

thing that they demand is that, as in Kanpur and Madras IITs, the book fund should be enhanced from Rs. 300 to Rs. 500. That is how the problems of these boys can be solved. This is a very serious matter. I expect the Government, which says that it has so much sympathy for the Harijans, to do something in the matter. They say that they are all out for the backward people, backward areas and so on. But here is a strange case where the boys, after getting admission, are being denied education and are being thrown out. Therefore, I would suggest that the Government should immediately take a sympathetic and favourable action. Otherwise, the boys, after reading for so many years, will be going out of the IITs without completing their studies.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): Sir, I would commend to the Government the Kerala example where the State Government gives a chance to the students in the medical colleges and in the engineering colleges if they fail in a term or semester.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, now, we are having a discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. But Sir, many of us have given motions under rule 170 that some day the international situation should be taken into consideration. Other friends have given motions that the nuclear policy of the Government should be taken into consideration and so on. I also gave another motion that the Prime Minister's visit to the United States of America and other countries should be taken into consideration. Like that, a series of motions relating to the international situation in its entirety have been

given. But all we have got now is to raise a discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. I never asked for it. What we want to discuss is the international situation. You will say that we can do it here. It is not that innocent as it looks. In this discussion, under this rule, we cannot move any amendment, we cannot pass anything, we cannot record our criticism and make our suggestion in writing. Nothing we can do. We can only talk, express our opinion and we go on and the Ministry also goes on. That is why this form has been chosen. Obviously, it suits the Government and it suits Mr. Vajpayee, because, he will not be faced with any voting here. On the other hand, if there had been a motion that the international situation be taken into consideration, I would have given an amendment that this House expresses its concern over the deviations and the distortions which are taking place. We could have made suggestions and, perhaps, this could have been passed in this House. But to stall this, this has been done. Whose brain-wave it is, I do not know. But then, this has been done. Suddenly, we find 'Discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs'. We do such a thing in the Budget session. It has been done to suit somebody's convenience. Everybody understands the way it has been done. I, therefore, wish to say this. In future, I hope, this will not be done. The resolution should be taken in the form in which we have given and for the purpose for which we have given. I strongly protest against this. I will participate in this. But I strongly protest against this. If you are so minded, even now, I would like to have it changed that the international situation be taken into consideration. But I know that you will not do that. We are also helpless now. We cannot move any amendment. Therefore, all I can do is to expose this and to register my protest. Well, Mr. Vajpayee will be very happy. But we are a bit unhappy about it.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I wish to make one point in regard to the point raised by hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I had also given, under this rule, a motion that the present international situation be taken into consideration and I personally spoke to the Minister of External Affairs that the Government should come forward with a motion, as it used to happen in the days of Jawaharlalji. But the correct position is that in the last session the Business Advisory Committee decided that four Ministries could be discussed, one of which was the Ministry of External Affairs. Because of the fact that the hon. Minister of External Affairs was not available in the last week, it was decided that this discussion could be deferred to the next session. When the Business Advisory Committee met in this session, it decided that in pursuance of the decision taken by the Business Advisory Committee previously, the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs should be discussed. Therefore, probably it is not either the Secretariat or the Government but the Business Advisory Committee which fixed the functioning of the Ministry, that we are to discuss today. This is the correct position in order to set the record right. At the same time, I want to associate myself with Shri Bhupesh Gupta. I request that the Minister of External Affairs every year should come forward with a motion that the present international situation and the Government's stand in relation thereto, should be taken into consideration, which used to be the practice before.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): Sir, before I begin, I would like to make a request to you that we should develop the practice that the time taken by the initiator of a debate like this should not be counted as a part of the time allotted to a party.

Sir, when Shri Vajpayeeji took over the charge of this Ministry I was very glad, because I thought the

Prime Minister had chosen the right person for the right job. He has a very charming and amiable personality. He is very liberal in his personal and private life. He has a disarming smile and, Sir, he is known for his ability and dynamic qualities. Therefore, naturally he aroused high expectations in the minds of not only Members of this House and the other House, but also among the people of the country. But after seeing the functioning of this Ministry for 16 months I am very sorry to say that I am quite disappointed. I do not see any initiative, any indication of dynamism in the conduct of the foreign policy which is going on for the last 16 months.

The first doubt arose in my mind when they started talking about genuine non-alignment. When the adjective 'genuine' was added my doubt started: What is this about, what is its meaning? Has it been used only to silence the persons like Swamis and Jethmalanis of this country? Or, is it to cover up the inner conflicts of the hon. Minister himself because of the hangover of his past pronouncements as a leader of the opposition, functioning in the other House? Or, is it to prove the Janata party's distinction from the policies followed by the previous Government? Or, is it the indication that you wanted to appease or please or satisfy somebody, some big powers in the world? I do not know. Either it could be one, or two, or all of them.

What is this genuine non-alignment, what is the genuine non-alignment policy that they have pursued so far? Some of them say that the previous Government's policy had a tilt in favour of the Soviet Union. This question must be faced squarely and must be answered squarely. What was the tilt? No doubt, we had very close friendship with the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc countries. There is no doubt about it. But why, how did it develop, how did it evolve, on what basis? It was on the basis of the fact that the Soviet Union and

the socialist bloc countries stood by India on all issues in which India's vital interests were involved. Take for example Kashmir, Goa, Bangladesh. Take the question of laying the industrial base of this country. Who came forward to offer liberal help and what is the attitude of the other countries? What was the attitude and what is the attitude of America and Western Powers towards Kashmir even today? What was their attitude in the case of Goa? What was their attitude in the case of Bangladesh? What was their attitude when we tried to establish the Bokaro Steel Plant, or when we started oil exploration? What was the attitude of those countries? And what was the attitude of the Socialist countries? This attitude, this friendship was based on facts. On what facts? On our own national interests and nothing else. There was no tilt.

Now, they might say that we submitted to Russian pressure. I challenge anybody in this country to give me a single instance to show that the previous Government submitted its national interests before Russian pressure or anybody. I can give three major instances to prove my case to the contrary.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): Rupee trade.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Mr. Mody, either sleep or go and talk outside.

SHRI PILOO MODY: If you make such a bold challenge, you must accept it.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I accept it.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Then I say Rupee trade. Now answer it. And if you don't know anything about rupee trade don't talk about it.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Sir, I give three major instances. (Interruptions)
Mr. Mallick....

SHRI PILOO MODY: Dr. Mallick, not Mr. Mallick

(Interruptions)

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Your Minister is here to answer. So I give three instances.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
तिब्बत वाले मामले को ही ले लीजिए। प्रधान
मन्त्री ने तिब्बत को कैसे सुपुर्द कर दिया था
चीन के हवाले ?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I can give three instances. The Prime Minister has tried to give the impression to the whole world that it is he who has refused to sign the NPT to save our national self-respect. NPT was not signed by the previous Government itself. That policy was followed long ago. It is good that he is following that policy. And we refused to sign the NPT in spite of the fact that the Russians were very anxious that we should sign it. We did not. Then the Russian proposal of Asian collective security system was there. We did not respond. We have very good reasons why we did not respond. The friendship with the Soviet Union or the Socialist countries did not stand in the way of our decision to restore diplomatic relations with China, at ambassadorial level.

These are the three major instances, political instances. There are other instances which, you know, I cannot disclose because I was under oath of secrecy. But Mr. Vajpayee knows them very well.

Sir, non-alignment has a history, has a philosophy. The seeds of this movement were sown, this movement was born, the idea was born, the concept was born in the womb of the freedom struggle itself. The criteria for membership of the non-aligned club were laid down in the first Summit Conference in 1961 held at Belgrade. All this is known. This

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

policy has been guided by basic principles and this has also served our national interests. It has served so far and it will continue to serve in future also. There is no point in calling it genuine or non-genuine, as if we followed a policy which was non-genuine non-alignment. What is genuine or non-genuine? Sir, the foreign policy is guided by two basic considerations: one, some principles and ideals; and two, national interest. These are the two basic considerations which guide and should guide the foreign policy of any country. And these are the two basic considerations which have guided and which did guide the former Government in conducting its foreign policy.

Sir, over the years, non-alignment has acquired more substance, more concrete content and more meaning. It is no longer a simple case of not joining this multi-lateral military alliance or that alliance. That was the origin of it. But over the years, it has acquired a new meaning, a new substance. What is it? It is a policy which stands against imperialism, against colonialism, against racialism. It is a policy which stands in support of all liberation struggles. It is a policy which is guided by the five principles of Panchsheel or peaceful co-existence. It stands for universal membership of the U.N.O. It stands for removal of economic disparity between the one-third developed and the two-third under-developed world. It is not a negative policy. It is not pacifism. It is also not neutralism. Janata Party members want to make out that genuine non-alignment is neutralism. It is not neutralism. I want to give a single instance to establish my case. Take the example of Vietnam war. The Vietnamese fought the liberation war against the United States. Vietnam was supported by the Soviet Union. The Vietnamese people faced new challenges and struggles. Now, was it not correct for India to stand on the side of the Vietnamese in their struggle? It is not a matter of who

stood against whom and who stood for whom. We stood for the people of Vietnam. Now, take our stand on the West-Asian situation. Can you talk of your so-called neutral stand or so-called neutral policy? You have to adapt your policy on the basis of the merit of the case. Therefore, non-alignment is not neutralism.

Some people from their camp have been saying publicly that it is no longer relevant and it is no longer valid because the world has moved from bi-polarism to multi-polarism. I do not want to enter into an argument. It is true that the world has moved from bi-polarism to multi-polarism. We welcome it as a non-aligned country. But non-alignment will remain valid as long as the last trace of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism remains on the face of the earth. Non-alignment will remain valid as long as the last trace of racialism exists in any part of the world, as long as there is no total disarmament, as long as economic disparity is not removed, as long as equality among nations, big and small and respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of every nation, big or small, is not assured, secured and guaranteed. As long as these things do not happen and as long as the world peace is not achieved, non-alignment remains the right policy, the correct policy and the relevant policy.

Sir, there are new trends all around. I do not want to go into them because I am trying to discuss mainly the functioning of the Ministry under the leadership of hon. Shri Vajpayeeji. But we have seen some negative trends in the world in recent times. The non-aligned movement itself is becoming weaker and divided. The North-South dialogue has failed. There is disappointment and frustration now about the last Conference of the United Nations on Disarmament. Well, our Prime Minister placed before this Conference high ideals, noble ideals and noble values. Quite good. But, if, politics is art of the possible then diplomacy is the art of the

practicable. It is very good that we keep high ideals and objectives, before the world. I don't complain about it. But we have not succeeded the way we conducted ourselves to achieve something concrete and substantial. I am afraid we have failed. There is lack of progress in our march towards collective self-reliance which we adopted at Colombo Summit Conference. There are conflicts within the non-aligned group and there is infiltration from outside. Attempts are being made to weaken the non-aligned movement as a whole. Sir, in this connection, I want to raise the question of Pakistan. Why was Pakistan admitted and why did we agree to admit Pakistan? They say that Portugal is a member of NATO, Romania is a member of Warsaw Pact and Philippines has a foreign military base and when they can become guests in the Conference, then why not Pakistan? There is a fundamental difference. Neither Romania to my knowledge, nor Portugal to my knowledge, nor Philippines to my knowledge is involved in any conflict or clash with any member of the non-aligned group in the world. But Pakistan is involved. Pakistan is still occupying some Indian territories illegally. As long as that problem is not solved, Pakistan is in a state of conflict and clash with India.

Therefore, this is the sum total of situation that we see before our eyes. Detente in Europe was all right. We said at that time that we welcomed the Helsinki Pact signed by so many countries. But there cannot be an island of peace in Europe alone. What has happened after that? War has been transferred and transported from the European soil to the African soil, to the Asian soil. This is not detente. This is not the true spirit of detente. Therefore, there also the world picture is not very bright.

Now, Sir, I do not know in all these matters what initiative India has

taken either through non-alignment movement or in the forums of the United Nations or any other forum. I do not know. I am not aware of it. I do not see anything. This is my complaint. Why is this failure of the Janata Government? What is the basic cause of it? The basic cause of the failure of the Janata Government to push forward the policy of non-alignment in any positive direction is their obsession with the so-called Super Powers or the Big Powers. Super Powers are there. Nobody can ignore them. They are there by virtue of their economic and military strength. But the world outlook of non-alignment must not revolve around the Super Powers or the Big Powers. We must have a different world models before us. We are marching towards a new world which must cut across the Super Powers or the Big Powers. We want to bring about a new world in which all nations will be welcomed, whether big or small, based on mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, equality and justice in the matter of economic relations. Such a new world must be there before our eyes. It should cut across the present arrangement, the present power structure. Our conception, our move, our initiative, our steps must penetrate through the present power structure in order to create a new world—may not be today; may be in the 21st century. What should be our objective. But our friends in the Janata Government have a different outlook. Their mind revolves around whether you are pro-Soviet—or pro-American. One may be pro-Soviet or pro-American. That is the only way in which some members of the Janata Party think on foreign policy. And, unfortunately, a section of our intellectuals are also suffering from this obsession. They do not see the rising forces, the growing forces, the changing pattern of the world. What was the United Nations in 1945? It had 51 members. What is the United Nations today? It has 149 members. The whole complexion of the United Nations has

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

changed. The whole complexion of the world picture has changed. But we do not see the change. We are static-minded. We live in static positions. We do not look at the development in its dynamics. That is the whole trouble with the Janata Government and that is why they are not able to make any mark or move in any direction, in the international sphere.

Sir, their main claim—as the Prime Minister has repeatedly said; I think the Foreign Minister has also said that—is that we have succeeded in creating a new climate of friendship, co-operation, peace, and so on and so forth, in South Asia, in the region around us. That is their main claim. Let us examine this. What are the facts? We never had any problems with Afghanistan and Bhutan. With Sri Lanka, the Congress Government had solved all the outstanding problems and nothing remained for the Janata Government to solve. With Burma, there was only one problem, i.e. about land boundary demarcation. That also was almost completely solved before they took over. We signed the maritime boundary agreement with Indonesia and Sri Lanka. They have signed one new maritime agreement, the tri-junction agreement among Thailand, Indonesia and India, which was also initiated during the time of the Congress Government. This is about these countries. Now four more countries remain: Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh and China. What are the facts? It was our initiative which brought into existence the Simla Agreement and which set into motion the process of normalisation of relations with Pakistan. It is we who restored the diplomatic relations with Pakistan. We signed a number of agreements with Pakistan. They have recently signed the Salal Agreement. Yes, you have signed it. But all the negotiations were nearly complete by September, 1976 and only one technical point remained. In the meantime we were out and you were in. They

took 15 months to sort out that point. They made concessions to sign that agreement. I do not mind if it ultimately serves our national interest. I do not know how the future will tell. What will be the consequences of this agreement. The height of the dam has now been reduced from 40' to 30'. But all the negotiations for this agreement were nearly complete in September, 1976. Nothing new has been done. That is about Pakistan. They have not taken any move regarding the maritime boundary with Pakistan.

Take Nepal. India has been the highest aid-giver to Nepal. The aid given by us to Nepal is more than double of that given by China, not to talk about that of the big powers who stand far behind. So many projects have been taken up with our co-operation. The Devighat project was also taken up during Congress regime. They have only signed a trade and transit agreement. I have no grudge. I wait to see the consequences of what they have signed in the trade and transit agreement. I want to see the consequences. But those negotiations were also carried on by the previous Government. That is about Nepal.

Now Bangladesh. My hon. friend himself was not only eloquent but highly emotional when he spoke on December 16, 1971, the day when Bangladesh was liberated, the day the picture of geopolitics of this entire region changed. That was our achievement. I claim it. We have given so much aid for the development of Bangladesh. It was in our time that the Farakka barrage was commissioned. Sir, this is what we did. They have now signed the Farakka second agreement by making concessions, concessions which will hit the Calcutta Port. Sir, the Farakka barrage was constructed only to save the Calcutta Port. Even in the British days, a large number of reports were there. It was they who pointed out that that was the place where we had to construct a barrage in

order to save the Calcutta Port in future, and that was why a Muslim majority district which should have gone to Pakistan, came to India so that Farakka might be within India, and a Hindu majority district was given to Pakistan, now Bangladesh, in an exchange by the Radcliffe Award. This is the history. Now, Sir, they have signed an accord at the cost of the Calcutta Port.

I come to China, Sir. It was again we who decided to restore diplomatic relations with China at ambassadorial level. We took the initiative, and, thereafter the changes took place. Other developments took place. Normalisation was started afresh. After that, what has happened? Now in the last 16 months I do not think that anything new of substance or significance has taken place under the Janata Government.

Now I would like to draw the attention of the House to the claim that they have created a new climate of peace, friendship and co-operation among the nations in this region. This is the tall claim of the Janata Government. I feel compelled to draw the attention of this House and the country to the other side of the picture. All right. You have signed some agreements, made some good gestures, friendly gestures; I do not grudge it. You have made some concessions. Okay. But what is the response? What is response from the other side? Take Pakistan. Still they are adopting a halting attitude in normalising even such matters as trade and communication facilities. Pakistan has again repeated recently its demand for creating a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, which is directly aimed against us. They have not only ceded our territory illegally to China but they have allowed the construction of a highway which was opened even without our being taken into confidence. The Ministry took nine days to lodge a protest, after the highway was inaugurated. And now, Sir, Pakistan is mobilising troops along the line of actual control in

Jammu and Kashmir. Why? What for? Against whom? Is this the response that we were expecting? We made gestures, we made concessions. And this is how they respond.

Take the case of Nepal. Anti-India propaganda is going on. They are still insisting on the "peace zone" concept, which is directed against us. Now, they are talking of developing transit through Bangladesh. They are going to render help to Bangladesh by using Chittagong and Chalna ports at the cost of Calcutta Port. This is the response you have got after signing the trade and transit agreement with them. They are also demanding the construction of a canal from Nepal to Bangladesh, connecting the rivers there, so that directly they can carry on trade without bothering for India at all. Is this how they are responding to our friendship?

Then, Sir, Bangladesh. We signed recently an agreement with Bangladesh. We even made some concessions in the hope that ultimately there will be a long-term agreement. Our proposal was that there should be a canal connecting the Ganga with the Brahmaputra. Up till now they have obstinately rejected our proposal. Not only that, when we talk of this canal connecting the Ganga with the Brahmaputra, they say that in that case China also must be involved because the Brahmaputra originates in Tibet. Wonderful argument from Bangladesh. They are trying to involve Nepal in the building up of a river system, a grid or something like that, connecting all the rivers of this entire region. They are trying to get Nepal involved in it. Not only that, they are trying to involve the World Bank. For money, all right. But they are trying to involve foreign powers, western powers in it. What is this? What is all this going on? Is this the result that we expected when we made concessions to them, when we made gestures to them? I want to ask the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister:

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

Is this the way that we are trying to create a climate of peace and friendship in this region? What is the response from the other side? Friendship is a two-way traffic; it is a two-way street, it cannot be one-way. And there is no progress at all so far as the maritime boundary is concerned. This is about Bangladesh.

Take China. China continues to encourage and train Naga and Mizo hostiles. They continue to instigate Nepal, Pakistan and Bangladesh against us. No less a person than Vice-Premier Teng Hsiao-Ping, the Number Two man in China, only recently visited Nepal and did all kinds of propaganda against us. I think Mr. Vajpayee will agree that he did it. This is what they are doing in response to our gestures for friendship. In spite of our gestures for creating a climate of peace and friendship in this region, they are still supporting Pakistan on the Kashmir issue. They are offering to set up a nuclear plant in Pakistan. As regards the Karakoram Highway some of the friends from the Janata Party said, 'we hope that the Karakoram Highway will be used for peaceful purposes'. God alone knows how. What a hope indeed: Are you living in the sky or are you living on the earth to imagine that a highway has been built by China for peaceful purposes, for carrying goods and human beings only?

As regards the border trouble, I am not referring to it. It is a big problem. I leave it. He knows, I know, everybody knows, it cannot be easily solved. But this is what they are doing. This is what China is doing to develop friendship with us. And what has China done? China sends a Vice-Premier to Nepal, another Vice-Premier to Pakistan and Sri Lanka, yet another Vice-Foreign Minister to Bangladesh. And to India they send a goodwill mission led by the President of the People's Friendship Association of China. Is this not the treatment we are getting? Don't you feel insulted, humiliated, that they send a Vice-

Premier, Mr. Teng Hsiao-Ping, the second man, to Nepal, a second Vice-Premier to Pakistan and Sri Lanka, another Vice-Foreign Minister to Bangladesh, and to India a goodwill delegation led by Mr. Wang Pin-nan who is the President of the Chinese People's Friendship Association. Is this the way they should treat us? This is what is going on. China still regards Sikkim, please note, as an independent, sovereign country, and has shown it so in the recent map when they showed the western and south-western boundary of China. This is what they have done. And now they have started a massive military mobilisation along the border.

All these things do not indicate any tangible improvement in the climate around us. It is certainly not better than what it was at the time of the Congress Government. In spite of concessions and liberal gestures from the Janata Government, the attitude of these four countries remains what it was. We must try to do our best to improve our relations. We must try our best to improve our relations and create a climate of peace, friendship and co-operation in our neighbourhood. And that must be our first priority. I entirely agree with the Janata Government on that. But it appears that all these four countries are taking the Janata Government for a ride, leading them along the garden path...

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA (Gujarat): May I make a humble request to my honourable friend? He was a Minister himself... (*Interruptions*) I am just making a request. Kindly hear me. My honourable friend happened to be Minister of External Affairs himself. So far as external matters are concerned, I would request him to talk in a more responsible manner. After all, we are discussing a very delicate subject. He should be more responsible on this subject. That is all. (*interruptions*) I have not heard a more irres-

possible speech coming from an ex-External Affairs Minister.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I have not uttered a single word or a single sentence which can be described as irresponsible even from the diplomatic point of view. I know much more about it than you do, Mr. Oza.

We must do our best to normalise the relations. But it appears that these four countries are taking the Janata Government for a ride, leading them along the garden path. The Prime Minister condemned the previous Government's policy saying that the previous Government was suffering from arrogance and big brother attitude. You are free, you are at liberty to say so. But the previous Government followed a policy of realism and, the most important, cautious optimism. That was the approach. You are now

3 P.M. exhibiting an approach of childlike—I won't say childish—exuberance in the conduct of foreign affairs with all countries—I do not discuss western countries—including our neighbours. You may say anything against the previous Government. You are at liberty to say that. We had committed errors, omissions and commissions and you are at perfect liberty to rectify past mistakes. You can improve upon it and we will welcome it. But for God's sake, please do not do one thing. I appeal to you—I warn you—not to allow this great country to be taken for granted by anybody or to be taken for a ride or, as I said, to be led along the garden path. Please do not do that. That is important and I warn them of that.

I also remind them of the Washington-Islamabad-Peking axis. That axis was destroyed in 1971. But attempts are being made to revive that axis—not only to revive that axis but also to extend this axis eastwards, southwards and northwards. I warn them of this

development so that they can be careful.

Our Foreign Minister is going to China. Well, what can I say if he wants to go? But I have some questions to ask on this. Some questions arise, and the country expects answers from them. I am strongly—I repeat 'strongly'—in favour of improving an normalising our relations with China. There cannot be any doubt about that. But may I ask one question? Is there a formal invitation? If so, from whom? This is a very concrete question. As I said, the Chinese Vice Premiers have been going round visiting all the neighbouring countries. Who visited us, I want to know? Should our Foreign Minister visit China under the circumstances that I have already explained? Is it proper from diplomatic point of view and from the point of view of our national honour and self-respect? What is he going to discuss? Has any ground been prepared for such a high level visit? Once again I caution our Foreign Minister against any kind of exuberant and over-enthusiastic—I do not want to use the word Mr. Dwivedra Nath Dwivedi used—way of handling diplomatic matters. What has really happened of substantive nature which calls for the visit of our Foreign Minister to China? I want to know and the House wants to know what has happened. These questions ought to be answered.

I do not want to refer to the Indian Ocean. We had discussed it. The foreign military activities are increasing there.

I want to know of the progress you are making in the matter of economic cooperation with West Asia, South Asia and Africa. Somebody from the other side said—I forget who said it—that we had not done anything for South East Asia and therefore 'we have to do something'. If the previous Government did not do anything, what are you doing?

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

For example have they tried to lend our cooperation to any one of the ASEAN projects they are implementing now in South East Asia? There are five ASEAN projects. Have we decided or tried to lend our cooperation for implementation of these projects? Sir, you want me to close and I am also coming to a close. Only two points I would like to make and then I will finish.

Sir, Sikkim is a part of India and everybody knows it. But what about the statement made by our Prime Minister, by no less a person than the Prime Minister himself? The statement made by no less a person than the Prime Minister has international implications. He said that it was his private view. May I ask: Has any Prime Minister of any country the right to express his private view on such an extremely delicate and extremely vital subject like Sikkim? And, Sir, what did he say? He said that the manner in which it was integrated was not proper. And who said it earlier? China said it; and the US said it. What China and the US said about Sikkim our Prime Minister has now dittoed. Being the Prime Minister, Sir, he speaks for the nation. Was it not a betrayal of the national interest, a gross betrayal of national interest? Morarjibhai cannot say, as Mr. Subramaniam Swamy or Mr. Jethmalani, whatever he wants to say. He is the Prime Minister. Here is the Prime Minister who talks on such a subject as this. He has no right to say this thing, that the manner in which it was integrated, the manner in which Sikkim was integrated, was not proper. By saying that you are only strengthening the hands of your enemies and they are trying to do propaganda against us. That is what you seem to be doing. Or, most probably, he did not understand the implications of what he was saying.

