 31st March, 1962. That is the doubt I had.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Then the Bill will die its natural death.

Mr. Speaker: All that the hon. Member says is that, if it is intended to present the Report at all, we may not sit till the 31st March, 1962 and, therefore, we may amend the motion to say 'till the last day of the next session'. I leave it to him.

Shri Jaganatha Rao: The Joint Committee felt that it should proceed with the Bill only after the submission of the report of the C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar Committee. We have not yet got the report. If, in the meanwhile, the report is received, the Joint Committee will certainly dispose of the matter and we will place the Report of the Committee on the Table of the House even before 31st March. I am only taking the later date.

Mr. Speaker: In either case, there is no chance.

The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to provide for the better supervision and administration of certain religious trusts, be further extended upto the 31st March, 1962."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the next item. The hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Sir, before you proceed with that, could I just ask this? Who are the other members of the Committee which the hon. Home Minister has announced to appoint for examining whether any other subjects could be transferred to the Territorial Councils? There is much dissatisfaction in the Union territories people.

Mr. Speaker: He can ascertain that from him. Hon. Ministers are not far away from us.

12.24 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we had recently been discussing in this House a very important aspect of our foreign policy and foreign commitments. Today I beg to move:

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

I shall endeavour, briefly I hope, to deal with some other matters, some of the aspects of the international situation and our policy in regard to it.

Since I spoke in this House on foreign affairs a number of developments have taken place. I attended the Belgrade Conference. Later I paid a brief visit to Moscow and met the leaders of the Soviet Union Government there. Recently I have been to the United States and met the President of the United States and had talks with him. Later I went to Mexico. The Prime Minister of Japan visited India and we had helpful talks with him. Only today the President of the Republic of Argentina left Delhi after a brief stay here.

12.26 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I need not now refer to what happened at Belgrade because much has been said about it or to my subsequent talks in Moscow, Washington or elsewhere which were necessarily confidential talks. All I would say is that all these talks with leaders of great nations were friendly and cordial. We did not always agree about any particular matter but that did not affect the friendliness of our approach to each other. So far as we are concerned we profited by it and I think the other countries got to know more fully what our attitude was in regard to present day problems.

The present day problem, of course the major problem, far more important than anything else that we may deal with is the problem of war and peace which has become rather acute and reached a critical stage. I do not mean to say that there might be a war soon. But, nevertheless, the situation has deteriorated. In the main it is connected with the situation in Europe—Central Europe, Germany, Berlin. Then there is the question of disarmament and the question of stopping nuclear tests which are more or less connected. On the whole, while one may say that in some ways the situation has slightly improved in regard to these very vital questions, the German and the Berlin question, yet, the improvement has not been very considerable. One can say now that some advance has been made in regard to talks between the principal parties concerned about the German situation and Berlin. Those talks have not resulted, as far as we know, in any agreement or any approach to an agreement. Nevertheless, the talks themselves are helpful in removing that state of high tension in which we have been living for some time.

Connected with this matter is the whole question of disarmament and nuclear tests. It was, we think, very

unfortunate and a distressing thing that nuclear tests were resumed in the Soviet Union and subsequently another kind of underground nuclear tests were resumed in the United States. Apart from the general question of disarmament about which the House may know and will remember that the United Nations passed a fairly comprehensive and strong resolution last year and both the Soviet Government and the United States Government have in their own language supported the idea of comprehensive disarmament, one would imagine that when this broad approach is so common it should not be too difficult to arrive at concrete steps to be taken. Yet, the fact is that the difficulty in arriving at the concrete steps is very considerable because behind the language of any resolution that is put up lie fears and apprehensions of the other party. It becomes almost a psychological question, how to get rid of these fears. One may say it is a kind of a vicious circle—the fears give rise to a certain situation and a certain situation gives rise to the fears. But the fact is, we have come up rather definitely against this basic question of this age, of this period at any rate, viz., whether we are going to have a nuclear war or not. It is increasingly recognised that if there is a nuclear war, it may well mean the end of normal civilised life in the world. It may not kill everybody, but it will kill very large numbers of people, which are computed to run into hundreds of millions. It is quite alarming how calculations are made now as to how many hundred millions of people would be killed in the first few days of the war, which shows that the possibility of war is considered not to be ruled out. It may occur; it might occur, and probably will occur.

So, this problem has come up in its full enormity before the world now and no one quite knows definitely what the future will bring—war or utilisation of these tremendous resources for more peaceful purposes.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Everybody talks about peace; every Government talks about peace and yet, behind their desire for peace and their words for peace, lie these dangers because of these fears, specially the fear that if a country takes any step, it may weaken it in the conflict if war comes and therefore, they must be ready.

I do not know why this resumption of nuclear tests took place in Russia and it was followed up in the United States. But one would imagine that one reason at least for the resumption was pressures from the military or whatever they are called, war departments in these countries. Naturally thinking in military terms, they want more and more efficient weapons, even though those weapons may put an end to them also. It is also hoped that we might have the better weapon so that we might destroy the other party sooner, before we are destroyed.

Yet, the major fact that comes out is first of all that there can hardly be a war confined to conventional weapons, I mean to say, major war. They are bound to go over to the nuclear weapons and once you go over to nuclear weapons, then there is no chance of limiting it. It is rather doubtful how it will end or whether it will end at all in the normal way, because from all calculations, the moment you reach the nuclear weapon stage in a war, destruction would be so tremendous and so widespread that organised activity in the countries affected will stop. Of course, military installations and the like will be attacked. Industrial installations will be attacked. Governmental offices will be attacked, so that practically organised activity will crumble down in that country. There will be isolated pockets of activity and this applies to the great nations. What would happen to the smaller countries can well be imagined, if they are attacked.

There can be no real victory in such a war. The most that we can say is

that you can measure the quantum of defeat and disaster that a country suffers. The odd thing is that while this is recognised and while there is a genuine fear and dislike of war and the desire to avoid it, still all the preparations go on for war lest the other country might go ahead. What is worse, I think, is the atmosphere continues to be full of this talk of war, preparations for war and the expectation of war. A war psychosis is thus built up, because the cold war techniques, the cold war methods necessarily lead to encouraging this war psychosis.

The matter is too big. I do not know if even the big Governments by themselves can solve it. It is something that has unfortunately gripped the public mind, which does not want war and yet expects it somehow to come sometimes or other. So far as we are concerned, it is generally recognised that we stand for peace and we are against war. But obviously any capacity for us to do much is strictly limited. What we say is appreciated and often agreed to, but it does not make too much difference. And yet, it is not a question of we, but it is a question of the world community. There is no doubt that the world community, including every country big or small, is opposed to the idea of a war coming, individuals apart. Wherever one may go, one finds that.

One feels that the only real way to tackle this, apart from trying to solve some of the immediate problems that arise—come to some arrangement about the Berlin and the German question—the only other way is disarmament and disarmament on a big and comprehensive scale, because this business of disarming 25 per cent or 50 per cent does not help at all. Whether you have 500 atomic bombs with you or 300 atomic bombs, broadly speaking the effect will be the same. Therefore, disarmament becomes very important if we are to continue

and if the world is to continue more or less as it is.

As I have just said, the Soviet Government put forward certain very comprehensive proposals. The United Nations passed a resolution, if I may say so respectfully a very good resolution, last year. President Kennedy, addressing the United Nations this year, also put forward comprehensive proposals, not in detail, but broadly. If there is such a widespread opinion—if you go down to the common people, there is no doubt that there is this overwhelming opinion in favour of peace—why then can we not come to some conclusions and decisions? It is a difficult thing and I have no particular answer for that, except that we should go on hoping for the best that some concrete achievements may come later to the world.

In this connection, the United Nations, of course, has a very vital part to play, although even the United Nations taken as a whole cannot easily solve this problem. Take a problem like this which is normally the business of the United Nations; take disarmament. There is this danger that in that wide forum with over 100 nations represented and having their say, we do not come to grips with the subject. Fine speeches are delivered by everybody no doubt in favour of peace. In effect, they are two major countries that can play a really important role, i.e. the United States of America and the Soviet Union and the other big countries too, which can help in this process. Therefore, we have been of the opinion that the initial agreement should come by talks between them.

The moment they come to a big forum like the United Nations Assembly, immediately it becomes difficult to have frank talks. It become a question of delivering speeches at each other, rather than exploring possibilities of a settlement. Therefore, we have been of the opinion that it should be dealt with in confidential private talks and after they can arrive at

some broad settlement, then it should come up before the United Nations. The United Nations must come into the picture, but we feel this difficulty that if the United Nations deal with it *ab initio* more or less, then it may result in a vast number of speeches, and no progress made.

12.40 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Apart from that, there are two other places of importance and where there is some danger of warlike developments: South-East Asia, Viet-Nam and Laos. We are naturally concerned with both Viet-Nam and Laos. Apart from the fact that they are not far away from us, they affect the peace of Asia; also because India is Chairman of the International Commissions there. Therefore, we have a certain responsibility to shoulder.

Now, in Laos there has been a curious position, repeatedly in the last few months. We have expected some decision, some agreement, something to happen. We come up very near agreement, and then something stops it. Apart from what is happening in Laos itself, there is the Geneva Conference meeting. Now, from all accounts—and I had the advantage only recently of speaking at the Geneva airport twice, on my way to America and on my way back, to the leaders of the principal delegations there, that is the United States delegation, the Soviet delegation, the Canadian delegation, the British delegation and maybe one or two others. And they all gave me to understand that they are getting on very well and they hoped to come to an agreement pretty soon, in the course of days—which is very hopeful news. And yet something comes in the way.

On the whole it may be said that the Geneva Conference has done well in spite of these difficulties, and the real obstruction now is in Laos itself, not in Geneva. The principles laid down in Geneva, broadly speaking,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

are good. And they are really a continuation of the old Geneva Conference. Everybody agrees and accepts the fact that Laos, as other countries there, must—I am using their language, not mine, I don't like this word—be neutral: that is, not aligned to any of the major groups or countries. Everyone agrees, for the very simple reason that if it is not, immediately it becomes a battleground of the great powers, with all kinds of far-reaching consequences.

Everybody agrees that there should be a national government in Laos, "national" meaning not a narrow party government but representing, broadly speaking, the major elements in Laos. Everybody has said it. Almost everybody agrees that the head of the national government should be Prince Souvanna Phouma who is supposed to represent the so-called neutral element in Laos and who was Prime Minister previously too. Now, one would imagine that great progress has been made in reaching this agreement. The three princes met, and they also agreed to various matters. And yet the next step of actually forming the national government, somehow, is not taken. In fact, efforts for the three princes to meet, to talk over it, do not succeed. They do not meet even, although they all live somewhere in this little country of Laos, and all kinds of conditions are put forward which are not acceptable to the other party even in regard to their meeting, and they do not meet: a very extraordinary situation. All that one can say is that some people are deliberately preventing any agreement to be arrived at there. Although all the major parties concerned have agreed—the major powers have agreed in Geneva—and even the princes at one time agreed in regard to it, still it does not come off. All I can say is, I hope it will come off. I do not know what more to say.

So far as we are concerned, we have been taking intelligent interest in

this matter and discussing it, as I said. When I went to Washington this was one of the matters to be discussed in Geneva, and I discussed it with the representatives of those major powers.

Next door, in Viet-Nam the situation is supposed to be much more difficult and critical. All these things have, of course, long backgrounds. In Viet-Name, as the House knows, there is an International Commission of which we are Chairman. But ever since the present government in South Viet-Name came in, they have refused to recognise that Commission. They have tolerated it in the sense that it is sitting in Saigon. But even that tolerance has been limited. Two or three years back the members of the Commission got a beating from a crowd there in their very rooms, not in the street, which was impossible unless it had some backing from the authorities there. So they made, in the last few years, the functioning of the International Commission there difficult. It has continued to function, because we realise that its ceasing to function would immediately bring about a very great deterioration in the situation there, leading not only to local war but something bigger. So we stuck on.

In Laos there was a Commission functioning, and it had done good work. Then it was asked to wind itself up. We pointed out that this will have bad consequences. Ultimately we had to agree. We could not remain there against the will of various authorities. But it was decided that it should not wind itself up but simply adjourn indefinitely and could be called again when necessity arose. It is an odd and instructive thing to say that the moment the Commission came away, that moment the situation in Laos began to deteriorate. It went on deteriorating, with factions and other things, one party helping one group and another foreign, outside party helping another group, with the result that they had ultimately to fall

back on re-convening that Commission. Having committed the error of removing it, they had to go back and retrace their steps. Possibly, the situation in Laos would be far better if the Commission had remained there. But that was not to be.

In Viet-Nam the Commission has been functioning, but in a limited way: one of the reasons being that the South Viet-Nam Government has not given it its full recognition. Oddly enough, the presence of the Commission has been on the whole helpful to the South Viet-Nam Government: I mean, it has prevented worse things happening there . . .

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Will the Prime Minister tell us how the United States is openly saying, "We are going to send arms and military personnel as advisers"? Is it covered under the Geneva Agreement?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a doubtful point, a legally doubtful point I mean. I believe some part of it may be covered, some part not. But it has been discussed a good deal there, and there have been various opinions about it. But apart from the legal technicalities, the only way to treat these countries who want to avoid war is to treat them as neutral countries which should not be tied up with any big power group: because, if one power group functions, the other comes in too, and then you have war, and a war on an ever-increasing scale. That is recognised, recognised by almost every party.

The North Viet-Nam Government is accused of creating trouble all the time for the South Viet-Nam Government. The North Vietnam Government accuses the South Viet-Nam Government of creating trouble and doing many things which they should not do. There have been many unfortunate things. There was the abduction and murder of Col. Nam—a very bad show. There is no doubt

there is great deal of violence. Whether violence is committed by people locally situated, local groups or those who come from outside, it is not very easy for me to say; probably they are both. On the other hand, the South Vietnam Government has been considerably helped in so far as arms etc. are concerned. The North Viet-Nam Government may also have been helped, for aught I know. Of course, they have close contacts with the Chinese Government and the Soviet Government. I think it is true that material supplies, warlike supplies have been given to both parties. I do not think that men, that is, armed men, have gone to either side. But, supplies have gone. It is not quite clear how the situation should be dealt with. Negatively it seems to us quite clear that if there is intervention in any major degree there on the one side, it is bound to lead to intervention on the other side. The poor Vietnam Government and the people will then become play-things of a major conflict which is bad. As I said, these are very complicated questions and it is rather very difficult for me to deal with them in this rather casual way.

Realising the importance of this, we have sent as Chairman of the Vietnam Commission one of our very able persons in the Diplomatic service, who has previously served there and knows the people there, Shri Parthasarathy. He has gone there. We have also sent a young and able lawyer, Shri Mukhi, from here to help him in the work there, whether it is in the Commission or other work.

The other place about which I should like to say something is the Congo. There, I cannot give any new information, because newspapers have been giving fairly full information. At the present moment, military conflict is going on. It appears that the U.N. Secretary General has given permission for widening the activity of the U.N. forces there, and that yesterday or day-before, they actually

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

took air action against Katanga air-fields and elsewhere. The main problem there, at the present moment, is the revolt, if I may say so, of the Katanga Government and their desire to break completely with the Congolese Central Government. The U.N. Security Council and the Assembly have all agreed that the whole of the Congo should hold together and should not break up into bits which should be disastrous. As it is, the Congo has suffered a great deal. The attitude taken up by some of Katanga's leaders like Mr. Tshombe has been entirely opposed to it. Mr. Tshombe, as perhaps the House may know, has been connected in various ways with the killing of Mr. Lumumba and with other deals which are not creditable for any individual, especially a person in a responsible position. There was some fighting in the Congo in this Katanga province some time ago. Then, there was a kind of truce arrived at. That truce, according to our news, has been violated many times by the Katanga people. Now, this fighting has again begun there and some casualties have occurred, a few casualties in the Indian forces and some larger ones on the other side. I cannot, in this confused situation, give precise information to the House, anything to add to the news that appears in the newspapers.

But one fact has appeared very recently in the last few days. The U.N. officer in Katanga, an Irish gentleman by name Dr. O'Brien, issued a statement only about four days ago, and day before yesterday, another Irishman, who was in command of the U.N. forces, Gen. McKeown has supported Dr. O'Brien's statement. I must say, these statements, both of them, make very painful reading. To say that we were surprised at this statement would not be correct. Because, we have ourselves been feeling that this was happening there the whole of last year. Ambassador Dayal's experience there and ultimately his resignation—all that was due

to all kinds of pressures being brought upon the U.N. by certain great powers. Now, as Dr. O'Brien says, his position became difficult and he specially protests against the fact that a Resolution is passed by the Security Council of the U.N. and voted upon by all the members of the U.N. and that those persons who voted in favour of them, come and undermine the implementation of that resolution. One can now realise how difficult has been this Congo problem and the functioning of the U.N. in the Congo because of this way of functioning by big powers.

Now, it is obvious that the U.N. cannot run away from this problem. If it runs away, it is almost doomed. It will make it clear that it can deal with no problem and nobody will then care much what the U.N. says. It has to face the problem and solve it as far as possible, of course, by peaceful methods, but if force is necessary, by the application of force. There is no other way.

Mr. Tshombe departed from the Congo some time ago, and was in France and elsewhere. Apparently, he is trying to raise the financial wherewithal and other things to carry on his war against the United Nations.

I might mention that in Algeria, again, it is difficult to say what is happening. But, it does appear that President De Gaulle is taking up a very strong attitude against his own rebels, that is, those who want a French Algeria, among whom are some leading officers in the French army and others. He has only recently, yesterday, I think, passed very strong measures against those who may aid and abet the O.A.S. organisation, French Algeria Organisation, which indicates that he proceeds and he hopes to settle the Algerian problem fairly soon. We hope so. Of course, we have been hearing this repeatedly. Gen. De Gaulle did make some efforts. It was difficult to find out where the efforts are going to lead to. If there was obstruction, then, he

sometimes varied his policy somewhat. But, at the present moment, I believe he is anxious to find a solution as rapidly as possible and he has thrown the full weight of his Government against those who are coming in the way of that solution. I mean to say, on the French side.

13.00 hrs.

Now, I come to the Portuguese possessions. In Angola, as everyone knows, horrible things have been happening, and I suppose they are continuing to happen. Then, there is Goa. Some time ago, not very long ago, there was a seminar held, not officially sponsored, but still we took part in it, and many important leaders of African parties and African groups came here. We welcomed this opportunity of meeting them and discussing the situation with them. And apart from the importance of Goa, and Goan freedom, to us—because it is a constant irritant, not only an irritant, but we have to suffer something in the nature of, I must say, humiliation from time to time at the hands of the Portuguese authorities there—during this seminar it came out that in the eyes of the African leaders, and especially those struggling against Portuguese colonialism in Africa, Goa was playing an important part. They attach much importance to Goa and what happens in Goa, and to some extent, that is obvious.

The House knows that for about fourteen years now, we have shown—and it can only be called—exemplary restraint. Sometimes, many Members of this House have probably not been very happy about our policy, indeed, have criticised it for being so. Yet, taking everything into consideration, we carried on with that policy, feeling always that Goa must, had to, and must necessarily, come to India; there was no way out for Goa, and it was better if we did it peacefully, even though it might take a year or two longer. But it has taken fourteen years, and so far as we know, there has been no change of heart or change

of mind or change of anything in the Portuguese attitude. And these feelings in regard to Goa have, because of Angola, become stronger everywhere.

And recently, as the House knows, there have been a number of incidents, each taken by itself not so big, but cumulatively, if you take them, fairly important and big, and it almost appears as if they were direct challenges to the Indian possession and to India, and challenges thrown out in an aggressive and insulting way. There have been the cases of twice firing across the sea, of Indian merchant men, Indian passenger boats, Indian fishermen. And these boats had been going up and down for years, and nothing had happened. And suddenly why this firing. The fishermen have been fishing for years. Why should they be suddenly attacked, and attacked not merely by an odd shooting from a carbine or something but by some bigish gun. Then, there has been firing recently, when some Portuguese crossed the Savantwadij border. There too, there has been firing. And internally, in Goa, according to our information, there has been intense repression recently and very bad treatment of persons in prison; many of them have been imprisoned in jail. And altogether, conditions in Goa have been even worse than previously; as it is, they were bad enough before. Also reports appear in the press about Portuguese Armed Forces being reinforced Portuguese gun-boats and the like coming into those Goan waters. Altogether, a situation is being created which progressively becomes intolerable for us to submit to or to accept.

Because of this, we came to the conclusion—it was after all these firing incidents on our ships and others.—that we must take steps to prevent this kind of thing continuing. We cannot possibly accept the fact of those seas there being almost denied to our shipping and our fishermen. We must clear the waters and see that they are cleared. And we must be

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

ready; and if we take any kind of a step like that, we must inevitably be ready to meet any development that might take place there, because it is always wrong to take a step and not follow it up.

Therefore, we decided to add to our forces, Armed Forces, round about Goa, and this has been and is being done. I cannot say what the precise steps may be because that will depend upon circumstances. But what I can say is that we have been preparing for any contingency that might arise.

Now, because of this, various people and countries which had been long asleep about this problem, thinking that it did not matter, are suddenly waking up, and references are being made in other countries that oh, they are prepared to help, give their good offices, as the phrase is, to finding some kind of a solution. What the solution envisaged is, I do not know.

As a matter of fact, in the course of the past few years, we have repeatedly drawn the attention of the other countries to this situation in Goa, and to the absurdity, anomaly, of Goa existing as an outpost of a foreign imperialism on our territory, and we cannot possibly continue tolerating it. We have referred to the fact that Portugal is a member of the NATO alliance, and undoubtedly, has profited because of that; apart from profiting physically, that is, in regard to arms etc., morally it has been strengthened by it. But this has produced little result. And, in fact, many things have happened, unconnected with India, but just raising or boosting the morale of the Portuguese present rulers.

Now, other developments have taken place recently, internally in Portugal, which show that even the people of Portugal, long suffering as they have been, are getting a little tired of present conditions there. There was a famous incident of the *Santa Maria*, that big ship, which rebelled in the high seas.

So, this is the position. As I have said, we have always been reluctant, as the House knows, exceedingly reluctant to solve problems by this application of major force, not from a pacifist point of view but from the point of view of our whole approach to these problems, world problems, and we want to keep in line with our general policy. But I must say that Portugal and the Goanese problem and the Portuguese attitude to it, have been exasperating in the extreme. It has been difficult for us to restrain our feelings or the consequent activities. The House knows, it is not for me to say, how this Goan problem has been irritating. Therefore, we felt that we should be perfectly prepared for any developments and consequences, and we have taken some steps to that end. What exactly will happen, I cannot say, at the present moment, because it depends on circumstances, on developments, for us to decide what we should do in the matter. But the present position is not to be tolerated. And as for friends who now wake up and make suggestions offering their good offices, we welcome good offices; but I should like to make it clear that obviously there can be no solution of the Goa problem except the Portuguese Government walking out of Goa. There is no middle way.

May I say something about the subject—it often comes up here—of Pondicherry, that is the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry? In regard to Pondicherry, I hope that this long wait of seven years between the *de facto* transfer and the *de jure* transfer is going to end. I think the French Government have declared that they are taking legal steps to that end and introducing the necessary motions in the French Chamber of Deputies this month soon. And it is hoped that next month this will go to the Senate there and then this anomaly will cease.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I know.....

Mr. Speaker: Let him note down the point. If in the end it is necessary, I will allow one or two questions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are one or two factual statements I should like to make. We have appointed an Ambassador to Senegal. There are new countries now in Africa. The Ivory Coast would also be under his concurrent charge. He will also represent us in Upper Volta. Our High Commissioner in Ghana will also represent us in the Republic of Mali. He has already been accredited to Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone. The High Commissioner in Nigeria will have concurrent representation in the Cameroons, Togoland and Dahomey.

Very soon, in fact day after tomorrow, the 9th December, Tanganyika becomes independent. We are happy about this. We are always happy when colonial territories become independent. In this particular matter, I should come the fact that we particularly welcome the fact that Tanganyika is becoming independent under the able leadership of Mr. Julius Nyerere. Mr. Nyerere has shown in the last year or so not only his normal qualities, what one would expect in a leader like him, that is, his patriotism, his courage and all that, but a wide vision which is important in this ferment of Africa today.

It was just about the time that we had the last debate on foreign affairs that Mr. Jomo Kenyatta had been released after 9 years in prison, and we had referred to this with considerable satisfaction. Ever since then, Mr. Kenyatta has been playing an important part in East African affairs, trying to bring about unity and all that. If I may say so with all respect, the part he has played has enhanced his reputation not only in East Africa but in other parts too of Africa and elsewhere. May I add that Mr. Kenyatta has been having constitutional talks in London with the British Government?

I regard Uganda, it has been announced that Uganda will attain self-government on the 1st March 1962,

and complete independence on the 9th October 1962—a few months later.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: What about the Central African Federation?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: One important development took place in West Asia about which the House knows, that is, the separation of Syria from the United Arab Republic. It is a matter of great importance for that region and for others too. It is not for me to praise or condemn any country, but I am happy that in this matter, very difficult matter, the United Arab Republic showed extraordinary restraint. We are only interested in the unity of these various country and not in conflicts between the Arab countries, and we can only hope that this unity of the Arab nations will be kept up, not only their unity but of other Asian countries too round about.

We are having tomorrow a visit from His Majesty the Paramount Ruler of Malaya, and about a week later we are having the President of the Soviet Union visiting India for some days. We are happy to have these visits.

