

**MOTION RE: STATEMENT IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR  
ON 4<sup>TH</sup> MARCH, 1975 IN LOK SABHA**

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur):

We welcome the Kashmir agreement as well as this agreement. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there are occasions in the life of a nation when the Members of Parliament must raise above the political parties and I believe that this is one of the occasions where we must look at the problem from a national perspective.

Sir, socialists have always believed that if the problems of reconstruction are to be solved, the various types of tensions that exist must be completely eliminated. We have always stood for the creation of conditions where the threat to socialism will be completely banished, where an atmosphere of Hindu-Muslim unity will be preserved and time will come when to solve various problems in this region, we will be able to establish a broad confederation in which India, Pakistan and Bangladesh will play their legitimate roles. So, all of us who had dreamt that way, would be very happy to welcome the accord that is being presented to us in the form of Agreed Conclusions.

Sir, as far as the problems of Kashmir are concerned, any tension that exists in this area of Kashmir becomes a threat to the forces of integration and forces of secularism. Therefore, any effort to normalise the situation in Kashmir would always be a welcome step. Sir, it is all right to say demagogically that today there, are normal conditions and we have a popular Government. But anyone who has visited Kashmir in the course of the last few years would have found a large number of army men and policemen stationed in Srinagar and elsewhere. In such an atmosphere, under these conditions, it is not possible to have the problems of reconstruction solved. Therefore, Sir, after this agreement, I have not the least doubt that the tension in Kashmir will be completely resolved and there will be no necessity for us to spend such a large amount on the Army and the Police. Probably, with the will of the people, with the consent of the people and with the cooperation of the people we will be able to build a better atmosphere in Kashmir. Sir, those who have been criticising this argument which has been arrived at lose sight of the fact that the most pivotal problem of accession to India has become irrevocable and this has already been established in the agreement which has been arrived at. I think the greatest merit of this agreement and the accord which has been arrived at is that the problems are sought to be tackled and solved within the broader frame-work of India's unity and within the broader framework of India's Constitution. That is the greatest merit of the conclusions that have been arrived at.

Sir reference is made by certain sections to Article 370. I do not want to attribute motives even to the Members of the Jan Sangh with whom, I differ on this problem. Probably, due to patriotic considerations they feel that Kashmir must be like any other part and since there is no Article 370 for any other State, this Article must not remain on the statute. But, Sir, they must try to understand that if you try to remove Article ,370, it will generate forces and generate a climate that will be contrary to the climate that even Jan Sangh wants to build up for the integration of this country. If article 370 remains in the Constitution and the people of Kashmir feel satisfied that their legitimate claims can be fulfilled within the framework of that article, we should not feel frightened about that article at all.

Of course, if even without that article, that atmosphere could have been created, I would have been extremely happy. But I would like to weight the issue like this. By making an effort to remove 370 from the Constitution, will more tensions be created? Or by retaining 370 can a better climate of integration be created?

My assessment is that if you try to remove article 370, probably more tensions will be rested and the effect will be contrary to what the members of the Jan Sangh are expecting. Therefore, I would earnestly request them: let them not rub this article the wrong way. There is another problem. There is so much talk about Sheikh Abdullah, whether you can rely on his promises. Here I would like to sound a note of warning. One may agree with Sheikh Abdullah, one may agree with his perspective, one may disagree with it. But it is a fact that if you want to deliver the goods in Kashmir, if we have to carry the majority of the Muslim population with us, if an atmosphere of integration is to be built up there, we must try to find out, with all our allergies to ertam individupls, who are the men in Kashmir who can deliver the goods. Without casting aspersions on any national leader, I would like to say that if any person in Kashmir can deliver the goods in Kashmir on behalf of the people of Kashmir, whether one likes it or not, it is Sheikh Abdullah's personality. Therefore, there is nothing wrong in entering into an agreement with Sheikh Abdullah. That is the point.

Ultimately, we have to carry all sections of the people of Kashmir with us. They have to have a sense of participation in the affairs of the country and if a man like Sheikh Abdullah who commands the confidence of large sections of the population in Kashmir is brought round and he comes into the mainstream of Indian national politics, I think he will act as a catalytic agent of the people of Kashmir, of the various sections of Kashmir and they can actually be brought into the mainstream of national politics.

MR. DEPUTY -SPEAKER: A catalytic agent does not itself change; it brings about change.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have a feeling that Sheikh Abdullah will not change. Therefore, I have deliberately used the words "catalytic agent". As a student of physics and chemistry, I know that a catalytic agent is one which does not participate in the process but at the same time accelerates it. Therefore, I feel that is the correct approach in bringing about these changes. As for the agreed conclusions that have been arrived at, first, all the changes sought to be brought about by common agreement will be brought about within the broader framework of India's Constitution; second, there were a number of tensions created by the slogan of plebiscite. Here I welcome Mirza Afzal Beg's statement of 6th February 1975, in which he has said that in view of the changed circumstances, plebiscite has become irrelevant. It is the greatest achievement for India that those who doggedly stood for the slogan of plebiscite have come forward in the new and changed atmosphere with a new declaration that in the changed circumstances the slogan of plebiscite has become irrelevant and outmoded. I think this is also a great achievement, the climate created by the efforts of arriving at an agreement. Third, there were certain voices of discord insisting that various affairs of Kashmir must not be brought within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India. I am glad that in the talks that have taken place and in the agreed formulations and conclusions that have been arrived at, the basic sovereign position of the Supreme Court of India has not been surrendered. I think this is the greatest achievement of those who carried on the talks and I am happy about it, because without undermining democratic institutions like the Supreme Court, without curtailing their powers and jurisdiction, the new formulations have been arrived at and agreed upon.

There is one more aspect. If Kashmir continued to be turmoil territory and if tensions of various types are there, we know that there are international forces which are willing to jump into the fray and make it a pawn in international power politics. If we are successful in ending tensions in Kashmir, we will succeed in preventing international powers from using this beautiful territory of Kashmir as the hotbed of international rivalries.

As far as Kashmir is concerned, our attitude should be this. While we should make Kashmir an integral part of India, we must try to maintain certain characteristic features of Kashmir and in the context of this agreement my attitude is that it should always be like a daughter in her mother's house but a mistress in her own.

That is the attitude which we should maintain, in the context of the overall unity of India. If there are peculiar characteristics and distinctive cultural features, we must give them an assurance that they would be maintained. If the agreement is arrived at in that context, I have not the least doubt that it will be possible for us to tackle the problem. I am saying this in a lighter vein, and nobody should take it that, I am casting any aspersions. While arriving at an agreement with Sheikh Abdullah, he has said that he retains his right to maintain his own views to various national problems. He has maintained his individual point of view on problems affecting the mainstream of national life. I am glad that he also accepted the fact that JP stands for democratic values. I only hope and trust that because of his attitude to JP he will not meet the fate of Mohan Dharia.