Sir, I do not want to discuss the nuclear policy now. We hope to discuss it on other occasions. With one

word, I will conclude my speech. I say this because nuclear policy, disarmament, etc. are all subjects of such a nature that they must be discussed separately. And, Sir, we have already condemned the statement made by the Prime Minister on the floor of the UN General Assembly that India will not go in for explosions even for peaceful purposes. Later on, Sir, he tried to correct himself by saying that we could go in for nuclear blast and not for nuclear explosions. Sir, I am a student of physics and I do not understand the distinction between nuclear blasts and nuclear explosions. As Mr. Dutt pointed out the other day, there cannot be any blast without an explosion. Even the children who play with crackers on the Diwali night know what an explosion is or what a blast is. But he makes a fine distinction between these two things and that was the policy statement which struck at the very roots of our policy of self-reliance. Number of explosions will be necessary to develop this technology. He says that some nuclear powers have come to the conclusion that such experiments are no longer necessary. Sir are we fools? Do we not understand anything? Those nuclear powers might be so big that such experiments are no longer necessary for them. That means they have done enough. They have done enough experiments to develop this technology and, therefore, they may feel that this is no more necessary. But have we done enough to develop that technology? Have you done much to develop that technology? Sir, nuclear technology has three purposes or aspects: One is use of radio isotopes for agricultural and medical purposes, the second is nuclear energy for power and the third is nuclear explosion for mining, for digging canals, for boring tunnels for oil exploration and so on. This is the Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency and it is not my private view. It is for these purposes that we want to develop this techno-

logy. They have developed it and they have conducted many experiments. But we have not done. But the Prime Minister here the other day asked: "What have we gained by this experiment?" He says that he was a student of science. Can any student of science by a single experiment master a technology? Are we fools or children? We are neither fools nor children. Sir, hundreds and hundreds of experiments will be necessary to develop a particular technology, especially the nuclear technology. Therefore, this policy statement was anti-national, was against the interests of the country. Sir, as I said earlier, I want to close now.

In the ultimate analysis, Mr. Vajpayee, the success of foreign policy depends upon the success of the domestic policies. Please take note of that. That means the political stability and economic strength at home. Nobody will pay any respect to you outside and nobody will care to study what your proposal is unless at home you are strong, unless internally you have political strength and economic strength. When the Government becomes weak and divided, and the economy goes down every day, when the unity and integrity of the nation are threatened when the stability of the very political system comes under a cloud, and when the economy goes down rapidly resulting in more misery, more suffering, more discontent and more unrest, no foreign policy can succeed or achieve anything however able and dynamic the Foreign Minister might be. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Margaret Alva. Please keep to the time-limit, otherwise you will be taking the time of your party members.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Don't worry. We have worked it out.

Sir, the foreign policy of our country, I believe, has been influenc-

ed by two basic factors. The first is that it has grown basically out of rigid historical commitments to certain principles and this policy has been influenced over decades as a part of our freedom struggle and international commitments. And, secondly, even more importantly, is the fact that India's foreign policy has always been marked by a consensus from all sections of our people, as far as our basic approach to international affairs is involved. Governments may come and go, Foreign Ministers may change, but I believe, the basic policy of this country can be changed only at the cost of the prestige of this nation, and perhaps even the stability of the Government itself. It is this foreign policy of peaceful coexistence, of non-alignment, of support to liberation struggles and national freedom movements, of cooperation with developing countries in their battle for scientific and technological self-reliance, and support to the assertion of equal rights of the newly independent nations of the world, that has given to India a place of prestige in the comity of nations, and has brought us friendship from all quarters of the world.

It has been stated by the Janata Government and particularly by the Foreign Minister repeatedly that that there has been a basic continuity in this policy. Perhaps in some way you can accept this fact. But the Foreign Minister has also pointed out just a couple of days ago that where the national interest was involved, they have not hesitated to bring about a readjustment. And he went on further to explain that when the Janata Party came to power, there was a certain lack of credibility in the country's foreign policy, and that they have set about deliberately to rectify the situation by projecting an image of India which is democratic, non-repressive at home and non-chauvinist and non-disruptionist abroad. I would like the Foreign Minister to clarify as to what exact-

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

ly he meant by saying that in the past the Government had been disruptionist abroad, because this is a charge which he is making against this nation itself. We hear repeatedly the term used by this new Government—and the Foreign Minister used it the other day—that it is “a result-oriented foreign policy.” What do you mean by result-oriented foreign policy? You have a policy, you stand by it and you implement it. But when you say that your foreign policy is result-oriented, then comes the danger that you are trying to play to the gallery...

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): Sir, on a point of order. The Minister is not listening...

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: You don't worry...

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAJEE): I am not playing to the gallery...

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: You are yawning...

(Interruptions)

He has been speaking about having a result-oriented foreign policy and not being confined to just keeping to something which has been handed over to him. That is why I say that we are faced with the danger that this Government is more interested in pleasing others and in getting others to accept them, than to seeing what is good for them and for the country. What has been the result of this policy during these 17 months? There is no doubt that there will be little difference in the approach between the previous speaker and me because basically we are Congressmen and we believe in the same policy. Non-alignment is probably the most important thing because it

really is the corner-stone of this country's foreign policy. As the speaker before me pointed out, they keep on repeating the new term ‘genuine non-alignment’. And the Foreign Minister has often clarified it. In fact, foreign policy was not an issue in the last general elections and nobody asked them for any explanation and no explanations were given. But our Foreign Minister later went on to explain this “genuine non-alignment” by saying that you have not only got to be non-aligned, but you have also got to appear to be non-aligned. In his great desire to explain this, the Foreign Minister went around trying to tilt the balance or trying to restore the balance. I do not know what happened in the process. But it has been repeatedly said by many great spokesmen of the Janata Party that the previous Government had tilted too much to the socialist side and that we were too much dependent on the Soviet Union. This had its historic reasons. There were reasons for being perhaps a little more friendly to the socialist countries. But the most amazing thing was our Prime Minister's statement recently and the Foreign Minister quoted his speech at 4 Seminar the other day saying that non-alignment, according to our Prime Minister, means “aligning with all.” I am surprised that Mr. Vajpayee should have quoted this. I ask him today: Can you be aligned with all when you speak about justice, can you be aligned with the exploiters and the exploited, can you be aligned with colonialists while supporting the cause of freedom and can you be with the imperialists when you are speaking about the right of new nations to their own economic self-reliance and independence? How can you be aligned with all if you have a policy? If you just want your policy to be result-oriented and want to get a part from everybody and to be with everybody, then have no policy at all. How can you say that our policy is to be aligned with all? Can you be with

SWAPO and other freedom fighters of Africa and also support the illegal regime run by the white minority? How can the Prime Minister and the Government say such a thing and then have it quoted by a Foreign Minister of Mr. Vajpayee's standing? How can you say that we are aligned with all if you are anti-imperialist and if you are with the freedom fighters and with those who are fighting in Africa for their independence? You speak about the tilt to one side and I ask why was there no tilt on the other side. What has been the role of the United States in this region? Why was the Seventh Fleet in the Indian waters during the Bangladesh war? What has been the role of the United States in regard to the Indo-Pakistani relations all these years? It was of arming Pakistan and supporting them in their illegal occupation of Kashmir. On several international issues, they stood against us and today you say that the previous Government was responsible for moving us away from one side and bringing us closer to the other side. With all the efforts that have been made by your Government, with all the visits and comings and goings and with all the nice speeches and personal friendship, what have you got by way of a commitment for Tarapore? Something has been given to you now. But even the contractual obligations have not been committed right up to 1980, in spite of all the attempts made by you after you came into the Ministry and occupied the Treasury Benches. As far as our role in the Non-alignment movement is concerned, I believe, it has been rather negative of late. The admission of Pakistan at Belgrade was, I think, the greatest blow to the prestige of this country. And, of course, I know what the answer from the Foreign Office will be. Your Government at Colombo allowed somebody to come in as a guest. Let me remind you, Mr. Vajpayee, and I am not wrong on this issue that at Colombo we op-

posed the admission of this country. But when it came to the question of a consensus, we went along with the consensus as a last resort. But what happened this time? The newspaper reports say that we made a commitment to Pakistan from the beginning, that we would not oppose the admission of Pakistan even though till today it continues to be a formal member of the CENTO. Have they withdrawn from the military pact? Well, you may not have wanted to oppose them openly, but you could have at least kept quiet. Why did we commit our support to them? Even before Belgrade, we had made our commitment to a country which is a part of a military bloc and which has been hostile to us all along. But you will say, as you said the other day at a seminar, that we believe in countries undergoing a change of heart. Please do not judge everybody by your standards. You may have undergone change of hearts. But countries do not overnight undergo a change of heart on these basic issues, and least of all Pakistan.

As far as our statement at Belgrade was concerned, I believe, it was too tame for a man of your dynamism. There was nothing positive in it, there was nothing new in it, and there was no dynamism in it. It just did not reflect your personality and there is no denying that it must have been, probably, put together by someone much less dynamic in the Ministry. I would, therefore, like to ask: At a time when the movement itself is ridden with internal problems, with internal dissensions, when infiltration is taking place, when the very existence of the movement is going to be threatened, in the long run, what has India, as one of the founder-members, to offer by way of a solution? Did your statement say this is it, this is it? Have you spoken about some concrete measures by which these trends could be checked right at the beginning? Or, do you believe in shoving everything under the carpet and let it lie until th

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

carpet cannot hold any more dirt under it? I believe, we have to take a positive step and a positive stand to see that some machinery is evolved within the Non-aligned movement itself to find solutions to problems which are going to be faced over the coming years. And unless we take some initiatives and see that our voice is felt, I don't think the Non-aligned movement itself can survive these pressures for very long.

You have spoken at home, abroad, in Parliament and outside about the great success of your policy by way of improving your relations with the neighbouring countries. The speaker before me also spoke about it, and, perhaps, I will not repeat what he has said. But there are certain other angles which I would like to emphasise. You have said that those accusing the Government of abandoning the national interests did not like the significant improvement in India's relations with her neighbours. Would you suggest that those of us who have been criticising something of what has happened for the last few months are not interested in improving our relations with our neighbouring countries? Do you believe that we want to be at war or at a perpetual hostility with our neighbours? But, Mr. Vajpayee, we also believe that there are certain basic national interests which cannot be sacrificed. Young men in their thousands have laid down their lives to defend the borders of this country, and we will continue to fight for what we believe to be the right and just cause of this nation irrespective of what the world or the super-powers or others may say about us. Let us not believe that just because a Government has changed, that the interests of this country have changed or that the needs and requirements of this country can over-night take a new turn altogether. This country will last beyond Governments, beyond Foreign Ministers and beyond Prime Ministers. And it is this long-term perspective that you have not to keep in mind when you negotiate with

your neighbours and when you sign agreements which are going to bind the future generations of this nations to which we belong. I would here like to ask you one thing more. You have said and I quote: "For the first time in a long time our foreign policy has produced an environment conducive to national economic development." I ask you: At what cost? Have you been functioning? And at what cost is this nation entering into these agreements? My views on Farakka have been very well-known. Probably, we may not see eye to eye as long as you are the Foreign Minister and as long as I am here in the Rajya Sabha to speak and fight about it. Let me tell you that Farakka according to you and your spokesmen in Parliament and outside has been a great achievement, a great feat of diplomatic negotiations, but I have termed it a sell out and I still believe it to be so. The effects on U.P., and Bihar in the long run, on the Calcutta port which are already noticed, and on certain smaller towns along the banks of the river are going to be a disaster. Let me ask you, after this agreement when we came down from 40,000 cusecs to 20,500 cusecs, what was the result? We were told in Parliament that in the interests of the long term arrangements, long term agreements and long term solutions, we have got to give in for a little while. What has been the effect as far as the long term solutions are concerned? Has Bangladesh agreed to our proposals or even agreed to consider our proposals for the Ganga-Brahmaputra link up? On the other hand, Bangladesh is trying to internationalise the issue day in and day out. She has already suggested that the Joint River Commission should be expanded to bring in Nepal and China in the long run, if possible. They want the World Bank to step in, the famous World Bank which has created havoc in so many countries. What has hurt me more than anything else is the fact that the British Prime Minister, when he addressed Members of Parliament in the Central Hall—his speech has

been circulated—referred to the waters of the Ganga as the waters of the sub-continent and congratulated this Government on entering into this agreement. For the first time I hear an Indian river being referred to as “the waters of the sub-continent”. May I know since when has the Ganga and these river waters become the rivers of the sub-continent? When all this was said, the Government stood up and applauded the speeches which these people made in the Central Hall.

And, then came Mr. Jimmy Carter offering aid for the development of the North-Eastern region. What interest is it to the Americans as to what happens to the North-Eastern region of this country? They offer aid for the development of these areas. What is the long-range project and objective of this new-found interest in this North-Eastern region of this country bordering on China and Bangladesh? In this connection, Sir, I would like to ask one more question. Is the Government going to consider this Bangladesh proposal to drop the Ganga-Brahmaputra link canal project, as suggested? Is Bangladesh not going to insist upon that? Of course, we will be told in Parliament that this had to be done in the interests of the country, and as Babuji has said once or twice in some of the speeches here and the Prime Minister has been repeatedly saying, we have to play the role of the big brother, after all, we are a big country and we have to be generous. I do not like the use of the words ‘big brother’ in international politics and nobody likes it. What is the meaning of saying that we are a large country and so we can go on making concessions? Does it mean that you can go on offering everything to others? What type of international negotiations are these?

It has been said that because of this understanding the refugee problem and the border problem have been solved. This has been solved at the

cost of hundreds of Mukti Bahini patriots, who have been sent back across the border and whose fate has not been known since they returned to their country. Is this the tradition of this country to have handed back or literally forced back hundreds of these Mukti Bahini volunteers who had taken refuge in India because of conditions at home? But we say today that we have solved the problem? Does sending people back and having them go down as others have gone, the way in which you treat patriots from a neighbouring country, who have taken refuge in India, mean solution of the problem?

As far as Pakistan is concerned, it has been said by the speaker before me and I repeat that the Simla Agreement and the first steps towards the normalisation of relations with Pakistan were taken by the Congress Government under Mrs. Indira Gandhi. We took the first bold step to see that friendship was restored and a lot of progress was made on the question of trade and the question of opening up the borders for transit and so on. What is the big thing that has happened over the last 17 months? The Foreign Minister has been there. Have any concrete results emerged out of it except perhaps for the overrunning by cultural troupes and Pakistani singers and so much is being made out of it, as if this country did not have enough of its own cultural heritage? What else have we got? The Salal Agreement has been concluded on their terms. We have given in ultimately to certain adjustments which they wanted. Then we have got the great resolution from the Islamic Conference reviving the call for a plebiscite in Kashmir. Then the ceremonial opening up of the Karakoram road and when a question about it came up here in Parliament, your Minister of State stood up here and very honestly said, “I want to assure the House that the Foreign Minister knew nothing about it when he went to Pakistan to have negotiations; he knew nothing about this

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]
road, nothing about its opening up, we were all taken by surprise and so it took us seven days to protest." This is how your Embassies function today; this is how your External Affairs Ministry functions today. When you go there for talks with a Government for negotiations, neither your Ambassador nor anybody else knows about the opening of the road. This is on the records of Parliament. Is that a compliment to the functioning of your Ministry or the Embassies or the Government of India itself?

And then comes this repeated pressure at the United Nations for the nuclear weapon free zone. And this is because of our own weakening stand at the United Nations. We had opposed this resolution year after year but for the first time, the year, we abstained. We said: "No, we would not take a stand." And because of this, the votes for the Pakistani resolution went up to the highest figure since the resolution came in the United Nations, because we abstained. And what was the response from Pakistan's Foreign Minister? There was a statement by him that since there is nobody opposed to this proposal from that region, we are prepared to enter into a joint declaration with the countries in this region to have it implemented. This is because we slipped up at the United Nations and did not take a positive opposing stand on that resolution and decided to sit back and watch the fun.

As far as Nepal is concerned, we had—the previous Government had—opposed this trade and transit treaty for a number of reasons but you have thought it fit to have it, and you feel that it is a great achievement. Only time will show who was right and who was wrong.

As far as China is concerned, I agree with the speaker before me that none of us is opposed to negotiations with China. It is an Asian power at our door-steps, and a country which has achieved a tremendous

lot in different fields and we what to be at peace with China. But let me ask you, Mr. Foreign Minister, who took the first step on this. It was we who restored our relations with China to the level of Ambassador a little before you came on the scene and we are all for finding solutions, the solutions which will not in any way compromise our stand on the border issue. I would request you to carry with you some of your own beautiful speeches in the Lok Sabha. I think that would make a beautiful background reading material for you. I think you should carry them with you and keep them with you. I was not in Parliament then but I think there were some of the most patriotic speeches you have made in your political career. Carry them with you please and read them on the way. Do not forget what you had once said and try to remember that what you said is today the duty of the Foreign Minister of this country while talking with China. That will help you and stand you in good stead. But we have no doubts about your capacity. I would only ask one question. Why has the Government thought it necessary to send a special envoy ahead of you? There was a big report; I think it was on the front page of the *Statesman* saying that this special envoy has received detailed briefing from the Foreign Minister, not the Ministry, but from the Foreign Minister and that he was going with the clearance of the Prime Minister to prepare the ground for the Foreign Minister's visit. I never thought that you would get anyone like that to go and prepare the ground for you. I only hope that pitfalls will not be prepared before you step on to the Chinese soil. So, I would suggest you to please be cautious before you send envoys on your behalf. And in this regard I would like to say that we are all for improved relations with China. But the border is important and the prestige of this country is important. Let me remind you that no country anywhere in the world any time in history has ever achieved greatness by the policy of appease-

ment. It is only a country which can stand up for its rights and assert itself when it must, that has ever been able to defend itself and to hold its head high in the comity of nations.

And then, before I go further, the speaker before me preferred to keep out of it, but I think I would be failing in my duty if I ignore the nuclear policy. We have been talking about it in and out in this House and I think it is of vital importance to speak about it. This was another aspect probably of the national policy where there had been a national consensus. Two things we had accepted. Firstly, we would not go in for nuclear armament manufacture. But at the same time, we have been proudly watching the development of our nuclear energy programme for peaceful purposes. In a country ridden by energy shortages, where certain countries are trying to hold the others to ransom, as far as these requirements are concerned, it is of vital importance that in a developing country, particularly, of the size of this country, we should be able to have nuclear technological self-reliance. But what are we doing? Every statement from the Government creates a new controversy, a contradiction and more confusion. Every few days, we have a new controversy in the Press, because, either the Prime Minister has made a new statement, or, he has contradicted his previous statement, or, he has found a distinction between a blast and an explosion, or, he has found a difference between the past and the present. We cannot understand where these policy statements are drafted, who makes them out and from where they come. Everytime the Prime Minister makes a statement, there is more confusion in this country and abroad and ambassadors come knocking at your doors to satisfy themselves that their interests have been kept in mind before the new pronouncement was made. I quote here what the Prime Minister went and

said before the U. N. Special Session on disarmament. A statement is made before the international body by the Prime Minister and I quote from the statement.

"We are the only country which has pledged not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons even if the rest of the world did so. I solemnly reiterate the pledge before this august Assembly."

Then, he goes further, more solemnly, and says:

"In fact, we have gone further and abjured nuclear explosions even for peaceful purposes."

What a tragedy to have to make this statement before the U.N. Special Session, when there has been the consensus that we would continue our nuclear research for peaceful purposes. The Prime Minister sees something wrong in it. I should not, but I would like to ask whether this was a Cabinet decision, to change this policy and to completely reverse the stand on peaceful nuclear energy development in this country by way of explosions, if they are necessary as far as the scientists are concerned, and, if they are safe by the opinion of our scientists. But instead, he comes back and what do we have? He says that the 1974 Pokharan test was a political stunt. Could there be a greater insult to the scientists of this country? You have ridiculed them before the world, you have ridiculed what they have achieved of which we are proud of which every Indian citizen is proud, by saying that it was a political stunt. Did you consult the nuclear scientists before you made a statement like that? Did they do it to please some political person or to please somebody else? Was it not because we felt that this country's technological development and nuclear programme required that experiment? But no. The Prime Minister says 'It was a political stunt, it was not necessary and I have decided that it will not take place'.

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

am the state,' said Louis the XIV. You laugh at some others for saying something else. But today, what is your Prime Minister saying? 'I have decided.' 'I go to international forums and make commitments because I feel so'. Is it how a democracy functions? Was there a consensus in Parliament? Was there a consensus in the Janata Party? Mr. Foreign Minister, you can contradict me if I am wrong. I think, even you would not agree to a statement like that, because we know your views on this.

As far as the NPT is concerned, we congratulate you on the very bold stand you have taken that we will not sign the NPT because it is discriminatory. This has been the policy of the country and we are with you hundred per cent on this stand and we hope the Government will stand by the commitment to the nation and hold on to it. Then comes the question of full scope safeguards. Here again, while you are trying to take a stand up till now, the Prime Minister makes a statement that if the two super powers, that is, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., agree to these three preconditions, he would have no objection to certain full scope safeguards. Now, I do not know if it is a wise thing to do, because, as far as we are concerned, if there are any countries by which we are going to be affected, they are China and France. China, because, their projects are right on our borders, and France, because, France is aiding Pakistan's programme of nuclear development. If you are leaving out these two countries from full scope safeguards and going on saying that as long as these two super powers agree to this, the rest can be looked after, I think, it is like—I will use the same term that Mr. Bipinpal Das used—child like exuberance. I do not want to spend more time on details, but it has been rather disappointing that the negotiations for the demilitarisation of the Indian Ocean have really not achieved any results. We do hope that you will

continue to voice our views on this matter and see that this is converted into a zone of peace.

As far as Africa is concerned, we have continued our support in every way to the freedom movements and to the finding of a just solution to the problems of these people. But I would say here once again that as far as Africa is concerned, you cannot be aligned with all. You have to be aligned with those who have been exploited, with those who have been denied their birth right, with those who have paid or are paying with their blood the price for their freedom. We are a country which has fought colonialism, we are a country which has faced that battle for a hundred years. How can you forget that today and say that in our new found freedom we are aligned with all and we can treat everybody equally? This is the very negation of the character of this country. Therefore, I would plead with you, please do not quote that statement of the Prime Minister anywhere abroad if you want to help this country in any way.

There is nothing more that I wish to say. I only want to add in conclusion that we do hope, Mr. External Affairs Minister, that at least for the future you will think more about our long-term interests and not think as if the destiny of this country is tied up with the term of Government of any one party. The interests of this country are going to last beyond the Congress Government, beyond the Janata Government and beyond any other Government that might come in at any time. Let us not make compromises which we will not be able to defend. And we have noticed over the last few months that you have either been missing when certain issues have been raised or you have refused to speak on them, allowing everybody else to speak, intervene and make statement on the issues. I can quote two or three debates where you preferred to sit and observe and

let others intervene probably because there are different opinions on these issues and many of you do not want to make commitments on many of these policies. We have noticed and perhaps in a way we are glad about it, that some of you still have different opinions on these issues, but for the future of the country and in the interest of this country please decide what your priorities are, what your interests are and please do not be obsessed by result-oriented foreign policy, but by the policy which will keep only the interests of this country closest while deciding on your options.

डॉ० भई महाबोर (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति जी, मैंने दो प्रमुख विरोधी दलों के वक्ताओं के भाषणों को सुना।

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE
(West Bengal): Why don't you
Speak in English? We would like to
listen to you in English.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शर्मा (उत्तर
प्रदेश) : नहीं नहीं।

डॉ० भई महाबोर : आप हिन्दी समझते
हैं। आप मेरा वक्त भाषा के सवाल पर क्यों
खत्म कर रहे हैं ?

मुझे उम्मीद थी कि भूतपूर्व विदेश मंत्री
के भाषण में उनके मन्त्री पद के अनुभवों की
कुछ झलक दिखाई देगी, लेकिन दिखाई यह
दिया कि मन्त्री पद छूटने के बाद लूटी हुई
आकांक्षाओं का सिर्फ भूत ही वहाँ रल रहा
है। उन्होंने दाव किया कि जो कुछ अच्छा
हुआ है वह तो उन्होंने किया और जो कुछ
खराब है वह इस सवा साल के अन्दर आकर
इस जनता पार्टी ने की है। चीन ने पाकिस्तान
को मिलाने वाली जो सड़क बनाई है जो सड़क
1962 या 1963 में शुरू हुई थी और
जिसके बारे में प्रोटैस्ट का रिकार्ड है 1965
में और 1969 में पिछली सरकारों का, उस
सड़क की जिम्मेदारी भी जनता सरकार के
ऊपर आ गई और महोदय ने फरमाया कि

आज जो चीन के लिए दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ रहा
है उसके बदले में चीन हमारे साथ यह सलूक
कर रहा है।

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated):
They are repeated what you used to
say.