Though there is much in these visits, I mean the official functions, banquets etc. which are becoming sometimes beyond our capacity to shoulder—to eat at so many banquets and all that—these contacts have a great value, because these eminent people from abroad do bring us nearer to their countries and they get an idea of our country. What is more, we have a chance of talking informally, apart from official statements.

Take the present visit of the President of Argentina. I think any person who followed even his speeches will have realised that they were not formal speeches, they were not only friendly speeches, but there was almost, if I may say so, some emotion behind them. He was emotionally affected by his visit to India, by the welcome he received here from the people. Generally this country which is far distant from Argentina, Latin America is regarded as, shall I say a land like that in the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Arabian Nights or something like that, which was not real, half-naked, half mystical, half mixed with romance and all that. That is the kind of picture that people have had. Coming into touch with reality, of course, the mystical part and the romantic part go, but even the reality produces a good impression. It appears in the case of the President of Argentina that it has produced a very good impression on them and on us, by our meeting.

It has long been my desire to visit the Latin American countries, but I have not been able to fulfil it, except that I went to Mexico some time ago. I hope that I shall have the chance to visit Latin America because it is not only a very important part of our world, but it is growing in importance in every way, and in some ways the problems they face are similar to ours too, economic development and the rest. So, it is a very great pleasure for us to meet him and his party here and discuss various matters with them. We found that in a large number of matters there was agreement between us.

The paramount ruler of Malaya now represents a different part of the world near to us and yet very different in our outlook, in our policies; but, nevertheless, we are friendly to each other.

There have been some attempts to build up some kind of what may be called an Association of South East Asian States. We have had nothing to do with it. But it was launched some months ago. The three signatories to this association are Malaya, Philippines and Thailand. The idea is to develop collaboration in economic, social and cultural fields, not military or political spheres. They are avoided.

So, I come back to what I began that all these changes are taking place. Everywhere some changes are coming. Some changes are good; some are not good. But the major problem

of the age that we have to face is this problem of whether there is going to be a nuclear war or not. It is obvious that if such a thing occurs all the hopes and aspirations and objectives and ideals that we may have end. We suddenly jump into some kind of new world of violence, destruction and hatred. And, what will come out of it, it is difficult to say; but nothing good will come out of it—and a great deal of evil will.

Shri Nath Pai rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Nath Pai: (Rajapur): Sir, since the House last discussed foreign affairs....

Mr. Speaker: No, no. I am not calling him to speak. I thought he wanted some elucidation. Hon. Members will have their opportunities. Let me first of all put the motion before the House.

Motion moved:

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

I have received Notices of two amendments to this, one by Shri Bal Raj Madhok, Shri Patil, and Shri Assar, namely:

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

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, regrets the failure of the policy of the Government in regard to China, Pakistan and Portugal."

and the other from Shri Jaganatha Rao, namely,

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

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of

the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the policy of the Government of India.”

Both the original motion and the amendments are now before the House. They will be discussed together.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan (Coim-bator): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister has already detailed to us the events that have taken place since last we had the opportunity to discuss the international situation. He has very rightly drawn our attention to the very serious situation that exists in South East Asia and, particularly, in Laos and in South Viet Nam.

In Laos today we are faced with a situation where unless a quick settlement is arrived at the danger of the repetition of war may come up. And, we fully support the stand that has been taken by our Government and by our representatives who went to the United Nations and to the Geneva Conference on this matter because it is only on the lines that they have outlined that we can rest assured of a peaceful settlement in Laos which will help the whole peoples of South East Asia and the world.

But, so far as the South Viet Nam is concerned, the matter now poses a very serious problem. Even the Prince of Cambodia, Prince Narodom, only recently drew attention to the fact that “South Viet Nam is already in a situation approaching that of Laos Conference at Geneva” and that “if the spectre of war is receding from Europe it is approaching Asia, and, in a way, that would appear to be far more dangerous”. In no uncertain terms he condemns the SEATO and the machinations of the United States of America in the South East Asian sphere. He pointed out that any landing of American troops in South Viet Nam would set off the spark that would well nigh envelop the whole world in darkness.

It is in this situation that the Chairman of the International Control Commission, Shri G. Parthasarthy has gone

to South Viet Nam. He is faced with a very difficult task; and, as the Prime Minister himself pointed out earlier, it was because of the non-cooperative attitude of the South Viet Namese Government that a settlement had been delayed. Today a very difficult task faces the ICC in South Viet Nam and I trust that the Chairman will see to it that the guarantees are there to restore confidence in the minds of the Liberation Movement of South Viet Nam and that American arms, American experts, technicians and American troops will have no quarter in South Viet Nam. It is only if confidence is aroused by these methods in the minds of the people of North Viet Nam but also in the minds of the people of other countries of South East Asia, in the minds of such leading personalities as Prince Narodom that we can be assured that a settlement would be speedily arrived at.

In this context, the talks that our Prime Minister had with the President of USA when he was in America are very important. We are happy indeed that he is reported to have taken a firm stand—I only wish he could have taken us more into confidence in this House—on this question of the landing of the American troops in South Viet Nam.

Then, with regard to the question of Berlin. Here also I am rather sorry that the Prime Minister skirted this question while he pointed out that it is a very important and a very difficult situation that exists there. He does not even repeat to us today the assurance that he gave earlier that steps would be taken by the Indian Government in regard to East Germany. He admitted at that time that East Germany, the German Democratic Republic is today a reality that has to be accepted by the world. And, if, today, the German question has to be settled, one of the conditions of settlement would be the recognition of East Germany because India, with her stature in the international sphere, taking a stand on this question will

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

help the settlement of this question by recognition of East Germany. By the recognition we could certainly hasten the solution of the problem because in so doing we would be able to a part in guaranteeing the access route to West Berlin, in the maintenance of the security of West Berlin and all the other problems of demilitarisation etc. These are the problems that today are facing the people of the two Germanies; and we, who already have our trade pacts and our trade agreements with East Germany, by recognising that country, would also have closer economic and other ties with them.

But, to my mind, today, perhaps, the most important problem that faces the world is the problem of the African nations because it is there in Africa that the Congo is situated, it is in the Congo that the UN is being put to test and the task of the Indian contingent in the Congo is one that is really important. With great steadfastness and great heroism our Indian troops in the Congo have carried out the behest of the United Nations and we should be proud of this fact that our nationals in the Congo are doing their duty by the United Nations and carrying a difficult assignment.

For some time, amongst the African nations, to my mind, there has been some hesitancy about the policy of the Indian Government towards the liberation movement of the various African nations, because they have felt that India has been rather out of step with the events that have been taking place in Africa. Therefore, it is necessary for confidence of people to be restored and for the maintenance of peace and progress of humanity that the friendship and co-operation among the Afro-Asian peoples, the new peoples that are coming into their own in this post-war decade should be maintained and strengthened. In this context it is necessary to remind the Prime Minister once again of the demands put forward again and again in this House and in the country that

the Algerian People's Government be recognised because that would be a very important step towards restoring the confidence in the minds of the peoples of Africa. Maybe today in Africa people are rather overwhelmed by their own problems of liberation and perhaps they do not see the issues of peace and war as clearly as do those who belong to countries such as ours have thrown off the shackles of imperialism. But we must also recognise that every defeat that is there against colonialism, every free nation that came into being is a death knell to the war moves of the old imperialist powers. It is in this way that we should view this matter. Every moral support, every help and every action of recognition of the free Governments that are coming into being would restore the confidence and strengthen the movement for the maintenance of world peace, a cause to which the Prime Minister himself is so dedicated, people of our country are dedicated.

Recently at the UN our delegation has played a very commendable role and the leader of our delegation, our Defence Minister, has come in both for praise and for brickbats, brickbats from the U.S. Press which unfortunately and unhappily are also echoed from the floor of this august House. May I take this opportunity of commending the work of our U.N. team in this very difficult world situation. I feel that the foreign policy as accepted by our country as a whole, the foreign policy of fighting for the maintenance of world peace against the outbreak of world war, has been carried out by the U.N. delegation at every Assembly meeting that has taken place. In so doing the U.N. has also been strengthened because we look on the U.N. as the one instrument that can guarantee the maintenance of world peace through which by peaceful negotiations matters in dispute between countries may be solved by peaceful methods. It is, as the Prime Minister said, a happy thought that in two more days

we will have one more free nation Tonganyika joining the comity of nations. It is in this context also that we should think of the reorganisation of the U.N. The Prime Minister also referred to the statement of Mr. O' Brien after he had left the Congo. We see the manner in which certain western powers, particularly Britain and France, all trying to play a certain role in the Congo, a task that has been taken up by the U.N., a task for which our Indians troops are there in the Congo. We should consider very seriously this whole question of the reorganisation of the U.N. Secretariat. It is a proud fact today that a representative of South East Asia from Burma is the Secretary-General. This in itself shows how the nations of Asia and Africa are today coming into their own. The U.N. is forced to recognise these new forces that have come into being in the world. The reorganisation the UN is an important problem because of the manner in which we have found the various imperialist powers acting, particularly in the cases where new nations are coming into being. It is a strange phenomenon that has come after the Second War that when new nations come into being, instead of one unified nation coming into being, we find two nations coming into being. The first problem that is faced is the problem of unifying the peoples of a country that is fighting to liberate itself. There is the unification of the North and the South Korea; the North and the South Viet Nam. Now again in Congo also we find that there are forces that are trying to hold back the liberation of these colonial countries and create a war path and war dangers. In these conditions, our country, a major colonial country which achieved its freedom could give both a moral and a practical support to the new nations that are fighting for liberation. I would request the Prime Minister to consider the recognition of the Algerian Government. It is important not only as a recognition of a free Government but it will be a factor in removing the source of some misunderstanding that

has come in the minds of the African nations. In this context, there is also the question of liberation of Goa. It is rather a delicate subject to touch at this very precise moment but in this context we must point out that it is our Finance Minister who by his contribution at the Seminar on Portuguese colonies has raised certain doubts and misunderstandings in the minds of the people of Angola and Mozambique and the Portuguese colonies. It is a very strange factor that those who claim to be fighting for the liberation of Goa and for the defence of the national integrity of our country remain singularly silent on this particular matter with regard to Shri Morarji Desai but it is amusing to find that they leap into fray whenever there is even the slightest criticism of the Defence Minister in the U.S.; they immediately leap into the fray and echo every sentiment that is expressed. Not one of these voices is raised when our own national freedom is involved, when the question of Goa is involved. The people of the Portuguese colonies look to Goa as the weakest link in the Portuguese Empire and we are also confident that Goa can be liberated with the greatest ease. Still they do not say a word about it. It is a strange state of affairs and I am not surprised because they repeat the same thing over and over again and when there is anything very uncomfortable they are accustomed to being singularly silent on it.

Closer economic and cultural and political ties with the new nations of Africa would certainly help our country also especially when Britain is going into the ECM and the breaking up of the Commonwealth is now becoming a stumbling block rather than a help. Reorientation of the work of our Embassies in these newly awakened countries and newly free countries would also help in our country both economically and raise its political stature even higher than it is. We must today work to be the most effective voice and representative of the Afro-Asian nations in the UN

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

and also in the international sphere. As I said that Commonwealth is a stumbling block in having closer friendship and closer ties with the African peoples. Even at the present moment, the point that is worrying the African people most is the role of Britain in the Congo.

This is again the time when we should remind the Prime Minister of the demand that is in the hearts of our people which has been raised time and again, that we should not have any further ties with the Commonwealth. Today, what is the Commonwealth? Britain has gone into the ECM. The Immigration Bill has been brought before the British Parliament. This Bill is discriminating, and particularly as was pointed out on an earlier occasion in this house, when questions were brought up, this Bill is directed particularly towards those countries within the Commonwealth where coloured peoples, exist. Not only that. We find in the Congo that Britain is playing a role, to say the least, a role that should be abominated by any right-thinking people in the world in the Congo. Under such countries, what glory do we get by being in the Commonwealth? Surely, the glory will be much greater if, courageously, we said, as a free nation, we will quite the Commonwealth. We will extend our hand of friendship and the hand of co-operation to all those who require it, and we will remain as friendly, as we have always been, not only to those countries which remain within the Commonwealth, but also to those countries that are without the Commonwealth. Such as action would have its moral repercussions throughout the world, and it is the countries of Asia and Africa that would be most enthused by such a courageous stand to be taken. These days of the old school tie and playing cricket are, I think, in the past and today, we as a free and, powerful nation, should be in a position to take this very courageous and very necessary step.

The Prime Minister referred to the nuclear tests. He pointed out how this question of nuclear tests and dangers has come up and how dangerous these nuclear tests are to world peace. It is not only a question of a fall-out. As has been discussed in this House, I think our people and our country are aware of the dangerous of the fall-out from the nuclear tests. But it is not only on the question of fall-out that these nuclear tests cause apprehension but contained nuclear tests certainly do increase the tensions that exist. And so long as those tests are there, the minds of the people are always harassed by thoughts of war, because a nuclear war will not only mean the destruction of thousands and millions of lives as the Prime Minister pointed out but it would mean veritably the destruction of the soul of humanity itself. It would destroy all those creations that are of man, of which every nation is proud, no matter where those creations exist, the creations of civilisation, of science, of culture. These creations would be destroyed, and that is why I say that the struggle of man towards a higher society, towards a better society, which has taken place throughout the ages, would be stopped and it is the soul of humanity that would be destroyed.

There is not a single mother in this world, there is not a sister in this world, who does not abhor the thought of war. A nuclear war is something far worse than the wars we have known throughout history, and a nuclear war is something that everyone of us should certainly strive against, and certainly, in this context, nuclear tests are to be opposed. We hope that the Government will take all steps to see that their good offices are used to bring about a settlement on this very grave matter, because nuclear tests precipitate tensions and these tensions can only be removed if these tests are put a stop to.

Further, our policy has been one of striving and working for total disarmament, and if total disarmament is

to be achieved, then the first step towards total disarmament is the stopping of nuclear tests, and, therefore, towards this policy it is necessary that we take a firm stand on the question of nuclear tests and that our representatives follow this policy and do what they can in order to achieve what is desired in this end. Therefore, on this occasion, when we are discussing the international situation, I appreciate very much what the Prime Minister has said about Laos, about South Viet Nam, about the German problem and the question of Berlin. But I would welcome from him a more positive approach to these issues which I have posed, the issue of the recognition of the Government of Algeria, the issue of the Commonwealth, the issue of the recognition of East Germany and also the assurance that Indian representative on the Viet Nam Commission will take up a firm stand on guaranteeing that there will be no American interference, no lending of troops, and the fear that has been expressed by the leaders of many South-East Asian countries, particularly, such an outstanding leader as Prince Naradom of Cambodia. These assurances are waited for by the people of our country and by the peoples of the world as a whole, who look on India as one of the outstanding nations, striving for the maintenance of world peace.

The liberation of Goa is our birth-right and I hope and pray that this liberation will very soon materialise and that we do not continue to be criticised by the Afro-Asian peoples for the rather weak attitude that they think we have been taking on this issue of Goa, particularly when the provocation has been very great and grave. There is always the last straw that breaks the camel's back, but in the case of our Government it seems that there is more than one last straw. So, I hope that the Portuguese Government is not going to be given an opportunity to produce any more straws, but that this is the last straw. The firing on our passenger boat and firing on our fishing vessels will be taken to show how uncompromising

has been the attitude of the Portuguese Government. I hope and pray that the Indian Government will take a courageous stand and I would say that the whole of the Indian people and the peoples of the world will be one with them, because in this, the Prime Minister will certainly have the support of everyone of the citizens of our country.

Mr. Speaker: Shri M. R. Masani. After that, I shall call Shri Nath Pai.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at this stage, I do not wish to spend the little time that I have at my disposal to take a reambling view round the world or to follow the previous speakers in their endeavour. I would rather deal with one or two matters which are closer to us in our own country and which, I believe, matter more to our people and the lives of our people in our own day. Those who are stuck at Delhi station for trains which are not available because of troop movements in our country may feel that long discussions on disarmament, global disarmament, are not perhaps of the highest relevance at this moment!

Only three days ago we debated the latest Chinese incursions in our country and that debate left us with two feelings. One was that of unanimous strength in this House, that everything should be done to repeal Chinese aggression, that everything should be done to show the Government of China that we are indeed earnest about the assurance given by the Prime Minister that this is the policy of the Indian Government and the people, and that if there should be any further aggression, force will be met by force. This was the result of the debate in this House.

It is true that when the Prime Minister gave his reply, two matters came out which were disturbing. One was the Chinese threat to cross the McMahon line and to commit greater aggression against India if we had the presumption to strengthen our

[Shri M. R. Masani]

defences within our own territory. The other thing which caused some dismay in this House was the statement of the Prime Minister, that in reply to a polite letter from Peking suggesting a re-negotiation of the Treaty of Friendship between our countries, subject to certain conditions being fulfilled, he would be prepared to enter into such discussions.

Well, Sir, stated in that form perhaps the answer is unexceptionable, but the very fact that we should have been so ready to respond to this appeal while aggression continues, while occupation of our soil continues, is something that the country has not taken very kindly. I hope that Prime Minister appreciates that the only one condition on which there can be any talk with the Chinese whether in regard to a Treaty of Friendship or otherwise is the clearing out of our territory in the same unconditional manner that he mentioned in regard to Portuguese outposts in our country. There can be no negotiation until foreign outposts which are an act of aggression are first removed.

I stress this because the increasing belligerence of the tone of Chinese statements makes one feel that they are not going to allow any little opening, any little opportunity, to pass for renewing and expanding their area of conquest. If we give any opening at all or any opportunity, we must be aware that our enemies across the Northern frontier are there ready to strike. Therefore, anything that weakens our position in the Himalayan border, anything that slows down the tempo of the build-up which the Prime Minister told us is in progress, I think the House will agree, must be scrupulously eschewed.

Now, it is against this background that discerning people in this country are concerned about the reports that we see in our newspapers of the military build-up on both sides of the Goa border. The Prime Minister made a statement on this matter in

the course of his speech this morning in which he said three things. He mentioned certain provocations that are being held out from the Portuguese side. He then went on to say that preparations were being made for defensive action against any threats that might develop from the other side. And he ended by recapitulating and re-stating the reluctance of our Government and our country to solve any problem, however pressing or just, by anything except peaceful means. I think, Sir, as so stated, the Prime Minister's position on all these three points was unexceptionable and nobody in this House or in this country could possibly take exception to it.

Sir, everyone amongst us stands for the end of Portuguese imperialism, whether in Angola or anywhere else and certainly in Goa, in our own country, and we are all looking forward to the day when the people of Goa can enjoy freedom like the rest of the people of India.

But that is not the issue. The issue is one of priorities. The issue, if I may state it, is whether this is the moment, faced as we are today, to give priority to the liberation of Goa, to which my Communist friend has just referred, as against the resistance and repelling of Chinese aggression from our own soil. That, Sir, seems to me to be the issue of international relation which is closest to us and which is of the most immediate concern to us today. The previous speaker has demanded liberation. She does not want us to wait for any more straws on the camel's back of patience. But, coming from that quarter, this is easily understandable. This demand for immediate military action against Goa is easily understandable, coming from the Communist benches. Indeed, she only repeated what her leaders outside have been saying publicly for the last few days. Why? It is quite obvious, that those who would like to take advantage of our involvement in

Goa would benefit from the kind of advice that is being given if it were to be followed. Therefore I say, the question is not what should be done. It is very clear. Goa must come. The Portuguese must go. The question is what should be done today and how it should be done.

Now, Sir, the problem of Portuguese possessions is a long standing one. We could have dealt with it any time in the last ten years or more. Why then has the present time been chosen to incite our Government to thin our resources of men and material from our Himalayan frontier where they are badly required to a remote zone? Will not such a policy expose India to further aggression marked by that same unhappy absence of retaliation and resistance by which every act of Chinese aggression in the last four years has been marked up to this very day? Will not the diversion of these resources and weakening of our Northern front mean a great danger to this country which we must avoid and resist the temptation to be drawn into?

Now, about this fact of diversion there can be no question. No less an authority than General Cariappa, the first Indian Chief of Army Staff said two days ago:

"At a time when the nation's troops were dispersed on a world-wide front in such far-flung areas as Gaza, the Congo and Kashmir,...."

....he might have mentioned Nagaland also—

"....he wondered whether it would be safe to embark upon large-scale military preparations along the Goa border."

Then he said:

"Any such action might serve to weaken the frontiers and endanger the security of the country as a whole when virtually a much greater threat than hitherto to Indian security had develop-

ed from the Chinese Communist armies."

General Cariappa went on to point out:

"that the Portuguese had not threatened to cross the Indian border and attack, while Chinese had indeed threatened to cross the McMahon Line, and that India did not possess an army of millions to fight on various fronts."

This was reported in the *Indian Express* dated 6th December. Sir, I am not an expert on this subject. I am a layman quoting what one of our highest previous experts on the subject had to say, the first ranking general of our Indian Army after independence. I think the issue he raises is a very important one. Our troops today are already in action in Congo. We have other fronts which are dormant at the moment—the entire Himalayan front against the Chinese, the Kashmir front, the Nagaland front. How safe we to assure, is there anyone to guarantee us, that these fronts will not erupt into activity if we get entangled in a military engagement in Goa? Is it fair to expose our armed forces to a new opening, to yet another front, when they are exposed on so many fronts already? Sir, the Government have always given an alibi for its supine resistance or absence of resistance saying that we have not got enough men, we have not got enough material in the right area. Will this diversion in Goa not weaken the already scarce material and men when we are facing far superior odds on our Himalayan frontier? Will not the imbalance be aggravated, will not the Chinese take advantage of it?

Sir, Mao Tse-tung's philosophy has been expressed in his notorious remark: "Power comes out of the muzzle of a gun". But, Sir, I do not think Mr. Mao Tse-tung will be very impressed if the gun is turned in the other direction. Therefore, the Chinese giant is only too apt to laugh at us if instead of repelling, instead of fighting that giant we go and beat

[Shri M. R. Masani]

up a pigmy, a small "pimple" as the Prime Minister once quite appropriately described Goa. Sir, can this country of Gandhi be very proud of overwhelming a miserable few hundred men who have no capacity to resist us?

Also, is it wise to assume a push-over in a day or two, as many people seem to imagine sitting in Delhi? The Portuguese are very obstinate, almost perverse people. Being what they are, to assume that we are going to have a pushover in a day or two and there is not going to be any major bloodshed would not be wise. If we get provoked, if we get bogged down in operations and an appeal is made to the Security Council of the United Nations, is this country with its clean record so far going to defy a cease-fire order by the Security Council? Is our Government prepared for that eventuality? Sir, when we act as a policeman in the Congo, serving the nations of the world, shall we put ourselves simultaneously in the position of an accused at the bar of the United Nations? How shall we reconcile the two roles if we do not bow to a cease-fire order? Therefore, whichever way one may look at it, I feel that this venture is marked by pitfalls, and I do appeal to the Prime Minister and the Government not to be encouraged by wrong advisers on this side who have an axe to grind in regard to their allies in China and be swept into this adventure without reckoning the many consequences to our country.

Finally, Sir, we come to this question, as I said, why has this moment been chosen (*Interruption*)? Sir, when the hon. Member wanted the liberation of Goa tomorrow I never interrupted her, I never said anything about it. Why has this moment been chosen to bring to a head something that has been simmering for over ten years? Why now? That is the question. I do not mind giving expression on the floor of this House to a belief that is held widely in this

capital and in this country, that it is a desire to make a demonstration of serenity after years of weakness on the eve of the General Elections. Let me quote from the *Hindustan Times* of this morning a few sentences which, I believe, are representative of intelligent thinking in our country.

"All that the Government is succeeding in convincing its critics is that it is suffering from a severe case of bad conscience. It wants to prove, after suffering several years of Chinese aggression without firing a shot that it is capable of action, and because there is natural scepticism in the country about the Government being capable of anything of the kind, it is going about the job in a manner more than somewhat theatrical. The atmosphere sought to be created is of a national emergency at hand....

It is these antics which give rise to the suspicion already voiced by the Opposition that the Goa emergency is an electoral smoke-screen for the Government's sins of omission in dealing with China. Let the Government be warned, betimes, and Mr. Menon particularly, that there are no easy electoral kudos to be picked up in Goa".

Now, Sir, it is a well-known psychological explanation about people who have not been able to hit back a big bully hitting a small boy; it is a very common phenomenon in all boarding schools, whether in this country or another. In particular, it is believed that the main electoral beneficiary would be no other than the Defence Minister, on whom the guilt of not resisting Chinese aggression is fixed by a large section of public opinion in this country. In England; sometimes, they fix elections immediately after a military victory and call it a "khaki election", a technique with which, I am sure, all students of British institutions are familiar. Here there is only one

difference, that instead of the election being fixed immediately after a military victory, the military victory may be planned immediately on the eve of the election that have already been fixed. Now, if the people of India were to believe this, they would not consider it a very honourable thing.

14 hrs.

I cannot judge whether this motivation that has been suggested in the newspaper I quoted and by others whom I have heard in the last two or three days is fair or not, but I should say one thing that, despite the Prime Minister's explanation today, it is difficult to find a more convincing or plausible cause or reason for this major build up on the eve of the elections. I doubt whether even such a strategy will bring any votes. I for one have too much faith in the intelligence of our voter, particularly in my own city, and I believe that the kind of "khaki election" referred to above is not going to deliver the goods. This would be an unworthy strategem and, I am sure, the Indian people would not respond to it.