डॉ० भई महाबोर : महोदय, विपिनपाल
दास महोदय ने जो कुछ कहा मैं सोचता हूँ
अच्छा होता वे थोड़ा बहुत यथार्थ के आधार
पर खड़े रहते और उस वक्त की बात सोचते
जब हम उधर थे हम ऐसा भाषण देते थे तो
हमें "वार-मोंगर" कहा जाता था। हमसे पूछा
जाता था—“क्या आप चाहते हैं कि हम
पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ाई करें, जंग छेड़ दें।
पाकिस्तान ने यह किया या वह किया, हम
पाकिस्तान को दोस्त बनायेंगे”। आपने भी
दोस्ती बनाने की कोशिश की थी। जब कच्छ
पर आक्रमण हुआ था आपने पाकिस्तान के
साथ दोस्ती बनाने के लिए पाकिस्तान को
कितना इलाका दे दिया, उसके पहले भी
काश्मीर पर जब आक्रमण हुआ था तो काश्मीर
का एक तिहई से ज्यादा हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के
कब्जे में चला गया। वह किस ने छोड़ा। क्या
जनता पार्टी ने छोड़ा ? आपने छोड़ा। किंग
लिए ? इसलिए कि आप सोचते थे कि उससे
पाकिस्तान दोस्त बनेगा। मैं आपके अजमेंट
की, आपके फैसले की आलोचना करना हूँ,
आपकी नीयत की आलोचना नहीं करता।
मैं समझता हूँ कि आपने यह सोचा था कि
शायद पाकिस्तान छोटा देश है और वह छोटे
भाई की तरह व्यवहार करे और मान जाए,
हम उसको प्यार से जीत लें और अपना बना
लें लेकिन वह नहीं माना। मैं आपसे पूछना
चाहता हूँ जो तजुर्बा आपने 1948 से शुरू
किया वही बार बार किया। आखिर में भी
बंगलादेश की लड़ाई के वक्त भी राजस्थान के
इलाके से सिंध के इलाके में जो हमारी फौज
बढ़ी थी, आपने वह इलाका पाकिस्तान को
लौटा दिया, छम्ब और जौड़िया का इलाका
जो पाकिस्तान ने अपने कब्जे में कर रखा था
उसको लौटाने का आग्रह किए बगैर ! यह

[डा० भाई महावीर]

सब किस लिए हुआ था ? पाकिस्तान का वह सारा व्यवहार भुला कर आज आप पूछते हैं कि पाकिस्तान आपके साथ कैसा सलूक कर रहा है ? यह जनता पार्टी के बोए हुए बीज नहीं हैं। यह कांटे आपके लगाए हुए हैं, यह विष वृक्ष आपके बोए हुए हैं जिनके कड़े फल हम को चखने पड़ रहे हैं। जनता पार्टी के नेताओं, विशेषकर माननीय विदेश मंत्री को मैं बधाई देना चाहता हूँ उन्होंने कभी दावा नहीं किया कि सारी अच्छी बातें उन्होंने की हैं इसके पहले की सरकार ने कोई भी अच्छी बात नहीं की। उन्होंने पहले नेहरू जी को श्रेय दिया, दूसरे नेताओं को दिया लेकिन यह सब श्रेय लेकर उनको संतोष पाने की बजाए हमारे बिपिनपाल दास साहब की भूख और भड़क उठी है। उनको लगता है कि यह भूख अभी शांत होगी जब आए बाएँ शाएँ कुछ न कुछ जनता पार्टी के खिलाफ उल्टा सीधा कहने की सम्भावनाएँ हों वह कह लेंगे, उन्होंने कुछ ऐसे ही करने की कोशिश की है। हमने रूस के साथ मित्रता की, उसके उन्होंने कई एक उदाहरण बताए। कहते हैं—हम हमेशा पीड़ितों के साथ खड़े रहे, हमने हमेशा वियतनाम का साथ दिया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ आप तिब्बत के साथ खड़े क्यों नहीं रहे, अफगानिस्तान के साथ खड़े क्यों नहीं रहे और वेतनाम के साथ खड़े क्यों नहीं रहे ? मैं यह सवाल न पूछता अगर भूतपूर्व मंत्री यह कहने के लिए मजबूर न करते। हम सिर्फ गलतियाँ करते हैं और आप जा करते हैं ठीक करते हैं, यह दावा करना छोड़ दीजिए। मुझे खुशी हुई अभी मेरी पूर्ववक्ता बहन ने कहा मंत्री आएंगे और चले जाएंगे, प्रधानमंत्री आएंगे और चले जाएंगे लेकिन यह देश कायम रहेगा। यह भाषा आपने सीख तो ली। थोड़े दिन पहले आपको क्या भाषा थी, मैं आपको याद नहीं कराना चाहता। उन्होंने कहा कि you say some other people say something else तभी मैंने पूछा था who are those 'some other people' and what is that 'something' which they said?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:
The Janata Government has learnt many more lessons, including Mr. Vajpayee.

(Interruptions)

डा० भाई महावीर : इसलिए नाम लेने की जरूरत नहीं है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अच्छा हुआ यह भाषा आप सीख गए। यह लोकतंत्र का पहला सबक है। यह जनता पार्टी ने आपको आ कर दिया। जब तक आप सत्ता में बैठे हुए थे तब तक आपको यह सबक नहीं आता था (Interruptions) महोदय मैंने कहा कि (Interruptions) मैंने आपको बड़ी शान्ति से सुना है। मैं ज्यादा समय लेने वाला नहीं हूँ। कहा गया कि यह 'जेनुइन' शब्द। नान अलाइनमेंट के साथ क्यों लगाया गया ? यह सवाल बड़ा सही है कि जेनुइन क्यों लगाया गया। इस देश के दो वर्ष के इतिहास में यह बार-बार कहा गया कि हम लोग जेनुइन डेमोक्रेसी ला रहे हैं। यहां जेनुइन प्रीडम आफ प्रेस है, यहां जेनुइन लिबर्टी है यह मुहावरा इतनी बार रटा गया कि इसको सुनते सुनते हमारे कान पक गये। अभी अभी हमारे दो पूर्व वक्ता महोदय बोले हैं। ये आपस में जरा फैसल कर लें कि जेनुइन कांग्रेस कौन सी है, वे कहते हैं कि उनकी कांग्रेस जेनुइन है और वे कहते हैं कि उनकी है। जिस दल के बारे में तय नहीं है कि वह जेनुइन कौन सा है, वह कम से कम जेनुइन शब्द के महत्व को समझते होंगे वे अपने लिए उस शब्द का इस्तेमाल करते हैं तो आशा है उसका अर्थ समझकर ही करते होंगे (Interruptions) महोदय, उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि पाकिस्तान 'इन्फ्लूटेट' कर गया, पाकिस्तान कैसे आया न न एल इन मूवमेंट' में और इस वास्ते घुसपैठियों के आने से इस आंदोलन के अंतर्गत गड़बड़ी शुरू हो जायेगी। आप भूल गये कि कोलम्बो में पाकिस्तान के आने का सुझाव था और कोलम्बो में अगर पाकिस्तान नहीं आ सका तो इसलिए कि कोलम्बो में आने के वास्ते पाकिस्तान आन्जरबर स्टेटस चाहता था, पाकिस्तान को

आब्जर्वर स्टेटस अभी भी नहीं दिया गया, अब वह गेस्ट के रूप में आया है, गेस्ट के रूप में आना चाहता था या नहीं, यह सवाल अब जरूर उठाया जा सकता था। लेकिन उस समय चव्हाण साहब विदेश मंत्री थे और वे इस बात पर आपत्ति नहीं करते थे कि पाकिस्तान गेस्ट के रूप में आये।

DR. V. P. DUTT: That is wrong. Don't make a wrong statement.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: You will have the opportunity to correct all the wrong things. You please keep glued to your seat for some time.

महोदय, यह एक सवाल हो सकता है कि पाकिस्तान जैसे देशों को आने दिया जाय या नहीं। लेकिन तब रूमानिया कैसे आया था? क्या रूमानिया मिलिटरी ब्लाक का सदस्य नहीं है? उस समय की सरकार ने, उस समय के विदेश मंत्री ने इसको कैसे पसन्द किया था, अगर पसन्द किया था तो मैं उनकी नीयत पर सन्देह नहीं करता। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि उन्होंने नान एलाइन्ड मूवमेंट में कोई विस्फोट करने की या उसे सैबोटेज करने की कोशिश की। उन्होंने सोचा होगा कि एक रास्ता होना चाहिए। जो आज पूरे एनाइंड है वे थोड़ा सा नान एलाइंड होने की कोशिश करें फिर और ज्यादा बढ़ें और एक दिन सारे बंधनों से छूट कर नान एलाइंड रूप में खड़ा हो सके। माल्टा ने ऐसा किया है। इस तरह बढ़ने का रास्ता अगर आप पाकिस्तान जैसे देशों के लिए देखने हैं तो सिद्धान्त शायद इसमें आपत्ति न हो। परन्तु मैं समझता हूँ कि नान एनाइंड मूवमेंट में, निर्गटवाद के आन्दोलन में कुछ देशों को और जोड़ने के प्रलोभन में यह करने की जरूरत नहीं है। हमें आप्रह करना चाहिए कि जो सही तौर से नान एलाइंड है केवल उन्हीं देशों को इसमें लिया जाय और पाकिस्तान जैसे देश जिस वक्त मिलिटरी ब्लाक की सदस्यता छोड़े नहीं

हम उन्हें इस आन्दोलन में लेने पर तैयार हों। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को यह स्टैंड लेना चाहिए।

महोदय, इसके अलावा भूतपूर्व मन्त्री जी ने फरमाया कि चीन ने सड़क बना ली और कुछ और कर लिया। चीन हमारे प्रति क्या रवैया रख रहा है, चीन ने हमारे पास केवल एक गुडविल मिशन भेजा था। जब यहाँ चीन के प्रधान मन्त्री साक्षात् आये थे तब उनके साथ गलबहिया होकर के हमारी सरकार के नेताओं ने हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई के गाने गाये परन्तु उनका जो चीन ने इशारा दिया था वह आप भूल गये। कराकोरम सड़क तो पाकिस्तान के अधिष्ठा क्षेत्र में बनायी गयी है। पाकिस्तान के पास वह अधिष्ठा क्षेत्र जनता पार्टी ने नहीं छोड़ा। किसी छोड़ा आपको याद है। उस क्षेत्र में जो सड़क बनायी गयी है, उस पर तो आप बड़े परेशान है लेकिन अबसाई चीन के अन्दर जो हमारा अपना दफा का है उसके अन्दर सी मील तक चीन ने सड़क बनायी थी वह किस सरकार की मेहरबानी से बनी थी, कौन सोया था उस समय, किन्तु इस देश को अंधेरे में रखा, संसद को अंधेरे में रखा, यह सब रिकार्ड पर है। उस समय के प्रधान मन्त्री ने चीन को चिट्ठी लिखी थी कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने जो हमारा इलाका कब्जे में कर रखा है इसका फैसला हो जाय, क्योंकि अगर यह देश को पता लग गया तो इसका यहाँ बड़ा भारी विरोध होगा, प्रतिवाद किया जायगा। महोदय, यह सारे बातें इतिहास की बातें हैं मैं इन सारे बातों में नहीं जाता अगर मुझे माफ़ूर न होना पड़ता चूँकि मेरे पूर्व वक्ता ने पहले यह कहा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन बातों को एक तरफ रख कर विचार करें मैं जहाँ इसलिए एक तरफ विदेश मन्त्री को बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस देश की भर्थाई को एक नए सिरे में ऊपर उठाया है। दूसरे देशों के लोगों को यह लगता था कि यहाँ लोकतन्त्र मर गया है लेकिन पिछले चुनावों ने—इसमें पार्टी के लिए श्रेय नहीं

[डा० भाई महावीर]

लेना चाहता हूँ—इस देश की जनता ने तय किया अगर एक सरकार वह कितनी भी देर से चलती आ रही हो। अगर वह गलती कर रही है तो उसको बदला जा सकता है और मैं एक जनता पार्टी के सदस्य की हैसियत से यह कहता हूँ कि यह सबसे बड़ी उपलब्धि है। हमारी सरकार को भी इससे बल मिलेगा जब हम इस बात को याद रखेंगे कि इस देश की जनता बड़ी सजग है और अगर यह सरकार भी गलती करेगी तो इसको भी बदला जा सकता है। महोदय, तो इस तरह के परिवर्तन के कारण सारी दुनिया के अन्दर इस देश का माथा ऊंचा हुआ है। परन्तु कोई यह सोचे कि जनता सरकार बड़े-बड़े देशों के साथ 'आवसेस्ट' या उनसे बहुत ज्यादा प्रभावित है, मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे ज्यादा बड़ी गलती नहीं हो सकती। और पिछले दिनों हमारे विदेश मन्त्री ने जो कुछ किया, जिन छोटे-छोटे देशों के साथ, भूटान, नेपाल और अफगानिस्तान के साथ मित्रता बढ़ाने की जो कुछ भी उपलब्धियाँ, अचीवमेंट्स हैं उनको आपने बिल्कुल मानों धुएँ में उड़ा देने की कोशिश की। कहा कि यह क्या बड़ा किया अगर पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता करने डिप्लोमेटिक रिलेशनस बनाने का फैसला तो हमने किया था। आपने फैसला किया था, इसलिये आपने अब तक कर क्यों न लिया? अगर कुछ भी यद्वाया गया है तो मानिये कि उस दिशा में जो भी कदम बढ़े, जहाँ तक आप पहुँचे थे उससे आगे जो दो कदम बढ़ाये गये हैं। अगर दो कदम बढ़ाए गये हैं तो हम यह कहते हैं कि दिशा बही थी, लेकिन दो कदम और बढ़े हैं, इसका अहसास कीजिये।

महोदय, थोड़े नुक्तों के तीर ही पर अपनी बात कह कर मैं खत्म करूँगा। बड़े देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हैं, लेकिन मैं विदेश मन्त्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बड़े देशों द्वारा हम से अपने न्यूक्लियर रिसर्च के बारे में न्यूक्लियर खोज के बारे में बड़े देशों का

सहयोग मिलेगा। अमरीका का खया खेदजनक रहा है। अमरीका ने अपने वायदा किये हुए सौदे को भी देने से इन्कार किया। रूस का खया इसमें क्या होगा? हमें इन दोनों देशों का सहयोग मिलेगा कि नहीं।

एक प्रश्न बहुत देर से हमारी सरकार के सामने रहा है। आपको भी याद होता चाहिये। रूस के अन्दर जो सरकारी नक्शा छुपे थे उनमें भारत की भूमि चीन का भाग दिखाई जाती रही है। बार-बार हम प्रोटैस्ट करते रहे और हर बार हमें बताया जाता रहा कि वह गलती से हो गया, नक्शा पुराने वक्त का है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार ने रूस के साथ यह प्रश्न उठाया और अगर उठाया तो रूस की सरकार का इसके बारे में क्या जवाब है।

महोदय, सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्धों के बारे में दक्षिण-पूर्वी एशिया का क्षेत्र काफी मात्रा में अपेक्षित रहा है। उस उपेक्षा को दूर करके इन सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्धों के आधार पर जो बृहत्तर भारत का एक चित्र था वही भारत के साथ मित्र भाव का दृश्य फिर से हम बनाएँ, इस ओर सरकार को अधिक ध्यान देना चाहिये। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस ओर ज्यादा ध्यान दिया जायगा।

इसी तरह से हमारे जो दूतावा . हैं उनमें अधिकारी कितने ढीले हैं यह जब मोरारजी भाई और विदेश मन्त्री जी अमरीका गये उस समय साफ दिखाई दिया। जिस तरह से उनके भावणों और विजिट का अमरीका के राष्ट्रीय प्रेस में ब्लैक-आउट हुआ वह बहुत ही खेदजनक था। मैं समझता हूँ इसके लिए उन पर दोष लगाने के साथ हमें अपने दूतावास के अधिकारियों की जो विफलताएँ हैं उनकी ओर भी ध्यान देना आवश्यक होगा। मैं चाहूँगा कि मन्त्री महोदय इसकी ओर ध्यान देंगे।

इसके साथ ही जो प्रवासी भारतीय विदेशों में वसे हैं उनकी इच्छा है कि वहाँ रहते हुए भी वे भारत के साथ सम्बन्ध बनाये रखें, दोहरी नागरिकता की मांग करते हैं। इसमें

व्यावहारिक कठिनाइयां क्या हैं मैं नहीं जानता हो सकता है कि कुछ कठिनाइयां हों। लेकिन यदि उनको दूर किया जा सके तो मैं समझता हूँ कि भारतीय मूल के वे लोग जो अमरीका, कैनैडा या दूसरे देशों में बसे हैं उनको बड़ी प्रसन्नता होगी और इससे भारत को भी उस स्थिति में लाभ ही होगा। यही नहीं दक्षिण अफ्रीका जैसे देश में जहाँ भारतीय हैं, वहाँ के वे निवासी चाहते हैं कि भारत के मैडिकल कालिजों में, इंजीनियरिंग कालिजों में उनके बच्चों को शिक्षा का मौका मिले। क्या हमारी सरकार उनकी इस मांग को पूरा करने की कोशिश करेगी कि वे भारत के साथ अपने स्नेह सम्बन्ध बनाए रखें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस ओर ध्यान दिया जाए। इसी तरह से युनाइटेड नेशंस के अन्दर जो भारत का प्रतिनिधित्व है यू० एन० के सैक्रेटेरिएट में, काफी शिकायतें सुनने को मिलती है। जो थोड़े से भारतीय वहाँ हैं उनको लगता है कि भारतीयों को अपने महत्व के अनुरूप जो महत्ता के स्थान वहाँ मिलने चाहियें, वे नहीं मिलते और इस दृष्टि से भारत सरकार भी विशेष रूप से सचेत नहीं है। मैं चाहूँगा कि मंत्री जी इस ओर भी ध्यान दें।

महोदय, मैं इतना कह कर समाप्त कर रहा हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री जी ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र में जो अपनी भाषा में भाषण दिया वह प्रतीक था कि भारत स्वाभिमान के साथ खड़ा होना सीख रहा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत इस स्वाभिमान को सारी दुनिया के अन्दर रखते हुए चल सके, जो गलतियाँ हम कर चुके हैं उनसे सीखते हुए आगे बढ़ें। मैं अपने विपक्ष के मित्रों से प्रार्थना करना चाहूँगा कि छोटे-छोटे विषयों को लेकर दलगत भेदों के बीच न फँसे। जहाँ सरकार सफल हुई उसके लिए, सफलता के लिये बधाई के शब्द कहें। जहाँ गलतियाँ हैं, हमारी पार्टी के अन्दर आपस में कुछ झगड़े हैं, उनके लिए हम खुद शर्मिन्दा हैं। और आप जब उनको उठाते हैं तो हमें खुद भी लगता है

कि यह प्रश्न उठाने के बाद अगर देश सचमुच इन गलतियों से सीख सके तो हमारी पार्टी भी बलवती होगी और देश भी आगे बढ़ सकेगा। लेकिन हर बात को केवल पोलिटिकल एंगल से, दलगत दृष्टिकोण से न देखें, इसी में देश की भलाई होगी। धन्यवाद।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I think it is our duty now, after 16 months of Janata rule, to alert the nation by telling the people that serious distortions and deviations have already begun in our foreign policy which is a nationally accepted foreign policy and which is supposed to be implemented with a truly national outlook, keeping in view the traditions that we have upheld.

(The Vice-Chairman (Shri Shyam Lal Yadav) in the Chair)

Sir, it is not necessary for me to give a brief review of the world developments, but I cannot simply avoid it because the Government is either not making a correct assessment of the present international situation or, if it is making such an assessment, is trying to suppress it from the people. On the contrary, it appears to me that the Government is more and more trying to adjust itself to the analysis and understanding of the present-day world situation in terms of the western powers and may be, also of their requirements. And there comes the great threat to our foreign policy because no foreign policy of a country can be effectively operated in the interest of peace, national liberation and the progressive forces unless it realistically and objectively reviews and assesses the situation from the standpoint of fighting these and other anti-imperialist forces. It is not being done by this Government. Many of its utterances, the utterances of the Prime Minister and even of the Foreign Minister of our country, would indicate that they are interested now in glossing over the dark side of the developments and, above all, the culprits in the present-day

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

international situation, particularly, the U.S. imperialism.

Sir, it is well-known today that the world is spending more than 1,000 million dollars per day on arms, which is a staggering figure by any account. And the figure is rising. We know very well that explosives equivalent to 15 tonnes of TNT per head have been accumulated. We know very well that the United States is maintaining five lakh troops outside their country in 222 major and 2,000 minor bases, involving 40 countries in the world. Despite Jimmy Carter's assurance that the military budget would be reduced in the United States of America the current budget is of the order of 129 billion—not million but billion—dollars, having gone up by several billion dollars in the course of one year. Sir, it is well known also that the United States is dumping arms in the world and trying to involve even some of the non-aligned countries in the arms race. Today arms sales in the world come to about 24 billion dollars out of which America alone accounts for 12 billion or so dollars. And we find that 8 billion dollars worth of American arms are being pumped in the Persian Gulf area. Israel is getting annually 1000 million dollars worth arms from the United States of America. Recently they have also supplied 3 million dollars worth of arms to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Tragically Egypt has withdrawn into the American orbit, for arms race at least. Five hundred and fifty million people are under arms today in the world. On top of it we find that a high-power conference, a summit, of NATO powers was held in Washington towards the end of May. And there a 15-year plan which would cost 60 to 80 billion dollars has been drawn in order to step up the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and to build up an integrated communications system. These are the war prepara-

tions going on.

At the same time we saw the NATO powers directly intervening in Africa and Zaire, well, supported by the US Task Force. And following that military intervention they are meeting in Paris and Brussels in order to find out other means of intervention, in order to maintain their colonial domination, their neo-colonial domination, and plunder and to browbeat and intimidate the liberation forces in Africa. These are important developments. In Korea we find the United States of America is pursuing its neo-colonial policy with a view to preventing democratic, peaceful, reunification of the countries which is the common desire of all Korean people. There they are equipping the armed forces by supplying arms, and it appears that already 8 billion dollars worth of arms and other equipment have been pumped into South Korea, in order to prevent the unification of that country. Now, I can give many, many examples of this type. We are in the midst of a new counter offensive by the imperialist powers led by the United States of America. This is a sign of their desperation no doubt. The world balance of forces cannot change against the forces peace and national liberation. American imperialism, and for that matter world imperialism, has lost its initiative in international affairs. There is no doubt about it. But at the same time an assessment has to be made of the manner of their operation, the technique they are following and their general posture and global strategy in world affairs. There I think the Indian Government is not making any assessment at all; even if they are doing it, they are not telling us. I say this thing because unless you make this assessment, what is our foreign policy going to be related to? What do we conquer? We are not good Samaritans going round the world to bring about settlements. We are in the world affairs in order to pursue our course of peace, in order

to help national liberation forces, in order to bring about a total disarmament, a nuclear disarmament in particular, in order to stand by the forces of African and other parts of the world which are fighting for their national liberation and rebuild their countries' national economy. We are there to expose and isolate the forces of American aggression and bring about a material change in the balance of forces so that we can advance in our cause of universal peace and set about the task of building a new international economic order which the Americans and others, despite their acceptance in principle, their verbal acceptance, are trying to sabotage. Therefore, we should be very friendly with all nations, especially the newly free countries, but let us not forget that we are up against the mighty imperialist power in the United States of America. After the Vietnamese war they have become desperate today. That is the situation today. And where is the recognition of this fact? Now the United States of America has taken to new manoeuvres, new offensives, new arms drives, new preparations, new provocations and new projections of gun-boat diplomacy. In that context, there is not even a proper assessment. There is no assessment as to what is happening in the context of relations between the United States of America and China. Today China is in open collusion with the United States of America and with NATO powers. **They are supporting NATO military action in Africa and they are asking NATO powers to build themselves up. They are insisting on more aggressive actions and preparations. Their war camps are declaring that war is inevitable. The whole country is being militarised. You are going there and you will come to know of it. The collusion and collaboration between the United States of America and China and between China and NATO powers is a dangerous major factor in international situation. Is it being taken into account**

at all? Is it being assessed? Are we adjusting our policy and projections keeping in view this dangerous development on the international scene? It is not accidental that the moment Zaire was under invasion by the NATO powers, the Chinese Foreign Minister gave support to their action against the liberation movement. Attempts are being made to build up Pan-American forces and to organise forces of mercenaries in order to keep down the forces of African national liberation. Have we taken this into account? Nothing of the kind is being done.

Shri Vajpayee is my old friend and naturally I have been reading his speeches very carefully. I have got some very interesting paper. This is "INDIA NEWS"...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): May I just point out to you that the time allotted to your Party is nine minutes and you have taken eleven minutes? Kindly bear this in mind.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not make it a farce.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): What can I do?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will not take much time I know that time has to be divided among various Parties. If necessary, we can sit a little longer. Otherwise it will be a farce.

For example, in this they have come out with the theory of super powers. The Americans have started saying that and now it has become the official policy. Mr. Goray, our High Commissioner in London, sends a message which is published in INDIA NEWS of the 29th June. This is brought out by the Indian High Commission. He says:

On the contrary, the signs are that the super powers are taking the world towards fresh crisis and confrontation.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Well, the Soviet Union is a friendly, peace-loving power and they are bracketed with the United States of America. This is what Mr. Goray, our High Commissioner has said. What could be a greater lie than this? Is the Soviet Union taking the world to confrontation? Or, are they helping the national liberation forces all over the world? Sir, all over the world, liberation battles are won not by nice speeches. They are won sometimes by weapons, sometimes with money and sometimes with arms. You know it very well. You know very well how the Vietnamese have won their war of liberation, how the Algerians have won their war of national liberation and you know how the African people are fighting today against some of the imperialist powers. They are not winning by anything else. It is not won by reading Mr. Morarji Desai's statements about Mr. Charan Singh. They are doing it with weapons in their hands, with material and moral support, with diplomatic support and so on. Well, Sir, we find that all these people have been equated now. Sir, here Mr. Vajpayee spoke the other day, I think, on Saturday, in Delhi. I was not present. I wanted to be present to hear my friend, Shri Vajpayee, in a seminar in Delhi. There he said something very interesting. He made certain utterances in his speech on last Saturday. He said:

"In this somewhat confusing picture today . . ."

Sir, the picture is not confusing at all. If you look at the picture, you will find that it is bright and dark. The brighter side and the darker side and the dark is dismal. But we can counter it. Anyway, Sir, he said:

"In this somewhat confusing picture, the relevance of non-alignment or, as our Prime Minister put it, alignment with all, has emerged with greater conviction."

So, from alignment to genuine non-alignment they have come and now alignment with all. Alignment with all. Alignment with the Soviet Union, alignment with America, alignment with Vietnam, alignment with Chile's junta: all these things have come. Alignment with all. No. Our foreign policy, our policy of non-alignment is not alignment with all at all. Our policy of non-alignment is directed against the forces of war and aggression, those forces which suppress national liberation movements, against imperialism, and it is for association with the forces of national liberation movement. It is not the policy of flirting with everybody as they think. Alignment with all! Our Prime Minister has said that. When did Mr. Morarji Desai understand our foreign policy? I should like to know that. Did he ever understand it? If so, what was that? Alignment with all? Sir, these are all meant to cover up and to prepare the ground for taking the country down the garden path until we reach a stage when we willy-nilly have to accept a reversal of the foreign policy of the country. It seems so.

I never say that our foreign policy has changed. The main features remain. But, within that framework, nibbling has started and these distortions have begun and these deviations have begun in a calculated manner. Recently, they held a conference or a workshop on disarmament in the Ashoka Hotel. All kinds of people were brought in. Mr. Rajani Kothari was there. I understand others were also brought in, representatives from America and from France and so on, but not from Vietnam. And, Sir, the Government of India spent about eighteen lakhs of rupees on this. What a generosity! Well, Sir, you see the list of those people who have participated in the Ashoka Hotel seminar or workshop on disarmament. Some of them are known to be associated with the CIA and we bring them and put them in

the Ashoka Hotel and spend the public money, about eighteen lakhs of rupees, in order to start a workshop on disarmament! Or, are we starting a workshop to sabotage our national policy? This is how things are shaping up. Sir, Mr. Vajpayee also made a speech sometime back in another seminar which has been published in the "India News" in London where he made very many statements. That was in a seminar on "Continuity and Change" in some Centre there. He made it on the 13th May and the topic was "India's foreign policy—Continuity and change". Here, Sir, he said:

"The traditional basis of our relationship with the US has been replaced by equal partnership based on friendship and common weal together both in bilateral matters and international issues."

Even the American children in the kindergarten will laugh by reading this. What are you talking? Talking through your hats? Has it happened? Is it a reality today? Sir, there are similar other statements which Mr. Vajpayee has made. Well, these are not accidental. They are links in the chain, in order to emasculate the anti-imperialist foreign policy and to take away the country as far as possible from its moorings of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, from the friendship that has been built.

We shall be tomorrow celebrating the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. No wonder, the moment genuine non-alignment policy was announced, the Americans welcomed it as a change for better relations with India. It is not accidental. They have been pleading that India and China must come closer. Well, at the same time, they are repeating that Kashmir has the right of self-determination.

Sir, therefore, I say that this distortion has started, deviation has started. A dangerous situation has

arisen. Mr. Vajpayee can bring his eloquence to cloud everything. But he should project the foreign policy on the basis of implementation, by taking anti-imperialist measures, by allying with anti-imperialist forces and by activating the people and rousing them against the menace that the world is faced with today.

Sir, what is happening? Today they do not condemn the American intervention, it was done openly. Even the British Prime Minister hesitated and said: We do not have a new Columbus to discover Africa. That is how they protested against it. But the Indian Government did not utter a word, that it is a blatant and naked aggression in South Africa in the form of military armed intervention. Nothing of the kind has been done.

Sir, some other things are happening. Take, for example, what is happening in this part of the world—South East Asia. The Chinese are attacking Vietnam. Our relations are good with Vietnam. But we have not uttered a word of criticism and condemnation against China. Cambodia has been put up artificially to give provocation to the Vietnamese people. All the offers of the Vietnamese people for a peaceful settlement of the problem have been turned away. Why not say something about it? Why not say that this is wrong? Why not say that we stand for peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem and we support the Vietnamese people and we just oppose the position China has taken? Well, if you remain silent, what does it mean? What does it imply? The Americans want to utilise China as a kind of lever in order to emasculate our friendship with countries like the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. That is why we are not interested in India and China coming closer. This aspect should be borne in mind.

One or two points more. But before that I wish to say that we are all for good neighbourly relations

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

with China. There is no doubt about it absolutely. (*Time Bell Rings*). But can you have it if China pursues this foreign policy or if China refuses to come back to the Bandung spirit or take to the path of Panch Sheel, unless it gives up this policy of war preparation and its co-operation with imperialist powers? How can you have good relations with China? Good relations must be built on certain principles. These principles have been laid down at the Bandung Conference in 1955 and earlier in the Panch Sheel Agreement of 1954? Where are they? Are they absorbing them? Do you think that you can have a new set of principles to build up relations? Now, Karakoram Highway is opened with a view to giving the greatest provocation to our country. They know it very well. The entire Chinese policy towards India is calculated to undermine and weaken us. How is it that China which did not like the previous regime at all, has developed such a liking for the present regime? Something must be there. The mystery must be unravelled. Is it because they have developed a liking for Mr. Vajpayee? Or, is it because of the collusion between China and the United States of America to put China into operation within our country? These things are to be kept in mind.

Now, I come to Pakistan. Yes, we want relationship with Pakistan. We have had it. Mr. Vajpayee knows it very well. But why not ask Pakistan to quit CENTO? It is not enough for them to go as a guest at the Belgrade Conference. We are not making any comment on it. But did you ask Pakistan to quit CENTO? All the others are asking. Even when the Pakistani Government is wobbling, why don't you ask Pakistan, directly or indirectly, to quit CENTO in order to have friendly relations? (*Interruptions*) Anyway, Sir, he is saying 'yes' here.

(*Time Bell Rings*)

Now, I come to our relations with the ASEAN countries. But what is happening in the ASEAN countries? They are being involved in the American arms race. Sir, America thinks that after the SEATO is gone, the ASEAN countries, so-called ASEAN countries, should be utilised as a kind of spring-board for neo-colonialism in that region, particularly as a counterblast against the development in Vietnam and around Vietnam. These things should be taken into account.

Sir, finally, I sit down. I know you will not give me more time. All I can say is that we are a little disturbed, slightly disturbed, by the trends in our foreign policy. Now, the South Block seems to be working on the reverse gear and keeping up the facade in a very calculated manner. Of course, it has to. No Government can sit comfortably in South Block if the basic foreign policy, which is a part of our national tradition, is given up. It is not possible that way. Even the Americans do not ask us to give up non-alignment. The age of Dulles has passed. But America wants to undermine the anti-imperialist content by breaking or disrupting relations between the newly-freed countries and the non-aligned countries and the socialist and communist countries, particularly the Soviet Union. All these things are there. As far as the visit is concerned. I only say that I protest against the manner in which Shri Vajpayee rushed to the Shah of Iran. I do not know why. Are you at the beck and call of the Shah of Iran? During the recent Afghanistan developments, you rushed there. I would say that the Afghanistan development is an important and significant and happy development in our sub-Continent. A peaceful democratic revolution has taken place. The Shah of Iran who is acting as an agent as a policeman of American imperialism in that region—he is using his force and money as he has been doing elsewhere—summons you and you rush there

and talk to him. What you have talked nobody knows. The previous Government started this kind of cultivation of relations with the Shah of Iran. Well, we know with what result. Even after you have gone, Mr. Morarji Desai has gone there. The Shahanshah of Iran, is he the Shahanshah of India also, I should like to know. Are you his Deputy Minister or what? You are the Foreign Minister of a great country, of a proud country with heritage and tradition. The moment he calls you, you rush there from other countries. You announced your China visit from the United States of America just as Kissinger announced his visit to China from Pakistan. You did not announce it in the Indian Parliament. These are very significant developments.

Sir, all I say, therefore, is that the present foreign policy is in danger of being subverted, of being distorted, of being mauled by the present Government. And I am very sorry to find our friend. Mr. Vajpayee, acting as a witting or an unwitting tool of such a conspiracy against the foreign policy. The task is to save the foreign policy, to defend it, not to allow the conspiracy which is going on not in the United States of America alone or in the NATO, CENTO, but right here in the South Block where the Pro-American, pro-imperialist elements have come on to their own and they think that now is the time to distort and change it in a manner that would suit the American imperialists and others and give it a pro-West twist. These elements were there. They have become now active, more active than ever before. That causes alarm.

Therefore, I again strike a note of grave warning that our foreign policy is in danger of being subverted. At the same time, I have the greatest confidence in our great patriotic people, in our anti-imperialist tradition, in the heritage that we carry forward, and unitedly we shall defend our foreign policy, we shall prevent the subversion, and we shall carry

forward. Well Sir, all that I can say is, let him say something. We will hear. Sir, all that I find is that they are now speaking in half-American accent. In half-American accent they are speaking. You have begun to speak and, perhaps, you are not conscious of it. Perhaps, when you speak in Hindi, it does not come that readily.

But when I read the speeches you read out in English, I can easily find that somebody has written them for you, for I find these are not in your English. I know your English and you know my English. These are written for you by the Secretaries. Be careful of the speeches that you read out. Your Secretaries and others are very clever. They know the play of words and in the play of words, they smuggle politics, bring in changes and commit something in the nature of a plain subversion. Be careful about that.

Well, Sir, All I say is save our foreign policy now. Defend it with all your mite and I hope we in this House shall do so. That is why I insisted that there should be a resolution, not this kind of a thing, so that we could register in the form of a resolution what we want and what we do not want. But, again, I say, we are confident that we shall successfully resist the subversion of our foreign policy, strengthen the anti-imperialist content, develop our relations with the anti-imperialist forces and carry forward the fight against imperialism which is now in collusion with Maoist China.

SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA (Delhi): Before I start, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would appreciate if a note is taken of the point raised by one of our hon. Members on the Treasury Benches, namely, that when we are talking on our foreign policy we should make very responsible statements, because it is a very delicate issue. I would only say that this unfortunately reflects on

[Shri Charanjit Chanaana]

those Benches from where some casual statements are made. In fact, those statements outside the country are taken as shocking statements. The casual statement made by the Prime Minister on Sikkim was really a very unfortunate statement. He did not stop there. Then he contradicts it and the press does not leave out anything at all. This was followed by a similar statement made by the hon. Prime Minister when he practically donated 14,000 sq. miles of Indian territory to China. Well, that was also contradicted. They do say so. But it was published in 11 daily newspapers of the United States of America.

We thought our hon. Foreign Minister belonged to a disciplined school, which boasted of at least one thing about which my colleague has just now mentioned, namely, patriotism. I feel that in this particular field we must build a positive co-relationship between our statements and our performance. That is very important. Keeping quiet about it also was, on the part of the hon. Foreign Minister, a very odd thing to do. We thought that he would speak on it and say that this was a wrong thing which was said. Well, in a parliamentary system just like the British parliamentary system such an important statement can lead to the resignation of the person who makes a wrong statement or the person who holds the portfolio on which a wrong statement is made.

Now, Sir, while talking on the performance of the External Affairs Ministry—I have seen its Annual Report which is a sketchy one—I say that there is one very good thing in this Report, namely, that the hon. Foreign Minister has promised the continuity of the foreign policy. But now a new concept has come into existence after the statement of the Prime Minister and we will have to discover a touchstone to test every commitment and every statement that he makes and find out whether it is

a genuine one or not. First of all, we will have to ascertain the genuineness of his non-alignment. That is why when people asked me a question about the performance of our hon. Foreign Minister at the Belgrade Conference, I told them that you must appreciate one thing and that is that the hon. Foreign Minister did not go to attend a conference which was a genuine non-aligned conference but only a non-aligned conference.

Now, Sir, there is another important thing. I am a student of economics basically. I would like to tell you that in the Third World countries and in the developing world countries economics plays a very important role as far as the political relations of a country are concerned, more so in the small developing countries. I would request you to see the performance of important countries in the South Asia and South-East Asia in the recent past. You can start seeing their performance from the year 1970 onwards. The first estimates of the Chinese economic performance were released by an American agency based at Hong Kong. It is very interesting to know that the first estimates put the oil resources of the Chinese territory at a very high figure. And, this was, at a time, when the Americans did not have an entry into the mainland. If you see the subsequent eight or nine estimates when they have, in fact, got involved in the economics of China, you will see that the estimates have gone down. Well, I would like you to interpret this in the best possible manner that you can. America's foreign policy towards China is determined by two important factors; one is economic and the second is political. Now things in that developed country also are very highly co-related. You would appreciate and you would agree with me that the involvement of the United States in Vietnam had one very important factor and that was the economic

factor. The multinationals involved in the supply of arms and ammunition and in the supply of other things did not want the U.S. Administration to withdraw from there. But at that time, the people of America did not want, and that feeling is still there they have developed energy for involvement in the war in any outside territory but they do not want the white skin to be involved in that. Their involvement has limit and that limit is a very interesting limit, that is, in the field of economics and not in the field of politics directly, although indirectly it does have a correlation with politics. Now, Sir, you would appreciate and would agree with me that after the withdrawal from Viet Nam, the United States of America, the U.S. industries and the multi-nationals have not yet been able to get rid of the very heavy inventory that they had of arms and ammunition. They have not surprisingly been able to deviate from the line of product they were in as far as their involvement in that big war was concerned. Secondly, the other important point is on the Chinese side. After 1967, after the withdrawal of Soviet technology to China, China took about three years or four years in deciding that they have to depend on the sources other than the Soviet Union. This was a very big market for the developed world and if you see the trade relations and the performance of China, you would see that it was dominated—and till today it is dominated—by Japan and West Germany and then by the United States of America. Now, with due regard to the political stability of this country, in Hong Kong and Tokyo, they always call it as an American umbrella. I would not like the Government to interpret it; I am just quoting what it is called there. Now, whole foreign policy there is being developed according to that, keeping in view the next 10 years or 15 years, taking China to be the biggest market for the developed countries and for the United States of America. And the most important item that they have already started with, directly or

indirectly, according to them, is the arms and ammunition. Now, the U.S. has not that feeling in the foreign policy or the defence policy. Even the second generation equipment of theirs is the first generation requirement of China because even when they have started this revolution of technological and scientific advancement, still there is a very big gap. I do not go by the figures given by the CIA estimates at all as far as China is concerned, because I have been to China recently and I wish China develops very fast, but I would not like to go by the CIA estimates because that is a salesman's estimate rather than an actual estimate. Those people who have worked on those estimates are the people who do not go to China. Whenever I happen to ask a question, I simply ask them whether you went to China or you were taken to China. Unfortunately, those people are taken to China. So that is my first question to them if they had been to China, because I remember people putting to me the same question after the partition when we were developing colonies in Nilokheri and Faridabad, and I said: Yes.

Coming back to the main issue, I would say, their outlook is politico-economic. Now, do we have to judge our foreign policy from what suits America? That is a very important question. Do we have to become an instrument in their hands? Do we have to please the United States of America by pleasing China? This was in fact the environment under which, we feel, the hon. Prime Minister made a statement in Washington, which unfortunately, surprisingly enough, the Foreign Minister did not contradict. He should not only have contradicted it, he should have taken the eleven newspapers which I gave them but he says: *Woh jhootha hain*. They are liars. And you know this very American press on whom you depended during the emergency. You used to quote from this thing. And a very interesting coincidence was that this very reporter was the reporter who was being quoted by your people. So,

[Shri Charanjit Chanana]

Sir, let us not build our foreign policy the way we are doing, a process which is a very wrong process. Let us be ourselves. Let us build the foreign policy which should be based on national interests. That is very important. We have to be ourselves. About Viet Nam, Shri Bhupesh Gupta just now mentioned, that is a case study. That is one country like ours to stand on its own. Anyway, we do not want to get ourselves involved in the fight between them and the Soviet Union or between China and America. My point is that our foreign policy is deviating from the slogan which is a very important slogan, and that is that we have to be ourselves. My second request and a very important request to the hon. Minister is that—it might be at the cost of repetition—let us stick on to what we say. In fact, you have very kindly sponsored an annual report which does say that you would continue, in regard to foreign policy, all those policies on which there has been consensus, cutting against party lines. The Janata Government appears to have pledged to the basic continuity of India's foreign policy followed hitherto. Now, my request to you is that, for heaven's sake, have a genuine commitment to that.

The third point that I have to make, the third submission that I have to make, to the Foreign Minister is that, let us do something positive. India can be proud of one very important thing and you would agree with me if you go into the statistical background of this that, in the third world, India has had the best performance as far as aiding the developing world is concerned. I would give you one example which a friend of mine quoted to me yesterday, of Tanzania. Now, I have nothing against any big country. But I am just giving you an instance and that instance is that we were also the tenderers for building a railway line in Tanzania. But the Chinese got it because they gave the lowest rate there. Then, I asked him 'Why did the rulers of Tanzania wind up that contract?' Actually, it was a 1700 Kms. contract.

But after the completion of the first 800 Kms, they stopped it there. It is important to remember here that President Nyerere made a statement at an African conference you can check it up—that the best consultants and the best advisers in the third world are the Indians. Then, the question I asked my friend was 'Why are you saying this?'. The Chinese did a very interesting thing which, of course, was good for them. It is this. Forty thousand Chinese went from China to build that railway line. All the equipment went from China. But they did not train a single Tanzanian. They did not at all generate a genuine economic development there. After the first 800 Kms. was completed, President Nyerere asked them to get out of the country. We definitely do not behave that way. We have in Tanzania and in other African countries and in other developing countries a very high reputation and my request to you is that you should maintain it. We did make a start in this sphere before your Government took over and I am sure you would be positive enough to float an idea like this. When you are thinking of a new economic order, India has the responsibility of developing a small garland out of the master garland which is known as the new economic order. India should take a lead in this direction. Not what it should become a big brother. That complex should not be there at all. I always feel that we should try to evolve an economic fraternity in South Asia. It may be known as the South Asian Economic Fraternity or it may be known as the South Asian Club. I was surprised why there was a numbness and a meaningless—or, I do not know whether it was meaningful—silence on the part of the Ministry of External Affairs after the Shah of Iran came here and floated the idea of an Asian Common Market. Asian Common Market may be a stage ahead of us. But why can't the Ministry of External Affairs take the initiative, why can't a leader like Mr. Vajpayee take the initiative, of organising a movement, a club, known as the South Asian Club

which would be having no political aims at all and which would be a part of the concept of non-alignment? Thereby, you would be promoting the economic growth, the economic development and the economic independence in this zone. You will also be respected more than you would be by becoming a tool in the hands of a big nation, whatever the big nation.

As far as the neighbouring countries are concerned, I would not like to repeat anything. But one thing I would say that the previous Government, the Congress (I) Government, did achieve something. You should have taken that.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Congress Government, not the Congress (I) Government.

SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA: I am sorry, the Congress Government. Now I started by saying that the statement and the performance must have a positive co-relation. Now compare your performance with your statements. You started saying that you will stick on to a process known as 'continuity' and then you started changing the process of that continuity also. When the Farakka talks were going on, I do not know due to what reason, under what pressures, you took the whole thing off the rails. I say, you should be honest enough about one thing, posterity would not pardon you for this deal at all. You made a similar thing with China. Well, one cannot put in under any other caption, but 'ridiculous'. This is what people say and this is what has been happening. The hon. Foreign Minister is trying to go to China and till today the agenda is not known. We do not see the agenda being evolved. Normally what happens, when a Foreign Minister goes to a country like China where we have a cleavage of 17 years, some homework is done. The homework is not done in the South Block, it is done by the official team....

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Mr. Swami is going to China.

SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA: Well, I have nothing at all against the gentleman personally. He is an hon. Member of Parliament. But that is not the system. You are evolving a system which does not fit in the national system at all. That smacks of something, I would not say what, I leave it to you to find out. I am only saying, for Heaven's sake, take the country into confidence. I know the hon. Foreign Minister has a wonderful aesthetic sense. He can go and see wonderful art in China. But that can be the 9th item on the agenda. The first item on the agenda must be, what he is going to do as far as the foreign policy is concerned, because incidentally when he goes there he goes there as a Foreign Minister and not as an individual.

Unfortunately, Sir, we are living in an environment of contradiction. This is one thing for which you can take credit. What is happening? One day the hon. Education Minister makes some statement and it is contradicted by the Prime Minister. One day the hon. Prime Minister makes a statement and the hon. Foreign Minister tries to explain it. That is not the right system. I thought you could develop a model which was an RSS model of discipline at least. But no, the performance is belying, that is contradictory.

Therefore, I would submit that you must prepare an agenda. It is in the national interest. In that agenda you must, first of all, justify what is the urgency of your visit. One of the hon. Members has just now explained that exchange of football teams, soccer teams, volley ball teams is a wonderful thing. The visit of the hon. Foreign Minister could also be a wonderful thing, but it should be very meaningful, it should be a visit with a target, it should be on the agenda. Unfortunately, Sir, it is not like that. At that time your Ministry will have to work as a Ministry, we cannot stick to an individual at all. Your Ministry has to put the vision of the country, it has to project the image of the country. But, unfortunately, the image

[Shri Charanjit Chanana]

that you are depicting is not the good image. This is the reason why I am saying that the image depicted is not good. I am leaving it to you to judge what is happening.

So, your foreign policy, my submission to you is, should be the India's foreign policy. It should not be like an individual's policy. I will tell you just one thing. I was in South Korea. As an individual you can promote ideas which might be spiritual ideas. Medically these might be very good ideas. I saw the quotations of the Prime Minister in one of the South Korean towns in the urinals. I was shocked because they talked about medicinal idea only. Massive consumption of urine can be as an individual's slogan. It can be the slogan of the Prime Minister of a country. But we cannot make it a national drink at all. I am not in a light mood. I am in a very serious mood. Similarly when the hon. Prime Minister goes out and talks of foreign policy, well he can donate money out of his income, he can donate his house, but he cannot donate 14000 kilometres of the territory of the country. You don't have the right to do it. Nobody has the right to do it. I do not agree with Bhupesh Dada when he talked of English as half-American. I know he was talking in philosophy; he was not talking in terms of language. The hon. Foreign Minister understands English as well as Hindi. My only submission to the Foreign Minister is that there is a thing known as *Deshdroh*. I know it is a very bitter word, but we should be very careful about it. The posterity is going to judge you. *Deshdroh* is one of the crimes which is always registered in the history of India as a very negative crime. Therefore, my submission to the Government, including the hon. Foreign Minister, is that the external affairs' policy that you evolve should be a policy which can be operated in right terms and should also be one which should be a national policy, which should be in the interest of the country. It should not be guided by the prejudices or predilections of

one individual man. It has to be a policy which must have a perspective and when you are thinking of a perspective, for heaven's sake don't do one particular thing of which we Indians, when we go out, are accused of. That is, we are generating a generation gap. We do not have to do that at all. Similarly, our foreign policy cannot be out of this process at all. You have to think of the next generation also when you are thinking of the foreign policy of the country, what your children will say about what you have done. The next generation, the posterity will not pardon you at all if you are sticking to a policy which is an anti-national policy. Thank you.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank you for affording me an opportunity to take part in this important debate on the foreign policy. I have heard with interest my friends, Shri Bipinpal Das, Shrimati Margaret Alva, Shri Bhupesh Gupta and others on the opposite benches. I had expected that I would really hear from the Opposition benches some good critique or at any raw criticism of the foreign policy. But what I found was that my friend, Shri Bipinpal Das, about whom I had heard so much as a foreign affairs expert in the previous Government, unnecessarily entered into a defence of the doings and misdoings of the previous Government in foreign affairs in a rhetoric which, as far as the present affairs are concerned, was nothing but a ridicule, but he must know that ridicule is not criticism. He unnecessarily was fighting, like Don Quixote, wind-mills in the style of a Shakespearian actor with this difference that while the Shakespearian actor on the stage had some message, to give, his speech was without any message. What I found from Shrimati Alva's speech was an exposition of her feelings of anxiety more for the good health and image of the present Foreign Minister and his safe return from foreign countries, particularly from China, rather than a criticism of the foreign policy. (In-

terruptions) Yes, I know that. I was reminded, when she was speaking, somewhat of an old man receiving a chiding and advice from his spouse on his doings and misdoings outside the house. And Mr. Vajpayee should deem himself very fortunate that this afternoon he had to undergo that experience without the legal responsibility of having a spouse.

Well, as far as my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was concerned, his speech was according to expectations in that he in his preroration started on a tirade on the imperialism of the USA, perfidy of China, and so on and so forth, and their allies. (Interruptions) Well, he did. You know, he said, "Don't be obsessed." And he was blaming that India, in its foreign policy, is more inclining towards America. He referred to South Africa. He referred to the imperialist forces in South Africa. That shows that in his speech his voice is that of his masters who even they be. While accusing our American friends as imperialists, as exploiters, he forgets about his own friends. They also are equally to blame. When referred to South Africa, he never referred to the rate of Cuba and its force entering into conflicts there. But he did make a reference to NATO and all that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry...

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: You are comparing Cuba to South Africa. Probably, you are referring to Angola.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: I am not answering you. I am saying about the Cuban forces in South Africa. What I have said is... (Interruptions)

DR. V. P. DUTT: Sir, this is news to us. The Foreign Minister should enlighten us whether there are any Cuban forces in South Africa.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: I am not very much concerned with that. What I submit is that the Members of

the Opposition forget that in the very beginning, when the Janata Party came into power, this was what was stated on the floor of the House, that the substance of the country's foreign policy was not an issue in the party's manifesto during the elections; to quote "the new Government reaffirms its commitment to the policy of non-alignment and affirms that it is continuing that policy". And we, as one belonging to the Janata Party, have stood by that. It is a continuation of the policy which was initiated by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru more than a quarter of a century ago except that according to the exigencies of times and the changed situation, the emphasis differs.