But, whether the charge is true or false, one thing remains. Precedence must be given to resisting the major threat to this country, and the major and the immediate threat to this country comes from nowhere than from across the Himalayas. Anything that weakens our resistance there will help the enemies of our freedom and our security. I do hope that the fears that have been expressed today are groundless and that consistent with what the Prime Minister said, a peaceful atmosphere will be maintained and nothing will be done which goes beyond the needs of the case. I would wish that in his reply to this debate the Prime Minister would give a clear assurance to this House, that beyond repelling aggression from the Portuguese troops, beyond defending our own frontiers and our own nationals, nothing will be done in the way of a major aggressive action, until at least after the elections so that the new Government and new

Parliament may be in a position to get the mandate that is required to do something more.

What I have said has not been very easy to say nor very pleasant but I believe it is the duty of those of us who are here to represent the views that we hold and the views of those who hold the same views in this country, and I believe that it is necessary for someone to say this. Let it not be said that nobody raised a voice of warning before we walked into this trap.

I suggest that we act in our own national interest and not just react to provocation. Our Prime Minister has often advised other countries not to be provoked but to hold on to the path of peace. I would suggest that we apply this warning and this advice to ourselves. Let not the Portuguese decide what we do. If my hon. friend who preceded me were to decide it, the Portuguese will decide what we do in Goa. I suggest that we take an over-all view of our frontiers, north, south, east and west, take an over-all view of our relations in the world and then decide what we shall do in Goa and not allow the Portuguese to provoke us into doing something. Provocation is easy, but restraining oneself from replying to provocation is difficult. I would like to believe that our Government and our country have the maturity to resist provocation, to stick to the point that the Indian soil must be first cleared of a foreign aggressor who has come during the last five years, before we try to undo facts which go back hundreds of years in history.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gracious and charming lady who spoke for the Communist Party weakly echoed and gave a paraphrase of what the Prime Minister said. But I am wondering if what Shri Masani has said will find any echo from any quarter in this House. We find ourselves incomplete disagreement with everything that he said regarding Goa. He has once again proved that in spite

[Shri Nath Pai]

of his brilliance, in spite of his scholarship and in spite of his eloquence, he and his party are completely out of tune with what the People of India think.

The Prime Minister started this unholy fashion of bringing in the elections in every consideration. He used a platform, which was not meant for the elections, a seminar platform in Bombay, for having a gibe at Acharya Kripalani and, I think, many are following it. It was wrong example to follow, even though the example was set up by the Prime Minister. But may I tell Shri Masani before I come to the main points that whether Shri Krishna Menon wins or does not win is a minor thing. The winning of a single seat is a minor thing as compared with the liberation of a half a million of Indians. I would like to plead with the Prime Minister that the whole nation stands behind him if he is determined to carry action against Goa, but not inaction. We have reached a point of no-return where there is no go back except ignominious retreat. Shri M. R. Masani, the patriot that he is, naturally laments, naturally mourns the retreat on the Chinese border, but the retreat before this small insignificant power, will it enhance our prestige, will it boost up the morale of our people or will it humiliate it still more? I, therefore, plead with him to discard other considerations, because this should be an issue on which we all stand united as a nation. I would also tell the Prime Minister that we demand something more concrete than mere cancellation of trade. I do not want any reply from the Prime Minister to the debate which we raise and, therefore, I am not going to raise any arguments, because when we talked on a Private Member's motion we have said all that can be said and if they were not enough, are not the shrieks, the agonised cries for help of these 500,000 people not enough to move us into action? What stronger argument do we need than this appeal and cry for help which is coming from

half a million Indians in Goa? All we shall plead, therefore, is that we act, act immediately, and act effectively.

If there are some papers in the United Kingdom and other countries criticising our action, we are not called upon to bother. Major issues are not to be neglected because there is adverse or hostile criticism. It has been the fashion of a section of the British papers to denigrate this country, to malign this country. Once again, we may provide them with an opportunity to indulge in their hobby. Why should we be worried about it? I, therefore, plead, and I do not think we need any more arguments for it, that the Government should not defect; it should not. It must not find an excuse that there was divergence of opinion in this country. This country stands united, if you are resolved, if you are made up, if your mind is made up, to liberate Goa.

There have been many major developments since the House discussed international affairs in the last session. There was, firstly, the Belgrade Conference. I am afraid, this conference will be remembered in history more for what it failed to achieve than by what it achieved. Non-alignment lost its polish, its glow, its finish in Belgrade. Non-alignment for its very success depends upon unwavering adherence to objectivity, to impartiality and to undaunted courage. The Belgrade Conference indulged in equivocation; it did not show that bold and honest courage and leadership which it was called upon to provide on the major issues with which the world has been confronted with. There was the resumption of the atomic tests, there was the Berlin crisis, and on both these issues it satisfied itself by indulging in some kind of plitudes. The Prime Minister emerged with credit because of the sense of progression and balance which he introduced in these discussions, but, I am afraid, non-alignment as such lost much in Belgrade. Even so loyal and

so consistent a supporter, interpreter and upholder of non-alignment as Kingsley Martin of the New Statesman had to declare that he came back a disillusioned and disappointed man.

There was the hon. Prime Minister's visit to the Soviet Union and to the United States of America. We are glad that he went there and we are glad to hear from him that both the visits were successful. But we do not know what exactly happened. I would like to call upon the hon. Prime Minister that we know something more than of course the tremendous ovation which he received. He told us that he told these people our views on major world issues. But what are their views on the issues that concern us? Did he talk to Mr. Khrushchev about Chinese misbehaviour and about Chinese betrayal of this country? Did he ask Mr. Khrushchev to use his great influence with the Chinese leadership to restrain China and, if so, what was the attitude of the Soviet Union? There has been a sphinxlike silence on the part of the Soviet Union on this major issue. Is the Soviet Union going to continue a policy of non-alignment when India's very existence is threatened by an ally of the Soviet Union? What is it that happened? Our, were these issues not discussed at all? Was what was discussed at this important and historic meeting such things like nuclear tests, disarmament and other issues, or were the issues that matter to us, that concern us also discussed?

I would also like to ask what was discussed with Mr. Kennedy. Was it only disarmament? Was it only some other issue with which we are concerned but not directly? Or, did he take up with Mr. MacMillan and Mr. Kennedy the issue about Goa and their attitude towards it? We would like to be told what the hon. Prime Minister discussed in these visits of his and what the reaction was because the communiques which are habitually issued hide more than they disclose.

1611 (A1) L.S.D.—7.

A reference has been made to the Congo. We strongly support the attitude of the Government in strengthening the United Nations. But, I am afraid, useful as this visit was to the Soviet Union, a large part of his visit to the United States had to be devoted to removing misunderstanding and to explaining things. I do not want to touch upon that very delicate subject, that very explosive and touchy subject of what the hon. Defence Minister does and does not do. It causes offence and creates great tensions; the hon. Prime Minister gets easily offended. But, I think, the definition of the words 'Defence Minister' is beginning to change. Defence Minister is beginning to be one who requires constant defence by the hon. Prime Minister of India.

I will not be saving anything except one thing and that is this. Ecomiums should be paid where they are due. I do not quarrel with that. But I think we place an unusually severe strain on Shri Krishna Menon, undoubtedly great as his abilities, qualifications and talents are, by asking him to carry the dual task of looking after the defence of this vast sub-continent and of representing it at the United Nations. Is it fair to a patriot like him that because he has the talent he should be asked to carry all the burdens? Is that not an advertisement of poverty of talent in the country that the same man should be asked to do all the jobs?

Secondly, is the defence of this country according to the hon. Prime Minister a job which can be done by a part-time worker and is not a full time job which requires all the energy, attention and concentration of not one Minister but more? But, we do not have even one full Minister to look after that. I have nothing to say about what he said here and there, but it is a serious matter. With due respect and regard for the talents of Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, I have to raise this issue.

[Shri Nath Pai]

About the Congo, we fully support the policy of the Government of India to strengthen the United Nations. But let not there be any encouragement to any effort to weaken the United Nations. We must make it clear that we want the strengthening of the United Nations to reflect the new balance of forces in the world, but certainly not toying with the idea of the troika which will do nothing but paralyse the United Nations. I would like to have an assurance from the hon. Prime Minister that in no form did the Indian delegation at the United Nations try to flirt with the idea of troika but solidly told the United Nations that we want its authority in the world to be upheld and strengthened as the one major instrument that mankind has forged in the cause of peace.

I should like to make only a very passing reference to what the hon. Prime Minister had to say about Algeria. He says that General De Gaulle, of course, wants to fight the OAS secret army of General Salan. Indeed, very good. But does he not see the tragedy of Algeria? Today the Algerian patriots are being compelled to fight on two fronts, that of the regular French Government and of General Salan. The Nationalist Government, that is, the FLN, is being compelled to fight on two fronts, that of General De Gaulle which is officially recognised by us and that of General Salan. Why did we refrain from taking the step which, we think, he was on the brink of taking before he proceeded to Belgrade? He had created the impression and had almost an assurance that we would proceed to recognise the FLN Government. I would like to hear from the hon. Prime Minister what is inhibiting him: what is retaining him; what is stopping him. What are our difficulties in recognising this government of the Algerian people?

I shall now turn to something which is very immediate to which, unfortunately, no reference was made

by the hon. Prime Minister. It is true that we discussed at length the China issue only three days back, but since we discussed it two major things have happened; therefore the need to mention it and mention it at length. I would claim your indulgence for a little while.

There was a note of China. There have been two notes, in fact—one telling us the consequences that will follow if we show courage to build our defences across the border and another offering, of course, as the hon. Prime Minister says, in a very polite way to enter into a treaty of friendship. Something is happening. Had we, that is, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh and I, not asked questions of the hon. Prime Minister that day, I wonder if even that mention would have been made by him regarding these two notes. But this is the vital issue today. Shall we be pursuing the mirage of friendship ignoring the reality of China's aggression? He has times without number told us that China's aggressive intentions towards this country are becoming clearer and clearer. But when China comes with the straw of negotiations and of friendship, like a sinking man we are ready to clutch at it. We ignore the bayonets and the mailed fist of aggression and are prepared to cling to and to clutch at the tattered glow of friendship. Is the brutal and grim reality of aggression, of threat across the McMahon Line to be ignored? The hon. Prime Minister told us, "We will consider it and it will be conditioned." Just as he said earlier that the only solution of the Goa Problem is that the Portuguese wald out of our country, the only condition that we should demand is that China should vacate her aggression. I want an assurance because this House will adjourn and will not meet for three long months. We want this categorical assurance from the hon. Prime Minister, not the repetition and reiteration that we will negotiate, negotiate, negotiate but that we shall refuse to enter into any

treaty, whether China calls it a friendship treaty, no aggression treaty, co-operative treaty or whatever the good name that it is pleased to give to it, unless China fulfills the prior condition that she vacates her aggression from our territory. This is the categorical assurance that this House and this country is entitled to expect before we reply. Reply very politely. All his charm and politeness we would like to see reflected in our note, but let there not be a mistake about the determination of India not to be made to look fools once again in the eyes of the world, namely, that China continues the aggression and we continue to negotiate.

At this stage may I point out what master tacticians the Chinese have proved themselves to be. They have established themselves as masters of diversionary tactics. They have engaged this country in a phoney war of notes, letters, statements, aide memories, more poignant and strong notes and, in the meanwhile, when our Government pats itself on the back, congratulates itself, feels excited, proud and triumphant that it is scoring points in letters and in its exchanges with the Government of China, when we win these points in letters on paper, the Chinese are advancing their military posts on our territory.

The hon. Prime Minister the other day said that his whole being is against war, that he does not want war. He chided us by saying that it is the result of 45 years of training under Gandhiji and said that we do not have that training. It is true that we did not have 45 years' training because we were not born 45 years ago, but we claim to be moulded by the same training and the same teaching. The hon. Prime Minister may be the political heir to the Mahatma, but so far as his teachings are concerned they are the proud and common heritage of all India. We have been moulded, made and conditioned by those teachings and, to a certain extent, by his own teachings. The Mahatma taught us to resist

aggression and the hon. Prime Minister also taught us to resist aggression and injustice. It was he who awoke this nation to aggression in Spain and in distant China in 1936. Does he expect us to forget this lesson when aggression threatens our own border from the Chinese? He says we do not want war. War is not our making. Can you avoid war by just expressing dislike and by expressing opposition? Today what is happening is this. There is an undeclared war against this country on the part of China. She is proceeding, committing aggression and getting the reward of aggression. But only we keep on chanting, "We do not want war; we are opposed to war". We do not say you wage the war against China. But is it the only way of avoiding war that they go on advancing and you keep retreating, you do not hit back and you do not shoot back? That is, of course, one way of avoiding war.

When I advocate it, the Prime Minister comes back and accuses us of wanting an adventure. Words are beginning to lose meaning. Is it an adventure to plead, to urge, to appeal that we defend the borders of our motherland? Aggression is an adventure. Defence against resistance to aggression is a solemn duty cast on everybody. What Britain did in the Suez Canal was aggression and an adventure. But what Egypt did in retaliation of Britain's aggression was the discharge of an elementary duty.

Further, it is the Prime Minister who always says, life is an adventure, more so a life of independence, liberty and dignity. To refuse to face this adventure in this way is to forfeit our life, forfeit our basic inalienable right to a life of liberty, freedom and dignity.

We are told against that we are unprepared. Time without number the Prime Minister tells us that we are unprepared. The unpreparedness of a potential victim is the supreme opportunity for the intending aggressor. It is the normal precaution, an

[Shri Nath Pai]

elementary rule of security, that you conceal from your adversary all your weakness, all your unpreparedness and try to discover his weaknesses and his unpreparedness. But the Government of India has made a practice of shouting from housetops that we are unprepared. Do they believe that this proclamation of unpreparedness will act as a deterrent to the Chinese, will put fear in their hearts and the Chinese will stop at the Himalayas and say, "Ah! India is unprepared. Let us not disturb them; let us go back to Peking? We fail to understand the logic of this unpreparedness.

Secondly, this kind of advertisement of unpreparedness is guaranteeing, underwriting, the victory of the potential aggressor. He has said—I will read something from it now—"What could we have done? It is the legacy of a long past". If he would have cared to look into his archives—busy he is, it is a mighty burden he is carrying; we know it—but if his assistants or those who advise him would have looked into his archives, this unpreparedness would not have been there. There was an officer of this Government. Do you disown everything left by the British? Do you disown the railways, the telephones, the police, etc.? Only the other day, we celebrated the centenary and the Home Minister claimed credit.

The bad things we do discard, but in the archives of the same department, we find this note written by Sir Charles Bell. In clear, ringing and unmistakable terms, he tells us what China will be doing. A great student of history, the Prime Minister himself said that China showed this tendency. This is what the note said:

"It will be natural for China to seek this relief for her overflowing population. She appears to regard the Mongolian people that border on her own and the Tibetan frontier, Nepal, Sikkim,

Bhutan and ever Burma as within her natural sphere."

The warning was there. There was another warning. The Prime Minister says, "What could we have done?" Did we make a note of it? Did we make preparations for that? He says, "What could we have done? We have to prepare". There was a committee which was appointed when the late Sardar Patel was alive and it was presided over by Gen. Himmat Singhji, the then Deputy Minister of Defence. We never heard what happened to that committee's recommendations regarding the new, awakened, alive northern border. What happened to those recommendations? They were completely forgotten, ignored and pigeon-holed till in 1959, the Dalai Lama sought refuge in this country.

The Prime Minister has appointed another committee on his own initiative under Gen. L. P. Sen? What will happen to the recommendations? Shall act upon them.

Sir, many of us were very happy at the success of the Chinese revolution. Shri Asoka Mehta had issued a statement and so did our Prime Minister. The communist party also had sent messages of greetings. This is the reply which Mao Tse-tung sent in 1948. He refers to the Government of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru as the agent of imperialists." What he says further is significant:

"Replying on the brave communist party of India and the unity of Indian patriots, India will certainly not remain under the yoke of imperialism and its collaborators. Like free China, a free India will one day emerge in the Socialist and People's democratic family".

God forbid that this happens, but this is his hope—

"that day will end the imperialist reactionary era in the history of mankind."

Did we take note of it? Did we act? Were the words not clear as to what

he means? He calls the Government of India the running dog of imperialism. What did we do about it?

There was another thing. He tried to defeat, to turn the tables against me—we do not mind it—on the issue of Tibet. This is what he said day before yesterday in his concluding remarks in this House on the Chinese aggression. When I asked, "Why did you allow the Chinese to walk in?" he said, "We are in full agreement with you, but what could we have done? No power could have gone there." Is that the thing or was that your policy? Was it a question of inability or not having the strength or was it your determination? This is what the Prime Minister said; I will ask him some questions before I read it.

If we cannot prevent the perpetuation of an aggression, must we be an accomplice in its commission? If we cannot rescue the victim of a sacrifice, must we play the part of a presiding priest at that gory sacrifice? If we cannot prosecute China, must we be the apologists of China? This is what the Prime Minister said in this House in 1954:

"I am not aware of any time during the last few hundred years when Chinese sovereignty—"

then he adds in parenthesis—

"—or if you like suzerainty—"

Are sovereignty and suzerainty the same? Is there not a tremendous difference between them? Then he goes on:

"I would be prepared to go into the entire history of this step by step. In my opinion, we have done no better thing than this since we became independent."

What was this tremendous thing of which he boasted? It was the handing over of this ancient free land whom history and destiny expected this country and Shri Jawaharlal

Nehru to defend. He has handed them over foot and hand bound to the Chinese. And, yesterday, we are told, "What could we have done?" Throughout history, she had expected India to respect and defend her autonomy.

Towards the end of 1949 and 1950, when the Chinese were advancing towards Lhasa, our Ambassador in Peking was there and it was at his instance that the Indian delegation informed the Security Council that the Chinese are not marching towards Lhasa, but they are going towards Chambo. This was in December and in April next year, the Chinese were already in occupation of Lhasa. The Dalai Lama ran away to Yatung; he was called back and he went back mostly in the hope that India will defend Tibet. Then what happened? This is a chapter that is not known.

The Government of India authorised Sardar Panikkar to advise the Chinese Government that we accept Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, provided that its internal autonomy is guaranteed. But the Ambassador misunderstood the message and he conceded sovereignty over Tibet. He was instructed to inform about suzerainty, but he conceded and granted, had done away already with the sovereignty. Later on, the blame was placed on the poor cipher assistant. Very often, the cipher assistant in this Government is made a very very convenient scapegoat to such high colossal mistakes of policy. In any other country, a very serious note would have been taken. We were indifferent towards the fate of this country. How heavily are we paying the penalty! The fall-out is the Chinese arm's fall-out on our own border. In refusing to defend Tibet, we have undermined the defences of this country. And that will be the verdict of history from which all the equivocations and all the brilliant pleadings given by the Prime Minister will not rescue this country.

I have only one or two points to make and I will sit down. The Prime

[Shri Nath Pai]

Minister said that day that we charge him with suppression of facts. We never like to say anything harsh about him, or anything which hurts him. But what are the facts? He pleaded with a feeling of hurt that he had just come after his tour of eighteen days and come straight from the Palam Airport to this House. It was a magnificent athletic feat. We are proud of it and even the younger generations should be proud that he could do it.

He said that we charge him with suppression. May I point out to him something from his own note, this white paper which was placed on the Table of this House. That points out that in our note of 31st of October we complained that Suriah was occupied by the Chinese in April 1960. and Daultbeg Oldi was occupied in the autumn of 1960. You mention it in your note and you have said in it that it is aggression of a serious type. But still till November 1961 we were not told about it. It means one of two things. The Chinese in their latest note complained: if this happened so long ago, why did you not tell us? Both these were major events; still we were not told about the one for eighteen months and about the other for thirteen months. And when we point this out, why should he get offended that we charge him with suppression of facts. The facts are there.

There is another interpretation possible. What does our intelligence do? If major aggressions take place without his knowing how many more may be committed now? May I, therefore, plead with him, Mr. Speaker that it will be very hurtful and it will be injurious to the interests of the country if he accuses us of generating heat because of impending elections. I have made the position very very clear. If our territory is to be regained, and if none of us is to be returned to this House, we will regard it as the highest reward that we have achieved. I would plead with

him that the time has come when we must do something about this. The Chinese must be warned and this tempting offer of polite negotiations must be contemptuously turned down; they must be told to make good the damage they have done to our faith and to our country. I will plead with the Prime Minister: this fumbling, this faltering, this failure on the frontier may prove fatal to the future of this country as a free nation. Contrast the Chinese bluffs, bluster and bullying with our bowing, bending and bungling.

It was the Prime Minister who told this country that success often comes to those who dare and act; it never comes to the timid. It was a teaching which we inscribed in our diaries and on our new books when we brought them at the universities. We wrote it with chalk in our study rooms. Let not history say when the hour of trial came when the supreme hour for him and his country came, he failed to implement his teaching and in the process made worthless, and meaningless what was supposed to be the most precious legacy to posterity and this country.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, three major speeches have been made from the Opposition Benches and I was amazed that each one of them had struck a note utterly out of consonance with the spirit of free India today. As I was listening to the speech of the hon. Member who has just sat down, I felt as if he was living in a dream world, as if he was living in a world where the breath of reality of free India never entered.

14-33 hrs.

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

It was amazing to hear him say that the Prime Minister has been saying to the Chinese that we are not prepared. I do not know where he got

the idea from. We have been listening to the speeches of the Prime Minister on the floor of the House and also elsewhere and don't think the Prime Minister has ever hinted at this kind of thing, has ever expressed this kind of thing or has ever given the impression to anybody, by implication even, that we are not prepared to meet the Chinese aggression. I think he has made his policy very clear. He has told us in unequivocal terms that we shall exhaust all possible means, means of peaceful negotiations, and we shall also make use of all diplomatic means which are available. If, however, we do not succeed in that and if war is forced on us we shall go to war with any country in the world to defend our sovereignty and our integrity and our homeland. That is what he has been saying.

We have been making preparations. We have been told many times on the floor of the House that we are adding to the number of check posts; we are increasing the number of military posts, we are trying to man these posts by all possible means. We are building roads and we are doing all these things which are a kind of indirect preparation for war, and also a direct preparation for war. We have been doing all that. And yet, the hon. Member has the audacity to say that our Prime Minister has been talking of unpreparedness. I think nothing could be a greater travesty of fact than the statement that he has made.

I think it is not the Prime Minister who gives encouragement to the Chinese, if any encouragement can be given. But it is these gentlemen who always talk about the weakness of the Government, who always talk of the attitude of the Government which is not war-like,—it is these persons who encourage the Chinese by trying to vilify the Government. It is they who try to boost the morale of the Chinese and I think they serve their cause much better than even those persons who are thought to be allies

of the Chinese in this country. I therefore think that this kind of talk is very harmful to the interests of the nation.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The hon. Member should know what he is saying. After all, does he understand the meaning of it.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I do. You always speak in Hindi; I speak in English.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What of that? You cannot charge people on this side.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I have not charge anybody.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, order. The learned professor will address the the Chair.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I said only this that the charge of being unprepared.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He has himself admitted it.

Shri D. C. Sharma: How do you know?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. There should not be any direct talks.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I told you this gentleman is in the habit of....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Everyone here is honourable. None should be addressed as this gentleman or that gentleman.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I was only submitting very respectfully that it is the people who talk about the unpreparedness of our country to meet Chinese aggression, or that we could not get the aggression vacated, who are doing a great deal of harm to our country and are indirectly helping the Chinese. I think it is they who try to promote the morale of the Chinese more than those persons who are thought to be allies of the Chinese here or elsewhere.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

Therefore I say that we are prepared to meet the aggression, but it cannot be met by means of speeches made or resolutions passed at public meetings. The aggression has to be met in terms of military logistics, in terms of strategy and tactics and I do not think any Member of this House is competent to deal with these problems of strategy and tactics. These problems are better left of our Army and Air Force; They are the best judges of the situation and also the time when action should be taken. Therefore I think our country is fully prepared to meet the Chinese aggression, and our country will meet the Chinese aggression not at a time when it suits China but at a time when it suits us. I do not see any reason why anybody should accuse the Government of being weak-kneed so far as the meeting of Chinese aggression is concerned.

Another important suggestion came forth from another hon. Member and it was this, that we should not try to bring in the question of Goa at this time or try to deal with it at this time and that, if we do so, these are diversionary tactics. I do not know what this phrase means. But I believe that our Government is as alive to the danger from the Chinese as it is alive to the danger from the Portuguese. Our Government has to take note of both these dangers and has to be prepared equally to meet both of them in the most statesmanlike and competent manner. And I think that is what our Government is doing.

It has been said, again, that we are dealing with the Goa problem only by the cancellation of some trains. Nothing could have been said more to under-rate or under-state the efforts that we are making to get the Portuguese hold liquidated from our side than this. When we are going to deal with an enemy we need ships, we need the air force, we need men and everything. Therefore, if the nation has got sometimes to make a sacrifice

by cancellation of some trains, it should not cry over it. I do not think any patriotic person will do that, and therefore nobody should highlight it that way.

So far as Portuguese imperialism is concerned our Prime Minister has given an unequivocal reply to them, and it is this that the Portuguese Government cannot exist on the soil of India. That is what he said even today, and that is what he has been saying all the time. The French have quitted, the British have quitted, and I have no doubt that the Portuguese will have to quit sooner than later. The people who think that the Portuguese Government is obstinate, this and that, I think, are really not in possession of the hard core of reality which we have to face. It is said that we should meet the Portuguese terror and we should have military build-up. And if we have a military build-up, people say, "You have cancelled the trains." I think every possible effort is being made to meet the Portuguese terror, to get our brothers and sisters under Portuguese rule liberated. And I think the time for that has to be judged not by me or by any other person, but the time for action has to be judged by those persons who understand the art of warfare, who understand the art of fighting and all those things. I think our country will not be found lacking when it comes to a question of dealing with the problem of Goa realistically and strongly and in a way which will put an end to this sore in our country.