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): Now it becomes 'genuine'.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: As far as I can see, 'genuine non-alignment' means this. Whatever dust and distortions came in the last decade with greater force, our Foreign Minister is trying to remove. It is essentially the process of removal of dust and distortions the resultant is known as the 'genuine non-alignment', nothing more. In fact, it is—as I understand it—a concept, it is a philosophy, but the real thing that matters is how it is implemented and how we apply the principles to develop our relations with other foreign powers. I need not go into this debate on what non-alignment is and what alignment is and whether non-alignment is equal to alignment towards all, for that would take a long time; suffice it to say that as far as the implementation of the foreign policy on the basis of non-alignment for the last 16 months is concerned, it has no doubt resulted in our image being further brightened up in the comity of nations, and for that our Foreign Minister, our Prime Minister and the whole Foreign Ministry personnel deserve grateful thanks of our country.

AN HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yea.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: There is no question of yea, yea. We are

[Shri K. B. Asthana]

just doing what even Pandit Nehru would have done had he been alive and incharge of the foreign affairs. You might have been trained to make distortions in the last decade or a few years before, but we in the Janata Party understand the real impact and the import that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wanted to give to the foreign policy of this country, and we are not making any departure. We want to be friends of all. Keeping the nation's interests and preserving our dignity, we want to build up our relations, and we have been able to build good neighbourly relations. For the first time in 30 years our relations with our immediate neighbours are really good and sound. (Time bell rings). Give me 15 to 20 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude because the time-schedule is like that.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: I have a friend from Nepal. He is closely connected with the royal family. He was convalescing after an operation in the Holy Family Hospital here. He goes every year to Nepal, and he told me that for once during his last visit to Nepal in May and June, he saw that a common Nepali is happy with the Indians and he welcomes them and that even His Majesty of Nepal expressed to him his gratefulness on the generosity and the farsight of India in signing the treaty of trade and transit. It is for the first time that we have done it. Similarly, with Pakistan as far as the common man is concerned—I am not talking of the people at higher level—certainly the relationship has become cordial, and there is more collaboration and more friendship between us.

A reference was made by Mr. Bipinpal Das and Shrimati Margaret Alva

about Bangladesh. They said that they did this and that in 1971. Well, after doing all that, what did you do? The history of Bangladesh will show that it was your attitude of cold-shoulderness to Mujib which resulted in his assassination. If you did help in preserving what you achieved for them, then it is your failure. You are now criticising the Farakka and other treaties which we entered into. If you had entered into these treaties during Mujib's time, he would not have met disaster. He was our greatest friend. (Interruptions) This is my analysis. You may not agree with me. But what I am saying is that it is no use being critical today of what you did yesterday. I say that if you criticise our present policy, then you are doing nothing but criticising your own regime, your own past. The whole policy is yours. We are only implementing it. I do not agree with my friend, Mrs. Margaret Alva and also Mr. Bipinpal Das who criticised our attitude towards unclear explosions. I, for one, would be proud to support my Prime Minister when he says that we will not have a nuclear explosion. I will not agree with the views expressed on the other side that we must have nuclear explosions so that with pride we can go before the world. (Time bell rings) Well, this nuclear weaponry is rather a devilish workshop, and the Americans are to be blamed because they first...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: ...threw the bomb on Hiroshima. I will never excuse them. No nation should be proud, no people should be proud, of showing off its nuclear power or nuclear devilry. I would, therefore, think that our Prime Minister is right when he says that at no cost will there be nuclear explosions hereafter, for I know, with the little knowledge of science that I have

gathered, that nuclear explosions are not necessary for use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It is not necessary, as the technology is well known, to make fresh explosions. It is only when you want to invent something new as a weapon of destruction that newer kinds of nuclear explosions are necessary. *(Time bell rings)* So when our Prime Minister says that there will be no nuclear explosions, I with pride, as a citizen of India, support him, and there is nothing to be ashamed of, and no criticism should be made.

Then, about Sikkim some observations were made. But you know, our policy is—and that is the real message of “Panch Sheel” which was invented by the great man, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru—that even in our diplomacy we must be ethical, we must be with principles, and there should be no chauvinism, no chicanery, no perfidy, no guile. It is in this context that the much-maligned statement of the Prime Minister on Sikkim should be judged. He was talking only as a philosopher when he said that he did not like, he did not approve of, the method of uniting Sikkim. *(Time bell rings)*. He only meant this that in our...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: ...future negotiations and future treaties with our neighbours, we will not act like that...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: That is all he meant. He did not mean that Sikkim is not part of India or will not be part of India. I would, therefore, appeal to my friends on the other side to think deeply before they criticise. Instead of giving some constructive suggestions, as they should, they are rather justifying their lapses when they were in

power. We never criticised you. There was no attack here in the debate against your past policy. The debate is on the present policy. So...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: ...your energies should have been directed towards telling us what to do...

(Time bell rings)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: All right, Sir. But for once I would like to follow them...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): No, do not follow them.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: Why not?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude now; otherwise, I am calling Dr. Dutt.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: Just two words and I will have finished. I want our Minister of External Affairs to keep two things in mind: One is that the goal of foreign policy should be, as our Prime Minister also said, disarmament, and the other is equality of all nations. Since the time is short, I am not at the moment going to speak on disarmament. But I would like to say a word on equality of all nations. India should strive for a modification or an amendment to the Constitution of the United Nations Organisation to get rid of the veto which the four great powers enjoy. Our foreign policy should be directed towards that objective...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Now please sit down, Dr. Dutt, now.

SHRI K. B. ASTHANA: In the United Nations our style should be to strive for a change in this. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Dr. Dutt, only ten minutes please.

DR. V. P. DUTT: No, Sorry, I cannot speak only for ten minutes. If you want me to sit down, I shall do so, but it is not possible to make my speech like this...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): I request the hon. Member kindly to appreciate...

DR. V. P. DUTT: It is not possible to make my observations in such a short time. Anyway, let us not waste more time...

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, he makes an excellent speech, no doubt, but there should not be any bargaining like this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): There is a time-limit with us. If the House decides to sit as long as Members want to speak, I have no objection. Dr. Dutt, your party is left with only four minutes. Still, I am allowing you ten minutes. What can be done? Kindly appreciate my difficulty.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: We will go beyond 6 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): In any case you are going to sit beyond 6 o'clock.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: We will go on.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Anyway, let me make my comments...

श्री भोल पावन शस्त्री (बिहार) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर समय की पाबन्दी करते हैं तो यह आपके ऊपर निर्भर करता है

कि आप किसी को छूट दे दीजिएगा। किसी को कम देंगे तो सवाल उठेगा। अगर आप सब के साथ एक जैसा बर्ताव करते हैं तो ठीक है। प्रोफेसर दत्ता इस विषय को बड़ा अध्ययन करते रहे हैं और वह ऐसे वक्ता नहीं हैं जैसे तो सभी वक्ता बराबर हैं, लेकिन हम सबको जानते हैं... (Interruptions)
इसलिए जितना समय आप दूसरे मेम्बरों को देते हैं कम से कम उतना समय मिलना चाहिए। यह तो सदन में सबको बराबर अधिकार है लेकिन आप किसी को कह दें कि आपको 5 मिनट समय मिलेगा इससे मेम्बर हतोत्साह होता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि हर एक पार्टी का समय निर्धारित है। हम बराबर प्रयास कर रहे हैं कि जितना समय है उसके अन्तर समाप्त कर दें लेकिन अगर कोई... (Interruptions)

श्री भोल पावन शस्त्री : अगर आप हिसाब से चलेंगे तो

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
प्रयास तो हम कर रहे हैं। आप सहयोग देंगे तो पूरा हो सकेगा।

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : पांच मिनट का समय इसी में बीत गया है।

श्री भोल पावन शस्त्री : हम तो सहयोग देंगे लेकिन आप बोलने से पहले ही कह देते हैं कि इतना समय मिलेगा जिससे बोलने वाला डिसकरेज हो जाता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
मैं मानता हूँ कि वे सराहनीय और उत्तम बोलते हैं।

DR. V. P. DUTT: I would have probably finished by now...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): It is not so easy.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the honourable Minister for External Affairs had very aptly said at another place that there is a national foreign policy, that he is trying to maintain the national components of this policy that he respects the elements of continuity and that in fact he has been trying to establish the notion of the continuity of Indian foreign policy. I welcome that. And whatever comments I make and even whatever criticism I have to offer, will be in that spirit and in that light, that foreign policy is not meant for politicking. If we look at the international situation, first we can see—I am sure the hon. Minister will himself say the same thing—that there are today disturbing portents on the horizon. Detente has gone awry. The language of the cold war has come back. The heroic postures of the past are being struck again. The basic conflicts, contentions and contradictions between the United States and the Soviet Union are coming into sharp relief again. The old world order is in its death agonies and those who have been dominating this old world order so far are irreconciled to it. There is no progress towards disarmaments. The non-aligned countries are facing greater challenges and bigger pressures and there is no movement forward in the establishment of a new international economic order. This is one side of the international picture.

Some Doctors in the United States some foreign office analysts, commentators and academicians are looking into the reasons for the patient's disease to find out what is wrong with the patient—the patient being U.S.—Soviet relationship. Why is the patient getting debilitated? Some of them have said that perhaps great expectations have ruined his digestion and that there should be perhaps a period of cooling off or disengagement. Some others have said: No. On the other hand, they

should have involved the Soviet Union in a network of more agreements carrying the lure of more trade and technological agreements, also implicit in it the threat of the loss of leverage if the Soviet Union did not go along with the United States. Of course many others in the United States are talking in the language of the cold war. They are indulging in sabre-rattling. They want to give hell to all those who dare defy them in Africa or elsewhere and so on and so forth. I will say that the basic fact of the international situation is that the era of paramountcy of power of one or two nations is dead and gone for ever and that the process of painful and prolonged.

adjusted the international system is both for those who have dominated

But there is another dimension also, which is what interests us. To the reality of the international situation. There is another trend: the capability of the big powers to impose their will on each other and on their allies has been substantially circumscribed. It is substantially circumscribed not by the balance of terror, but by the new international system—a system which has undergone radical transformation from a rigidly bi-polar world to a system of multiple relationship cutting across alliances, cutting across old group loyalties and cutting across old ideological adherences—an international system in which the leverage of super powers over each other as well as over others is being reduced. This is what we often call the blurring of the east-west line, the disintegration of the spheres of influence and the decline of the global alliances system.

The plentitude of power is there and they can destroy the world many times over, if they want to. But there is a limit to the use of that power. This was symbolised by Vietnam more eloquently than anywhere else that there is a limit to the use of power even by the greatest of powers in the world. If there was will

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

and if there was determination, even a small country could stand up against a great power. I would like to submit to the honourable Foreign Minister that, unfortunately, we have not sufficiently used this trend to expand the area of influence and leverage of the non-aligned movement and that we could have made greater use of this opportunity, but we have not been able to do so. The non-aligned movement is facing tremendous pressures as the honourable Foreign Minister himself has said at a seminar the other day. I do not know what exactly has been our role except what I have read in the newspapers and most of the time the newspapers have pointed to our role of mediation and, Sir, someone remarked, half seriously and half jocularly, that since mediation is the national policy of Mr. Vajpayee, he is only carrying it on into the international scene. Now, what is the mediation in the non-aligned movement, mediation between whom and for what, I do not know. But I would like to say that whatever may be the policy of an individual non-aligned country, whatever may be even the sum total of the policies of the various non-aligned countries so far as the non-alignment movement is concerned, this movement has stood against imperialism, against racialism, against neo-colonialism, and these cannot be diluted by any mediation and that our commitment to these basic principles against imperialism, against racialism, against neo-colonialism, must remain steadfast. I am sure that the honourable Foreign Minister would tell us that they have remained steadfast, that the Government sticks to those principles. This question arises because in his speech at the seminar the other day, Sir, the word imperialism had not appeared and, therefore, there were questions as to what our stand was with regard to imperialism. Now, I have feeling that much of the problem can be traced to what I have seen in the Press, to what is being said again

and again, I mentioned it in the seminar also. But, since the Minister was not there, I might repeat it here. A phrase is being used again and again that we are following a result-oriented foreign policy. Now, Sir, I am not going into the question of genuine non-alignment and so on. That has been taken care of by both the sides and I am not going into that now. But, when you say that your foreign policy is a result-oriented foreign policy, Sir, if it is a question of image-building, then it is another matter and I have nothing to say about it because it is just a question of image-building. But, if it is a serious proposition, then, Sir, I would like to raise some questions, some serious questions, for the Foreign Minister because, after all, foreign policy is not like, what should I say, *madari ka pitara* and it is not like "*Choo mantar ki goli*". But foreign policy is the result of patient, painful and brick-by-brick building up and it is the result of responding intelligently and flexibly and according to principles to developing situations and it is the art of maintaining friendship and extending the area of friendship and minimising the area of enmity, but again without sacrificing one's principles. But, if you go in for quick results, if you want to show that this is what you have achieved here and that is what you have achieved there, then, I am afraid, it will result in distortions. In fact, the fears, the misgivings, that we have expressed about these distortions arise from this very basic proposition that you are going in for, I do not know on whose advice or on whose formulation, quick results. If you are trying to go in for quick results no foreign policy can succeed since foreign policy does not admit of quick results.

Sir, I would like to take up the question of our policy of friendship with our neighbours first. Sir, the policy of friendship with our neighbours was one of Jawaharlal Nehru's cardinal principles of foreign policy.

For this he was ridiculed and reviled. By whom? By those who are adorning the treasury benches today. My friend, Dr. Bhai Mahavir, has gone away. But I would like to ask: Who were the people, who were the forces that opposed Jawaharlal Nehru at every step on account of his policy of trying to achieve friendship with neighbouring countries? These were the forces... (*Interruptions*) These were the forces which were sneering at Jawaharlal Nehru by calling him 'Maulana Nehru'. Who were these? Dr. Bhai Mahavir as the Vice-President represented those forces. The RSS spread this thing around the country, calling him "Maulana Nehru"... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MA-
THUR: This is all wrong. Have you read the Jana Sangh's manifesto? (*Interruptions*)

DR. V. P. DUTT: Yes, I have. I know your embarrassment. But I cannot help it. What I am saying is that at every step there were forces which opposed the policy of friendship that Jawaharlal Nehru followed with our neighbouring countries. And in fact, today also I was surprised: Dr. Bhai Mahavir roared like a lion when it came to criticising Jawaharlal Nehru's policy towards Pakistan, Jawaharlal Nehru's policy towards China and he said, "This is what you did, that is what you did". But then, when it came to the present policy, suddenly he became a lamb. He said: Well, we have only gone two steps forward; so why are you complaining? I thought he would say, since I was opposed to what you were doing then, since I was saying that you should not have done this, then today also I would say: Please do not go ahead, I oppose this also. Can there be a greater example of double talk and double think? This is what our fear is that it is not conviction but it is the need to achieve quick results. I hope I am wrong.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Did I say "quick"? Please do not mis-
quote me...

(*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not
quoting you.

DR. V. P. DUTT: The point is not that. I do not want to belabour this point that at every step, even including the Simla Agreement, they were the people who opposed it, who are now sitting there; sitting there at the time they were opposed to it. But also there are certain principles. Who is not saying that there should be friendship with China, Nepal or Pakistan? All that we have said is that it should be according to certain principles. Now, the hon. Minister had said the other day that if we have shed high-mindedness and arrogance, then I plead guilty to it, I hope you have not substituted it with petty-mindedness and supplication. That is what it looks like—supplication. What we are saying is that in the agreements that you have arrived at with neighbouring countries there is a suspicion that certain principles have been sacrificed, and that those principles should not be sacrificed. If anybody says to the contrary, I do not agree. I say, we are all for the policy of friendship with neighbouring countries. We should develop friendly relations. But certainly it does not follow that you should develop friendly relations with Pakistan by giving up your principles and welcoming Pakistan in the non-aligned community when Pakistan continues to remain a member of the military alliances. If Pakistan gives up that membership, certainly, we will welcome. In fact, we want Pakistan to give up its membership of military alliances and come into the non-alignment movement. But do not compromise your principles. I was sorry that it was left for Afghanistan to do so, whereas India welcomed Pakistan there as a guest member.

Now, somebody raised a question about Rumania. Maybe, we were helpless in the case of Rumania. Even then it was my personal view at that time, and I also expressed it openly,

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

that we should not have agreed to it. But if we did agree, even then I say, here our own national interests are involved. You don't get up and welcome this development that Pakistan remains a member of the alliance system and yet becomes a member of the non-aligned movement. Similarly, I would say to the hon. Minister with all honesty: Do have friendship, but you do not have to go out of the way to invest the military dictatorship with respectability more than it deserves. There is no need to invest both the Generals Zias, General Zia on this side and General Zia on the other side, with greater respectability than they have in their own countries from their own people. It is not necessary. They do not enjoy it at home. In fact, the suspicion is that there is non-development of relations with Afghanistan to the extent that they could have developed after this changeover there, because on the one side there is the pressure from the Shah of Iran and on the other side there is this urge for quick results in foreign policy. (*Time bell rings.*) Therefore, let me assure the Minister for External Affairs that I for one am not interested in any partisan gain in this matter because, as I have said, foreign policy is too serious a matter to be left partisan or political consideration. Take China, for instance. Now, I am not one of those who would oppose the policy of trying to find a solution to our problems with China, trying to normalise relations with China and trying to discover a common language with China. Certainly I am not one of those who is opposed to your going to China. Granted that we should have friendly relations with China, I would say that after all China is one of our biggest neighbours and if China and India are not on friendship terms, then obviously the peace in Asia will be affected. But again it should be on certain principles. Certainly, you cannot have a situation in which the Vice-Premier of China goes to our neighbouring country and says that he stands for self-determination in Kashmir. Kara-

koram Highway is also completed. Even then you say that you want to normalise relations with China or that you have nothing to say about all these matters. You do go to China. You do have talks. (*Time bell rings.*) But the talks must be in the context of finding a solution to the border and other political problems between China and India. It cannot be that China can say whatever it likes about India's national interest, but we will not say anything. But I do say that not only with China but with other countries also, you should follow the principle that we have laid down; friendship with one will not be at the expense of friendship with others. Don't try to play the Soviet card with China and the Chinese card with the Soviet Union, as they say in the United States. That will lead to disaster. That is why I have pleaded that we must follow certain principles. I am just now winding up. You must give me two or three minutes more. I am ending by saying that today the non-aligned movement and detente in the world have come under heavy attack or heavy pressure. One of the areas is Africa. We had discussed it in the Consultative Committee for External Affairs also that today Africa is divided and the cold war is intruding into Africa. You should raise these questions. I should like you to tell us the analysis and the root cause. What is the root cause of the troubles in Africa? The root cause is neo-colonialism and racialism. The root cause is South Africa and the illegal regime in Rhodesia. This is the root cause. Barring a couple of regimes like Idi Amin's South Africa is the most repressive Government on the African continent. It is a Government which imprisons its own citizens without trial and then tortures them and kills them in prison. It is a regime which decides which communities will live where according to skin and colour. It can even declare a person non-person. You are living but you are a non-person. Nobody can talk to you and nobody will publish anything from you. And five million people out of a population of 25 million

people are trying to maintain their dominance. This is the root cause. And it was the South African effort to go to Angola in October, 1977 which led to the Cuban intervention. It was that which led to the Cuban forces going there, because if South Africa had succeeded in Angola, it would have dominated the whole African continent. Therefore, Sir I say that you must also analyse what the root causes are. I am not saying that there should be foreign intervention in Africa. I want that the African States should find their own solutions to their own problems. It is not my argument that there must be more conflict. But I say, the root cause must also be seen. First things must come first. Our commitment to principles, our commitment to Non-alignment, our commitment to anti-imperialism, our commitment to anti-neo-racialism, our commitment to anti-neo-colonialism, our commitment to solidarity with the Non-aligned movement, our commitment to solidarity with the developing countries, and our commitment to principles in relation to our neighbours must be maintained for our foreign policy to carry conviction. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET (Punjab): Mr. vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not want to nor is there any time to go into the history of our foreign policy. Since some of the friends here mentioned that before the Janata Party came to power, the foreign policy was one of consistent anti-imperialism, I have to make a mention about that.

Sir everybody knows that in the beginning, immediately after our independence, we were trying to follow in the United Nations the US and British imperialism. And in the first four years, only on one occasion, we had voted against imperialism and voted with the socialist countries. And on all other occasions, we were helping them. It was only after the US imperialist defeat in Korea, it was only after the imperialist countries refused to help us to industrialise our country that we began to see the

danger of what imperialism means. You go back to the recent period. I would not agree and it cannot be proved that we have been helping Vietnam, that we have been courageously supporting all the anti-imperialist forces all the world over. India was not the first but the last country to recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Vietnam. After everybody else in the Non-aligned world recognised it, India has recognised it. Not only that. In relation to Cuba what had been our attitude? Because of the pressure of the US imperialism, where was our trade with Cuba? Even in relation to some other countries like Korea, what attitude we have been taking? So, I do not want to go into all that. I only want to say that it is a welcome step that the present Government has stated that we will continue the foreign policy which our country has evolved. That policy, as Dr. V. P. Dutt just now stated should mean firm opposition to imperialism, opposition to neo-colonialism, and opposition to racialism. We want to judge the policy on that basis. And if we try to judge our foreign policy on that basis, there are welcome features in the policy which the present Government is following. But then certain vacillations and doubts arise that we are not in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. Even if you go through the debates of the Belgrade Conference which was held recently, you will find that Afghanistan, where a revolution took place recently, took a firm position on all the problems facing the world and a firm opposition to imperialism. Although we have restated our position, we were lagging behind in that. When we judge our foreign policy, we have to see that in the economic sphere there is a debate in the world about the new international economic order and in that respect we know that it is imperialist countries which are refusing to help all the under-developed countries and they have even refused to help with their 7 per cent national income which they had promised. They have even refused either do

hailed in a big way in our country as hero fighting for national liberation. We have not done anything about it. That is why it shows vacillations. Why are we not doing it? And I was amazed to listen from the Janata Party members that they are trying to equate Cuba with imperialist intervention in the countries and they want to point out that Cuba is doing the same thing. Cuba has categorically stated that wherever the people are fighting for national liberation, they are there to help them. We committed ourselves at Colombo. Our country has committed itself at Colombo that whatever happens in Southern Africa, we will help them materially by all sources, arms, materials and everything. Where do we stand now on that question? Why vacillations are there in our foreign policy? We would not like those vacillations on this question in the interest of our country.

The third important centre of tension is Korea. Even after so many years, after 17 or 18 years, American forces are there in Korea. Recently, manoeuvres on a very large-scale were carried on and America is trying to see that Korea is divided and two Koreas are made. And here is the Government of India, here is our Foreign Minister; I have tried to study his speech. There is no mention about Korean unification. A reference to it is in the declaration there because there are other forces in the non-aligned countries. You find a reference made very boldly in the speech of the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan but not in the speech of the biggest country's Foreign Minister. Shri Vajpayee. There is no mention about Korea at all. Why? Is it because the American forces are there? Is it that we do not want to displease America? Otherwise, what is it? We have fought against British imperialism; we have made tremendous sacrifices; we have stood in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism and we do not want our country in any way—when the issue comes of independence or liberation—

to vacillate, and vacillate before imperialism. That is why, on all these issues, there have been lot of vacillations.

Now I come to the question of the attitude we have taken at the non-aligned conference. We want all countries to join us and leave their blocs, military blocs and join us. But what is this guest business? Earlier, at Colombo, the imperialism got diluted this definition of non-alignment. Now, who are invited as guests. They are Turkey, Portugal and Pakistan who are the part of the military blocs. If tomorrow they give up the military blocs, and join us, we would welcome it but without giving up the military blocs, they are invited as guest. And General Zia has said: "If it does not benefit me, then only I will give up the bloc; otherwise, I will not give up." And he says it shortly after Shri Vajpayee admits him. But the point here is, how do we accept them as guests and support them as guests? Is it not diluting the definition of the non-alignment? Secondly, if they try to equate in their declarations those forces fighting for and supporting the national liberation movement, and the forces of imperialism, this equation would not work. This will naturally be taken to be the attitude of our country which is not in our interest.

Lastly, Sir, I want to make a mention about our relations with the neighbouring countries. There is a lot of contradiction in what our friends are arguing here. We have always been working for the improvement of relations with our neighbouring countries. It is one thing that we should see as to what type of regimes are there. But we must resolve our differences with those countries and normalise our relations. I would say that it is a welcome sign that the present Government is making efforts to normalise the relations. This does not mean that we approve of the policies which those Governments are pursuing. We cannot approve of the foreign policy which Pakistan is

[Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet]
pursuing. We cannot approve of the military regimes in Pakistan and Bangladesh. Nor we can approve of the foreign policy which China is pursuing. One cannot understand China supporting Mobutu the murderer of Lumumba nor can anybody understand what China is doing to harass the people of Vietnam, the heroic people who have conducted such a big struggle.

But we have got our own problems. I do not know why the people are expressing so much concern over Mr. Vajpayee's visit to China. They want to know from whom he got the invitation. Perhaps, they are thinking that he is going there without passport. Perhaps, they are very much worried that he may be caught there. I do not understand. We have got our own bilateral problems with China. There are only two courses before us. We know who started the process of normalisation. This was started by the previous Government. You study all the reports of Foreign Ministry. What do they say? They say 'We are trying to normalise our relations, but there is no response'. After that, some initiative is taken. They claim that they had taken the initiative, they sent the ambassadors there and that they re-established the relations with China.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): For saying that, they sent us to jail.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: All that has been done. Now, there are only two courses open to us. One is, let the situation remain as it is, which means, freezing the situation and no advance. If anybody says that by going to war, we can do something, it can be their claim. We cannot say that. The second alternative is, we should try to normalise our relations and, through that, resolve the outstanding problems with China. There, one should be very careful and one has to be very care-

ful. Nobody here can say that you can barter the interests of your country with anybody, whether it is America, Soviet Union or China. India is strong enough to defend itself. Nobody can do it. I think, unnecessary concern is being expressed over this visit. Why the very same concern was not expressed earlier when everybody was visiting America? Why was not the same concern expressed when the then Prime Minister visited America, the imperialist country, which is responsible for organising coups in various countries, as it happened in the case of Chile, which has been intervening in Africa, which has been dividing the African people, which has been dividing the Arab people and so on? Why was not the same concern expressed when people visited America with a begging bowl to the World Bank and so on? I do not understand why so much concern is being expressed now. Some of the friends here were talking about anti-imperialism but they have argued as if our main enemies are Pakistan and China, not the imperialists. They forgot imperialism. Even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta took a lot of time in explaining and in cautioning Mr. Vajpayee who is already very much cautioned. I can understand people cautioning my going to China or cautioning Ramamurti going to China. He is trying to caution Mr. Vajpayee that when he goes to China, he should be careful. He is extra careful. Now, the roles have changed. Therefore, I do not understand why so much concern is being expressed over his visit. It is in the interest of our country that our relations with China and Pakistan are improved. Somebody said here 'What was done to Mujib'. Perhaps, they do not know the history. It is American conspiracy there which resulted in that. Who came to power there? The pro-Soviet forces did not come to power there. I do not want to go into those matters. It is America which organises coups in the world; in every country, everywhere, it is America. Not these people. You

have to differentiate other countries from the Soviet Union. It was the Soviet Union which stood by us at the time of the 1971 War. Now, when Mr. Vajpayee took over, some doubt was expressed that the first thing that he will do will be to do away with the Indo-Soviet Treaty. 6 A.M. That was believed. After that our Prime Minister visited the Soviet Union and they had asserted again that they stood by those relations. They have again and again said that their improving the relation with other countries were not at the cost of their friends. This they have made clear many a time. Sir, I do not want to take much of your time. I only want to say that we should look to the foreign policy from the angle of our role—we are the biggest non-aligned country in the world—of fighting against imperialism, against neo-colonialism, against racialism. We should not leave the initiative to other countries, but take the initiative ourselves and become a leading force in giving the better content to the movement so that the imperialism is not able to divide and disrupt the movement and is not able to weaken the national force.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): There are so many speakers (*Interruptions*). I think the House agrees to sit longer. Yes, the State Minister, Shri Kundu.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Why not tomorrow?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): It will be concluded today.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI S. KUNDU): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have been listening to this debate with great attention.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Are you speaking on behalf of the Government?

SHRI S. KUNDU: What do you mean? Do you think I am speaking on your behalf? You should allow me this much of commonsense at least.

Sir, I will be very brief and short because most of the points will be dealt with by our Foreign Minister. I would only express some of my feelings. Immediately after the Janata Government came to power in March 1977, I remember those days, whispers were floated and people were told to wait and see, after some time this Janata Government will be a partner, a part of a quasi-satellite State of a Super Power.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: It is.

SHRI S. KUNDU: It was whispered by some people who say 'it is', 'it is', because they never see the result. It was whispered that Shri Vajpayee and other people here will fight with West Asia.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: You are the satellite of America.

SHRI S. KUNDU: It was also said that India will lean heavily to one power, like the leaning tower of Pisa. But today, at least the gist of the speeches is this, all those apprehensions, fears have been belied. All these have turned to be day dreams. We have not only emerged from this fire, but we have emerged unscathed. We have restated our independence of judgment. We have restated our faith in the basic postulates of our foreign policy. The whole world recognises this and I am sure the Honourable Members in this House would agree with me. If you do not believe in our performances in the last 15 months.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: 17 months.

SHRI S. KUNDU: I cannot imagine a more distortion of truth. I was very intently listening to Shri Bipinpal Das, the former Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs. He did not see any good anywhere. It is a very strange thing. He said that we had not done anything new to our neighbours. In any aspect of our foreign policy, he did not see anything good. It just appeared to me like the four blind men trying to identify an elephant. I would only request, let him speak from his heart. If Salal Dam Agreement has been signed, or if some of the problems with Bangladesh were settled, or if today with Nepal we have signed two Treaties, it is due to the fact—the most important fact—that these countries trust us as their friend. I had some illusion—perhaps it is not true—about the high-mindedness, the aggressive posture, the big-brotherly attitude which India was accused of in Mrs. Indira Gandhi's era. The way Madam Alva spoke and the way our friend, Shri Bipinpal Das, pointed an accusing finger towards the Foreign Minister and went on pouring sermons after sermons, I thought he was a professor or a head-master in a school.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: We have only one headmaster in this country.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Your headmaster is in the South Block.

SHRI S. KUNDU: Sir, the Salal Dam Agreement has been signed because of our Foreign Minister having gone to Pakistan after 12 years and creating a climate of friendship. You must face facts. I do not know the reason why the former Government did not sign the two Treaties with Nepal. You wanted to do arm-twisting. You wanted some of the countries to fall prostrate at the feet of the great deity. The Salal Dam agreement is one of the most important achievements of our foreign policy. We have been able to arouse confidence and trust among the neighbouring countries. They are just like our

ears and hands. I will say here, it is the duty of a big country like India to not only assure but re-assure Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka and other countries that we have no other interest except to build bridges of friendship. That we have been able to do by our actions and speeches. You will never see the reason.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Sometimes by shameless surrender also.

SHRI S. KUNDU: We have been accused on the floor of this House that while developing friendly relations with our neighbours, we sacrificed principles. I would like to know what principles we have sacrificed when we developed friendly relations and signed economic and cultural co-operation with Vietnam. I had the honour and privilege to go as the leader of an economic delegation to Vietnam. After that Mr. Pham Van Dong, one of the great Prime Ministers of Vietnam, who fought inside the jungles for 30 years, had come to India. We signed an agreement on co-operation. What is the principle we have sacrificed there? Don't try to read anything fishy about it. We want Vietnam to be strong like any other country. In this area, we want that there should be peace and stability so that we can progress quickly. If Vietnam is weak, if Sri Lanka is weak, if Nepal is weak, India will also be weak. That is the position. And we have said there, when I had gone to Vietnam, that it is our moral responsibility to help in the reconstruction of Vietnam. India is a poor country, capital-importing country, but, in spite of that, we could find about Rs. 40 crores. we could find about 300,000 tonnes of wheat. I know my Foreign Minister argued before the Cabinet, the Prime Minister and others for this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA (Bihar): Sir, he says "my Foreign Minister"; he should say "our Foreign Minister".

SHRI S. KUNDU: I stand corrected.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is only a small expression of love and affection.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Say "my beloved Foreign Minister", not "my Foreign Minister".

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. KUNDU: When some journalists asked our Prime Minister: "Why do you give aid to Vietnam", he had the guts and conviction to retort back saying: "It is none of your business. We feel that it is our moral duty to help a country which is suffering. And we stand by it." We do not attach any importance to political ideologies or jargons or cliches while giving aid to certain countries. We have stood by it. We want to build up an Asian personality which has been the dream of many. Asia has been the cradle of civilization and culture for many years. Don't you want to build that Asian personality? You will never see the reason. You are so much obsessed and biased with narrow, sectarian political considerations that you will never rise above them. Try to rise above them. Read the writing on the wall. I have got great admiration and respect for Bhupesh Dada. He is a great man, sacrificed quite a lot. But, Dada, I would request you to listen to your speeches 10 years back and now. They are like a gramophone record. They are the same. Sir, the USSR has changed its views on ASEAN countries, but Dada still feels that it is a military bloc. Dada, please rise when the world rises. Don't go back to a stupor, Dada, don't see the ghost of any 'bloc' in South Block. We are not pro-anything. We are pro-Indians; we are pro-people of India.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: You are rising.

SHRI S. KUNDU: I remember with disgust and dismay that part of history of India, what had happened in

the past, in the Battle of Plassey. Clive with 200 soldiers finished 50,000 soldiers of Sirajuddaula. Right from that day, the honour and dignity of India is in the drain. I was in Lok Sabha in 1962 sitting and watching in the visitors' gallery. That was the day Bomdilla fell, I had seen a great man like Jawaharlal Nehru coming stooped and in terrible condition, Hem Barua waving a telegram and saying: "Assam is going to fall" and Satya Narain Sinha coming and saying: "Don't say anything. Don't say anything. Nehru is terribly disturbed and all that." That aberration, and that mistake we want to correct. We want to build a new India, a prosperous India, India for the people, with the mandate which the people have given during the elections after the last Emergency. That is the mandate with which we work. (Interruptions) I can tell you, Mr. Rai, your shouting will not help. Try to see reason.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Your gestures will not help.

SHRI S. KUNDU: I have gone to foreign countries after I became the Minister and I have found one thing which I want to tell you, Dada, that everybody—whether a Minister or a diplomat, whoever he may be—is surprised at the way the poor people of India have restored democracy. The prestige of India is sky-high. I tell you that the prestige of India is sky-high. I do not indulge in nasty jargons. (Interruptions). Our goodwill in the world is our capital, this is the capital which we have. With this capital let us march ahead, go ahead, and let us build a new India. During this one year of about 16 or 17 months—I tell you Mr. Rai, you can do a lot of shouting in the public meetings—in the West Asia and North Africa, out of Rs. 1,500 crores of works so far, Rs. 740 crores work we are doing. There is a great demand for our younger people, engineers, doctors and others. Let us face the challenge, and we are preparing this country to face this challenge. We are

[Shri S. Kundu]

never cowed down. We will never surrender. We will refuse to surrender.

Somebody here raised a point that perhaps we did not effectively play our role in the economic affairs of the world. Somebody said it here. Recently, I attended the ECOSOC Conference. You know, the world is passing through—I should not say crisis, but I should say—economic malaise. Stag Flatisi is ruling, that is, there is recession and inflation. There is unemployment. At the same time, the developed countries are raising lots of barriers for blocking the exports from the developing countries to flow. About debts, about the contribution of 0.7 per cent of the GNP by the developed countries etc. have not been implemented. Whenever we found an occasion, we put forth our views very strongly. Because we are charged that we do not play our role effectively, I will just read out a few lines of the speech which was made at the ECOSOC Conference at which this humble self represented India. This is what I said:

"Before I conclude, I must remind this august gathering of the ECOSOC of our solemn undertaking way back in 1973 when we adopted the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order." (*Interruptions*) ..

MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Let him conclude. Order, please.

SHRI S. KUNDU: "We then said:

"We shall correct inequality and redress existing injustice, make it possible to eliminate the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries and ensure speedy accelerating economic and social development and peace and justice for the present and future generations..." In our irresistible desire to see the fructifi-

cation of the undertaking so set out, we had gone ahead and committed to the people that the Declaration "shall be one of the most important bases of economic relations between all peoples and all nations." Therefore, this has been a charter of hope mainly for the millions of suffering humanity. Failure to put it into effect would, therefore, not only be unethical, but would also appear to be a breach of faith with mankind in aspiration for a better life which has been denied to it for no fault of its own."

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: The speech should be placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI S. KUNDU: Madam, bear with me. I must tell you... (*Interruptions*)

MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Order please.

SHRI S. KUNDU: I told the world body in these words:

"I must tell you with all humility that unless solutions are found in the foreseeable future, the resurgent people of the developing countries could not be expected to remain passive spectators." What more do you want? (*Interruption*) The personality of India is asserting itself in the world forum. (*Interruptions*) You can go on shouting and jeering. The people would not listen to your shouting and jeering. I will wind up because the Foreign Minister will speak. I will not take much of your time. I will just mention two small points. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Order, please.

SHRI S. KUNDU: About the passport matter, I would just like to inform you—tomorrow we will be discussing about passports—that since the new Government came, we decided to allow as many people to

hold passports and move freely exercising their constitutional rights...

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:
Except Mrs. Gandhi.

SHRI S. KUNDU: No, no, not even Mrs. Gandhi. Let Mrs. Gandhi get clearance... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: It is shameful that they are not allowing a passport to Mrs. Gandhi, the former Prime Minister.

SHRI S. KUNDU: You do not know the truth. Please Sit down. Don't disturb.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: You have not allowed a passport to Mrs. Gandhi. Shameless.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): You take up passport tomorrow.

SHRI S. KUNDU: Sir, in 1975 4.5 lakh passports were given. Last year nine lakh passports were given. This year so far we have given seven lakh passports and by the end of the year we are thinking of giving two million passports.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:
Will you give the former Prime Minister a diplomatic passport?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Why have you not allowed a passport to the former Prime Minister of India? Have you got anything to say?

SHRI S. KUNDU: You read my answers to the questions.

Coming to the question of Haj. I would like to share some information with the House. The desire of the Muslim community is to perform Haj. This year we have increased the number of Haj Pilgrims from 18,000 to 20,000. We have allowed more doctors to assist Haj Pilgrims, we have given more facilities in foreign exchange and all that. We want that the Mus-

lims here in this country should remain as equals with everybody and this we have been ensuring ... (*Interruptions*) Sir, to wind up my speech... (*Interruptions*) All right, you had your say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): You conclude.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:
The minorities do not need foreign exchange to feel equal. We are equals without the foreign exchange. Let me tell you, we do not need your charity...

SHRI S KUNDU: My speech was meant for those who think they are not equals. It is not for you. It is meant for those minorities who still think they are not equals. It is our duty...

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:
We are equals without the money.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. KUNDU: So, I thank you very much for giving me the time. I will again request hon. Members: they should stop scratching on the wall.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:
There are no walls here.

SHRI S. KUNDU: They should see the results. I think after the Janata Government has come, we have pursued a dynamic, purposeful foreign policy. We want to continue with it and see that it is successful.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Shri Kamalnath Jha.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Tomorrow. Now, let us adjourn.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Order, please. Shri Kamalnath Jha.

श्री कमलनाथ झा (बिहार) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, अभी अभी माननीय राज्य मंत्री महोदय का भाषण सुनने के बाद मुझ ऐसा महसूस होता है कि जनता पार्टी का वैदेशिक नीति में क्या स्तर है वह उनके प्रवचन से ही स्पष्ट होता है । मैं आपके माध्यम से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी ने दो बातों की बड़ी जरूरत घोषणा की है । एक घोषणा तो उन्होंने सत्ता को संभालने के पूर्व कि हम नये भारत का निर्माण गांधीजी के आदर्शों पर करेंगे । गांधी जी की नीति, गांधी जी के कार्यक्रम के आधार पर मैं भारत का निर्माण करूँगा और दूसरी घोषणा उन्होंने की कि मैं विश्व में भारत की वैदेशिक नीति को पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के रास्ते पर लेकर चलाऊँगा । ये दो घोषणाएँ उन्होंने की थीं । तो वैदेशिक नीति पर कुछ कहने के पूर्व, माननीय अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी चले गये हैं, मैं कहूँगा कि यह आठवाँ दुनिया का आश्चर्य है और इस जनता पार्टी में महात्मा गांधी के कट्टर विरोधी और विरोधी ही नहीं, अगर मैं शत्रु कहूँ तो अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी, और इसी तरह से जवाहरलाल जी के कट्टर विरोधी संगम का नाम जनता पार्टी है । अगर मुझसे कोई कहे कि जनता पार्टी की परिभाषा करो तो मैं कहूँगा कि महात्मा गांधी और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की नीति के कट्टर विरोधियों के योग का नाम ही जनता पार्टी है । आप इसको अनलाइज कीजिए । लेकिन कुर्सी पर बैठने के बाद, सत्ता संभालने के बाद भारत के इन दो महान सपूतों का नाम लेकर वे राज चलाना चाहते हैं । इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि गांधी जी की समाधि पर कसम खाकर सत्ता पर बैठने वाले लोग जो 17 महीने हुए उसमें लोगों का क्या हाल हुआ । गांधी जी कहते थे सर्वोदय, सर्वोदय उनका सिद्धान्त था । अन्योदय ही सर्वोदय है, जो सब से दुखी है उसकी सहायता करना ही सर्वोदय है । वह हरिजनों की वस्ती में ठहरते थे । आज 17 महीने के राज में हरिजन लोग ज़िन्दा जले, उसके

बाद गांवों से भागे और अब प्रान्त छोड़ कर भाग रहे हैं और 17 महीने और ये रहे तो देश छोड़ कर भागने वाले हैं ।

(Interruptions)

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

वैदेशिक नीति में गांधी जी के आदर्शों की जो हत्या हुई 17 महीने में उससे इन्होंने कहा कि जनता पार्टी का इमेज बढ़ गया है । जनता पार्टी का जो इमेज देश में था हिमालय की चोटी पर वह उतर कर आज जमीन पर आ गया है और थोड़े दिन के बाद जमीन के नीचे दफना दिया जाएगा । अब देश में आपके नेता ने कहा, आपके केन्द्र के नेता कहते हैं कि जनता पार्टी का इमेज खराब हो रहा है । जनता पार्टी का, जिस पार्टी का इमेज देश में या घर में बिगड़ गया उसका विदेश में क्या बनेगा ? यह तो आप फूल्स पैराडाइज में हो कुण्ड साहब । यह सारी दुनिया देख रही है कि आपके मंत्रिमंडल में क्या हो रहा है । आपके समाज में क्या हो रहा है । आपके यहां माइनारिटीज के साथ क्या व्यवहार हो रहा है, हरिजनों के साथ क्या हो रहा है और आप कहते हैं कि मेरा इमेज बढ़ गया है । हो सकता है कि व्यक्तिगत आपका इमेज बढ़ा हो लेकिन भारत की इमेज आपने 17 महीने में मिटा दी है, उस पर कालिमा पोत दी और 30 वर्ष में गांधी जी की तपस्या पर पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जिस इमेज को खड़ा किया था उसको आप पोत रहे हो ।

जैसे आपने गांधी जी के आदर्शों की हत्या की है वैसे ही अन्य की की है । नान-अलाइनमेंट शब्द की बात मैं आपको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी वैदेशिक नीति ऐसी है कि हरब

फरव जोड़ने से कोई पता नहीं चलता है । इतनी शैथिल्य से, इतनी चालाकी से आप हिन्दुस्तान की वैदेशिक नीति को गलत ढंग की ओर ले जाना चाहते हो, गलत रास्ते की ओर ले जाना चाहते हो कि उसकी टोटल पिक्चर, उसका सम्पूर्ण चित्र एक कंटीन्यूइटी में देखना होगा । कहीं एक भाषण देकर अगर आपकी फारन पालिसी के बारे में कोई अज्ञान निकलेगा तो क्या होगा ? इस फोरेन पालिसी की एक डायनामिक प्रोसेस में स्टडी करना पड़ेगा । आपकी पालिसी की आधार शिला क्या है और अभी तक हमारी फोरेन पालिसी की आधार शिला क्या रही है यह मैं बताना चाहता हूँ । हमने अपनी वैदेशिक नीति का एक आदर्श खड़ा किया था । वह आदर्श क्या था ? वह आदर्श था कि संसार के जो दलित देश हैं, जो दुखी देश हैं, जो गुलाम देश हैं जिन लोगों की आजादी छीनी जाती है उनकी आजादी के लिए हिन्दुस्तान अपनी आवाज बुलन्द करेगा, फार द राइट आफ द पिपल, दोस्ती के लिए नहीं । हमारी चियांग-काई-शेख से दोस्ती थी लेकिन कम्युनिस्ट लोगों ने, चीन की जनता ने जब इन्कलाब किया तो हमने चियांग-काई-शेख की दोस्ती को बलाय तक रख दिया और माओ-त्से-तुंग की सरकार को मान्यता दी क्योंकि उसके पीछे चीन की 60 करोड़ जनता का संकल्प था । इसी तरह से अफ्रीका के देश में, इसी तरह से दूसरे देशों में जहाँ-जहाँ की जनता गुलामी की जंजीर में जकड़ी हुई थी और अपनी आजादी के लिए आन्दोलन करती थी उस देश में उनकी आजादी के लिये गांधी जी, जवाहरलाल जी और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी और कांग्रेस की सरकार अपनी आवाज बुलन्द करती थी । आप अपनी छाती पर हाथ रख कर पूछें । हम से मत पूछिये । आज आप दोस्ती की बात करते हैं तो जिन-जिन देशों में जनता के अधिकार छीन लिये गये और उनकी छाती पर संगीनों और गोलियों से ठुकमूत

लाद दी गई लेकिन अपने उनके लिये कुछ नहीं किया । इससे क्या यह नहीं पता लगता कि आपकी दोस्ती जनता के साथ नहीं है और जो जन-विरोधी लोग हैं, जो जन-शक्ति को कुचलने वाले लोग हैं उनके पक्ष में आपकी दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ रहा है ? क्या यह नान-अलायमेंट की पालिसी है ।

अभी मेरे दोस्त सुरजीत सिंह जी ने कहा कि अगर आपके दिल में गरीबों के लिए दर्द होता, आजादी लेने वालों के लिए दर्द होता तो अमेरिका के सामने आप पेलेस्टाइन के सबाल को उठाते लेकिन आप नहीं उठा सके । आपकी विदेश नीति का अगर ठीक से विश्लेषण किया जाए तो लगेगा कि अमेरिका की साज पर आवाज दे रहे हैं । बेलग्रेड में आपका क्या कंटरीव्यूशन था ? वाजपेयी साहब चले गये हैं । वह अपना एक अमेंडेमेंट लाए हैं 'ह्यूमन राइट' के बारे में । कार्टर भी ह्यूमन राइट की बात कहते हैं । वह ह्यूमन राइट के लिये लड़ रहे हैं लेकिन चिली में ह्यूमन राइट नहीं है, पेलेस्टाइन में ह्यूमन राइट नहीं है, साउथ अफ्रीका में ह्यूमन राइट नहीं है, नीग्रो में ह्यूमन राइट नहीं है । कहा है ह्यूमन राइट । आज दुनिया के दो-तिहाई भाग में ह्यूमन राइट नहीं है । इस चीज को आपको समझना पड़ेगा । इसलिए आप आँखों में धूल नहीं झोंक सकते । हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ने आपको समझ लिया है और संसार की जनता भी आपको समझ रही है कि आप कितने प्रोग्रेसिव और नान-एलाइंड हैं । (Time bell rings) आपने समय की घंटी बजा दी और मैंने तो अभी शुरू ही किया था । एनीवे, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप अपनी नान-एलायंड की पालिसी को अमल में लाना चाहते हैं तो आपको इसके लिए कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे ।

यह बात ठीक है कि हिन्दुस्तान में और संसार में कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि आपकी

[श्री कमलनाथ झा]

पालिसी को हम सही मानें या आप हमारी पालिसी को सही मानें । हम दोनों की पालिसी अलग-अलग हो सकती है । लेकिन सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि हम गांधीवादी हैं आप कहते हैं कि लेकिन गांधी जी के आदर्शों की हत्या करते हैं । आप कहते हैं कि हम नेहरू जी की नान-एलायंड पालिसी को मानते हैं लेकिन उनके विपरीत आप काम करते हैं । इसलिये मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ ।

एक बात पूछने के अलावा मुझे तीन चार बातें और भी पूछनी हैं । सब से पहले मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप इस बात में आस्था रखते हैं कि आज भी संसार में अमेरिका ने और अन्य साम्राज्यवादी देशों ने अनेक देशों का गुलामी की जंजीर पहनाये रखी है और क्या वे आज भी अपने साम्राज्यवादी व्यवहार को खत्म नहीं कर पाये हैं ? अगर आप इस बात को मानते हैं तो आपको इस बात का भी पता होना चाहिए कि अब अमेरिका संसार के देशों को आर्थिक दृष्टि से गुलाम बनाये रखना चाहता है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस बात को ईमानदारी से समझ लें और इस बात को समझ करके आपको अमेरिकी और पूँजीवादी देशों के वर्चस्व को खत्म करने के लिए नान-एलायंड देशों की मदद से जोरदार प्रयास करना चाहिए । इस दृष्टि से अगर आप अमेरिका जाकर अमेरिका वालों से बात करते हैं तो इसमें मुझे कोई विरोध नहीं है । जब हमारे देश में प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू थे तो उनकी दोस्ती अमेरिका से भी थी और रूस से भी उनकी मित्रता थी । वे दोनों देशों से बात करते थे । आप जानते हैं कि संसार में अब यह सिलसिला चल पड़ा है कि रूस अमेरिका से अन्डर-स्टैंडिंग करना चाहता है, अमेरिका रूस से

दोस्ती करना चाहता है इसी प्रकार से रूस और चीन भी एक दुसरे के नजकदी आना चाहते हैं । अमेरिका वालों की दोस्ती चीन से हो रही है । ऐसी स्थिति में अगर हिन्दुस्तान भी चीन के साथ बातचीत करके अपनी समस्याओं को हल करना चाहता है तो यह बात नान-एलायमेंट के खिलाफ नहीं है । मैं ऐसे लोगों से सहमत नहीं हूँ जो देश या किसी खास सिद्धान्त का त्रिफ लेकर बात करते हैं । अगर रूस और चीन अपने मतभेदों को दूर करना चाहते हैं, तो कोई कारण नहीं है कि चीन और भारत को भी बाइलिट्रल बातचीत द्वारा अपनी समस्याओं को हल करना चाहिए । अवश्य ही भारत और चीन को बातचीत करके अपनी समस्याओं को हल करना चाहिए । जब हमारे देश में कांग्रेस की सरकार थी तो उन्होंने भी दूसरे देशों के साथ अपनी समस्याओं को बातचीत के द्वारा हल करने की कोशिश की । श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के जमाने में जब एक बार अमेरिका के साथ हमारा झगड़ा हो गया था तो उसके बाद भारत सरकार ने अमेरिका के साथ अपने रिलेशन्स सुधारने का प्रयास किया । नेहरू जी भी इसी नीति पर चलते थे । यह कोई अनुचित बात नहीं है लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि आपको अमेरिका की चाल पर थिरकना नहीं चाहिए । अमेरिका के साज के साथ आपको अपना सुर नहीं मिलाना चाहिए । जब आपकी पार्टी में कोई सदस्य आपकी नीतियों के खिलाफ बोलता है तो उसको आप अनुशासनहीनता की संज्ञा देते हैं । इसी प्रकार से अगर आप किसी एक राष्ट्र के सुर में सुर मिलाकर बोलते हैं तो यह बात नान-एलायमेंट के खिलाफ जाती है । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जब भी बोलते हैं तो ऐसा लगता है कि वे अमेरिका की आवाज में सुर मिला रहे हैं । सिक्रिम के बारे में, एटम बम के बारे में, चीन के साथ बार्डर डिस्प्यूट के

बारे में, जब भी वे बोलते हैं, ऐसा लगता है कि वे दूसरों के सूर में सूर मिला रहे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में यह सरकार कैसे कह सकती है कि यह नान-एलाइन्ड सरकार है ? आप सीधे-सीधे अमेरिका केम्प में नहीं जाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन पीछे से समर्थन अमेरिका की नीतियों को देते हैं। जिस तरह से आप लोग गांधी जी का नाम लेकर गांधी जी के सिद्धान्तों को हत्या कर रहे हैं उसी प्रकार से आप लोग श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू की नान-एलायमेंट की पालिसी का भी अन्त कर रहे हैं। साम्राज्यवादी तात्त्वों के विरुद्ध सारे संसार को सतर्क रहने की आवश्यकता है। आज हमारे सामने सवाल यह है कि क्या जनता पार्टी की सरकार हमारे देश की मूल-भूत नीतियों से दूर जा रही है ? उसकी स्थिति देश के अन्दर डरावनी है। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया कहा करते थे कि संसार के गरीब और पिछड़े देशों की मुख्य समस्या भूख की है। एशिया और अफ्रीका में गरीबी और भूख मिटाने के लिए इन देशों को अपने पांवों पर खड़ा होना होगा। इसके लिए आवश्यकता इस चीज की है कि ये देश इकोनामिक दृष्टि से मजबूत हों। लेकिन हमारी जनता पार्टी की सरकार के मंत्री रोज कहते हैं कि देश में सीमेंट की कमी को दूर करने के लिए सीमेंट विदेशों से मंगाया जायेगा। देश के अन्दर जिन चीजों की कमी होती है उसके लिए ये लोग विदेशों की तरफ देखने लगते हैं। अगर देश में नमक की कमी होती है तो ये लोग कहते हैं कि नमक विदेशों से मंगाया जायेगा। इस प्रकार की नीति से तो हमारा देश विदेशों पर निर्भर हो जाएगा। दूसरे पर डिपेंड हो जाओगे तो फिर आप कैसे एक स्वतंत्र, निर्भीक और नान-अलाइन्ड पालिसी को लेकर चलेंगे। आज अमेरिका समूचे एशिया और अफ्रीका के देशों का आर्थिक दृष्टि से क़िपल करना चाहता है। अमरीका कहता है कि अगर तुम दाम बढ़ाओगे तेल का तो युद्ध होगा लेकिन इन्स्ट्रुमन्ट गुड्स का दाम

25 गुना बढ़ा दिया तो इसका अमरीका को कोई मलाल नहीं। इसलिये आपकी यह फारेन पालिसी ...