Another point that has been made is that we should quit the Commonwealth. Well, this is a very old idea which is repeated again and again and is a stock-in-trade with some political parties in my country. I would submit very respectfully that while persons here say that our Defence Minister does not do well here or there, that our diplomacy is not successful, there comes the President of Argentina. This is what he said last evening, that "I have been watching

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, England, France and West Germany cannot remain non-aligned if they withdraw from the N.A.T.O. They will either have to hand over their defence portfolio to the U.N.O. or to enter into military alliances with either Russia or China. The withdrawal of the U. S. A. from the Rimland or of the States of Western Europe from the N.A.T.O. would mean.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Why did you say order, order, Sir?

Some Hon. Members: There was some disturbance behind.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Can he question the Chair?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I thought you were asking me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not you.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: would mean either the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact or the intensification of the conflict between Russia and China. The resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact is not possible because American military power is not weakened at all by the withdrawal of the U. S. A. from the Rimland, and further because it would be for more advantageous for Russia to bargain with America than with China. The withdrawal of the U. S. A. from the Rimland or of England, France, and West Germany from the N. A. T. O. would lead to the establishment of Anglo-Russian, Franco Russian and Russo-German alliances.

I am one with the Stalinists. Because, I am not in favour of a political settlement between Russia and America. Further, because, I am not in favour of democracy in the Soviet Union,.....

An Hon. Member; Why?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: except on the basis of universal and complete disarmament. I am in favour of Stalinism.....(Interruption).

Shri Tyagi (Dehradun): I hope not in India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; we have to listen and learn and not get impatient.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am in favour of Stalinism because I want the centre of international communism to shift from Moscow to Peking. It does not lie in the power of either the Stalinists or the anti-Stalinists to wage a nuclear war. When the Chinese communists talk of the inevitability of war, they mean that Russia and America should fight amongst themselves. China would remain neutral if such a war breaks out, for, she wants to establish her hegemony over the world. The resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact is not possible because American military power has become impregnable as a result of the nuclear stalemate. Both India and China will be defeated both politically and militarily if a war breaks out between them. America and Russia cannot join opposite sides if such a war breaks out. A Sino-Indian war will be transformed at once into a thermo-nuclear war if they join opposite sides. Such a war will lead to the destruction of the globe. Russia and America are not going to destroy themselves for the sake of the maintenance of India's sovereignty over the Aksai Chin Region and the N.E.F.A. If Russia remains neutral, America will also have to remain neutral. If Russia joins hands with China, America will have to remain neutral or join hands with China. If Russia join hands with India, America will have to remain neutral or join hands with India.

American help to China will be superfluous if Russia and China come together. American help to India will be superfluous if Russia and India come together. America cannot be of any use either to India or China if a war breaks out between them. A political settlement between Russia and America cannot be arrived at. A political settlement between America and

Russia can be arrived at on the corpse of India and China only. The condition precedent to a political settlement between Russia and America is the outbreak of a war between India and China. A war between India and China would not lead to a war between Russia and America. It may lead to a war amongst all the Afro-Asian States. A war between India and China would not lead to the outbreak of a global war, but to the establishment of white hegemony over the Afro-Asian land mass.

It is a conflict between Russia and China and not between India and China which is going to determine the shape of things to come. A conflict between India and China is not of an elemental character and of a historical nature. A conflict between Russia and China can never be reconciled on any basis except that of universal and complete disarmament. If no war breaks out between India and China, the whole of the next century is going to be an epoch of Sino-Soviet conflict of an elemental character the like of which the world has not seen before. No conflict between any two States has been of such a titanic nature as the one that is rapidly developing between the two communist giants.

I am in favour of the Stalinists because the break up of the Sino-Soviet empire in Eurasia will lead either to the establishment of either American or Pan-Islamic hegemony or to the return of the days of Chengiz Khan, Timur, Nadir Shah and Ahmed Shah Abdali. The Stalinists stand for the maintenance of iron dictatorship over the heart-land. Neither a virgin nor a rupee would be left off in India if the right of self-determination is granted to tribal people living on our borders. All the States in the Soviet Union would become sovereign republics if democracy is introduced in Russia.

I am in favour of the centre of international communism being shifted from Moscow to Peking, because, if Russia is integrated with the west,

the status of the black and coloured races would be reduced to that of hewers of wood and drawers of water. But, if Russia is integrated with the Afro-Asian land mass, perfect democracy would be established on earth. Whatever Mr. Khrushchev might say, Stalinism cannot be liquidated in a world of sovereign nation states. The condition precedent to the liquidation of Stalinism is the transformation of the U.N.O. into a world government. As long as there is conflict between Russia and America, the maintenance of dictatorship in Russia is inevitable. Dictatorship in Russia would collapse the day America resorts to disarmament.

Stalinism is not a phenomenon confined to the communist world alone. There are Stalinists in the so-called free world as well. Men like Senator Fulbright and Dean Acheson who stand for strengthening the NATO and weakening the U.N.O. cannot be designated but as Stalinists however repugnant the cult of communism may be to them. They are champions of war and hegemony. They are opposed to disarmament, peace, freedom and democracy. They stand for the maintenance of the position of the United States of America as a world Power, by all means, violent or non-violent. Opposed to Senator Fulbright and Dean Acheson are a few people who want the United States of America to accept gracefully the status of a regional Power in the New World. They stand for liquidating the NATO and strengthening the U.N.O.

15 hrs.

I am not in favour of Stalinism if it means either adherence to the cult of violent revolution or war against the U.S.A. The goal of Stalinism can never be realized if it is to establish socialism over the whole world by the method of dictatorship. Capitalism in the old sense of the term does not exist in the U.S.A. Not a socialist State but a strong military State can be established by the method of dictatorship. The kind of world economy

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

that may emerge in the thermonuclear age may be neither capitalist nor socialist.

I shall say one word about disarmament and I have done. Disarmament means handing over of the defence portfolio to the U.N.O. The goal of disarmament can never be reached if the U.N.O. is not transformed into a world government. It is only by the handing over of the defence portfolio to the U.N.O. that it can be transformed into a world government. Disarmament does not mean destruction of all weapons and disbandment of all forces. A classless society may come into being only centuries after the establishment of a world government. Disarmament in the sense of destruction of all weapons and disbandment of all forces is a feature of a classless society. It is only after the U.N.O. has become the sole custodian of the defence forces of all the countries of the world that the task of destruction of certain types of weapons and of partial disbandment of Armed Forces can be undertaken. Those who want to torpedo the ideal of disarmament mix it up with the questions of espionage and inspection. The goal of disarmament can be achieved only in the manner in which the Indian Native States who had armies of their own were disarmed. All the States in the world should similarly sign an instrument of accession handing over their defence portfolios to the U.N.O. China, Russia and America will not disarm unless the non-aligned nations disarm themselves and thereby liquidate the possibility of the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact and of the establishment of Russo-American hegemony.

There are only two Powers which can fight against China, and they are Russia and America. They can do so only if they come together. If Russia attacks China, America should remain neutral or join hands with Russia. Similarly, if America attacks China, Russia should remain neutral or

join hands with America. China cannot be attacked by either Russia or America if these conditions are not fulfilled. A war between India and China alone can bring Russia and America together. The opportunity for the establishment of Russo-American hegemony can never arise if India and China do not fight. India and China can never be weakened unless they fight. The Afro-Asian landmass can never be divided if India and China are not weakened. Russia and America can come together only on the basis of the division of the Afro-Asian landmass into two spheres of influence, Russian and American. If the result of a war between India and China is not going to be a victory either for India or for China but the establishment of Russo-American hegemony over both, some other method must be devised to check-mate China, which may ensure victory for India.

Chinese aggression over India cannot be halted by any negotiations. It can be halted only by resorting to disarmament, that is, by the handing over of the defence portfolio to the U.N.O. The responsibility for defending India must be foisted on the shoulders of the U.N.O., that is, upon the shoulders of more than one hundred member-States. Surely, China cannot fight against them. China will walk out of our territory if the Defence Forces of so many States are harnessed on our side. The possibility of a war between India and China, leading to the establishment of Russo-American hegemony can never arise if India resorts to disarmament.

What is implicit and conditional in the Charter of the U.N.O. must be made explicit and obligatory by handing over the defence portfolio to the U.N.O. Today, the U.N.O. can resort to force to ward off aggression, if a complaint is lodged by a State that it has been subjected to aggression. But no such complaint can be lodged if the State is subjected to subversion before aggression. But if a State hands over its defence

portfolio to the U.N.O., it can be subjected neither to subversion nor to aggression. There cannot be any aggression because no State can withstand the combined onslaught of the Defence Forces of more than one hundred states.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (New Delhi): Sir, effort has been made to draw a distinction between the aggression or the fighting in Goa and that in Ladakh. I feel that there is no place for that distinction. Aggression is aggression, whether it is committed by Pakistan or by China or by the Portuguese. The only difference is that the aggression in Goa was committed by the Portuguese some hundreds of years ago. It is a legacy that we have inherited from the past, whereas the aggression that is taking place in Ladakh has taken place only recently, that is within the last ten years, and the direct responsibility for that lies on the present Government. All the same, aggression has to be vacated. Therefore, I do not agree with those people who say that we can wait in regard to Goa. We must take every possible action to get the Portuguese aggression in Goa vacated. But I do not like the theatrical way in which we have set about doing things. I wish we had a statesman like Sardar Patel who could have done this small job very comfortably without making much noise about it. The way it is being done now is not the right way, and I think that we should look into this matter. There can however, be no difference of opinion as to the necessity and need of getting Portuguese aggression in Goa vacated as early as possible.

The real question in regard to foreign policy is not just what is happening in the outside world. Our Prime Minister has just now given a very rambling and very broad review of developments here and there. We are all very interested in them. He talked of war and peace. He has said that disarmament is not taking place, and we are all worried about it. If a war breaks out, no country can remain

safe from it. But the foreign policy of any country is not a question of platitudes; it is not a question of pious wishes; it is not a question of some dogmatism, it is not a question of some kind of idealistic policies, but it is a question of realism, it is a question of situations as they face us. And primarily, the foreign policy of any country is determined by geography and by history and by other conditioning factors. In the case of India, these conditioning factors are mainly two, one, the partitioning of the country as a result of which our eastern and western borders have become very unnatural, and the other the two immediate neighbours that we have who are both inimical to us. If the neighbours had not been so, that is, if they had not been so inimical, then our foreign policy might have taken a quite different shape altogether. But, at present, China is inimical, and Pakistan is also inimical, and the Portuguese are also inimical in Goa. So, we have to keep in mind our relations with these countries while formulating our foreign policy.

In respect of China, till about four-teen years ago, we had no direct link with China. The only place where China met our frontiers was in Gilgit, where the three empires, the Russian, the Chinese and the Indian empires met. But, elsewhere, China was not our neighbour at all. Between India and China, Tibet was a vast country, a buffer country and a friendly country, and so long as Tibet was there, there was no question of any direct quarrel coming up between India and China. That was the main reason why during the last few centuries, we and China had been great friends. In fact, there were two factors which made China and India friends; one was our cultural proximity, and the other was our geographical distance. Culturally, they had come nearer when Buddhism spread there, and they began to respect India as the land of their *gurus*, and, therefore, the Chinese had a respect for the Indian people. Geographically, our borders never joined,

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

because Tibet was there in between. Because of these two factors, India and China could continue to be friends, and there was no case of war between the two countries during the last two thousand years nearly. But with the coming of the Communists in China, in the first place, that cultural link was destroyed. When the Communists took over in China, Buddhism disappeared, and religion disappeared, and that one cultural link which had unified us and kept us friends with China disappeared.

The second factor which had maintained peace between us and China, namely, the existence of the buffer State of Tibet, has also disappeared, because China has been allowed to eat up Tibet. Actually, the biggest blunder that we committed in regard to our foreign policy was that we did not stop China when China invaded Tibet. One may say, as the Prime Minister was saying, 'What could we have done?' We could have done a lot. At that time, China was not as much prepared as she is today. At that time, China needed our friendship very much. Had we taken a firm stand in regard to Tibet at that time, we would not have been in the predicament in which we are placed today. We could have bound her to the condition that she would not attack Tibet and that the autonomy of Tibet would be maintained. We did nothing of the kind. But actually when Tibet had been eaten up by China, we signed a treaty with China about Tibet, the so-called *Panchsheel* treaty.

It is one thing to have an aggressive policy and another to have a strong policy. It was a blunder not to have adopted a strong policy towards China. But when we recognised the aggression of China against Tibet *de facto* and *de jure*, we committed a greater blunder. That is how the trouble started with China. All the present trouble has directly come out of that treaty.

Since then China has been going forward. The treaty was signed in April 1954. The first aggression by China started in Bara Hoti in May. Since then, aggressions and incursions have been taking place everyday. The biggest incursion has been in the Ladakh region.

Our Prime Minister says that Ladakh is a barren area and nothing grows there. I do not agree with him. I happen to have been born in that area. I spent my childhood in that area. I feel pained when the Prime Minister says that Ladakh is a barren area. It is a very rich area. Of course, it is at a great height. But the Dogras had conquered and ruled that area. People have gone there. Revenue officers have gone there. Now because we have not been able to defend it, to say that it is a barren area and no tree grows there is not correct. I would appeal to the Prime Minister that instead of minimising the importance of Ladakh, he should take active steps to get the aggression vacated. There is a Hindi couplet:

इधर उबर की न बात कर,

यह बाला कि काफ़ले क्यों लूटे,

हमें रहजनों से ग़रज़ नहीं,

तेरी रहबरी का सवाल है ।

'Do not tell us that it happened like this, it happened like that'. Do not say that because the troops were not there or the army was not there, we were not able to defend it. Why did you fail there? Your leadership has failed there. Instead of trying to minimise it by saying that things happened this way or that, we want that India, a great country with 430 million people with great resources should take action. Why cannot we match China? If we cannot stand against China, no other country can.

This morning, we heard a review of the international situation by the Prime Minister. He said something about Laos and in Viet-Nam and what is happening there. It is true there is trouble in Laos and trouble in Viet-Nam. The main reason for it is that China is pressing and expanding. The Chinese want to eat up those small countries. So long as this Chinese threat remains, there can be no peace in Laos, or Viet-Nam. You may have a Geneva Conference or any other conference. If we want peace to return to South-East Asia, peace to return to Laos, Viet-Nam and to Nepal, we must see that we stand up to China. Unless we follow a firm policy, unless we set an example before South-East Asia, to show that China can be stopped, the Chinese steamroller will advance and will eat up the small countries, and we may have to face the threat later on. India should, therefore, stand up and call a halt to the Chinese aggression.

In this respect, I will make two suggestions. The Prime Minister has said that China has approached us for a renewal of the so-called *Panchsheel* treaty. He said that the request had come in a very polite language. Politeness in words is one thing, but action is different. We should not be taken in by polite words. The situation demands that we must not renew the treaty. We had earlier demanded that that treaty should be denounced. But now that the treaty is expiring, we should not renew it. We on our part should give back to Tibet her right of self-determination. We cannot perhaps do anything actively for Tibetans, but at least we can give them our moral support. We will recognise Tibet as an independent country. We should stand by them morally at least for anything that they do to regain their independence. This is the most essential thing that must be done if the problem of China, which is going to be a bigger threat to us, is to be solved finally.

As regards Ladakh, it is not only enough that we build a road from

Srinagar to Leh. That road passes near Kargil which is in the hands of Pakistan. It is just 7 or 8 miles from the main road. It is very important for the defence of Ladakh that we build a road from Manali to Lahaul and to Ladakh. The Srinagar-Leh road on which we have spent a lot of money may not be of much use to us.

Another factor is the attitude of our neighbour, Pakistan. As the Prime Minister said in Srinagar the other day, Pakistan was born with enmity towards India and it lives in hostility towards India. That is very true. Pakistan cannot exist otherwise. Therefore, whatever we do to appease Pakistan, whatever we give her in respect of canal waters, evacuee property and so on, Pakistan is bound to remain our enemy, because her very existence depends on that. For this purpose, she will always come out with one excuse or another.

Not a day passes when we do not hear of some incursion by Pakistanis into our border. Have you heard of any other country in the world whose borders are so often violated as the borders of India are by Pakistan? This is simply because we have not understood the real character of Pakistan's rulers. They are bullies. If we do not call their bluff, they will go on behaving as they are doing.

The next danger that comes from Pakistan is in Kashmir. I come from Kashmir. The Prime Minister also comes from Kashmir. He says that he knows more about Kashmir. He knows that his ancestors had come away from Kashmir 300 years ago. I was in Kashmir until I was driven out by Sheikh Abdullah. I was driven out because I had the courage to fight the Pakistanis while he was taking refuge with the Prime Minister in Delhi when Pakistanis invaded Kashmir. I was driven out because I was the person who carried on a campaign for full integration of the State with the rest of India.

Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir): You sabotaged the movement for integration. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: What I mean to say is that I claim to know something about Jammu and Kashmir.

Shri A. M. Tariq: You are not a Kashmiri.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whoever might be the 'driver', both are here now.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: He was there. He came to arrest me. So he knows better. (*Interruptions*).

Shri A. M. Tariq: I will come to arrest you again.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: The situation in Kashmir is getting dangerous. Large numbers of Pakistanis have infiltrated on the Poonch-Rajauri sector and fifth column activities are going on very fast. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should not interrupt like this.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: This is the internal situation in the State which has encouraged Pakistan to adopt such an aggressive policy. That is why she is following the policy she does with regard to 'Azad Kashmir'. That is why she is training guerillas for attacking Kashmir. I feel that if we have to face this threat in Kashmir squarely, first we must put things in order at home. Unless and until we fully integrate Jammu and Kashmir with the rest of India, unless and until we clear out the fifth column elements and Pakistani agents from that State, the threat to Kashmir will become real and aggression may take place in that sector, about which we may not be aware, just now, but which may take us unawares.

Therefore, it is very important that we take note of the situation there. Pakistan is an enemy and I do not agree with those people who think

that by following a friendly policy we can be friends with Pakistan. Pakistan will not be friendly with us so long as it exists as a separate State. Therefore, our foreign policy should always keep in view the fact that in Pakistan we have to tackle a country which is an enemy whose aggressive potentiality has increased very much in the recent past.

The third danger, as I said at the very beginning, is from the Portuguese. Of course, Goa is a small pocket and Portugal is not a big power. But situated as we are, it is quite possible that Portugal may be encouraged by Pakistan. Already there are reported to be some kind of hobnobbing going on. Therefore, while dealing with Portugal, we must beware of Pakistan, we must be very elert about Pakistan also.

In the end, I would only say that the foreign policy of any country will ultimately have to be judged by how it safeguards the national interest. Our Prime Minister has been talking much in regard to Algeria and Korea, but in history his achievements as Foreign Minister of India will not be judged by what he has done in Algeria or Korea or Congo, but mainly by what he has been able to do to safeguard the interests of India. It is wrong for us when we are confronted on so many sides by inimical nations that we should fritter away our strength by sending our troops to Congo and Gaza. Actually, we must concentrate all our strength in the country and keep our own interest foremost in our minds. That is the only way in which we can safeguard our interests. Otherwise, one would be able to say without fear of contradiction that the Prime Minister's foreign policy has failed the country and will fail it in future. That is why we demand that a reorientation of the foreign policy of the country should take place in view of the actual realities of the situation in regard to China, in regard to Tibet, in regard to Pakistan and in regard to Goa.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps, hon. Members would like to know when the reply would be made. The time allotted for this discussion is 6 hours and we have taken it up at 12:25. We have to complete it today by 6:25 p.m. The hon. Prime Minister will be called at 5:30 p.m. to reply to the debate.

Shri Dinesh Singh (Banda): Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Sir, today again we meet under renewed threat of annihilation by nuclear bombs. The new bombs that have been exploded have brought this realisation to us very clearly that unless we learn to live together and come to some sort of arrangement in peace we may have to face complete annihilation. It is, therefore, our duty; and the main aim of our foreign policy is to try to build up peace. Everything else we may do should naturally be conditioned towards that.

I submit that this peace can only be built by non-alignment, by extending this area of non-involvement so that people do not live in fear of attack from one another so that they do not go on building up their armies, which is always at the cost of other development works and which always lends to a tendency to jump into some sort of conflict. This is, therefore, the first aim of our foreign policy and it has been admitted by almost all sections in this House that to this end we have succeeded.

My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai, in his eloquent speech made certain accusations regarding the defence of our border. I thought this matter had been dealt with at length the other day and had been settled. But it seems he has not been satisfied and I think it will be very difficult to satisfy him.

He has raised two points which are rather important. One is that he charges the Government with not trying to repel this aggression. I do not

clearly know what he implies; whether he implies that we should send large forces to the border to throw out the Chinese from there or whether he implies that we should take action elsewhere to force the Chinese to withdraw.

Aggression has taken place. That is there. The repealing of aggression has to be conditioned to our place of choice and our time of doing it. If we enter into an adventure, he did not like the word adventure, but it will be an adventure—if we go into this area without sufficient preparedness to drive out what we have to do is to build up our forces to meet this aggression. Unfortunately, other parts of our territory have also been occupied by other forces. It is a matter of great regret. But that does not mean that we should jump into it without full consideration of what our objective is.

We have always stood for peaceful negotiation. We have always stood against achievement, even if it is a legitimate claim, by armed aggression or by armed forces. Today we have been attacked. That does not mean that we must forget everything and suddenly rush into this business. We have to take an overall picture.

It is quite clear that China has not attacked us just to gain that small portion of territory. It is part of a much bigger struggle, not in India alone but a struggle in the whole of Asia. It is a struggle between our ways of life and political philosophy of achieving by force or by negotiation. I submit that the way to meet this Chinese aggression is to build up ourselves strongly and to show to the world that we have not been moved in the hour of crisis to jump into this sort of adventure.

Shri Nath Pai also accused Government of handing over Tibet to China as if it were ours Government to give to China. He went in detail into certain historical papers he brought. But I am sorry to say that

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

he did not care to read the whole history of Tibet. Tibet has been under the domination of China for a long time. We did not allow that. It was part of a system that had been there for hundreds of years. Even when the first contracts were made with Tibet by the East India Company, Tibet always refrained from signing any treaty or agreement saying that it was to be ratified by China. China was the main power. China was to decide. Even the British recognised it. Even during the War Chiang Kai-Shek's suzerainty or sovereignty was accepted. There is not much difference between the two but my hon. friend tried to make out a difference. In that way it was their right to send to that area troops. It is wrong and it has been rightly said that they should not have taken away the autonomy of Tibet. It was something that they had agreed and we had hoped that they would abide by the agreement. But they did not keep that agreement in dealing with that territory that belonged to them. How are we justified in moving our forces there or in taking any action?

My hon. friend also raised this point that Government always advertises its weakness and this is not the way to defend it. This is a curious situation. The Prime Minister has always offered to discuss this matter with the Opposition and even then there is this discussion in Parliament. When the difficulty is explained they say it is a show of weakness. This is a rather curious way of dealing with it. Either we do not discuss it here and discuss it privately or if we discuss it, then, certain things are bound to happen. bound to come out; and that is not the weakness of Government.

Today a very important thing is happening in Goa. I would like the House to consider it in all its seriousness. Goa continues to remain a Portuguese colony in India. While other colonial Powers are moving out of their colonies, the Portuguese refuse even to discuss the matter, even

to think about it. They feel that they have a right to stay on there because it is not a colony but it is a part of Portugal, 7,000 miles away, divided by three seas. However, this matter was considered in the United Nations. Certain criteria were drawn up by which colonies should be determined, because, otherwise, every country would call every colony a part of its own territory—its integral part. Even according to the criteria drawn up by the UN, Goa is a colony of Portugal and a colony has an inherent right to independence because it is not part of an integrated system. The people of Goa have therefore a right to independence and we in India consider them as part of India which they have always been. Very severe repression is going on there as we see from the newspapers. The Portuguese in their frustration of what is happening in Africa are becoming trigger happy and building up these forces in Goa and have not only contained that repression inside Goa, they have started doing these things at the border districts. What are we to do? Are we to sit and wait and see our people being murdered and looted? It was suggested here that sending in armed forces in Goa would be a kind of aggression and it was compared with repelling aggression that China had made. It was also mentioned that China being a bigger enemy we have not been able to do anything and Goa being a small enemy we want to take this step. It is not a question of size; it is a question of a situation and what is happening there. We cannot shut our eyes to what is happening in Goa in spite of what may be happening in China or on our borders with China. Sending of troops in Goa is not an aggression. We have always wanted to discuss the matter. The people there have launched several peaceful movements; all of them have been crushed. Even then we waited. Now, when the Portuguese cannot control themselves there, they want to move out and raid our borders, our districts and villages along those borders, now we have to take action

not only to liberate the people of Goa which they will do by themselves, if necessary but also to protect our people. We are not going to invade. The liberation of Goa is by the people of Goa themselves. We are only trying to stop these atrocities there and I submit that it is not wrong under the international law or even against the conscience of anybody. It is our duty to help the people of Goa to liberate themselves.

In talking about colonialism, my mind has also drawn towards Africa. Africa continues to be a troubled continent and colonialism has only changed its form and neo colonialism has come in. Political domination is being changed to economic domination. We see what is happening in Congo. The Belgian Government has ostensibly moved out but the people continue to suffer under the new economics of colonialism. Our troops there have a very difficult task to perform. I should like to record in this House our deep appreciation and admiration of the great work they are doing under great restriction. But we should at the same time make it quite clear to the UN that we are not going to leave our troops there just to be made pawns in the game that they have definite assignments and they must be carried out effectively. It is also our duty to help the other parts of Africa to liberate themselves. We see Northern Rhodesia joining hands with Katanga and South Africa in an effort to perpetuate for ever that kind of slavery that exists in South Africa. It is our duty to help the people there and to take every step that we can with the British Government to see that this territory is not utilised for this purpose and that they move towards independence and independence is granted as speedily as possible to them.

Sir, you have already told me that my time is up and I, therefore, like to mention just one point: recognition of Algeria. In the last foreign affairs debate, the Prime Minister was pleased to say that while we had not re-

cognised Algeria formally, we have a kind of *de facto* recognition. This, I submit, is not sufficient: recognition should be full and complete. The Prime Minister mentioned that the only difficulty we have is a kind of legal difficulty. I therefore like to quote very briefly from a legal authority on international law. Oppenheim from volume I on Peace. It deals with recognition. Chapter 72 says:

"Recognition is of special importance in those cases where a new State tries to establish itself by breaking off from an existing State in the course of a revolution."

This is what is happening in Algeria.

Here it goes on to say:

". . . in every case of civil war a foreign State can recognise the insurgents as a belligerent power if they succeed in keeping a part of the country in their hands, set up a Government of their own, and conduct their military operations according to the laws of war."

I submit that Algeria fulfils all these conditions. They have control of territory, they maintain an army and they conform to international law. So, I would request the hon. Prime Minister to consider recognition of Algeria.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Braj Raj Singh. I will be calling Shri Tyagi a little later.

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं, भारत सरकार द्वारा कांगो में अपनी फीज और जवानों को भेज कर, वहाँ की जनता की आजादी के लिये जो कुछ किया जा रहा है, उस का स्वागत करता हूँ। बार बार सदन में और बाहर भी कभी कभी ऐसी बात कही जाती है चूँकि हिन्दुस्तान के सामने चीन का मामला है इस लिये हिन्दुस्ता का अफ्रीका

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

की, और खास कर तीर पर कांगो की, कोई सहायता नहीं करनी चाहिये थी, अपनी फौज भेज कर ।

15-38 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर यह जिम्मेदारी है, और अपन तरीके से, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने इस को पूरा करने की कोशिश की है, कि कांगो में जो सहायता वह कर सकती हो, उसे करे, और मैं उसकी इस बात का स्वागत करता हूँ ।

इसी संदर्भ में स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के कुछ प्रवक्ताओं के द्वारा जो कुछहम गोवा में करने जा रहे हैं, जो उस का जिक्र किया गया है और कहा गया है कि इस तरह से हम चीन से मिलने वाली सीमा पर अपनी ताकत कम कर रहे हैं, मैं उस के प्रति अपना धृष्ट व्यक्त करता हूँ मैं समझता हूँ कि चीन से हम को सुलझने की जरूरत है, और जल्दी ही उस से सुलझना चाहिये, लेकिन उस का बहाना बनाकर हम अपने देश की छाती पर गोवा में साम्राज्यवाद के बने रहने को भी बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते । जितनी जल्दी हम उस को अपनी फौज के द्वारा या अन्य तरीकों से खत्म कर सकें, उस का स्वागत किया जाना चाहिये । मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि सरकार के रास्ते में ऐसी कोई रुकावट नहीं आयेगी और जल्दी ही हमें वह शुभ संदेश सुनने को मिलेगा कि गोवा आजाद है और पुर्तगाल की कोई भी निशानी हिन्दुस्तान में बाकी नहीं है । लेकिन इसी के साथ साथ मुझे लगता है कि पहली दफा जब यहां हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा हुई थी तब से लेकर अब तक प्रधान मंत्री के जो भी भाषण हुए हैं, खास तीर पर बेलग्रेड सम्मेलन में, उन में उन्होंने जो जोर दिया है दुनिया की समस्याओं के ऊपर, वह हिन्दुस्तान की अपनी परम्पराओं को देखते हुए, और खास तीर

से अफ्रीकी राष्ट्रों की आजादी का जो सवाल है, उस को देखते हुए सही नहीं है । प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि वे दुनिया में सब से ज्यादा महत्व देते हैं शांति कायम रखने को । मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में कोई दो रायें नहीं हो सकतीं कि दुनिया में शांति कायम रहनी चाहिये । तो सवाल यह है कि दुनिया में एक तरफ शांति कायम रखने की बात है और दूसरी तरफ दुनिया में कुछ जगहों में गुलामी को खत्म करने की बात है, इन में से अधिक महत्व किस को दिया जाना चाहिये । मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की आत्मा यह कहती है कि शांति तो कायम रखनी चाहिये लेकिन पहले महत्व है दुनिया में से गुलामी को खत्म करने का । लेकिन अगर हम शान्ति कायम रखने के प्रश्न को ही अधिक महत्व दें और उसी को लेकर चलें तो इस के मानी यह होंगे कि अल्जीरिया में जहां गुलामी को खत्म करने के प्रयास में ६ लाख राष्ट्रवादी मारे जा चुके हैं वहां पर वे लोग अपने हथियार डाल दें और शांति भंग करने की कोई चीज न करें । लेकिन ऐसा करने से उनकी आजादी छतरे में पड़ जाती है ।

अफ्रीका के दूसरे राष्ट्रों के लिए यह आवश्यक हो गया है कि वे अपनी आजादी प्राप्त करने के लिये हथियार उठाएं । तो एसी अवस्था में शांति पर सब से ज्यादा जोर देने का अर्थ यह होगा कि इन देशों में गुलामी बनी रहे । इस का यह भी अर्थ होगा कि चीन ने जो हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा कर लिया है उस को वैसे ही बना रहने दिया जाए ।

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस संबंध में रूस के प्रधान मंत्री श्री खुश्चेव ने हम से आगे बढ़ कर एक बात कह दी । उन्होंने कहा कि शांति कायम रखना तो ठीक है लेकिन उस से पहले दुनिया से गुलामी खत्म करने की

जरूरत है। मैं चाहता था कि यह बात हमारे प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा कही गयी होती तो उन के अब तक के अपने जीवन के साथ न्याय होता और दुनिया की परम्पराओं के साथ भी न्याय होता। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि आज भी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि दुनिया में सब से आवश्यक चीज शांति को कायम रखना। यह आवश्यक हो सकता है, लेकिन उस से पहले अधिक आवश्यक चीज है दुनिया से गुलामी को खत्म करना। जब तक यह नहीं होता तब तक दुनिया में शांति कायम नहीं हो सकती। इस गुलामी को कायम रखने में कुछ लोगों के निहित स्वार्थ हैं। जब तक उन निहित स्वार्थों को खत्म नहीं किया जाएगा तब तक दुनिया से गुलामी खत्म नहीं हो सकती और अगर वे अपने आप नहीं हटते तो उनको लड़ाई लड़ कर हटाना होगा। और मैं समझता हूँ कि अफ्रीका के देशों के लिए ऐसा करना जरूरी हो गया है।

इसी संदर्भ में मैं अनुभव करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को अल्जीरिया की राष्ट्रवादी सरकार को, जो वहाँ के लोगों की विधिवत् स्थापित वास्तविक सरकार है पूरी मान्यता देनी चाहिये। अब अधिक समय तक यह बात नहीं कही जानी चाहिए कि हम ने उस को डि फ़ैक्टो मान्यता दे दी है और डि ज्युरे मान्यता की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि कानूनी मान्यता का भी अपना महत्व है और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को उस में ज्यादा देर न कर के अल्जीरिया की सरकार को पूर्ण मान्यता दे देनी चाहिए।

इसी के साथ साथ मैं अफ्रीका के उन राष्ट्रों के लिये अपनी और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की सद्भावनाएँ भेजना चाहता हूँ। जो जल्दी आजाद होने वाले हैं। ये राष्ट्र हैं टैंगेनाइका और गूंडा। इनमें से टैंगेनाइका तो आगामी दो दिनों में आजाद होने वाला है और गूंडा कुछ समय बाद आजाद हो

जाएगा। इसी के साथ मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार अपने प्रभाव को, फौजी प्रभाव को नहीं बरन नैतिक प्रभाव को, इस्तेमाल करेगी ताकि अफ्रीका के सभी राष्ट्रों को आजादी मिल जाए और अफ्रीका से गुलामी का निशान खत्म हो जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह हमारी परम्पराओं के अनुसार होगा और मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया से गुलामी के खत्म हो जाने से हमको अपने शांति कायम रखने के उद्देश्य में भी बड़ी मदद मिलेगी।

मैं ने इस सदन में एक बात की पहले कई बार चर्चा की है और उसको मैं आज फिर दुहराना चाहता हूँ। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि आज की दुनिया में दोनों गुटों के बीच में किसी तीसरी शक्ति के निर्माण की बात उचित नहीं हो सकती। लेकिन मैं फिर अपनी बात पर जोर देना चाहता हूँ, कि अगर हमको दुनिया में शांति कायम रखनी है, दुनिया से गुलामी को खत्म करना है, जो न्यूकलियर परीक्षण हो रहे हैं उनको बन्द करना है, तो सम्भवतः ऐसा तब तक नहीं हो सकता जब तक कि अमरीका और रूस के बीच में हम एक ऐसी तीसरी शक्ति का निर्माण न कर लें जिसका उद्देश्य होगा दुनिया से लड़ाई को खत्म करना और किसी भी शक्ति में किसी लड़ाई में शामिल न होना। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि दुनिया में ऐसी किसी तीसरी शक्ति का निर्माण नहीं हो सकता जो इन दो गुटों के बराबर की हो, या जिसमें उनसे लड़ने की सामर्थ्य हो और जो उन से लड़ने को तैयार हो। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर दुनिया में शांति कायम रखने का सच्ची भावना का उदय करना है तो वह तब तक नहीं हो सकता जब तक ऐसी तीसरी शक्ति का निर्माण न किया जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया के राष्ट्रों का बहुमत ऐसा है जो लड़ाई नहीं चाहता। मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया की जनता का स्पष्ट बहुमत ऐसा है जो लड़ाई नहीं चाहता। उन राष्ट्रों की

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

जनता भी जो कि आज न्यूकलियर टेस्ट कर रहे हैं और जिनमें हथियार बाजी चल रही है दुनियां में लड़ाई नहीं चाहते। दुनियां में तब तक शांति कायम नहीं हो सकती जब तक कि उन राष्ट्रों की एक तृतीय शक्ति का संगठन नहीं किया जाता जो इन दो गुटों से सम्बन्धित नहीं है। यह तृतीय शक्ति शांति का गुट होगा जोकि इस तरह की घोषणा करे कि कि उसका उद्देश्य किसी से लड़ना नहीं होगा, वह न अमरीका के और न रूस के गुट से लड़ेगा, बल्कि उसका काम दुनियां में शांति कायम रखना होगा, और यह गुट यह स्पष्ट घोषणा करेगा कि दुनियां में लड़ाई होने पर वह किसी का साथ नहीं देगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री इस प्रकार की तृतीय शक्ति के निर्माण का काम कर सकते हैं जिसमें एशिया के सारे मुल्क चीन को छोड़ कर, और अफ्रीका के मुल्क होने चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि लैटिन अमरीका के मुल्क और कुछ यूरोप के मुल्क भी चाह सकते हैं कि इस प्रकार का एक संगठन बने जो स्पष्ट घोषणा करे कि हम दुनियां में लड़ाई नहीं होने देंगे, दुनियां से लड़ाई का खातमा करेंगे और जो भी लड़ाई करेगा उसके साथ सहयोग नहीं करेंगे। अगर कोई ऐसा संगठन कायम किया जा सके तो शांति के पक्ष में दुनियां की जनता में विश्वास फैलेगा। यह दुनियां के राष्ट्रों के बहुमत का संगठन होगा और इसके जोर देने पर दुनियां से लड़ाई का खातमा हो सकेगा। और इस संगठन के बनने से उस उद्देश्य को पूरा करने में सफलता मिलेगी जिसकी तरफ बार बार हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ध्यान दिलाते हैं।

अगर दुनियां में न्यूकलियर टेस्टों को खत्म करना है तो यह तभी हो सकता है जब अमरीका और रूस इसके लिए तैयार हों। मैं मानता हूँ कि आज की परिस्थितियों में ये दोनों सब से शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र हैं और उनको जबरदस्ती इस के लिए तैयार नहीं किया जा

सकता कि वे न्यूकलियर टेस्ट बन्द कर दें। लेकिन अगर उनको यह पता लगेगा कि उनके अलावा दुनियां के राष्ट्रों का बहुमत ऐसा है जो चाहता है कि हथियार बाजी और न्यूकलियर टेस्ट बन्द हों, जो चाहता है कि दुनियां में निःशस्त्रीकरण हो और लड़ाई न हो, तो उनको भी मजबूर होना पड़ेगा कि निःशस्त्रीकरण के लिए और न्यूकलियर टेस्ट बन्द करने के लिए और यह घोषणा करनी पड़ेगी कि दुनियां की समस्याओं को वे लड़ाई से हल नहीं करेंगे।

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस काम को करने में हिन्दुस्तान एक बहुत बड़ी भूमिका अदा कर सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान की अब तक की जो नीति रही है उसमें वह इस भूमिका को अदा करने में असफल रहा है। मैं कामना करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जो इस भूमिका को अदा करने की तरफ अपना कदम बढ़ाएँ।

अन्त में मैं आपकी आज्ञा से एक दो बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने उस दिन चीन सम्बन्धी बहस का जवाब देते हुए कहा था कि हम लोगों ने उन पर इस बात के लिए अपराध लगाए हैं कि उन्होंने सदन से सूचनाएं छिपायी हैं, देश को चीनी अतिक्रमण के सम्बन्ध में सूचनाएं नहीं दीं। मैं उनका ध्यान उनके भाषण की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो कि उन्हें मेरे २० नवम्बर के काम रोकों प्रस्ताव पर बोलते हुए दिया था। उसमें उन्होंने कहा था :

"It has come to our knowledge that in the past few weeks—it is difficult to give the date—some new check-posts were built by the Chinese a little beyond their own check-posts between the two boundaries they claimed."

और उसके बाद, वह आगे जाते हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि ३१ अक्टूबर

के हमारे अपने नोट में जो हमने चीनी गवर्नमेंट को भेजा है प्रधान मंत्री महोदय का यह बयान है और लोक सभा में कहा गया कि—विद इन ऐ फ्यू वीक्स—अगर यह महीनों की बात थी तो इसको—फ्यू वीक्स—न कह कर फ्यू मन्थ्स—कहना चाहिए था।—जब वह फ्यू वीक्स—कहते हैं तो हमारे जैसे लोग जो कि कम अंग्रेजी पढ़े हैं या हिन्दुस्तान की जनता यही अर्थ लगाएगी कि यह काम हफ्तों में हुआ होगा महीनों में नहीं। लेकिन जो प्रोटेस्ट नोट भेजा गया था ३१ अक्टूबर को उसमें कहा गया था कि वह कार्रवाई १२-१८ महीनों से चल रही थी और जो चैक पोस्ट चीनी लोगों ने बनाए वे वीक्स में नहीं महीनों में बनाए गए थे क्योंकि उसमें आटम कहा गया है। तो ऐसी सूरत में उन्होंने बड़ी भावत्मक तेजी से कहा कि हम लोगों ने उन पर यह आरोप लगाया है कि उन्होंने सदन से सूचनाएं छिपायीं। यह खुशी की बात है कि वह सदन से सूचना नहीं छिपाना चाहते और और जनतंत्र वादी मुल्क में सूचनाएं छिपानी भी नहीं चाहिए। हम यह जानने की कभी कोशिश नहीं करना चाहिते कि चीनी हमले को हटाने के लिए क्या तैयारियां हो रही हैं। हमको तो संतोष हो जाता अगर आप इस तरह की घोषणा कर देते कि हम पूरी तैयारियां कर रहे हैं किसी भी खतरे का मुकाबला करने के लिए। हम यह भी नहीं जानना चाहते थे कि आपने कहां सड़कें बनायीं हैं या आपके पोस्ट कहां कहां हैं क्योंकि इससे दुश्मन को फायदा हो सकता था। लेकिन अगर कोई हमारी भूमि पर अतिक्रमण करता है और हमारे प्रदेश में घुस आता है तो उसकी सूचना हमको दी जानी चाहिए और अगर उसके सम्बन्ध में कोई सवाल किए जाते हैं तो यह नहीं समझा जाना चाहिए कि हम उन पर कोई लाञ्छन लगाते हैं। हां लाञ्छन लगाने की बात हो सकती

है और उस के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की जनता लाञ्छन लगाएगी। वह इसलिए कि आक्रमण को रोकने की और उसको हटाने का घोषणा सरकार की और से होनी चाहिए। वह हटाया जाएगा यह ठीक है, लेकिन यह कहना कि सदन से सूचना नहीं छिपायी गयी सही नहीं है। प्रधानमंत्री महोदय इस गलत फहमी में न पड़ें कि हमने बिना किसी आधार के कुछ कहा है। हमने उनके बयानों से ही यह बात निकाली है। इसलिए यह नहीं कहा जाना चाहिए कि हमने किसी गलत फहमी के कारण या जानबूझ कर अपनी तरफ से कोई बात कही है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूं। उस दिन जब उनसे त्यागपत्र देने का कहा गया था तः उन्होंने एक कहानी सुना दी थी। मैं उस कहानी को दुहराना नहीं चाहता। मैं नहीं समझता कि मुल्क में कोई मेरी बड़ी शक्ति है। लेकिन यह शक्ति का सवाल नहीं है यह सिद्धान्त का सवाल है। चूंकि आप मुल्क से इस आक्रमण को हटाने में असफल रहे हैं और आपने जो नीति अपनायी वह सफल नहीं रही, इसलिए मैंने अपने भाषण में कहा था कि देश की जनता को उठाने के लिए, उसको जगाने के लिए और हिलाने डुलाने के लिए आप कोई ऐसा कदम उठाएं कि देश की जनता को पता लगे कि इसमें उसका हित है। अभी देश की जनता को यह महसूस कराना जरूरी है कि देश पर चीन ने हमला किया है और उसके अतिक्रमण को हटाने के लिए उसे अपनी ही शक्ति से जुटना चाहिए। आखिर इसमें कोई राजनीति का सवाल नहीं है। हमारे विचारों में एक दूसरे से विभिन्नता हो सकती है लेकिन जहां तक देश की सुरक्षा का सवाल है इसमें देश की जनता के एक एक व्यक्ति को कुर्बानी देने के लिए तयार होना चाहिए। क्या आप देश की जनता को जगान में समर्थ रहे हैं

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

इस बात के लिए कि जो आप उससे चाहते हैं उसे वह करने की तैयार है? जाहिर है कि वह तैयार नहीं हो सकती है क्योंकि इस देश की जनता इस बात को जानती नहीं है कि हमारी भूमि पर अतिक्रमण हुआ है। उस संदर्भ में मैंने यह कहा था। मुझे इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि आप पुनः प्रधानमंत्री नहीं होंगे। सम्भवतः आप ही फिर प्रधानमंत्री होंगे आपको यह वाजिव था कि इस मामले में जनतंत्रवादी तरिका अपनाते और खुले रूप से अपना गलती स्वीकार करते कि हमने अब तक अपनी जनता को नहीं जगाया और अब हम अपनी देश की जनता को जगाने के लिए काम कर रहे हैं अगर अपने यह किया होता तो इससे आपकी प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ती और आपका इससे दर्जा ऊंचा होता। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की नीति में अब दृढ़ता आयेगी। गोवा को हम जल्दी आजाद देखेंगे। अफ्रीका में जहाँ आज भी गुलामी के निशान बाकी हैं उन निशानों को हम खत्म करने में सफल होंगे। अल्जीरिया की सरकार की जल्दी ही मान्यता दी जायगी और शान्ति के सवाल को लेकर हम गुलामी हटाने के सवाल को पीछे नहीं धकेलेंगे।

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the last two or three days a number of motions for adjournment have been tabled in this House on the question of Congo and Goa with a view to, as I understand it, elicit information. I was to have made a statement this morning, but when this debate was raised I thought it more convenient that I should speak at this time.

So far as Congo is concerned, the reference was mainly to the incidents that are now taking place in Katanga and the participation of our troops therein with its consequences. What

happened was, at the Elisabethville airport on 2nd December 1961, some members of Katanga gendarmerie, probably drunk, were restrained by the Indian personnel, who were responsible for law and order in that area, when they were molesting a Baluba woman. 31 gendarmerie soldiers and 15 policemen were taken into protective custody by our troops. They were later returned to the Katangese authorities.

On the following day the gendarmerie established a number of road blocks and positions and fired at random on the UN forces. UN reconnaissance helicopter was shot at from Tshombe's palace and it had two bullet holes. There were no casualties in these incidents. At that time Mr. Smith, one of the UN representatives and Mr. Urquhart were taken by the police. Much before that the UN representatives met the Katangese Foreign Minister Kimba and demanded immediate withdrawal of gendarmerie to their camps from all road blocks and asked him not to have any patrolling in the town except by unarmed police. The United Nations representatives made it clear that unless this was done the cease fire would no longer remain effective and the UN would take all necessary measures to maintain law and order. This, I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, is in conformity with the resolution passed recently in the Security Council. Kimba and Munongo both assured Mr. Smith that there would be no firing on the night of 3rd/4th December. They, however, gave no definite answer to the question of withdrawing all gendarmerie to their camps.

On 4th December the gendarmerie established more road blocks and constantly reinforced their position. Kimba was told that the deading for the withdrawal of the road block established between the airport and mand was 18:00 hours after which the UN would take action. At 18:00

hours Kimba rang up to say that he was going to see a senior military officer on the spot to remove the road block.

The road blocks were still there at 08:00 hours on 5th December. It was clear that senior army officers of the Katangese force had no control over the situation. This is one of the features of the Congo situation. The Gorkha troops and some Swedes went into action at 14:30 hours on 5th December and cleared the road blocks. The Gorkhas suffered the following casualties in this action: one officer was killed and three Gorkha officers injured. The casualties on the other side were heavy but figures are not given.

The gendarmerie withdrew to far side of the airfield and the UN consolidated their position. There was sporadic firing at Headquarters Katanga Command, during the whole of 5th December by machine guns and mortars directed by the Belgians from surrounding villas. There were however no further UN casualties. Firing on the Swedish Battalion and Gorkha road block during the night of 5th December continued. The Katangese aircraft dropped three bombs on Elisabethville airfield on 5th December. There was again heavy mortar and automatic fire on Headquarters, Katanga Command by the Belgians on 6th December from houses in the vicinity. Most of the houses in this area have LMG and MMG's mounted on them. Our guns have since silenced two houses.

It was at that time that the Indian Air Force was called in to go into action in regard to these Katangese forces and they destroyed the opposing forces by both jet and transport aircraft. The fuel dump and the tower of the airport have been damaged. One bridge was also damaged. There have been no further reports. This is the position in Congo.

I would like to say that since the withdrawal of Mr. McKeown our Brigadier Raja has greater responsibilities to carry, and perhaps this occasion should not pass without my mentioning that—this is a matter on which some reference was made the other day—the Indian forces enjoy a high reputation in the whole of Congo and they have behaved with a remarkable degree of discipline that is expected of them.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Have you any information about Major Ajit Singh?

Shri Krishna Menon: This applies not only to our combat troops but also others including our field ambulance, nursing officers and others.

With regard to Brigadier Ajit Singh, he is known to be alive. He is in Jadotville, where you may remember the Irish officer was taken prisoner by the other side one time. I believe the UN forces in this matter is acting with a degree of caution because is actually in their hands. But with the turn of events in Katanga and the superiority of UN personnel and the new arrangement of Command, it is to be hoped that they will get him released very soon. That is the position in regard to Congo.

In this connection, in connection with this UN matter, some reference was made to our position with regard to reconstruction of the United Nations. I do not know whether it was directly said or not, but it was implied that we were giving support to what is called "Troika". Of course, "Troika" is a word which is differently interpreted at different times. The position of the Government of India had been first stated by the Prime Minister two years ago in the United Nations and afterwards carried out in a very big form, that we do not support "Troik" for the reason that we do not accept the division of the world into three parts and, what is more, so far as the Secretary-General is concerned, it goes contrary to the Charter. And, if

[Shri Krishna Menon]

I may so speak here, with all modesty, no government or no delegation has made a greater contribution to the resolving of the deadlock with regard to Secretary General. It is well recognised, and today we have, without the veto and without avoiding the appointment of a Secretary-General, a solution that has satisfied everyone for the time being.

Now we come to the position in regard to Portugal. First, I will give such facts as we have in this connection. On the 17th of November, 1961, the Portuguese troops fired on an Indian passenger steamer s.s. *Sabarmati* while it was plying on her normal course between Karwar and Cochin. This resulted in injuries to the Second Engineer of the ship Mr. D'Penha. It was clear that the firing was deliberately directed at the Engineers' Mess. Indian ships have plied on this route for years and their right to do so has never been questioned. I raise this point to show that there is no question of territorial waters involved here unless there is a state of war. Before the firing was resorted to by the Portuguese troops no warning was given by the Portuguese. It was an unarmed passenger ship and was on its normal run. The firing was in broad day light. All these points add to the provocation.

A few days later, on the 24th of November, 1961, the Portuguese troops fired at the Indian fishing boat which was returning after its normal fishing trip off the Karwar coast. One of the bullets hit Mr. Kochrekar, who ultimately succumbed to his injuries. This action was again an unprovoked attack, without any justification in fact, on peaceful Indian nationals engaged in their traditional vocation which had been conducted without any interference for centuries.