श्री सभापति : कृपया समाप्त करें।

श्री कमल नाथ झा : आपकी नान-अलाइनमेंट के नाम से तब तक सफल नहीं हो सकती जब तक कि आप इन मुद्दों पर विचार नहीं करेंगे और इन मुद्दों पर विचार करके अपनी बातों को मजबूती से विश्व में नहीं रखेंगे। खतरा यही है आप बात तो करते हो नान-अलाइनमेंट की परन्तु काम करते हो अलाइनमेंट की। इसलिये आपको शक और मुश्काल की नज़र से लोग देख रहे हैं। उपसभापति जी, आपका आदेश है कि मैं समाप्त करूं, इसलिये मैं आपका आदेश मानता हूं। हमारे विदेश मंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने बहुत कुशल हैं, इसमें कोई उनका जोड़ नहीं है। बात को शब्दों में ढककर, आवरण देकर चाहे जो कहें लेकिन यदि वह नान-अलाइनमेंट के छोर को पकड़कर रखेंगे, तभी उनकी प्रतिष्ठा रहेगी और इस देश की भी प्रतिष्ठा रहेगी।

श्री नत्थी सिंह (राजस्थान) : उप-सभापति महोदय, शब्दाडंबर से तिल को ताड़ बनाने की कला का प्रदर्शन अगर कभी देखना है तो वह आज विरोधी दल ने सदन में प्रस्तुत किया। कई बार हम सुनते चले आये हैं, कई बार यह आलोचना की गई है कि अब तो यह जनता की सरकार कांग्रेसी राह पर चलने लगी है। और बातों में मतभेद हो सकते हैं लेकिन विदेश नीति में यह बात सही है कि पुरानी सरकार ने जो लोक बनाई है उसी लोक पर ही श्री वाजपेयी भी चल रहे हैं, जनता सरकार भी चल रही है। फर्क केवल इतना सा है कि तराजू के जो दा पलड़े हैं उसमें कमी पासग दिखाई दिया और उस पासग को ठीक करने का काम उन्होंने कर दिया। उसमें आपको क्या क्या नज़र आता है ? आपका नज़र आया कि यह ता

[श्री नत्थी सिंह]

नान-अलाइनमेंट है और जेनरुयिन की बात करते हैं, सब के साथ अलाइनमेंट की बात करते हैं, रिजल्ट ओरियन्टेड पालिसी की बात करते हैं। कौन सी इसमें बुराई हो गई मगर ये कहते हैं कि जेनरुयिन नान-अलाइनमेंट हो, अगर यह कहते हैं कि सबके साथ अलाइनमेंट हो या यह कहते हैं कि रिजल्ट ओरियन्टेड पालिसी हो। कौन नहीं चाहता कि इसमें हमें रिजल्ट प्राप्त हों। हमारी पालिसी बाइस हो यह कोई नहीं चाहता। उधर के जो माननीय सदस्य हैं उन्हें साफ साफ कहना चाहिए कि हमारी जो नीति हो वह इस तरह की हो जो उबर हो, देश के लिये सार्थक हो। हमारी जो नान-अलाइनमेंट की नीति है उसका नतीजा यह होना चाहिए कि जो देश गरीब है, डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज है और जो आज दूसरों के साथ सैन्य संगठनों में बंधे हुए हैं, एक मौका उनके लिये ऐसा आया जब कि उनको इस पर सोचने का समय आया और अगर ऐसा मौका कुछ देशों को मिलने लगा है इस नीति से तो आपको इसमें खुशी ही होनी चाहिए, नाराजी नहीं। पाकिस्तान जो गेस्ट बना, उस पर मंत्री जी बताएंगे कि क्या सुधार हुआ है। लेकिन मुझे बड़ी ख़ुशी है कि पाकिस्तान के जिया साहब गेस्ट के रूप में आये। यदि वे सन्टो से सम्बन्ध तोड़ ले, वहाँ से निकल जाते हैं तो इसमें बुराई की कोई बात नहीं है, अच्छी ही बात है। श्रीमती मार्गेट अल्वा जी ने कहा कि वाजपेयी साहब की पुरानी स्पीचस बहुत व्यटीफुल थी आज उन में बेढंगापन है। विपिन गाल दास जी ने यह कहा कि जो सुदृढ़ आधार हमने दिया था, पुरानी सरकार ने तटस्थ विदेश नीति को जो सुदृढ़ आधार दिया था, वह सारा का सारा आधार चूर चूर कर दिया गया है। न तो नेपाल के साथ कुछ हुआ, न चीन के साथ और न ही श्रीलंका और पाकिस्तान के साथ कुछ हुआ।

उनको एक तरफ तो यह दुख है कि उनके साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध नहीं बने हैं और दूसरी तरफ इस बात का भी दुख है कि उनके साथ सम्बन्ध सुधारने की बात क्यों कर रहे हैं। इसमें साफ प्रतीत होता है कि इनकी यह दो गी नीति है और क्योंकि कुछ न कुछ कहना है इसलिए इस नीति को क्रिटिसाइज करना चाहिए। उपसभापति महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी जो तटस्थता की नीति थी आज तक वह किस आधार पर थी। हमारा देश जब आजाद हुआ उस समय द्वितीय महायुद्ध समाप्त हुआ था। जब हमारा देश आजाद हुआ तो उसमें अफ्रीका और एशिया के देशों में एक नव-जागृति आई और इन देशों में स्वतंत्रता का संघर्ष तात्कालिक हुआ। उधर दूसरी तरफ युगोस्लाविया जो कम्युनिस्ट कैम्प में था उसके रूप के साथ संबंध बिगड़े वे इसमें आए और तीसरा इजिप्ट में नासिर का उदय हुआ और वे एक अरब कंट्रीज के नेता के रूप में उभरे और रूस के साथ संबंध अच्छे जुड़े। आज वह सारी स्थिति बदल चुकी है। अब आप देख लीजिए साम्राज्यवाद, उपनिवेशवाद और जातीय रंगभेद की नीति इन तीनों के खिलाफ लड़ते के आधार को ले कर नान-अलाइनमेंट की नीति चलाई थी। आज साम्राज्यवाद का दुर्ग ढह गया है, उपनिवेशवाद मर रहा है, रंगभेद की नीति अभी है। उसके खिलाफ संघर्ष भी है। और मित्र के रूस के साथ मैत्री के संबंध थे वे बदल गए हैं, आज उनके अमेरिका के साथ संबंध अच्छे हो रहे हैं। टीटो साहब के रूस के साथ अच्छे संबंध नहीं थे। आज संबंधों में कुछ सुधार हुआ है। रूस हमारा दोस्त रहा है इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है। यह सरकार कहती है रूस के साथ हम दोस्ती बरकरार रखेंगे यह बात सही है। जब जब संकट की स्थिति आई तो रूस हिन्दुस्तान के समीप

आया है, पास आया है। मददगार साबित हुआ है। उस बात को रखते हुए, दूसरे जो डेमोक्रेटिक कंट्रीज हैं, हमारी जनतन्त्रवादी व्यवस्था है उस व्यवस्था में विश्वास रखते हुए अगर जनतांत्रिक देश भी हमारे साथ आते हैं और पुरानी गलतफहमी दूर होती है तो उसमें किसी को गिला नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं तो धन्यवाद देता हूँ इस बात के लिए मारे परिपेक्ष में होत हुए भी हमारे वाजपेयी जी और प्रधान मंत्री जी अमरीका गए, इस बात का खतरा होते हुए भी कि हमारा नारापुर परमाणु बिजली घर नहीं चलेगा, समाप्त हो जाएगा फिर भी कहा कि हम परमाणु संधि पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेंगे जब तक हमारे देश इस सिद्धांत को नहीं मान लेते हैं और उन्होंने नहीं किया। दूसरी बात उन्होंने कही कि यह जब सुपर पावरज हैं यदि वे चाहते हैं कि वास्तव में मारे विश्व में शान्ति हो, डिसआरमामेंट हो तो पहले उनको शुरूआत करनी चाहिए, अपने परमाणु हथियारों को बनाना बंद करें, सारे भंडारों को समाप्त करें। इस बात को एंप्रिंशिएट करना चाहिए इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती। हमारे राज्य मंत्रों ने कहा कि हमारे पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ संबंध सुधरे हैं और दूसरी बात यह है कि जो हमने नान-अलाइनमेंट का निर्णय लिया है, उसके दूसरे फेज में प्रवेश कर चुके हैं। सैनिक साम्राज्यवाद नहीं है लेकिन पूँजीवाद और साम्राज्यवाद का डर है। आज डवलपिंग कंट्रीज और डवलपड कंट्रीज के बीच में सघष इस दुनिया में है। डवलपिंग कंट्रीज यह चाहते हैं कि हमको हमारा हक मिलना चाहिए। मैं यह चाहता हूँ इस लड़ाई को लड़ने के लिए जितने डवलपिंग कंट्रीज डवलपड कंट्रीज के सैनिक संगठनों के कारण चंगुल में हैं उनको निकालने

की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। यह बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने कहा कि हमारे मंत्री जी चीन जा रहे हैं और चीन का सारा रुख इस तरह का है कि काश्मीर में जनमत संग्रह होना चाहिए, कराकोरम सड़क बन रही है, चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों मिले हुए हैं। फिर यह क्यों जा रहे हैं? मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक परिवर्तन आया है। जो हम लक्ष्य करते हैं वह केवल आइडियलिस्टिक नहीं, हमारी तटस्थता की नीति यथार्थवादी है। यह भी परिवर्तन आया है। वह कैसे? मैं पंडित नेहरू जी का बहुत आदर करता हूँ लेकिन यह मानना पड़ेगा कि जब हिन्दी चीनी भाई-भाई हुआ था यह आवाज इस देश में उठी थी कि तिब्बत पर आप लोग मंचेत रहें, तिब्बत को चीन की गोद में मत दो तब फिर आदर्श के नाम पर इस बात को नहीं समझा गया। तिब्बत गया और हिन्दी चीनी भाई-भाई की बात होते हुए भी इस देश पर चीन का हमला हुआ। चीन की हमले की बात भूल गए जो आज यह बात कर रहे हैं कि अमरीका के साथ मत जाइए। भूल क्यों जाते हैं। मन् 1962 में हमारी वही प्रगतिशील सरकार माया मांग रही थी कि हमको बचाओ, दानव हमारे ऊपर चढ़ता चला आ रहा है। हम क्यों भूल गए हैं। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ आप जाएं, जरूर जाएं लेकिन यह याद रखें कि आज भी संकट हम पर है। तिब्बत का खतरा तो तब था आज बंगलादेश का खतरा है। मैं चाहता हूँ दो तरह की बात साफ होनी चाहिए। हमें इस बात का फक्र है कि बंगलादेश की आजादी की लड़ाई में हिन्दुस्तान का योगदान रहा है इसमें शर्म की बात नहीं है लेकिन आज हमको साफ करना पड़ेगा जो एक भ्रान्ति इस देश में भी है और

[श्री नन्थी सिंह]

वाहर भी है। बंगलादेश में आज भी सैनिक तानाशाही के खिलाफ वहां की जुझारू जनता कदम बढ़ा रही है। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार और आज के हिन्दुस्तान के शासकों का क्या रुख है? कोई मुझ जैसे आदमी को सन्देह होता है जब हम यह सुनते हैं कि हमें कोई मतलब नहीं है, पड़ोसी देश हैं हम उसमें हस्तक्षेप नहीं करेंगे, शरणार्थी आयेगे तो हम धक्का देकर बाहर निकाल देंगे ऐसी बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। एक साफ दिमाग रहना चाहिए। अगर हमने बंगला देश की जुझारू जनता का साथ नहीं दिया और उनको अपने जनतान्त्रिक तरीके में अपने भाग्य का निर्णय करने का अधिकार नहीं दिया तो तिब्बत को लेकर चीन ने जिस तरह हमारे साथ किया था बंगलादेश के साथ भी होकर फिर हिन्दुस्तान पर वैसा ही खतरा आ सकता था। इसलिए वाजपेयी जी वहां जायें सही लेकिन उनको यह भी याद होगा, वे यह बात नहीं भूलेंगे जो उनके ब्यूटीफुल भाषण में याद आ रहा है कि हमारी जमीन पर, हमारी पवित्र जमीन पर आज भी चीन का अनधिकार कब्जा है। यह बात भी हुई है वे उन सैन्य संगठनों का साथ दे रहे हैं। आज वियतनाम जैसे मुल्क में जिसने आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी है और अमेरिकी साम्राज्यवाद में अन्तिम कोल ठ की है उसकी आजादी के बाद आज चीन उसको भी आख दिबा रहा है तब वह हमारा कितना मित्र हो सकता है? लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम मित्रता के लिए पहल न करें और उसको प्रचार करने का मौका दें कि मैंने तो हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया था पर उसने बढ़ा हुआ हाथ थामा नहीं। इसलिए वहां जायें बात करें कोई बात नहीं है लेकिन पुरानी सरकार की तिब्बत वाली भूल न करें और हमारे देश की जो पवित्र भूमि है, आनबान है उसकी पवित्रता का ध्यान करने हुए यदि किसी सम्मानजनक समझौते पर पहुंचें तो जब एशिया के बड़े देश दोस्त बन जायेंगे तो दुनिया की राजनीति में

एक बड़ा अन्तर आ सकता है इसमें कोई दो बातें नहीं हैं। इसलिए मुझे कहना है कि हमारे लायक दोस्त जिनको इस पर बहुत ही खतरा नजर आया, ऐसी बात नहीं है उन्होंने कोई ऐसी बात नहीं करी खतरे की। एक बात हुई थी और जो विपिन पाल दास साहब ने कही कि कोई विदेश नीति तभी सफल हो सकती है हमारी घरेलू नीति सफल होगी और घरेलू नीति सफल तब होगी जब आर्थिक नीति सफल होगी। लेकिन मुझे दुःख है कि इस देश में कांग्रेस पार्टी ने राज किया और इस समय जनता पार्टी राज कर रही है परन्तु दोनों पार्टियों की एक ही विचारधारा रही है और वह एक मामले में आज तक है। वह यह कि हमारी आर्थिक नीति मिश्रित आर्थिक व्यवस्था पर होगी और इसमें खिचड़ी में चावल दाल का क्या अनुपात होगा केवल यही फर्क है। चावल और दाल का बढ़िया अनुपात रख दोगे तब यह सुपाच्य खिचड़ी बन जायगी और अगर कच्चा पक्का रह गया तो मार्च 77 का फल दिखाई देने लगेगा। लेकिन बहुत बड़ा परिवर्तन खिचड़ी परिवर्तन से चाहें सारी दुनिया को दे देंगे ऐसा नहीं है। इसलिए जो वास्तविकता है, जो स्थितियां हैं उसको देखते हुए हम दूसरे देशों को कितनी दूर तक आगे साथ ले जा सकते हैं और विश्व शान्ति के लिए जो विकास-शील देशों के लिए जरूरी है, और तभी हम तरक्की कर सकते हैं उसमें कितना सहायक हो सकते हैं, इस बात के लिए भारत का योगदान होना चाहिए। एक बात उन्होंने कही कि जो आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे उनके साथ एलाइनमेंट होना चाहिए। कहा गया कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका के साथ इस तरह की जानबूझ कर गलतफहमी की बात करनी है। हिन्दुस्तान ने दक्षिण-अफ्रीका की नीतियों का कब विरोध नहीं किया। 16 महीने में कब साथ दिया। कौन सी ऐसी आजादी की लड़ाई है, अफ्रीका और दूसरे देशों की जिनके खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान ने कुछ कहा हो। सारी आजादी की लड़ाइयों में सारी रंगभेद की नीतियों की लड़ाई में हिन्दुस्तान का वही तरीका रहा है, वही तौर

रहा है जो आजादी के दिनों में हमने सीखा था और उन सारी शक्तियों का साथ देने की इस सरकार की नीति है, इसमें कोई परिवर्तन नहीं आया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं, हमारे विपिन पाल दास घबड़ा गये कि तराजू के पलड़े का पासंग क्यों दूर कर रहे हो, पासंग दूर हो जाने दा, ओरनों का मही हाने दा। उसके साथ-साथ दुनिया में से विश्व में से जो आज भी सुपर पावर का खतरा है जब हम आजाद हुए थे, लड़ाई बन्द हुई थी और शीत वार चला था लेकिन आज हम फिर दूसरे आर्थिक पुनर्निर्माण की ओर जा रहे हैं, फिर एक शीत युद्ध चल रहा है, संहार का खतरा है, विश्व से इस खतरा को कम करने के लिए हमें हिम्मत के साथ, तटस्थता की नीति, जेनुइन और सक्रिय तटस्थता की नीति पर चलना होगा जिससे कि विश्व के दलित विकासशील देश आगे बढ़ सकें, मजबूती के साथ और दुनिया में शान्ति का शोषण, आर्थिक शोषण, ह्यूमन राइट का शोषण समाप्त हो सके। इसके लिए जरूरी है, इसलिए जो नीति अपनायी जा रही है उसमें हम असंगति नहीं पाते हैं, असंगति केवल सोच में पाते हैं और उसे विपिन पाल दास दूर करेंगे ऐसी मुझे आशा है और इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद दंगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan will speak and then the hon. Foreign Minister will reply.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am happy that at last an unattached Member has also got a chance to unleash himself on the attached Members.

Being very agonisingly aware of the limitations of time in the late hour, let me add, and being more cynically conscious of the marginality of influences which speeches even in Parliament have a propensity to make on the process of policy formulations,

I will still try to submit certain theoretical aspects on a couple of major sensitive issues for the consideration of the Foreign Minister and his Ministry. Firstly, the perception of international reality and linking it up with the perceptions of the national reality, even if one has to emphasise again, requires a very systematic and careful study, almost consciously. In a highly inter-dependent world which is passing through a tremendous phase of change, sometimes the modality in the speed of change is so staggering that one is almost unequal and has to be almost continuously prepared by those who are called upon to make policy options.

Firstly, I do not agree with the proposition articulated in this House and elsewhere that bi-polarity has collapsed and multi-polarity has emerged, as if one can speak of bi-polarity versus multi-polarity and as if the phenomenon is not one where simultaneously both bi-polarity at the pyramid level does not co-exist with multi-polarity at the intermediate level. One has just to see SALT 1 and SALT 2. One has just to see the problem of disarmament. One has just to see that despite the fact that isms have taken in ideological politics even when the chips are down, the two super powers remain two super powers. Let us not ideologically or academically get away from it. This is one of the attempts made by interested and partisan scholars of the more developed countries, uncritically accepted by some of our more sensitive minds also. It is not the position that one can speak on bi-polarity versus multi-polarity. The position remains that bi-polarity exists for certain aspects of world problems while multi-polarity and polysynthesism also exist. Sir, I would like to say that there is this framework of pyramid where at the apex you have bi-polarity and at different levels you have polysynthesism and you have the position of linkages. The perception of foreign policy will remain highly inadequate or will remain lopsided if you perceive only one aspect

[Prof. Rasheeduddin]

of this phenomenon and come to a policy formation only on that basis.

Therefore, I say that a couple of major developments should be kept in mind specially from April 1978. Freezing of detente, about which a mention has been made very forcefully, is a factor to be kept in mind and I will refer to it somewhat later. New threats in Africa are emerging. Reactivisation of the NATO has taken place. But, what is more significant, which has not been analysed, not even mentioned, is the trilateral commission's role in the policy formation of the United States of America particularly and also of the 12 countries of Western Europe and Japan and the western hemisphere. The unilateral commission today has emerged as the policy formulating agency having the NATO as the strategic-cum-military build up base and multi-nationals for the penetration of economic and commercial strongholds. Therefore, unless you link up the NATO, the multi-nationals and the trilateral commission, the whole perception of the foreign policy, particularly of the U.S.A. becomes somewhat distorted. It is a fact that Mr. David Rockefeller launched in 1973 the trilateral commission of which President Carter, at that time the Governor of Georgia was a private member, in which the dynamic contribution of Mr. Brezezinski has to be very very carefully analysed. Several papers have also been published. About fifteen reports of the 7 P.M. trilateral commission are there. I very strongly urge that the Foreign policy office should make a very careful study as to how does the recommendation of the trilateral commission impinge on the policy formulation of the U.S.A.

Sir, the attempt to side-track the U.N. Disarmament Conference is not understood unless juxtaposition of events is made sometimes, which is the whole part. On the 7th of June,

a very important policy speech is made by President Carter at the U.N. Naval Academy at Naps. Forty-eight hours later, Morarjibhai speaks in the U.N. Special Commission on Disarmament. Forty-eight hours after that, Morarjibhai meets President Carter. This blowing of hot and cold should be kept in mind.

On one side, the meeting of the NATO was taking place; on the other side, consideration of trilateral commission was going on and on the third side, the Prime Minister of India goes and meets the President of U.S.A. Now what does one make out of all this? I can only say that there is simultaneous attempt to weaken the whole process of detente, blow hot and cold and they try to speak a language of hypocrisy, of sublime hypocrisy, which is capable of being interpreted according to the consciousness of the different parties.

The second theoretical proposition about which I am concerned is the bilateralism. I think many things have been mentioned about it and rightly so. I would like to give full credit to Mr. Vajpayee—a dynamic Foreign Minister—without taking any partisan position. I think some of the things which he has done are worthy of being recognised as a very positive contribution to national consensus. But when he speaks of bilateralism, it has to be very carefully understood, because I feel, bilateralism is being counter-posed to multi-lateralism. I would like to ask a couple of questions to understand what is the being counter-passed to multilateralism. Is it a term to imply unilateral input into a bilateral framework? Is it a unilateral institute and endeavour, unmindful of a *quid pro quo*? Would it be allowed to become a soliloquy in lieu of a dialogue? Is it only a formal one-to-one equation without carefully calculating the balance of reciprocity? Should not bilateralism be conceived as just one dimension, even if it be a valid and a vital dimension, within the larger framework of multilateralism, parti-

ularly in a world that is highly interdependent and intertwined by multiple ties of transactions? Bilateralism is not and ought not to be presumed to be, insulation, much less isolation of two States from the inevitable global ramifications. Bilateralism is to be a situation of solving exclusive two-party issues, without the interference of a third party. No less and no more. But certainly, its operation presumes a pattern of effective reciprocity, of mutual benefit, of a *quid pro quo* a genuine effort for keeping third parties out of the bilateral problems and issues. Yet, in a world, whose major concern is the intelligent management of interdependence at a global and regional levels, it is both impossible and impracticable from the operational angle, and undesirable and illusory from the narrative angle to speak of bilateralism *per se*. Let us recognise that there is limits to bilateralism. For a healthy, meaningful and viable bilateralism, it is necessary first to have a clear global perspective, with defined scale of policy priorities for the region, our own region, like South Asia of which we are an integral part, and of contiguous regions, that is, South East Asia, West Asia, East Africa, Indian Ocean regions etc., whose developments become factors of significance for our own foreign policy operation. It seems, as if now, that our policy of bilateralism, valid in parts—but only in parts—imbued with genuine impulses as it is, is based more on euphoric sentimentalism, to somehow come to terms even with intransigent aspects projected by our neighbours. The only virtue of bilateralism, as practised so far, has been to partially extricate issues from obvious external influence or interference. Partially because, as has become evident now, the Indo-Bangladesh talks on Farakka have now got mixed up with other neighbours as well. The design of bilateralism has now been encroached by trilateral patterns, with Nepal standing in the wings. Similarly, our negotiations with Pakistan, ostensibly on

bilateral basis, have clandestine multilateral edges to it. This is true even of our efforts for talks with China. U.S. interest is all too apparent. Therefore, let us not naively believe that a more formal bilateral format is enough of a security for avoiding exogenous interference. Precisely because of this limitation, there is a clear and urgent need for working out a broad global framework of foreign policy priorities and goals, both in terms of long-term and short-term objectives, and then, work out within that global framework, the specific of bilateralism, keeping in mind enlightened national interest and the larger global concerns.