16 hrs.

Apart from these incidents, reports have been pouring in from different parts for the last two weeks of in-

tensified firing activity, repression and terrorism in Goa and of heavy reinforcements of Portuguese Armed Forces in the territory of Indian now held by that colonial power. There was a report a few days ago of 2,500 troops having been deployed along the Goa border, the significance of this being that it is in the area which has been sealed. There was also a report of a fleet of two Portuguese frigates standing at guard in Anjadedv Islands. When these frigates went there, the Indian Navy sent two frigates on Sunday, or a week ago; but our frigates have taken no hostile action; they were sent there for demonstration purposes. Since then, there has been no offensive action against the fishermen as such, but there have been landings on the island. On 1st December, there was a report that Portuguese warships reached Diu with 300 soliders and that 2,000 troops from African and other places have also arrived. A few days ago, it was also reported that dawn to dusk curfew had been imposed and that anyone going out after the curfew hours would be shot at sight. There was a report that fresh reinforcements amount to 700 Portuguese troops had arrived. Another report said that in Daman over 1,000 Portuguese soldiers had landed. There have been reports of warships and other ships arriving with arms and ammunition and fresh supplies of military stores. The Portuguese Armed forces are thus poised near the border at various points in order to overawe and intimidate both the residents of Goa and those living in the border villages on the Indian side. Hit and run raids across the border already seem to have started. A raid in a village near Sawantwadi was reported two days ago. This is position that obtains now.

Having said this, there are two or three other aspects of this matter to which I must make a reference. First of all, the view of the Swatantra party was represented here that in doing this, apart from all other considerations, we were fighting on so

many diverse fronts which will weaken our resistance against other enemies, other opponents, and the authority of an ex-General of the army was quoted. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I did not consult an ex-General, but I have been advised by a serving General. But there has been no withdrawal of any effective, or any forces—by forces I mean even equipments—of any strength from any part which might be threatened from other quarters. This country cannot organise its army in such a way that there are no troop movements anywhere else. There are only two ways of doing this—either have troops all over the country, which will probably mean spending large sums of money and having millions of men, or have mobile forces which can be moved from one place to another. All these things have been taken into account in the movement of troops that has been made and only the minimum that is required is done and no more.

When all this is going on in Goa—and really, from the point of view of defence technically we are, perhaps, not concerned with other matters that have been raised; but we cannot isolate them—if as a result of these intimidations, major atrocities take place in the territory of Goa to our people and, what is more, these for instance, in Dadra and Nagar Haveli which have come to us and so on, then neither this House nor this country can remain patient without arranging for defence.

At the present moment, the position of the Government is that there is no question of our going and liberating Goa. The question is that we shall not leave our places undefended, nor allow or leave it to chances in regard to any action they may take. It must also be remembered that the Portuguese also are not without notice in this matter. In the Security Council the Portuguese attacked the Prime Minister for something he said about the use of force, if necessary. Though we have imposed upon ourselves a self-denying ordinance that we will never use force for this, that

or the other we have publicly stated that we will decide when, where and how to use force. This country has never abjured the use of force for the vindication of its rights wherever it thinks fit. So there is no question of suddenly hitting or attacking. In fact, we very much regret this giving of a colour to this job that we are marching a liberation army into Goa. That is not the position. We are the aggressed and it has been going on for the last so many years. And what has been happening for the last one year, and especially in the last few days, has been of a character that no Government with any sense of responsibility can keep quiet when its borders are being assailed. We have also reason to think that the Portuguese are not without air support; that is, as far as they propose to go.

Shri Nath Pai: You seem to completely agree with the Swatantra leader. We are surprised.

Shri Krishna Menon: Well, I could reply but it is far too serious a matter to bandy with words. They are not without air support and, therefore, our Air Force has also been alerted. And I make no secret of this fact that if the Portuguese do try to do what the Katangese have done, they will get it hot as the Katangese did. There seems to be sufficient evidence to think that apart from 1,000 or 2,000 troops all over the place, they have elaborate provision of air-fields all over the place in these territories of Diu and Daman on the one hand and Goa on the other, and they are very much strategically adverse to us unless we are extremely careful about it. There the position of the Government of India is that it has deployed its troops in the necessary positions not only on the Goa border at the moment but wherever troops are required. If we are a small country, we would not be in this position. Our general life and our means of communications are not of a highly mechanised character where movement can take place quickly. We have a single railway track system and a

[Shri Krishna Menon]

large number of people have to be moved and many operations undertaken. Therefore, these things appear in the newspapers.

I am sorry that trains have been stopped, but they have all been restored. I wish people give as much publicity to the restoration as to the stoppage; but that is not being done. Anyway, this inconvenience is very much regretted. But, on the other hand, if notice had been given beforehand, the troubles would have been even more. We have no system of censorship in this country. We have a free press, we have free radio and as large number of newspapers.

An Hon. Member: No free radio.

Shri Krishna Menon: We have a radio which circulates news with objectivity. If there is any complaint on that point, it may be referred to the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. Anyhow, we have a large number of foreign correspondents here, some of them flying between Karachi and Goa and so on. I have not seen even one foreign correspondent, when he reports about the atrocities committed by us, report about the atrocities inside Goa. They are so concerned about popularising or publicising where we have departed from virtue. That standard of virtue they do not apply to themselves; only to us. There have been no reports, as far as I know, of what has happened in Goa itself.

So, the position at the present moment is that these are precautionary measures, certainly of a sizable character. But the point is that no Government with any sense of responsibility could sit quiet under these conditions when there is this kind of movement of troops. But suppose there was a large scale action or some action by the air force or by sea. There have been news of a number of naval vessels and the mining of the land. In regard to sea, we do not know whether there is mining

or not until we get there. But when mining operations are going on in one place, there is no reason why it cannot be equally done in another place.

Shri Masani may rest assured that Government is not thinking of push over operations. First of all, it is not thinking of any operations, and push over does not square with the other party; the other party is making too much preparations. We do not expect any push over either. I think the House may feel satisfied that if, unfortunately, we are drawn into hostility....

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): The Defence Minister is not replying to our points. He has replied only to Shri Masani. He is not the only party to be replied to. What is his reply to us? We want action here and now.

Shri Krishna Menon: So far as that is concerned, I believe there is a rule against bringing arms into this House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member wants the hon. Defence Minister to take action against him.

Shri Krishna Menon: That is your privilege, Sir. He is a friend of mine.

Therefore I can only say that any Government must reserve to itself, so long as it is a Government, the use of troops. As to the question of when, how and where, that has to be decided according to the proper circumstances.

A reference was also made to action that may be taken at the NATO or the Security Council or anywhere else. That is all a part of the offensive against us. After all a number of people who are in military alliance with Portugal are there in the Security Council, but if it goes before the General Assembly, we know where we stand in this matter.

Before, I conclude, I would like to say, since this reference has been

made, that Portugal and South Africa are the only two countries who have voted against the resolution on colonialism. We should hold that the whole position of colonies has now reached juridically a different situation from what it was before. It is not a question of what we hold. We have the legal rights and so on. Secondly, in the face of overwhelming vote pressure spread over two or three years she has also refused to conform to the United Nations' Charter in regard to informing the world about her self-governing dominions. On the top of it there is all that repression that is going on elsewhere. We are not taking reprisals for it.

If African troops are going to be shipped over to Goa to fight us and to contribute to the pressure on this side, a new situation arises. I would like to inform the House about conditions that prevail. As for the shooting at the merchant ships, may I say that this bullet that entered the ship was not a rifle bullet either; it was a military bullet. In the conditions of not only continued aggression of colonialism but of attack on this country, after all, we are not to be treated and continued to be attacked in this way. If there are any violations of our territory by land, sea or air, a new situation arises. No one can say with any authority that we are invading and the army is ready to go and liberate. Liberation must be accomplished by the people within. But when the people within accomplish liberation, we cannot sit back if they are shot down, repressed and massacred. That is the reason for these movements.

Shri Tyagi: Sir, the whole discussion veers round our general policy of external affairs. The policy has been one of non-alignment. All criticism from wherever it is moves round this policy. But non-alignment is nothing but a true interpretation of the requirements of our Constitution. Our Constitution lays down that we make friends with all nations. Therefore non-alignment in this cold war

was natural for us. It was the mandate of the Constitution. Therefore that cannot be criticised.

Moreover, the policy during these last 13 or 14 years has paid us dividends. It is obvious. We have gained in prestige all over the world. We have gained in power also. The policy has not done us any harm so far. We have been helpful to many countries in South East Asia, Africa and elsewhere in the achievement of their freedom. Whenever there was any aggression and anything wrong was done to them at any level, we came forward with a message of sympathy. We stood by them. That is the way in which our policy is being expressed. I think we have had quite a lot of success in this policy. We have lost nothing. Therefore as far as the basic policy is concerned, there is little to criticise.

An hon. friend has raised the question as to why we still stick to the Commonwealth. We became a free nation and a republic. Every nation wants friends. I cannot understand the wisdom of the advice that we must give up the friends we have all round. The Commonwealth is a family of friendly nations. We were there. They accommodated us in spite of the fact that we were a free nation and a republic. We had round about us a number of friendly countries. How could we have given them up? After all, they had done us no wrong. So there is no harm in our keeping relations with the Commonwealth. On the one hand they say, "Your non-alignment policy is a policy of wilderness; where are you?; there is no friendly country with you" and on the other hand they say, "Why do you have Commonwealth friends along with you?" No country can exist without friendship, without its neighbours and other countries in a free world.

Now the question is of our opposition to war. That, I think, is universally recognised, namely, that for the maintenance of peace in the world we are the foremost nation; we are the most forward and the credit goes to

[Shri Tyagi]

our hon. Prime Minister. He has really earned credit to the whole nation. We stand today in the midst of this cold war as one single big nation which is respected universally for our honest dealings in the world and for our upright expression of policies. There is no mincing of matters. I would like my friends in the Opposition to pin us down where we have faltered in this policy. We have stuck to this policy all these days.

Shri Goray (Poona): Where is the question of pinning you down?

Shri Tyagi: That is what I say. Therefore you cannot find fault with us.

If hon. friends were to go to the South Asiatic and African countries, they will find how friendly they are towards our policy. Take for instance the Berlin question. The Berlin question was the most burning question, I must say. But then we had some hand in getting it to cool down a little. Does it not bring credit to the nation? Had not our Government succeeded in doing something? So, it is not the policy of just remaining silent or of keeping quiet. It is an active policy of non-alignment.

Now I am coming to the burning topic of the day here. My hon. friends have asked, "Why did we give up the Tibet treaty" and all that. They said that if we had not agreed to China's views and had just stuck to the old treaty terms with Tibet etc., China would not have entered Tibet. I wonder whether China wanted a passport from India to enter Tibet. Even in spite of the treaty could she not enter Tibet? To accuse the Government of India of having invited China to Tibet is something which is utterly illogical. How could we come in their way? Suppose, we had agreed and struck to the old treaty of the British days, even then we could not have stopped China from entering Tibet. After all, we had no powers there. It

was only a question of an agreement. They could break that agreement any moment. After all, they have broken the agreement with us now. They have committed aggression on India. They could break that agreement too. So with regard to Tibet to accuse the Government of India of being instrumental in sending Tibet into the fold of China is something absolutely illogical. I cannot understand that. It was immaterial whether we had agreed to their entering into Tibet or not.

But the real thing where I myself is a little bit doubtful is this and I wish the hon. Prime Minister kindly pays attention to it. We had absolute faith in the friendship of China. We were relying on that. On that basis our relationship went on quite well. But suddenly we found that they committed this aggression. I want to know whether your Embassy there has failed you. Did you not get intelligence in time about its attitude towards these territories? It is there where I just want to have a clarification from the Government. It is not the professional sort of ability that is wanted in your ambassadors. The ambassadors have to be watchful. They must have their system of receiving information and they must pass that information in time to India. My fears are that perhaps we have failed in this regard. Either they were shrewd enough not to let our ambassadors and diplomats know anything or our diplomats failed to obtain information in time and we were surprised by aggression. It is true that there was no preparation made against such a friendly nation. Nothing had been done for a long time, no doubt. It is only after the aggression which came as a painful surprise that we had to make our preparations. But we must know that in the first place today war does not mean only a struggle between one country and another. War means a great war. War also means allies. Suppose we are at war with China. We are not wedded to fight singly.

[Shri Tyagi]

did we allow them? How did they come? Why could we not stop them on the sea? Why are they being allowed to lay mines all round? That makes our action impossible. There was enough time in regard to Goa. Action could have been taken earlier without any information being given or publicised. But I am glad the Defence Minister says there is no idea of any aggression and only defensive measures are being taken. If they commit excesses, then action has to be taken. If we were to take any aggressive action, of course, the movements have to be kept strictly secret. Now since there is no aggression, I do not think there would be any harm. But anyway it is very important that all information about the frontier should be kept secret and I would appeal to the House not to insist upon getting all detailed information about what preparations are being made on the frontier.

Then, it is a fact that today Pakistan is not very friendly with us. But let us realise that it is because of the success of our policy that we have avoided a major conflict with Pakistan. It is wrong to say that every day there are violations of our border. I have been associated with borders. I am glad about the manner in which the Prime Minister has succeeded in defining the border both on the east and on the west. Quite a chunk of our land was in their possession and quite a chunk of their land was in our possession. I know once negotiations were going on and the Generals advised me not to give back that land to Pakistan because it was an important bridgehead for us or something like that. In spite of the fact that our relationship with Pakistan is not always happy, the exchange was so nicely done. Our borders stand well-defined now without any struggle. Is it not a success that we have avoided war with a neighbour, who is never friendly with us? After all, when there are two neighbours, there may be trespasses one way or the other in one or two cases and that

cannot be called aggression. Although our relationship with Pakistan has not become so friendly as we desire, there has been no struggle and no quarrel with them as far as border is concerned. There has been no fight or any type of aggression, etc. There also we have succeeded.

I think, on the whole, our policy has not been bad at all and we are moving according to the times. To insist that we must immediately start a war is something wrong. No General will start a war unless he knows what the proper time is, what the terrain is and how the preparations are. If hon. Members really take the pains to go and see how speedily roads and other preparations are being made in Ladakh, they will realise what the army is doing in a place where even breathing is difficult, because the air is too thin. It is all snow and there is no shelter. Those people who have come from there told me the other day—I was talking to a Major—that it is a sight to see how happy they are. A small little party of Gurkhas in that snow was just having a drama on the Dusehra day. So, those people are living a happy life. We must concentrate to give strength to our army and not demoralise them by saying that we have lost so much of territory. So long as the Prime Minister has made an unequivocal statement that we are bent upon vacating this aggression, so long as that policy is clarified, I do not think the Parliament should have any objection to that policy, because it cannot be vacated in a moment. The opportune time should come. We have to wait for the opportunity to do that. We are proud of our resolve; we are proud of our patriotism and we are sure that we shall get this aggression vacated.

With these words, I congratulate the External Affairs Ministry.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): If the Government of India were to be

criticised, or if it should be criticised, my hon. friends can choose other venues where there may be some little doubts and fears, but to assail the Government on their performance in regard to foreign policy and external relations is, to say the least, the weakest form of attack on the Government. Time and again it has been admitted here by hon. Members opposite that our foreign policy is the best, and it has gained the recognition of the whole world and of all parties in all parts of the country.

Today, during the course of the debate, hon. friends mentioned about the 'smokescreen of electioneering' and all that. I would like to submit that the boot is on the other leg. They want to fly kites of publicity for their electioneering campaign, starting from the floor of the House here, that we have failed in Goa or in Ladakh border, and they want to catalogue all those 'failures'. Their intention is to bring to the minds of the people that the Government's foreign policy and their performance is wrong, that the defence is not all right and all those things, so that these things may incite the people into the feeling that the Government has failed. At the same time I would like to say that any other government of a different order would certainly have made use of this occasion or this situation to tell the people that there is an emergency and thereby canvassed that due to the emergency this Government should be voted again. But we are far from doing such a thing. We have rather refrained from making use of the situation for the benefit of the party. But we cannot preach morals to the other people. They can make use of the situation and carry on any sort of propaganda. But to bring these things into the military affairs and the defence affairs is, to say the least, absolutely wrong. Because, if they are earnest and sincere about the defence of the country, they should not go about saying that the country's defences are not all right.

Now, Sir, they mentioned about past history of a decade or more, how China got suzerainty over Tibet etc. May I remind those friends that while the Lamas were discussing with India, they were sending a delegation to sign a treaty with China. Were we to tell the Lamas not to sign the treaty with the Chinese? Is it wrong that we did not tell them? Did we have any command over them?

An hon. friend said the other day that we should have a buffer state. What shall be the buffer state between Pakistan and India? What shall be the buffer state between Tibet and China? Hon. Members speak as if geography and history are things which are made to order to suit the convenience of Members of Parliament here and that States can be created or liquidated.....

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): A section of the Parliament.

Shri Thanu Pillai: I stand corrected—a section of hon. Members opposite. But even if hon. Members on this side decide like that, it will not be listened to. We are not having sovereignty or suzerainty over those territories to go about dictating to them. We are far from it. Our policy is one of non-alignment and good behaviour. It has paid dividends in the past and it is paying dividends in India.

Mention was made about our performance in Goa. It is becoming hot for Portugal to control Goa. And the Portuguese do not want to quit honourably and give credit to India for having acquired Goa peacefully. If they want to go only after a showdown and war, we are not going to oblige the Portuguese by resorting to war and invasion. As an electioneering campaign hon. Members expect that the Portuguese will make incursions during the time of election and that they can make use of the situation to say, "Look here, not only in Ladakh but

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

even in Karwar and other areas the Portuguese are invading India and we are not able to resist it".

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Don't imagine things.

An Hon. Member: It is in reply to what you said.

Shri Thanu Pillai: This sort of situation should be avoided. It is being avoided. We have the army to defend India. In the process of defence on our part, if the Portuguese want wrongly—because that is becoming apparent—to declare war on India and if in the process of that war they are defeated and Goa comes back to us, we have no objection. But we will not go about declaring war to please a few friends here.

On the Chinese front, the matter is not something new. It has been discussed over and over again. It was criticised by the opposition before that our preparations were not good. Now when our Prime Minister explained that these are difficult terrains and therefore some more preparation might be needed and we should resort to direct action as and when the proper time comes, now they say that it is a wrong statement and that we are giving information to the enemy. When the Government do not say anything, they criticise it saying that the preparations are not right; when they admit it and say that they are making preparations and are making headway, they come and say "you have given out a secret". It is completely illogical. That means that they only want to criticise for the sake of criticism.

The hon. lady Member of the Communist Party gave advice to us as to how our representative in Indo-China should behave. She was very careful to say so many things, about the possibility of American arms or army

coming there, but she completely avoided any reference to the other side. The Prime Minister was pleased to explain the situation in Viet-Nam, that there are divisions on both sides, that there are supplies of arms, if not armed personnel. Hon. Members opposite talk about Goa and about difficulties elsewhere, and about America, but conveniently leave out the other side. I was watching whether the hon. lady Member would say something about the Chinese incursions into Ladakh. She conveniently and completely avoided going into that area at all, but thought it fit to advise us as to what should be done elsewhere, how the policy should be shaped and so on.

Coming to our troops in Congo, it is a long time since the Parliament took note of the fact that the British Government, in spite of their being a party to the resolution that was passed and supporting the UN action there, and some of the western countries which have endorsed it are not behaving all right. Still the reports are that they are not changing their way of behaviour. It is time that the Government of India told the United Nations that either those members should be made honest and called upon to implement the resolution, or we will have to revise our opinion and our stand towards our sending in future armed personnel. Because there is no purpose in our side alone trying to implement the resolution and being honest and other members of the United Nations not carrying out their obligations.

Nearer home we have got Nepal and other South-East Asian countries. Hon. Members mentioned here that China is trying to isolate all these countries. True. Why are they trying to make incursions into India and not doing the same thing with respect to these small countries? Perhaps they think that once India is settled, then these 'small frv's can be swallowed in no time. That may be their intention. But these small countries also are not unintelligent enough not to know this.

But do we expect that they should be going about quarrelling with the others and declare war, saying "Because you have not entered into an agreement with India, therefore we will not also enter into an agreement with you"? Certainly not. What is best in the circumstances, they are also agreeing to.

I would submit, about Government of India's policy towards these small nations, particularly in Nepal, our interest is great. We have got a responsibility of joint defence. That country going about entering into agreements and jeopardising the defence arrangements of our country by allowing the Nepal-Tibet road and all that should not be simply objected to by a sort of protest, but a more serious note should be taken and we should have discussion with them. I hope the Government will take a serious note of it. Because, whatever might be the view and wish of that country, this is a new menace which will flow from Nepal to India, about which our people are rightly agitated in our minds that due caution should be taken even here and now.

As regards the other South East Asian countries, for good neighbourliness, they want a price from us—whether Pakistan or Ceylon or other countries. Because we are not in good terms with a big country like China, are we to surrender everything, every respect, to smaller nations who are our neighbours, to earn a good neighbourly name? As regards the situation that is developing in Pakistan, though there has been a settlement over the border disputes, their utterances are not very good. Hon. Members of the Swatantra party, inside and out, have been saying that we must enter into a defence pact with Pakistan. Nothing can be a greater wrong than this sort of a thing. Their price for a compromise is the whole of Kashmir.

The price that is asked by little countries like Ceylon is our honour and prestige. Recently, they have been

passing legislations about our state-less people and making observations about illicit immigration as if we are a nation of illicit immigrants going into small little countries. It is as a consequence of 100 years or 200 years of Indian labour continuing to work there and Indian traders going there that these people—a million of them—have become stateless. Perhaps some of them, not having the normal avenues of passport to come and go, might have resorted both ways to illicit travel. They are taking the opportunity of some few people going like that to say that lakhs and lakhs of people are becoming illicit immigrants. Their sinister motive is, as most of the state-less people might have lost their ration cards or may not have proof enough, to name all these labourers as illicit immigrants and throw them on India. It is a small country, I know. We have been very kind, very considerate towards them. But, there is no reciprocation. We understand that the Government of Ceylon is trying to negotiate with the Government of India. Their past performances are, they bring a team of their political party leaders and say that though the Government would agree, that political party may not agree. By these disputes between India and Ceylon, a million people of Indian origin, who are state-less, are being affected. I beg of the Government to give an opportunity to the representatives of the state-less people to be present in such negotiations. We are not going to be a party to the negotiation as a directly affected party. We are only to be a good friend and try to solve the problem of two sets of Ceylonese, because, the state-less people are no more Indian, but are part and parcel of Ceylon. I would request the hon. Prime Minister to use his good offices and see that the teasing and insulting of our people is stopped. Though they are no more Indians, they are called Indians and whatever insult is done to them is an insult to us. We should take it like that. In the South, there is a feeling that it has not been adequately looked into.

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

With these few words, I commend the foreign policy, subject to these few observations which I have made.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I would request hon. Members to confine their remarks to ten minutes each, so that I might be able to call two or three more hon. Members.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister on his success in his foreign policy.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The hon. Member's ticket has not yet been decided.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: I suppose an hon. Member of Parliament should possess better sense than my hon. friend does.

India is a great country, and India has a great history, but the world is greater than India. India has a great history, but the world has a greater history. So far as the recording of history is concerned, over nearly two thousand years it is almost a mathematical exactitude to say that whenever there was a rigid bipolarity between two great powers, and a new deadly weapon was created, war was inevitable. It was a great spectacle that after the Second World War, when the United Nations was formed by Russia and the United States of America; France and Great Britain were taken in as they were allies, and China was taken in as a matter of prestige only. It meant that the whole world was to be divided between Russia and USA, and all decisions concerning the fate of humanity were to be made either in Moscow or in Washington. It was given to our great Prime Minister, if it can be given to an individual, in the modern age, to devise a means by which this bipolar world may be substituted by what is called the world of Great Powers, so that there could be a diffusion of the power. Now, on the scene is our great country, Germany, Italy, China and Japan. Five great people have come in. Today, there are no less than 12

great nations which can make an atom-bomb and can be a rival to any great Power in the arena of war.

So, the evolution of the non-alignment policy and the creation of a third bloc between the two bipolar powers is of great significance so far as the peace in the world is concerned. If after 1945, a mother could sleep with the hope that tomorrow she will be able to kiss the child on her breast, it is much more due to this great Prime Minister than to any other individual. So, all credit to him. I pay my humble tribute to his courage, intelligence and wisdom.

Still, the position is that Russia and China are two great communist countries. All the world over, where democracies rule, the sentiment, the will and the aspiration of the man in the street counts, but where dictatorship rules, the sentiment, the will, the power and the desire of the individual of the dictator alone counts. It is a fact that Russia today rules over less of the territories than she used to rule in 1900 or so. That is to say, many countries have gone out of the sway of Russia. So, Russia had had the greatest era of her dominance in history. Russia, despite her great production capacity, and despite the most modern weapons of destruction has not come to the greatest pinnacle of glory which she had enjoyed in the course of its great historical epochs. When power is given to the individual, he has certainly to display the will to power. Herein lies a danger.

There is again the danger in China with nearly 650 million people, who are a great source of power, of course, though China does not have much of modern development. Yet, she is under the heels or under the command of one man and that one man says that if a world war comes, 300 million Chinese may die, but the 350 million will still remain and they will rule the world. Though this is easily said, the implications of it cannot be realis-

ed so easily. 300 millions are not going to die at the command of one man. It is a stupidity to think so and much more of a stupidity to talk about.

The position today is that peace in the world depends on the creation of a United Germany armed of course, but neutral in its intentions. It is abnormal, inhuman and unnatural to keep Germany divided, and occupied by the victors in the last war. So the success of statesmanship and peace in the world depend on how soon Germany can be united and how she can be made into a neutral Power, free to arm itself but not joining the Russian bloc or the American bloc. Herein lies the key to peace in the world. Herein lies the key to what is called the maturity of man all over the world which means 3000 calories of food for every man in the street, enough cloth, a good house to live in and better life to live. The dream of the child is to realise the fullest stature of his manhood. The fullest development of the capacity of his being lies in the creation of a United Germany, independent and armed, but neutral, not joining either bloc.

So far as India-China relations are concerned, I beg to differ from my hon. friends who in their enthusiasm have generated unnecessary heat. Disputes arise between two countries. In law, when the honour and integrity of a country is attacked, there is no course open to it but to take up arms and fight, though it may be shattered to pieces in the process. But such a dispute has not arisen between India and China. Why? Such a dispute arises when the aggressor country says, 'I am at your chest today and I mean to be there'. Here China says that that part of the country, that part of the earth, she is occupying belongs to her by history and by law. It may be wrong. We claim it is ours. The dispute is with regard to the legal jurisdiction, with regard to legal right, with regard to historical precedent. It is not rank aggression as such where we should at once take up

arms and go to war. It is patience that is necessary, it is wisdom that is necessary, it is statesmanship that is necessary.

Every dispute should be solved by negotiation, arbitration or adjudication and in the last resort, by recourse to arms—war. In the modern world, no administrator or ruler will take up arms and go to war unless the forces behind him and the people behind him force him to go to war, unless the people say, 'You rascals, get out of the Government or go to war'. Such a situation does not exist in India. Have prices in the market gone up? Is there not easiness in life outside? I find no uneasiness. The plough is working in the field as it used to do. The market places are working as they used to ten years ago. Where is the uneasiness? It is in the minds of people like Shri M. R. Masani and some others. They do not represent the man in the street.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has taken 10 minutes.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Sir, I shall conclude soon.

My submission is that there are many disputes between two great countries which take a long time for solution. There are other disputes which are not solved easily or are not solved for long. This dispute between China and India we should try to solve to the last possibility by negotiation because it is a dispute between two great countries which may have its repercussion not for us alone but for generations to come.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, unfortunately the criticism of our foreign policy is directed from a wrong perspective, because the critics of the policy have not fully grasped the significance of the role India is playing since freedom. They need to be re-educated; and for their benefit, I would recommend to them a new book written by a Cambridge Professor, E. H. Carr, who has point-

[Shri Khadilkar]

ed out the dynamics of present day history and what view of history we take of the present world. On that basis alone we can direct our policy in a proper direction.

According to this author, broadening horizons at the present juncture give us a new world perspective and he calls it a universal perspective of history. If I may make a submission, our policy is, as directed by our Prime Minister, based on that view. Unless you grasp it firmly, it is extremely difficult to fully appreciate the achievements in the international field.

For instance, nobody emphasised that his visits to Moscow and Washington were meant to bring about a certain lessening of tension, to build a sort of bridge of understanding between the two power centres of the world. Because of that, today, we can say that the tension that was rising was brought down considerably, regarding Berlin, regarding the German problem and, to some extent, the administrative set-up for UNO also. The so-called disarmament problem which seems to be quite insoluble has at least come within the pale of mutual discussion and debate.

Therefore, as one author has put it, those who want to appeal to irrationalism, to impulse and emotion, they hit below the intellect. And in this House the critics of the foreign policy hit the policy from this angle.

Take, for instance, our dispute with China. Our Government has put it in the proper perspective and the proper focus. But they want to take it out of it and magnify it because of ideological considerations. We have just heard the spokesman of the Swatantra Party. When the question of the liberation of Goa came he got up and gave a cautious warning. He said priorities should be determined. But those priorities, according to him, are not based on national interests but on ideological interests. He wants to

magnify our conflict with China as against the imminent danger we are facing, a challenge from a little pocket of Portugal in our land. We have got to take some firm action today or tomorrow. Therefore, he committed a mistake. I admire his courage. He has brought in the elections. The Swatantra Party is going to the elections. I would say this. Who in this country with a little sense of patriotism would vote for the Swatantra Party when men like Shri Masani on the floor of this House say: be cautious; ignore it; there are several dangers—as they say in the Mahabharatha and advise them to be very cautious. In his heart of hearts he wanted this party to be defeated and that is because of that he has given this advice.

17 hrs.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):
Shalya Nithi.

Shri Khadilkar: What would the people of Bombay feel where they are fighting—the trioka are fighting the elections and opposing the Congress candidate in the elections. I do not stretch that point too far. As he referred to the election, I would say this much that his attitude towards Portugal, towards the Chinese and in fact towards the whole world perspective is determined by ideological considerations. What he said is nothing new. The British Conservative journal has given the same warning and for the benefit of the House I will just refer to one sentence. I mean the *Daily Telegraph*.

"It is infinitely more preferable to tolerate the pressure of the Portuguese than to face the incalculable consequences of trying to drive them out by force."

Now, he paraphrases the *Daily Telegraph*. We have tolerated the Portuguese possessions for so long. At the time of satyagraha I was on the border. I know that at that time we would have taken action but there

was a self-denying ordinance. If now they are threatening us and mobilising the forces and there is so much of Portuguese persecution and brutalities and what not in regard to our own kith and kin, are we to sit quiet here and be guided by such counsels, that are given by the ex-commander-in-chiefs and are people like Gen. Cariappa to be quoted as authorities on the floor of this House? I feel ashamed if any persons of this House were to say that regarding the Goan liberation at the present moment. Of course it is a political decision. How to execute it, when to take it up, it is for the Government to decide. This House must unanimously support the political decision that the Government is about to take or has taken regarding the liberation of Goa.

Now, let us look at Congo. We are very proud and we ought to be proud if we understand what role we have played in the Congo. But for our insistence and active participation in the Congo's affairs, I am afraid the UN would have suffered its worst defeat; and the only hope of the world organisation that has emerged after the last world war were the statesmen from different countries who met and talked and tried to evolve some sort of a peaceful solution—otherwise that platform would have been completely dismantled for the future. It is therefore good that we participated there and risked every thing. Our soldiers are fighting there. There violence and non-violence—the self denying ordinance does not apply because it is a moral issue. We stand by the UN and we want to strengthen it. That is our resolve and therefore our soldiers are fighting bravely and laying down their lives. That is the aspect of our foreign policy which deserves commendation from all quarters. But, as it is said, they look to the tree instead of the wood. They isolate the Chinese problem and try to look at the world situation and the role we have played everything harping on one thing. They do not realise what moral influence and what influence in the field

of diplomacy all over the world our Prime Minister exercises at this moment, when the other statesmen are guided because of their ideological and power bloc divisions in different directions? I say that this role of building the bridge of understanding between the conflicting blocs is a big historic achievement to our credit.

Let us come to the question of Belgrade. Somebody said that we have failed there, almost failed. But we must understand what happened at Belgrade. Two points of view were present: the African nations, newly liberated, looked at the problem from their immediate interests. Still, they are in that level of development. I do not want to blame them. They have not had that perspective, where the issues of war and peace are more important; though one realised that the issue of colonial liberation and the issue of war and peace are in some way interlinked. One cannot say 'No'. But because our Prime Minister gave more prominence to the question of war and peace and on this basis carried on a mission to Moscow and later on to Washington, they sometimes felt that their immediate problems were by-passed or were not given that much prominence which they desired they should get. But if we understand the significance of the Belgrade conference, and the later developments that have taken place, I would humbly submit that but for India, but for our Prime Minister, and our spokesmen there at Belgrade the whole picture of Belgrade would have been totally different, and the so-called non-aligned powers—they are non-aligned to a degree, in a different sense and at different levels—would have lost and would have perhaps given a wrong decision and would have lost their moral prestige, whatever little influence they exercise now in the international councils.

Therefore, that is another big achievement to our credit. Now, as you have said that I would get only

[Shri Khadilkar]

ten minutes, I shall proceed to the next point.

Mr. Speaker: The ten minutes have been exceeded.

Shri Khadilkar: I will finish in a couple of minutes. Take next the question of Algeria. This was referred to. I do not see, when France is carrying on negotiations with Algeria for a *de facto* recognition, with their spokesmen, though secretly, what the point is, in saying that we are giving them just *de facto* recognition. Why not here and now give them a recognition, so that they would be more strengthened while negotiations are going on and they would achieve their objective? That would satisfy also the African and the Arab world's sentiments, as I understand. Therefore, I would plead for the immediate recognition to be accorded to them.

I would also like to plead another thing. Where is the harm if we recognise East Germany? Let us understand it clearly against the background of the last war. We are not following the dynamics of history. We are living in the postwar period, and therefore, we must realise this point. The German territory has been divided into two, and two social systems have come to stay more or less permanently. East Germany is under a different social system, and there is no possibility of unity between the two parts in the near future. Therefore, would it not be better, would it not be strengthening the forces for a peaceful settlement if we give a proper recognition to East Germany and showing to the western statesmen, "Here you are; now, by recognising East Germany and giving them *de facto* recognition, the problem of Berlin could be easily solved". You can get more guarantee; it can be really a sort of independent free city—Berlin—with access to the west unhampered. That solution is easily possible. Therefore, I would plead for the recognition of East Germany; what are the diplomatic difficulties or

other political considerations in this respect? I do not understand.

With one more point, I shall conclude. The topic of our relations with China was brought up. There is a latest communication for the renewal of treaty. I for one would say this. We are following a particular policy, and so delimit the area of conflict as far as possible, because, from the latest letter, it is obvious that they are sticking to a position, as they pleaded at the time when our representatives were there. The dispute is regarding Ladakh only. They took unilateral armed action. That was their mistake. It is condemnable, no doubt. But after saying all this, is it not better, as I said in the beginning, when the centre of world gravity has shifted from the western or English-speaking world to the east, to Asia and Africa, to build a permanent understanding with our neighbour? On this basis alone we can preserve world peace and all our efforts would be consistent with that policy.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Sir, you were kind enough to call me the other day to speak on the China debate, and I would not have participated today at all, but after hearing my hon. friend Shri Masani I thought I should say a few words.

This is indeed a very grave hour. We cannot lighten the burden that is on ourselves. This is perhaps the gravest period of our history after we have attained independence. As I mentioned the other day, we have a three-pronged drive from every side, from China, from Pakistan and from the Goa end. Taking the Goa end, it is perhaps the tiniest wedge. On the other hand, we have got China which presents very great difficulties. It is wrong on the part of my hon. friend Shri Masani to say that we were trying to exploit the coming elections. How he has minimised the gravity of the situation is a thing I really cannot understand.

He talked of President Kennedy. He talked of our anticipating the Security Council's decision. Did President Kennedy anticipate any decision in the Security Council when the American forces, when the American armed forces or the popular forces, whether the visible forces or the legitimate forces or the armed forces of America, entered Cuba the other day. We are in a much graver situation. Goa is right in our midst. Cuba is their neighbour. We have nothing to do with their motives or their actions. It is their business. But when America thinks it is in her own interest to enter Cuba in some way or the other and that Cuba is of paramount importance to the security of America is it not proper on our part to say that Goa is ours and that we have got a very, very serious duty on ourselves? Shri Masani's eyes are turned on the elections, but the leaders of the Swatantra Party are wandering aimlessly round the country to get seats in the next elections. Here is a party that is trying to be second in line with the party of the Government of India, but it cannot claim seats for its own *thrimurtis*—I say this with great respect because they are great leaders who have rendered great service to the country in the past—one was the first Indian Governor-General, the other is an ex-Governor and the third, I mean Shri Masani, himself was our first Ambassador in a Latin American country. I do not want to reduce to mockery anything about their position. But today we are faced with a very serious situation. We have to think very seriously. We cannot take any false step.

You have read the reports in the papers today that the Portuguese authorities intend to hold an exposition of St. Francis Xavier's body in Goa. They never yielded in regard to the exposition even when the popular demand of the Catholics was on. Suddenly they want to hold the exposition of the body of St. Francis Xavier so that St. Xavier would cry out from heaven and save them from

the danger of invasion from India. Well, there is a saying that those whom the gods want to destroy for their wickedness, they first drive mad, and here is an absolutely foolish, foolhardy act in which the Portuguese are indulging. They have committed all kinds of inhuman atrocities in Angola. Do you think they will do anything less in Goa? They will commandeer temples and churches and utilise them as instruments of war. People are already muzzled. You know how our own Members of Parliament from the other side—I respect them even though they belong to another party—went and courted imprisonment in Goa, how they suffered there. If I am not mistaken, even the late Mr. Dulles with all his great of policy of massive retaliation and containment said in dismay "I can't manage the Portuguese". He ultimately, I suppose, perhaps moved the Portuguese authorities to see that our own Members of Parliament were released from Goan jails. I do not know, I heard some words of whisper, which may or may not be true, that even Mr. Dulles had thought that the Portuguese did not possess sufficient forethought and even he threw up his hands in despair.

As I mentioned on the last occasion, when we have heroines of the type of Sahodara Bai, untutored in the university arts, not accustomed to using cosmetics or paints on her body, who fought for our freedom without caring even for her life in such a way that the hon. Prime Minister had to make two declarations on the floor about the wounds sustained by her, when we have such heroines in the Indian freedom movement, we need not despair about China or Goa. Goa is a very small pimple on the body of India.

Can the Government of India disclose its plans about defence when our fishermen are being shot? My constituency is on the border of Goa. People are very much alarmed and everybody wants action to be taken there. As I mentioned on the last

[Shri Joachim Alva]

occasion, if we speak to the jawan of the Indian army, or a sailor or air force man he will say off the record "take action". If you ask a businessman in Bombay, any top businessman, he will say "take action". I met a Bombay businessman casually and when I asked him about his opinion, I was shocked to hear him saying that we should take action, though I do not know how many millions he has. That is the kind of public opinion which we have. Shri Masani, who is the champion of free enterprise, says that his party does not want the Government to take any action in regard to Goa. I am prepared to give him the name of the gentleman with whom I talked, he can go and ask him, because he is one of the pillars of the Forum of Free Enterprise. If that is the kind of public opinion we have in this country, that Goa should be taken, should Government stand with folded hands and do nothing? Or, should it announce by the beat of drums "we are going to enter Goa"?

As I mentioned on the last occasion, the Bengal tiger springs into action without any notice. And when the Bengal tiger springs into action, it does take hold of the victim remorselessly. Now we have been too long non-violent tigers. My hon. friend, Shri Masani, is not in very happy company with the right wing of the British politics. The *Daily Telegraph* talks of the "great consequences" which Shri Masani has quoted. Mr. Winston Churchill also talked of the great consequences if India went independent! The British are afraid of the skeletons in their cupboard. They have had Hongkong, Malta, Cyprus which has recently just got independence and, last but not least, Gibraltar and many possessions in the African continent and so Britain is afraid of the skeletons in her own cupboard. Should we not take care to destroy the relics of imperialism which lie in our country? It is time that we take time by the forelock. The people of Goa, whether Hindus or Catholics with whom the Portuguese claim kin-

ship, they have been impatient. Even though they have not gone through the fire of suffering through non-violence as we have gone through, it is time that we went to their rescue and it is time we did something, and the sooner we do it, the better. What the Government of India does, I do not know; nobody knows; but the sooner it is done, it is better for all concerned.

If we take some action, suppose some bombs are thrown over Bombay. Then what will happen to the industrial might of Bombay? I am only talking very plainly. Because, these great cities are exposed to external danger. Our great cities are the life-blood of our nation; our great cities have to feed our Five Year Plans. Without these great cities nothing can be done.

Shri Masani or Shri Nath Pai talked about the Suez. Well, President Nasser kept quiet until the bombs fell on the Suez and threatened Cairo. I am happy to note that new towns have sprung up there, and that is one of the biggest things in the history of Asia. President Nasser was threatened with the war of invasion by France, by Israel and by England, and believe me when I say so, because I have seen the bombing centres of Budapest, the Soviet Union was frightened and panic-stricken, because there was a three-cornered fight, a three-cornered invasion of Egypt as they thought that their frontier was in danger. Hungary was her frontier post and she felt that the life-line of the Soviet defence was in danger. So, it hit hard because it wanted to save its own life-line. Let us look at it from that point of view. You must see it from a broad point of view.

My hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, has been a very impressive speaker. We are very much interested in his speeches. He is one of our finest young men. He has spent a lot of his time abroad championing the cause of Goa. But he was rather unfair to the Prime Minister when he said on the

last occasion that the hon. Prime Minister had to ask all the VIPs who come here. "Will you give us bakh-sish about Goa?" Today he asked whether the hon. Prime Minister had spoken to Mr. Khrushchev or not about Goa. Our honourably accredited Prime Minister does not go and ask for all these things every time. If they say, "Well and good", well and good. We cannot say that when VIPs come. We had the case of the hon. Prime Minister of Canada. When he came here he said, "Goa is not within the NATO". By the time he went back, he was pulled up and he ate up his words. I am sorry to use that phrase. So, we are in this position.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Joachim Alva: I will end up by saying one or two words.

Time has also come for an accord with Pakistan in the interest of our own security and well-being. We cannot go on spending these enormous sums of money in Kashmir. So, the time has come for an accord with Pakistan. It may not take place right now. We are busy with our own internal affairs. Internally we have got many troubles. There are many uncalled for agitations. But when the new Parliament will be elected, when new majority will be acquired by any party, whether your party or our party but a national party whichever party it may be, it will be the bounden duty of that party with that majority to seek an accord with our neighbour. We are friends and neighbours. We are of the same flesh and blood. We belong to the same land though it may be divided into two. We have to close up our ranks. The danger to our border from outside is real and grave. We cannot tinker with it.

The Chinese letter saying that the McMahon Line will be crossed which was read out by the hon. Prime Minister, is a red danger signal. It is

time that we took time by the forelock.

One of the illustrious leaders of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha, Pandit Kunzru, said yesterday in the other House that the nation was behind the hon. Prime Minister in regard to his policy and that we should stand as one. On that, let there be no division and no misunderstanding. Some of my hon. friends of the Communist Party are great patriots. They spent their time with us inside the jail. Perhaps today they are talking of a different policy. But even they, if they talk of a policy which is against the interests of our motherland, they will remain Stateless in the inner councils of Moscow. I say this in all humility and not with any patronising spirit. But the country is everyone's country on which we stand firmly. If we lose our balance, we are lost.

The last point is.....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow.

Shri Joachim Alva: Only one minute more, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No, if Shri Bharucha will finish by 5.30, I will allow him.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandedh): I shall be very brief. I desired to speak on several points, but in view of the very limited time I shall confine my remarks to one or two matters.

When the debate on China was proceeding in this House, I made certain observations that this House was being kept in the dark in respect of certain aggression which had taken place. In this connection I desire to bring to the notice of the House one or two things. It will be recalled that aggression in respect of certain posts took place as far back as autumn 1960. This fact has been disclosed, if I recollect rightly, in the note dated the 31st October, 1961 when it has been admitted that so far as the Daulatabeg Oldi post was con-

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

cerned, Chinese incursion took place as far back as autumn 1960. That fact was not disclosed to the House till November, 1961.

Again, another incursion had taken place in the region of Suriah as far back as April, 1960 and that fact was not disclosed to the House. Probably, after the Aksaj Chin road was constructed the construction of another road took place. We do not know when. But that fact again was held back from the House. Now I should like to ask the hon. Prime Minister that when comparatively petty aggressions took place, of 20, 80 and 200 yards into Sikkim, and that fact was brought to the notice of this House, why these major acts of aggression were withheld from the House.

The other day I made a complaint that we are not getting maps, as a result of which, if there is any confusion in the minds of the opposition, the opposition cannot be responsible. Today I was shocked to see a news item in the papers that even the Press was not permitted to have a look at the map which was exhibited in the Central Hall. I cannot understand what is there so very extraordinary or sacrosanct about a map, which it should be the duty of the Government to bring to the notice of everybody. This type of action on the part of Government creates doubts not only in the minds of.....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Those maps are in the possession of the Library of the Parliament Secretariat—the Lok Sabha Secretariat. Government has parted with them. I do not know what has happened.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I shall accept that. Whosoever is responsible surely at least the Government should have taken the precaution to have these maps made available to Members and the Press.

Coming to the question of Goa, one thing which has emerged from today's debate is the disillusionment about

Goa. When the trains were cancelled and everybody thought that the time had come, because there was more than sufficient provocation to justify not only police action, but military action in Goa, today we are told point-blank that the Government feel that sufficient provocation is still not there. They are waiting for still further provocation.

I ask, judged by canons of international law, when Indian nationals are murdered in our own home matters, is it not sufficient provocation for the Government to take action? Are we still going to parade behind the cloak of *ahimsa* and non-violence? It is true that the Prime Minister has built up a reputation as an apostle of peace; we all respect it. I for one feel that in the Belgrade conference, he has done extremely well; may be at the risk of losing something of the content of non-alignment. There what he has done is that he has thrown to the forefront and highlighted whether there was going to be peace or war in this world. But how long are we going to be frightened by this unfounded apprehension of conflagration of the war? Is it not a fact that our nationals have been killed? Is it not a fact that a peaceful passenger ship has been fired upon? Now, if these are not violations of our sovereign rights, I ask, what can be violations of our rights?

All I can say is that the nation is deeply disappointed. There was a big show of cancelling the trains, as if the next day the Government was going to march the troops into Goa. They have not done it and they are not going to do it, I do not know for how long, because Portugal is not so foolish as to give a major spectacular provocation to the Prime Minister to justify the marching. I do not desire to take more time than you have permitted me. I think these are the two points which require more than careful consideration at the hands of the Government. I would only hope and pray that in future, whenever aggressions take place, at least let this

House have immediate notice and let there be no attempts to belittle the aggressive action on the part of China, so far as the Prime Minister is concerned.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I begin with immediately dealing with the last sentence of Shri Bharucha's speech? Shri Nath Pai also referred to this matter about facts not being stated or kept back and the House not being informed. They referred to the letter dated 31st October, which we sent to the Embassy of China here. In this letter, at page 53 of the White Paper, a number of instances are given. It says:

"Instances of recent Chinese intrusions into Indian territory are cited below:"

Every one of these is what is called a patrol coming over the border. There is a vast difference between patrols coming over—it is highly objectionable, but I do confess I quite fail to understand the force of this argument that every time a patrol comes over, we should rush to Parliament and tell that 10 Chinese soldiers have been found coming over the mountain border 80 yards or 100 yards.

Shri Nath Pai: In one case, it was 22 miles inside the 1956 line and in another 8 miles. I will find out the places; I can prove it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not understand what the hon. Member refers to. But I am talking of the reference made to our letter of 31st October.

It talks about Suriah and says:

"In April 1960 Chinese military personnel posted at Khurnak Fort patrolled the Suriah area inside Indian territory.

A Chinese survey party visited Suriah on June 25, 1960 and returned towards Khurnak Fort the same day.

On October 13, 1960 two mounted Chinese soldiers were seen about 1½ miles east of Hot Springs.

Four Chinese soldiers were seen about five miles from Hot Springs in the second week of October, 1960.

Sometime in May 1961, the Chinese intruded into Indian territory near Chushul.

A Chinese patrol intruded into Indian territory near Dauletbeg Oldi sometime in the autumn of 1960."

All these are patrols.

Shri Nath Pai: Twenty miles and eight miles inside of the 1956 border.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am trying to find out. Which one is twenty miles, would the hon. Member mind telling me?

Shri Nath Pai: Suriah is twenty miles to the west of the 1956 border.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is Suriah area. It is not at that point. I am sorry—but sometimes this kind of petty things are constantly happening, whether it is on the Pakistan border or on the Chinese border. I have got a long list of complaints from the Chinese about our patrols going, according to them, across their border.

What I mean to submit is that there is a certain relative importance of an event which should be put before Parliament. It sometimes so happens—I do not know if the House considers it wrong—that if a thing like this happens, my Ministry writes to the other Government without my knowing about it even. Of course, later on I know about it, but not then. Because, in an area of this type where patrolling is taking place, and hostile patrolling too, it is a frequent occurrence, whether it is on their idea or on our side or on the Pakistan side, whatever it is.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

It is not important enough for me merely to say that two or five or ten Chinese soldiers have been found patrolling there—it is important from our point of view, because that indicates the preparation for future activity; that is a different matter; therefore it is important and we object to it and we try to stop it—but for me to inform the House every time a patrol is seen seems to me rather fantastic.

Now, it seems to me that this debate has been largely confined to the issues of Goa and China. I will not refer to the China matter, because we have discussed it at some length the other day—not because I consider it less important. I have said repeatedly that from the point of view of India—I would go further and say, from the point of view of Asia—there is no matter, except one, which is of greater and more profound significance than the trouble that we are having with China and their aggression on our border. It is of the most profound importance to us. I have repeated that. People seem to think that we attach little importance to it because we do not go about waving flags and taking out processions on this subject. I have mentioned it and I repeat it: it is of far more importance, whether you have one Goa or a hundred Goas—let me put it as strongly as I can—this is a far more important subject, except one subject. And that one is just a conflagration which will put an end to the world. Short of that, it is the most important thing that we have to deal with in the political field. Because, it is so important and of vital importance not only today, tomorrow or the day after, but it is going to govern the future of Asia and of India, I do not know for how long—maybe decades, may be generations, I do not know. That depends on world developments, not only on us. So let us be clear about one thing. This is of the highest importance and it should be dealt with as a thing of the highest importance. Although I attach a great deal of importance, obviously, to their

committing aggression in our territory,—we resent it; we should resent it and all that—it is even more important than that. It is a conflict of two of the greatest countries of Asia. We have to see it in the proper perspective, geographical perspective, historical perspective and try to understand it. Something very big has happened, which is not going to be set aside merely by our getting angry even though anger may be justified. We have to plan for the future in perspective as to how to deal with a situation like this which is of the most vital importance to us, to the future of Asia and of the world. We have to prepare for it.

Shri M. R. Masani talks about priorities. There are priorities. But, there are no priorities between, let us say, a mouse and an elephant. There is no question of priorities between Goa and that place. The priority is always of the border in our consideration, in our minds, in the importance we attach to it. But, there is no question of priorities as if instead of dealing with Goa now, we should deal with the border. I am sorry, the hon. Member's thinking is so extraordinary that it is difficult for me to grasp it. Of course, that is a matter not relating to this, in almost everything he thinks about, he seems to be perverted, and that is a basic thing. I think Shri Khadilkar, in a sense brought that point out.

We can isolate any problem and examine it. We ask, let us say, our Military headquarters to tell us their view of a certain problem, whether it is Goa or whether it is the Chinese on the border. They give their view. But, even then, if they are wise, having given their view of a particular thing, they give a larger view-point in relation to other matters: what will be the effect on other matters. So, we see a larger view point. The larger view point ultimately embraces sometimes, if it is big enough, the world. There is a world military situation, a world political situation. All

these have to be done even by our military people and certainly by the civil people in charge of the military. In judging this, therefore, our general conception, our world view, the perspective in which we look at it, as Shri Khadilkar said, governs our thinking. I am prepared to accept that.

My thinking about this problem is of various kinds. One is my immediate angry reaction towards what China may do on our border: I am angry about it for a variety of reasons. Then, I consider it from another point of view, the Asian point of view. The first reaction remains. But, another reaction comes in. I consider it from the world point of view and other things. I hope I am not wrong, but I suspect that Shri M. R. Masani basically objects to our policy of non-involvement.

Shri M. R. Masani: I never said a word about it. That suspicion does not arise.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know you did not. If you had said it, I would not have said, I suspect. If that is not so, I shall be very happy. That governs his and my consideration of any problem before us.

As I was sitting here, I saw some press telegrams which have come today. We know—this is about our communist friends and others—they dispose of a problem or dispose of a country by calling it imperialist. We have been called imperialists as individuals, and worse still, stooges of imperialists. We have been called that even by the leaders of China about ten years ago. And that is sufficient answer. You throw that and everything is answered. Some other people dispose of a problem by saying, communist, and everything is disposed of—this is communist. What made me think so was this. I was just reading one press telegram. Mr. Moise Tshombe who was in Paris till today was very angry at what the United States Government has done in regard

to Katanga; they have supported the Congolese Government and they have given them planes, Globemaster aircraft and others. So, because he was angry with them, he immediately said this; and I am reading from the press telegram:

The Katanga President, Mr. Moise Tshombe charged in a television interview here today..”

that was in Brussels—

“...that there must be communists in the American State Department.”

—of all places, the American State Department.

It shows a certain, shall I say, idea seizing hold of your mind, colouring vision and your thinking in everything. You cannot think straight. That is the main difficulty, and that was what made me suspect that Shri M. R. Masani's mind is also coloured in such a way. It was coloured in every way. It was really so extraordinary, his balancing Goa and China. There is no question of balancing. Whether we go to Goa or not, it does not affect our frontier policy; it does not weaken our frontier policy; it does not delay our frontier policy; it has nothing to do with it. It is an independent thing, which can be thought of independently. Of course, if it had been a big affair, it might have affected, but as it is, it has not.

So far as Goa is concerned, it is so relatively small that we can isolate it from other problems and deal with it as we choose. But there is this basic thing. And what are we to do?

Shri M. R. Masani quoted what perhaps almost might be to him scripture, an article in the *Hindustan Times*.

Shri M. R. Masani: I quoted also Gen. Cariappa, your own former Army Commander-in-Chief.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Rather, he quoted two scriptures; one is a states

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

ment by Gen. Cariappa, and the other an article in the *Hindustan Times*, stating, if I remember rightly, something about the elections having induced us to take some steps in regard to Goa. I am sorry that even the *Hindustan Times* could have stopped so low as to say that the Government, and I especially, should go about manufacturing a position in Goa, because there are elections. I really was astounded and amazed that such a thing should come into anybody's head. It would be, I say, little short of a crime for any responsible individual to play about with the country's future and present condition in this way. I do not wish to say anything more about it, but there it is.

But I should like the House to remember about this so-called timing of it; it is as if I have timed it, as if I had made the Portuguese fire on our merchant ships or on our fishermen and others. The fact of the matter is that the Goan situation has been a developing one. Fact after fact accumulates not only in India, but it is affected by things happening outside India; what has happened in Angola affects it very much; what is happening in Africa affects it. What is happening in the United Nations affects it. The United Nations charges Portugal with not giving news of its colonies because Portugal says that they are not colonies but they are bits of Portugal; that is the explanation. However, all these actors go on accumulating, apart from the original fact that Goa is just India,—there is no doubt about it—and must become part of the Union of India. Apart from that, these factors go on accumulating. The United Nations makes a much more positive declaration in favour of the removal of colonial domination from every part of the earth's surface. Then, there are tremendous upheavals in Africa; they are tremendous; when the history of the present day is written, probably the most important chapter will deal with these upheavals in Africa which are changing the face

of a good part of the world and affecting the rest of the world. All that happens. All that happens is in regard to all colonies. Then, suddenly Angola comes up and becomes a symbol of the worst type of colonialism, and the fact, the quite astounding fact that Portugal is now the biggest colonial power in the world comes up. All these facts condition our minds in regard to Goa too.

I did not go into all this background but I did refer to the Seminar we had here in Delhi and in Bombay where many people from Africa came. We knew, as I stated, how their thinking was partly directed towards Goa, not because it was their own problem, but because they saw it was connected with the larger problem with which they were dealing.

All this happened, this piling up of our mental agony about Goa. Then comes news about extreme repression inside Goa. It is reported that there have been some bad torture cases and all that. Then comes this firing on some fisherman, then a merchant-ship and later on Sawantwadi, across the border. All these things in an isolated way would irritate, would even anger. But if just one thing occurred in an isolated way, we would be angered, we might express our anger and go on to do something else. But all this has to be viewed in the context which has been built up in the country's mind, though these incidents become big and upset us and almost drive us over the verge.

I do not want to develop this argument in detail, but I do want to make the House feel how we have been feeling about Goa. As the House knows, we have been criticised for our restraint, call it lack of a spirit of adventure, lack of this or lack of that. So it became almost inevitable for us to take some action, what action is another matter, because, as I said, it was aggression. If a soldier fires a gun by mistake, it does not matter. But this a deliberate attack

by a biggish gun on our ship. What is the reason for it in the mind of the Portuguese authorities, I do not know. Was it deliberate provocation to us to do something or not, I do not know.

Anyhow, all this, the Sawantwadi firing and large forces coming from Mozambique, made it quite inevitable for us to take steps. The least step is to send our ships, and some of our armed forces by land, to prevent this kind of thing happening right before our noses.

Now, as to what all this will lead to, I cannot at the moment say, except that ultimately it must necessarily lead to the liberation of Goa. But that is the ultimate thing. In between, what it leads to, I cannot say because it depends on many factors. If it is going to lead to that ultimately, then we must not take any step, any single step, without being prepared for the next step and the third step. That argument applies not only to Goa but to the border with China too. It is not the first step that counts, it is the last step that counts, in war as in anything. It is not a skirmish that counts but the winning of a war that counts. So we have to make adequate preparations to this end, to be prepared for any emergency and any development.

Now, Shri Tyagi laid great stress on the fact that we are not committing aggression but we shall only be acting on the defensive. True, in a sense, but there is aggression being committed against us all the time, and our meeting that aggression is the truest defence. You cannot draw in a case like that very fine lines. We are not crossing and going to another country to attack it; we are dealing with a place which according to us, belongs to us, must belong to us, and is a part of India. But it is perfectly true that in law it has been part of Portuguese territory.

Some people, I think Shri Nath Pai and one or two others, spoke about the virtues of adventure and a spirit

of adventure. And it reminded me of something I had said already some 30 years ago.

Shri Nath Pai: Don't you feel it today?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am explaining it. I have not said anything against adventure. I am all for adventure; I have said, do not be adventurist, which means something entirely different. That is the difficulty, about using a foreign language. To be adventurist is not good at any time. To be venturesome, to be fearless and going in for adventure is normal unless it is rank foolish adventure; because adventure may be foolish or good. That is a different matter. But I do think that adventurist action is not just normal; and certainly not by any person in a responsible position in Government because he is not playing with his own. I am not playing with my life or my anything. I have no business to take vast risks for a great country like India. It is a tremendous responsibility to talk about being venturesome. I agree each individual should be. A person who loses the spirit of adventure is not much good.

I forget which hon. Member, but I think it was Shri Khadilkar who read an extract or referred to a newspaper in England. Let me say that the newspaper is a very good newspaper as far as news is concerned, but it is a highly conservative newspaper. The trouble was that the reasoning and the thinking and even the language of the newspaper should fit in so much with the thinking and reasoning of Shri Masani and the Swatantra Party. It has not added really because it has come to this. In our public life the party which the hon. Member represents does represent the viewpoint which is the *Daily Telegraph's* viewpoint. That is a fact whether it is in social policy or in political policy or international policy. It all fits in.

Shri M. R. Masani: There is not one argument in that editorial of the

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Daily Telegraph which has anything to do with my speech. What I said was a logistic thing. Can you fight on three or four fronts. The issues raised in the *Daily Telegraph* have nothing to do with my speech. I wish the Prime Minister would not distort things and link up things to attempt guilt by. Please read the article.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The *Daily Telegraph* also refers to the elections.

Shri M. R. Masani: That may be.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: And warned us not to have anything to do with Goa, warned us of the grievous and distant consequences. It was almost a threat; really the consequences were not so much in Goa but somewhere else. The hon. Member is constantly telling us and warning us not to get tied up in Goa but devote all our energy in more worthwhile pursuits.

As I pointed out, so far as the frontier in Goa is concerned, there is no question of overlapping or conflict or getting tied up anywhere.

I have to deal with one or two facts.

Shri Nath Pai: It is not a question of foreign language. After listening to what the Prime Minister says about Goa, we find it difficult to say where exactly he differs from Shri Masani. He said that he differs basically from Shri Masani. He is reaching the same conclusions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know to what conclusions that I have reached the hon. Member is referring to. I do not know. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member want the Prime Minister to say here and now that he declares war?

Shri Nath Pai: No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In regard to Tibet Shri Tyagi referred to an old British treaty with Tibet. I wonder if Shri Tyagi has read the old so-

called British treaty. It was a treaty which, among other things laid down that as the routes were unsafe, till they were made safe by the Government there, we could keep 200 men here to guard our couriers and postmen and others, a few men in Lhasa, in Yangtse and Yatung. That was one part of the treaty. As soon as the routes were declared safe, then, we had to remove them. They were not an army of occupation; they were to protect our couriers. We had a telegraph system and it was to protect the telegraph system from marauders and others. In any event, quite regardless of whether a revolution took place in China and the Chinese came to Tibet or not, we had to remove those people after we became independent. It is not at all in keeping with our aim that we should keep 200 people there; it is not good at all; they could not fight; they cannot carry on any major operation; they were there only as a kind of guards. And when the communist revolution came in and they started coming in there, obviously we had to remove them; we did not want them to be left there to be arrested and then march an army to release them. The whole thing could not be done; there is no question of doing it. The old Tibetan treaty lapsed by the efflux of time. We cannot stick to it.

Shri Tyagi: I was only answering them by arguing that our stay in Tibet would have been ineffective in stopping China entering, even if we had stayed; even then that would have been the position.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: You were completely right; that is what I am saying in a slightly different language. The hon. Members go on saying that we betrayed Tibet, we came away from there. There is no basis for saying so; I do not understand it. One can say things like a brave knight though we had to come away from there and there was no chance or possibility of our staying there unless of course we wanted to declare a war against China and send the whole of

the Indian Army across the Himalayas which is beyond our desire or capacity. We had to bring back the 200 or 300 people we had there; we had to hand over the telegraph and postal system there; we could not run them if they were there. The only other change that took place—major change—was that instead of the British representative there, in future our representative was called the Consul-General in Tibet. One thing we could have done perhaps and that was to say that we disapproved of all that had happened in Tibet; the Chinese are a bad people; we will have nothing with them. It is conceivable. We may have, after coming over to India, expressed ourselves strongly against the Chinese activities. Well, I do not think that it will be correct or right or proper in that context or in any context. Anyhow, it would have meant no difference to Tibet. To say that Tibet, by our action fell to China and we could have checked China has manifestly nothing to do with relation to facts or reality.

Shri Nath Pai: I pointed out from your own speeches and other documents.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Pointed out what?

Shri Nath Pai: Pointed out what you have yourself said. There was not only any question of our being unable to do something. You took the position consistently of solemnising what China has done there; you never said a word of disapproval. Tibetans would have got the greatest moral support; whether they would have succeeded or not is a different matter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Member will remember that we did accept a fact which had been there long before the communists came there, which the British had done before us whom we succeeded here—in regard to this policy, I mean. He pointed out about the suzerainty of China and hon. Member read out from the book of Sir Charles Bell.

Shri Nath Pai: I am quoting your speech; you have mentioned sovereignty and suzerainty simultaneously.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have also had the good fortune of reading that book and a number of other books in connection with this. The hon. Member may remember that when in a different context a similar situation arose, that is, in 1911 I think, when the 13th Dalai Lama was pushed out of Tibet, he came and took refuge in India. I think it was probably in Darjeeling. He went to the then Governor of Bengal somewhere there and he hoped that they were friends; they were the British at that time. Sir Charles Bell writes: he came expecting us immediately to march an army to help him against the Chinese and when I told him that could not be done, they were not going to attack China on this issue, the poor man was struck dumb—the Dalai Lama. This is as far as my memory goes. The British Government wanted the Dalai Lama to have some strength and the Chinese Government not to come to our own borders; although the Chinese Government was then a very weak Government even then they hesitated and they did not do anything. The Dalai Lama had remained here for a long time till the revolution broke out in Peking—the first revolution—and because of that revolution their hold on Tibet collapsed. Then the Dalai Lama went back.

Shri huz:

I am merely pointing out this. It is almost a repetition of history, 40 or 50 years ago, and this thing happened there, with one big difference: that what emerged now was a strong, powerful central Government in China, not with that confusion of the revolutionary period as 50 years ago.

There is one thing more. Shri Nath Pai referred to Himmatsinghji's report and asked what has happened to it. I sent for the papers; I cannot read the whole report, but I shall

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

read the note on it, when the report was sent—not the report sent previously—

“The President has recently seen the report of the North and North-Eastern Border Defence Committee. He has asked for a note indicating the action taken on each of the Committee’s recommendations.”

This note is dated in September, 1959
Another paragraph is:

“It will be seen that almost all the recommendations of the Border Defence Committee have been implemented. The only important recommendation which has not been fully implemented is with regard to the construction of certain roads.”

In this connection, some other paper should be seen, because, subsequently, this was taken up. Indeed, as the hon. Member knows, apart from the Border Committee, we took up this question in a biggish way just about then or a little later.

Shri Nath Pai and others asked us not to be misled by the mirage of friendship with China, and asked us also not to keep on to the treaty; they further said that if we consider any treaty with China certain pre-conditions should be laid down about the vacation, etc. Some other hon. Members went a little further and said that we should have no treaty, presumably even if they vacate or accept the condition we lay down.

It really is a question obviously not of accepting their proposal, but I would submit also not of merely saying ‘No’, because it has no meaning, but of replying in some conditional form; the conditions naturally would relate to their aggression, whatever it is—something like that. I cannot say now, because one has to give thought to it, because I do not know exactly what we will do. But when I had

said that, I had some such thing in mind.

About this mirage of friendship with China, I do not know if the hon. Member has concluded from the various discussions we have had, in the course of the last year or so or more than one and a half years, that we are overwhelmed with this image of a friendly China next to our border. Obviously we are not. I am trying to explain my thinking on this subject. Quite apart from friendship or hostility, looking at it objectively, ten years ago, soon after the revolution, we came to the conclusion that our borders were going to be, well, threatened in some way. In what way, of course, we do not know. From that moment we had this picture, because notional policies are often based on certain objective considerations apart from the views. The views may expedite a certain direction or delay it. But from that moment we had this in view.

This report of the Himmatsinghji Committee is dated soon after the Chinese Revolution and soon after I think the Chinese had come to Tibet in 1951, a year after, but long before any other development. They discussed it at length about this matter, about the fact of these new developments, on the border situation and they gave their views. So these facts have long been before us. You may say, and you may be right in saying, that we were overtaken by certain events, possibly; but we never doubted that these questions were arising and will arise in the future. And, as I have said previously, we took steps too. Again you may say that the steps should have been more and more strong. We took steps chiefly in the North-East Frontier Agency border and partly in Ladakh. But certainly we did not take all the steps we should have taken. It was very difficult for us to take all the steps because of various difficulties—terrain etc. We did take those steps. So the question of our losing all perspective,

thinking of a friendly China sitting there and taking no steps is a wrong view, because from the very beginning we had been thinking of this regardless of Chinese friendship or not. The fact of a huge elephant of a country sitting near our border is itself a fact that we could not ignore, and a country which has a different policy and a country whose, even apart from communism, past history has been, whenever strong, one of expansion. After all, some time or the other most of these countries round about us paid tribute to China—Burma paid tribute to them, Nepal paid tribute to China—and they can easily twist that thing and say: "Well, you are subordinate to us". If you take that long period of several hundred years, all kinds of things have happened in history. So we were not at all complacent about China's presence near our border. We were constantly thinking about it.

Our thinking ran on two lines. One was that this was a reason to strengthen our country as rapidly as possible, to strengthen it industrially. That is the real strength out of which armies come, out of which arms come, aeroplanes come and not merely by buying aircraft from America or Russia or England and training some people. That is superficial. Where you are thinking of the future in some perspective you have to think of building it yourself. So there is the importance of the Five Year Plan, the importance of our developing our defence industry, our defence science. It was thought of in this connection that defence science is highly important, because it is science that gives rise to these things.

One of our hon. Members on this side, on our side, suggested "scrap the Five Year Plan and do this". If we scrap the Five Year Plan we scrap India, we surrender to China the moment we scrap the Five Year Plan because we have nothing left to face this menace not today or tomorrow or the day after but ten years, twenty years or thirty years. It is extraordinary.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhaasi): I did not say.....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, I have not mentioned any name.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: What I said was, concentrate on the development of the border areas instead of other places.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That may be a very desirable objective and that is being done. But I want to concentrate more on a thousand factories which produce goods, I want to concentrate on better agriculture, this, that and the other. As for the border areas, I referred to certain border areas. Certainly they can be developed. But if anyone imagines that we are going to develop these areas, let us say, in Ladakh, all I can say is that he or she is totally ignorant of where human beings normally live. If we ask people to go and settle down there they will be a tremendous burden on us to feed them and to keep them going. You cannot settle them there. Maybe, it is quite possible that some Tibetans can go and settle there. It is a possibility. Because, they are used to these altitudes and this kind of life. Even they will find it difficult.

So, it is a question of looking at it from a long perspective. As Shri Sharma has mentioned it, one has to consider the relations of not today but what would be the relationship between India and China 50 years or hundred years hence. We must have a long term perspective; we must not be swept away by the present. And when we have a long term perspective, we have to see what it leads to ultimately and we must be prepared for it. We do not aim at war; we want to settle it otherwise because, in the long term perspective, it would be disastrous for us, for China and, I think, for Asia, if for the next fifty years we live in hostility and enmity in the frontier all the time. We are both big countries. Neither country is going to be knocked down or knocked flat. So, if we go on, coming in the way of development with feelings of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

hatred and fear, it is so bad and it will reflect in so many ways in the world, taking even the shape of cold war which one wants to avoid.

Meanwhile, we have to deal with the situation as it is, and one can only deal with the situation by preparing for it in every way, so that whatever has to be done is done thoroughly and quickly. It is a simple equation. Any other way of looking at it would, I submit, be, if I may use the word again, adventurist.

There are one or two words and I am done. Much was said about the recognition of the provisional government of Algeria. Before that, I would like to refer to another thing. Shri Tyagi asked why our Ambassadors in China or in Peking did not inform us about all these developments. What developments? In Aksai Chin area? Well, the simple answer is: because they did not know, and the further answer is they could not know. It is not possible for them or anybody to know except the select circles which might know. Normally news about things prevailing there come in a very very limited way; whatever the Government wants to give; there is no other way. And this particular thing taking place about 5,000 miles away from Peking, it is quite impossible for one to know unless the Government agencies put it out. We did get to know first of Aksaichin area because it was published in a Chinese magazine. Immediately, our Ambassador drew attention to it. The Ambassadors we have sent to China ever since the rebellion have been top-ranking Ambassadors, because we attach importance to this position that was arising there and, so far, our best men have been sent there.

I confess that this question of the recognition of the Algerian Government has troubled us greatly, because our minds and hearts are with the Algerians fighting for their freedom. We have said so repeatedly. We have

helped them in many ways, morally and otherwise, apart from resolutions, diplomatically and otherwise. It was not merely a question of legal flaw, although legally one normally does not recognise a Government that does not exist in its own territory. It is an emigre Government. It is recognized only in war time for special purposes. But the real difficulty was—we considered it several times—whether it would be more advantageous to Algerians if we recognize it or refrain from doing so. As we have said, we are thinking of it, we continue to think about it and a time may come when we will do it.

But in the last two years or so there have been constant talks between the Algerian national leaders and the French Government and always there has been hope that these will lead to some result. I still hope and I think it is quite conceivable and even probable that some agreement will be arrived at fairly soon to make Algeria free and independent. So I was informed too when I was passing through Paris recently. But I cannot guarantee because there have been so many slips in the past. This kind of a thing on the verge of taking place, a gesture because it would only be a gesture of saying that we recognise the provisional government, instead of helping them, may even come in the way. That is our thinking. We may be wrong or we may be right. We thought we may even come in their way. It will certainly come in our way to deal with this problem in any other way because then all the other approaches will be barred. Anyhow, what I am trying to point out is this that we have felt very strongly the tremendous suffering and sacrifice of the Algerian people. In their struggle we have been wholeheartedly with them. We have expressed ourselves in this way everywhere, in diplomatic correspondence, in private talks, in the United Nations, here and everywhere. As to this gesture of recognition, it might under certain circum-

stances is good and it might not. One balances these things and in the balance we thought that it might do a little more harm to their cause than otherwise. That is why we did not do it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Why not explain this position because there is a lot of misunderstanding on this point? Why it will harm them is a point which is not understood either by our people or by others.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I cannot go into all these details. First of all, our approach in this matter to the French Government would not only be limited but ended. Our views and our approach has some value for them and for the reasons too. The French Government, I believe, attaches some value to our opinion; not that it follows us, but it does attach some value. That door is closed then. That itself is some loss for them.

I will just refer to one thing more, because this matter comes up frequently, about the Chinese treaties with Burma and Nepal. They are independent countries. They do what they feel like doing. They have done something which we do not wholly like, certainly Nepal. So far as Burma is concerned in spite of our very close friendship with them—they consult us; we consult each other—they thought in their context of things that they should arrive at that treaty with China about their border. Certainly, looking at it from that point of view it brought them some benefits. About that trijunction which was referred to they did not agree. It is true that they might have gone further and refused to have any treaty at all. But there is no agreement on that issue and the basic agreement, or rather the border agreement is based on the assumption and the acceptance of the crest of the Himalayas being the boundary line. That has always been our contention about our border with China, namely, that it is the water shed, which the Chinese have not accepted here. But

in the both the Burmese and the Nepalese cases they have accepted that contention and I do not see how they can deny and repudiate it, when the same principle has been applied, to India. So these treaties except for the mere fact that they are having treaties with China which may be though undesirable by some, are not harmful to us. To some extent, they are advantageous to us and to some extent, where they might be harmful, the matter has not been finally decided yet about the trijunction.

Finally, I would say that we cannot afford to look at any matter today in an isolated way. They are all connected with each other and affect each other. India is not a small country. It is big and what India does has a certain effect on others. What India thinks also is respected and regarded by others. Therefore, in what we do and what we think, we have to be careful, also looking at the future perspective, and not get tied up today, which may in some way come in the way of our progress in future.

I am prepared to accept Shri Jagannath Rao's substitute motion.

Mr. Speaker: Need I put Shri Madhok's substitution motion to the House?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, regrets the failure of the policy of the Government in regard to China, Pakistan and Portugal."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Shri Jagannath Rao's substitution motion to the House.

[Mr. Speaker]

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

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the policy of the Government of India.”

The motion was adopted.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: There are two half-hour discussions.

Some Hon. Members: Not today.

Shri Nath Pai: I seek your guidance in the matter, I know how exhausted the House is. Of the two, one is mine. What happens to them? Will you give us time tomorrow? Tomorrow may be the last day.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: What about the discussion on the railway accidents?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members want the discussion on the railway accidents to conclude. Therefore, I will give preference to it tomorrow. Tomorrow afternoon, there is non-official work. In between I do not know if we will have any time for these half-hour discussions. There is another half-hour discussion tomorrow. Under these circumstances, they may conveniently stand over to the next session.

An Hon. Member: After the elections.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now stand adjourned and meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18-23 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December 8, 1961/Agrahayana 17, 1883 (Saka).