Here, I come to the problem of China. While it is most welcome that the Foreign Minister should pursue a line of 'normalising relations with China', I would caution him at the same time. I do not hesitate to say so. Sir, I have been one of those who have always been wanting friendship with our neighbours, particularly, China. I am the admirer of Chinese civilisation. I am the admirer of the role of China. I am the admirer of the revolutionary temper of China. I have also been one of the founder-members of the Indo-Chinese Friendship Association. But the fact remains that you cannot overlook the perspective of China as of now. Quite apart from the traditional Chung Kuo concept celestial empire, middle kingdom at the centre of the world and so on, the whole perspective of China today, I am sorry to say so, particularly, sitting next to Mr. Surjeet is an attempt at splitting the world movement, disrupting the whole process of solidarity of the third world and distorting the pattern of the socialist countries. Here, I would like to quote, particularly, from a very important policy document, *Renmin Ribao* (People's Daily) of November 1, 1977. In this, certain formulations are startling. First, it says:

'The Soviet Union's ruling clique has completely betrayed the cause

[Prof. Rasheeduddin]

of communism, capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union and it degenerated and became a social-imperialist country. The Soviet Union not only turned into an imperialist superpower that threatened the world as the United States did, but also became the most dangerous source of another world war.

The most interesting conclusion which they come to is this:

"In short, both the Soviet Union and the United States are imperialist superpowers, the biggest international exploiters and oppressors, the largest forces for war and aggression and the common enemies of the people of the world."

Ultimately, they end up by saying:

"The conduct of the Soviet Union in international affairs is quintessential imperialism and hegemonism, without a trace of a socialist proletarian spirit."

Then, this is the conclusion:

"Of the two imperialist superpowers, the Soviet Union is the most ferocious, the most reckless, the most treacherous, and the most dangerous source of world war."

I am amazed at the formulation of and otherwise sensitive Chinese mind. Therefore, when Mr. Vajpayee goes to China, he should keep in mind the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation with the Soviet Union and our own experience of China. He should keep this in mind when he sits down there for talks. I am reminded here of a couplet in Urdu.

"यह कहते थे यू कहिये जय उ ने कहा कहिए
नो चुप है कि क्या कहिये, खुशी है जवा कोई"

What will he talk? It is impossible to talk. As a representative of an advanced civilization, as a representative of a civilization which has con-

tributed as much to world development as China, I would like the people to take note of this fact that we are second to none in our pursuit of peace. We also have a national ego and respect and I think the hon. Foreign Minister of India should take note of this. Delegations from China could come here and delegations from India could go there. They are welcome. But why should the Foreign Minister of India take an initiative to reach China at a time when the perspective of China is like this; I am saying it with a heavy heart? Therefore, I am asking, when you speak of China, when you speak of normalisation within the bilateral framework, are you keeping in mind that this bilateral framework is ultimately part of a larger framework or not?

Sir, I would also suggest here that it is a fact that the Chinese role in Africa, the Chinese role as proxy in the non-aligned movement in Belgrade, has encountered to the very assumption of India's foreign policy. India's foreign policy having based on certain assumptions, while we would like to establish normalisation with China, with Bangladesh, with Pakistan with Sri Lanka but to at all at the cost of our principles. This is linked up with our perception of the United States of America. I have several academic friends in the U.S. I have no quarrel with the academy of U.S., but I am afraid that the whole approach of the State Department and the Pentagon, particularly Brezhnev, is to be kept in mind. The United States today stand as a power with which the third world has basic divergence of interest. While we have to normalise our relations with the United States of America, but it ought not to be done at any cost. It was, therefore, somewhat surprising that the Foreign Minister's visit to China was announced in the United States of America. That it was announced in the United States of America, one fears despite the patriotic acumen of Mr. Vajpayee and his discretion because Brezhnev and President Car-

ler were very eager to see that somehow the Foreign Minister of India goes. Why should America be interested in this visit?

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): As a second Kissinger.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: They are interested in it because they would like India to come to terms with China on China terms. Therefore, I would very strongly plead that India should make it very clear that we have no belligerent attitude towards China, that we despite the aggression of China, despite the famous road-building by China are still prepared to sit with a large heart, vision, but not on the terms of China alone. It should be terms of mutually agreed formulation in which India's interest and the larger global interests should be maintained.

Sir, the United States of America again is playing a role which has to be very clearly watched. I am afraid, while I have got a lot of admiration for Mr. Vajpayee, I wish I could say the same thing about the Prime Minister of India. I have very severe reservations about the policy, perspective of the distinguished Prime Minister of India, having known his position during the last 30 years. His decisions are based sometimes on fads, sometimes on spiritual insights, sometimes on old habits, sometimes on revulsion against what the previous Government has done and partly because of the age, despite his otherwise healthy look because of his *abe hayat* which he takes, I am told. I am sometimes worried whether the Foreign Minister as part of a collective responsibility of the Cabinet, does not give in again out of his culture for the elders and culture for arranged norms of Parliament etiquettes to what the Prime Minister says. The Prime Minister's speeches are horrible and I am using the strong words because when he speaks that non-alignment means peace for

all, I do not know what he means by all that. Is it something of the inner statements which he often makes when he says I am satisfied in all conditions, I am always happy? Is it humanly possible for anybody to be happy all the time? Either a person is totally bereft of sensitivity and capacity to find out what is good or bad. He says: "I am happy under all circumstances. I am satisfied". How can you be satisfied and happy under all circumstances? There are certain situations in which you are angry. I think we have not to take a metaphysical view of politics but a clear, rational, humanistic view of politics. Therefore, I plead that even at the risk of being asked to resign, the Foreign Minister would do well to heed the Prime Minister for purposes of spiritual ecstasy, for purposes of therapy of a peculiar indigenous character, but not as far as the foreign policy is concerned.

I have reservations about some shifts here and there. One shift which I would like to mention is—I think he was somehow misled into it—the shift in his speech at Belgrade, in which he said—and I quote:

"In Belgrade the torch of independence, non-conformity".

I would underline the word "non-conformity" because this is the first time he has used this,

"and non-militarism was lit. There was a real danger that new nations were going to be disciplined into forms of military dependence or ideological subjugation"

This is an attempt to bring surreptitiously the doctrine of equi-distance. The doctrine should be totally rejected because the non-aligned world has no equi-distance between the socialist countries and the Soviet Union's liberation movement on the one side and the United States and Western imperialism on the other side. We must reject it categorically. When

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

you speak of ideological subjugation, we are not, out of politeness, going to bring in this subjugation. Yugoslavia somehow wanted us to say in the same breath that we reject American military bloc and we reject the ideological overwhelming presence of the Soviet Union. The overwhelming presence of the Soviet Union has served some purpose. While I have certain reservations about certain aspects of the policy of the Soviet Union, I have no doubt that without the Soviet Union large chunks of the struggle for freedom, struggle for liberation would not have been there. So this shift has come. I was waiting for 16 months to catch Mr. Vajpayee and I have been able to catch him here. Somehow he allowed his Indian compassion to let Yugoslavia sit on his head and say, write down these words—'ideological subjugation'. I would urge him not to repeat these words. Once a phraseology comes into an international document, it gets repeated. The word "hegemony" also appeared because Mrs. Gandhi allowed that term to be used in Algeria. Therefore, once a term comes into an international document, it has a propensity of its own. Let the Foreign Minister of India, who has extricated himself from his erstwhile linkages also extricate himself from his recent shackles.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Ideological.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN:
Yes, ideological subjugation.

Sir, these are some of the things which I wanted to say. I will end up by saying that despite all discordance which you have heard from Smt. Alva to Dr. V. P. Dutt, I think the fact remains that there is a broad national consensus. Let us not break that consensus. The Janata Party has done several things on which it can be attacked. But by and large the foreign policy has remained outside the purview of such attacks. If at

all, it is more as a warning for Mr. Vajpayee not to go the way which some of us apprehend he might go. But, otherwise, the fact remains that the head of India has been held high and I hope that that head will be held high and Peking will give an opportunity to play host to them rather than we go as a guest to them. Thank you very much.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपन्यास-
पति जी, इन चर्चा में जिन सदस्यों ने भाग
लिया है मैं उनके हृदय में अत्यंत आभार
चाहता हूँ ।

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Please
speak in English.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
I will speak in English as well as in Hindi. Of course, not at the same time. Sir, I am grateful to the hon Members who have participated in this debate. I have heard their speeches with deep interest and considerable benefit. I must say that my friend Shri Bipinpal Das and Shrimati Alva are more effective in Opposition than they were while they were on the Treasury Benches.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:
Sir, I could return the same compliment to you also. You were much better on this side.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
So, if there are no fire-works in my reply and if I do not reply with any passion, friends sitting in the Opposition can very well understand my position.

Sir, I do not understand why a strong objection has been taken to the use of the word "genuine". How can anybody oppose genuineness? Would anybody like us to follow a policy of non-alignment which is fake, which is spurious? Certainly not. Sir, the policy of non-alignment is not a policy of an individual or a party. It has been evolved as a result of national consensus. When I was

elected in 1957 to Parliament for the first time—Panditji was alive; he was our Foreign Minister—and when I spoke for the first time in the Lok Sabha in the debate on the subject—though I was elected on a ticket of the erstwhile Jana Sangh—I said: We accept this policy of non-alignment because this is the only policy which India could have adopted after becoming free.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But, Mr. Vajpayee, we never heard you saying that “we accept the policy of non-alignment subject to its being made genuine”.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, we continue to stick to the policy of non-alignment, because it is in the best interests of the country, because it is a policy for peace. It is a positive policy and not a negative framework. Non-alignment is not neutrality. We can never be neutral between peace and war. We stand for peace and those who would like to...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Between imperialism and national liberation.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Of course, I am coming to that. We cannot be neutral between freedom and slavery. We stand for freedom. We fought for our freedom and we have been helping freedom fighters in South Africa since the days of our freedom struggle. There can be no question of supporting the racist white regime either in Namibia or in Rhodesia or in South Africa. Apartheid is a crime against humanity and we are fighting against this crime shoulder to shoulder with other non-aligned nations, with other countries. We are committed to a world order in which there will be no political domination, no racial discrimination. Sir, we are not neutral if freedom is imperilled, if injustice is perpetrated, if a war is thrust upon by those who would like to make profit because they are

engaged in the trade of armaments. But non-alignment has to be followed with regard to changing world situation; it cannot a static policy. Of course, we have to stick to certain principles, but if conditions change, we have to adjust and that adjustment cannot be ruled out.

Sir, I am inclined to agree with the analysis of the world situation which was made by my friend, Prof. V. P. Dutt. The international situation today presents a curious mix. So much of the familiar framework of the international relations is in a flux in the great power context, not the super-power context. Peace has prevailed since the end of the War, but the search for stable and confident international relations is bidevilled by lingering suspicions and diversity of national and international objectives. The confidence in the logic of *detente* has recently come under a shadow. Power politics and ideological and block relationships have changed out of virtual recognition. Today a new debate is taking place on the forms of rights and wrongs of intervention. Unfortunately, continuing or incipient conflicts are occurring in the various parts of the developing world.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, since India joined the international community as a free nation, we have unwaveringly been guided by non-alignment and independence of judgement. We have sought to pursue our own developmental path and strategy and respected the right of others to do so. But with that right we never doubted that independent nations, regardless of their economic or political systems can, indeed must, co-operate with each other. Our guidelines have been clear and consistent. But steering a foreign policy which serves our national interest and takes into account the events which erupt to the surface of the tidal currents of economic, political and strategic changes which are under way below the addies and storms, demands a careful appreciation and shrewd judgement.

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

Mr. Deputy Chairman, these are the broad parameters within which we function. Our policies have sufficient flexibility to adjust to change and turmoil. We have the national resilience to see the opportunities to give positive thrust for advantage of bilateral and multilateral co-operation. We have reason to believe that the entire world community has a clearer and more favourable understanding of the objective of our foreign policy than in the past. Some misapprehensions and misunderstandings which had existed, have been assuaged, established friendships have been preserved and strengthened, bilateral relations where they had been luke-warm, have gained a measure of confidence and warmth.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is the trouble. The moment you are speaking *ex tempore*, you are talking understandable sense. The moment you start reading, you start rigmarole, absolutely rigmarole. This is the proof. Produce it, present it before the House. This is the trouble with him. I was listening very carefully. When you are speaking *ex tempore* you are making some sense. Now it is obvious that there is not a word of imperialism, not even colonialism in the high-falutin, lecture. You have put them aside.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Have I to keep on repeating what I have said? I am sorry, Sir, my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, can repeat his speech every year. I cannot.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, the hon. Minister said that there is a clearer understanding of our foreign policy than in the past. Would he explain it?

(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I would like to assure my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that there is no conspiracy to change the foreign policy, there is no deviation,

no distortion. We firmly adhere to the basic postulates that have governed our foreign policy since we are independent. Sir, we have to function in a complicated and complex world. When the non-aligned nations met at Belgrade...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no, don't read.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: This is a document, the Belgrade Document. Sir, he is very much afraid of any paper in my hand. At the Belgrade meeting we emphasised that the distinct identity and the authentic character of non-alignment must be preserved. (Interruption). What did my friend, Mr. Sharma say?

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: No. I did not say anything. Prof. Ranga was saying something.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, I would like to quote further from the document.

"As an independent, vital force, the non-aligned movement has given its whole-hearted commitment to the struggle against imperialism, expansionism, colonialism, new colonialism, apartheid, racism including Zionism and hegemony, in other words, the rejection of any form of subjugation, dependence, interference or pressure, be it economic, political or military."

Can any exception be taken to this? And we are a party to this declaration. I am inclined to agree with my friend, Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan: "hegemony" was included at Algiers.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Mistakes have to be removed and not repeated.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If the word is used in a proper context, then we should not quarrel over words. Let there be no wordy duel or squabbles. Sir, we have to see whether the substance is being preserved or not.

Now, people say that we are tilting towards one particular bloc. No, we are not. We will never do that. Non-alignment does not mean that we have to adopt a policy of equidistance. No, Soviet Russia has been our friend. Indo-Soviet friendship has stood the test of time. I was in the Opposition when the treaty with Soviet Russia—the treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation—was signed. And while belonging to the Opposition, I had supported that treaty. Whenever India was in difficulty, Soviet Russia came to our assistance. In building the infrastructure of our industrial base, Soviet Russia has been of immense help to us. More than 70 projects are functioning in our country with Soviet assistance. So, there is no **question of equating one power with another power**. But I would like to claim that we have succeeded in developing a more balanced relationship with all the powers in the world.

A lot has been said about our agreements with our immediate neighbour. We have been accused of appeasement. It has been said that we are guilty of sacrificing our national interests. Sir, I cannot accept this charge. The Salal agreement contains nothing new. We have not made any new concessions. It has been arrived at on the same basis on which the previous Government wanted to conclude that agreement. Even then we are being accused. I know there are differences on the Farakka Agreement. But let nobody say that we have betrayed India's interests. What was done for one year by the previous regime . . .

SHRI L. R. NAIK (Karnataka):
sell-out.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
. . . has been formalised in an agreement. Nothing new has been done even in the case of distribution of the Farakka waters. One might differ whether there should be two separate treaties, one for trade with Nepal and another for transit or

whether there should not be two different treaties. But to say that because we have agreed to have two separate treaties, we have sacrificed national interests, is beyond the mark. We have succeeded in building bridges, of confidence, of understanding, with some of our immediate neighbours. We have strengthened our ties with Soviet Russia. In this connection I would like to consult the records. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, should not object to it . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Oh ,
no. I will not take objection if you say good things. Why should I?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
My friend Dr. Mahavir, referred to the Soviet maps depicting our boundary, our northern boundary. I know, when I was in the Opposition I used to raise this question. This question has been raised from time to time . . .

SHRI N. G. PANGA: We marched together again . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Then we assumed responsibility, we again raised this question and I am glad to mention to the House that the Soviet Union has informed us that in future the cartographic delineation of Sino-Indian frontier in Soviet publications will more closely correspond to the delineation in our maps. We have yet to see the new maps. But we have been informed that the border in the western sector will be delineated by the conventional sign of an unestablished border but in the middle sector and the eastern sector the new delineation will correspond with our own. For years the erroneous delineation had been the subject of representation by our Government. It was pressed again after this Government assumed office. This significant response in the light of our repeated requests is an improvement which should be welcomed.

A beginning has been made for improving our relations with the United States of America. There are differences. Some differences are of a

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

very vital nature. But as we are wedded to the policy of resolving all differences through negotiations, we have adopted the course which is best suited to our interests. I would not like to take up the question of atomic energy because the matter is being dealt with by the Prime Minister. But we have refused to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and we will continue to refuse to sign it because this treaty is unequal and it is discriminatory and, therefore, we can never accept the treaty in its present form.

India has unilaterally decided not to manufacture atomic weapons. But those who continue to pile up atomic weapons day in and day out have no moral right to tell India to sign a treaty which is against our self respect. Nor are we prepared to open our indigenous atomic installations for international inspection unless the non-nuclear weapon States get similar facility to inspect the nuclear installations owned by the nuclear weapon States. Unless all nuclear installations are opened for international inspection, we are not going to submit to any such arrangement. It is yet to be defined what full-scope safeguard really means.

How did South Africa get fissionable material? Who supplied the material to Israel? Obviously, the material has gone from those countries who would like us to tighten our security arrangements so far as atomic energy installations are concerned.

Sir, on West Asia I need not reiterate the Government's policy. We would like Israel to vacate all the Arab territory that it has occupied. The inalienable right of Palestinians must be restored including the right to have a separate homeland and separate State. This stand is based on principles. Aggression is aggression..

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How to arrive at that?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
By convening the Geneva Conference.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Say so.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
That I have been saying. I am prepared to repeat it. We did not welcome the new initiative taken in West Asia. Unless our Arab friends stand united and if the attitude of Israel continues to be intransigent there will be no just solution to the West Asian problem.

Our stand on South Africa is well known. We are helping the freedom fighters morally and materially. But if there is a negotiated settlement and a peaceful transfer of power, then we would certainly welcome such a development.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: What is the material assistance we are giving?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
It is not to be disclosed, Acharya Ranga. But I can tell you in private, if you so desire. Certain other points were raised. In the case of the Belgrade conference, I was asked why India did not oppose Pakistan's participation as a guest. After the Colombo Summit, the doors were wide open. Rumania was admitted as a guest and so also Portugal and Philippines. Pakistan wanted to come as an observer which was resisted. We also resisted the same demand. But India decided to go along with the consensus in Colombo. So, we also decided to accept...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: CENTO and Pakistan's participation in CENTO are there.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
I know it Dada. That is why Pakistan cannot be come an observer. But if Pakistan wants to leave the CENTO, if Pakistan wants to join the fraternity of the non-aligned nations, if Pakistan has come to realise that military alliances are not going to pay, then we should help Pakistan in that

process. As a guest Pakistan will have no right to reply. They will not participate in the decision-making. They will be there just as a guest and I said it in my speech so very clearly and categorically that "I hope that Pakistan would detach itself"....."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Two things are there. The US military pact and CENTO. These are the two things.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If there were no pacts like this, then Pakistan could have become a full-fledged member. But even the observer status was denied. There is a move to make it conditional for those who want to come as guests the condition being that they should make a declaration of their intent to leave military alliances. We have supported this move and I hope, before the hawana summit, something will be finalised on this question.

Sir, there is a lot of controversy as to whether I should go to Peking or not. I don't understand it ...

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: What happened to Zaire?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It was surprising indeed that my friend, Mr. Das, asked as to who has invited me. I have received a formal invitation and the invitation has come from the Foreign Minister of the Republic of China. Can I go uninvited?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But why should this doubt be raised? After all, I know what our relations are.

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The doubt arose because Mr. Subramanian Swamy was telling us that there was difficulty. *(Interruptions)*. Then he left and before leaving he said that he had no quarrel with Mr. Vajpayee any more.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: May I clarify that Prof. Swamy has gone on his own? He is nobody's emissary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You are free to go to China and also to Soviet Union if you like.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: The doubt arose because of what has appeared in the newspapers.

(Interruption)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Yes, Mrs. Alva, go on.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: don't go on contradicting what your free Press says.

(Interruption)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Our free Press? I know that you would not like the Press to be so free.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad that ...

(Interruption)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But the freedom of the Press has come to say and I cannot go on contradicting every day.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I believe what the Press says. I believe them.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No. Please take them with a pinch of salt.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Yes, in future.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Recently, a newspaper in Delhi published something....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I am very glad that Prof. Swamy has gone on his own. Now, Sir, the meaning and definition of "own" will begin to change. Something has to be written into the Oxford English Dictionary as to what "own" means.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He is not the Government's emissary, and he has not taken any message from me. He decided to go and he has gone.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There will be a revolution if he goes with a message from you. Angel of peace...?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There are allegations. I am sorry to say. Whatever good has been achieved during the last 17 months was begun by the former regime. I do accept that the process of improving relations with Pakistan was initiated by the former Congress Government. But I have taken that process further. Am I to be complimented or to be decried? I know you would not compliment me. (Interruptions) You are a miser. I know how I praised the former Prime Minister in 1971, without any reservation though I did not call her Durga or Kali. No, I did not. I praised her. I stood with the Government. Let the foreign policy be a field in which party considerations should not be allowed to vitiate our outlook. There might be some differences.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: This point was raised only because the Prime Minister had said—not once but several times—that it is they who have succeeded in creating a new climate of peace and friendship.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If there is a new climate, what is wrong in it?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: That is not the point. The point is that it is not you who have done it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No, no. You started the process, and we have....

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: I am quoting what he said now: There is a clear.... (Interruptions).... a more balanced relationship with the powers

.... (Time Bell Rings) Is it the presumption that the previous Government were not balanced, not clear?

(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There was a clear understanding. It is clearer.... (Interruptions) Let not fight over trivialities. If and when I go to Peking, the harder problem will be uppermost in my mind. (Interruptions) And I would like assure the House that we will have friendly relations with any country at the cost of any third country. (Interruptions). If there is to be a solution, it has to be on the basis of maintenance of our territorial integrity and keeping in view our national self-respect. But when we have ruled out the use of force, then there is an alternative but to talk. We will talk out of fear; but we are not afraid to talk....

(Interruptions)

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Will you also raise the question of Chinese helping and training the Naga and Mizo hostiles and their stand on Kashmir?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Every problem will be raised.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You remind them about Panch Sheel and Bandung spirit.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Of course. There can be no normalisation of relations unless all outstanding problems are solved. And the problems can be solved on the basis of five principles of peaceful co-existence. That I have said so many times. And I hope I will succeed in this mission. But rest assured that there will be no bartering away of India's vital interests.

उपसभापति जी, इस बात की बहुत जरूरत है कि हम विदेश नीति के मामले में इस पर क्यों बल दे रहे हैं कि नीति फलदायी हो चाहिए। उपसभापति महोदय, विदेश नीति

का निर्धारण संचालन कार्यान्वयन कुछ लक्ष्यों की पूर्ति के लिए किया जाता है। किसी राष्ट्र की विदेश नीति हवा में लाठी घुमाने का नाम नहीं है या किसी राष्ट्र की विदेश नीति मात्र ऊँची-ऊँची घोषणाओं पर आधारित नहीं हो सकती। हमें आदर्शों के आकाश में विचरण करना है मगर अपने पांव वास्तविकता की धरती पर मजबूती के साथ रखना है।

राष्ट्रीय हितों का संरक्षण विदेश नीति का प्रमुख दायित्व है। इस दायित्व की पूर्ति में हम संलग्न हैं। यह कार्य किसी एक दल का या दूसरे दल का नहीं है। यह ठीक है कि राष्ट्रीय हितों की पूर्ति के लिए कुछ सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करना होगा और जिन सिद्धान्तों का निरूपण होगा उनके बारे में इस सदन में मतभेद है न देश में मतभेद है। थोड़ा-थोड़ा सन्देह इसलिए नजर आता है, और जैसा प्रो० रशीद उद्दीन खान ने कहा कहीं आगे जाकर ऐसा न हो जाए, वैसा न हो जाए संशयात्मक विनश्यति। अपने मन में से संशय निकाल दीजिए। भारत की जनता किसी ऐसी सरकार को बर्दास्त नहीं करेगी जो राष्ट्रीय हितों की बलि चढ़ाने की भूल करे। विदेश नीति मात्र सरकारी पक्ष का प्रश्न नहीं है। उसके साथ भारत की 60 करोड़ जनता का वर्तमान और भविष्य जुड़ा हुआ है। राष्ट्रीय स्वाभिमान, राष्ट्रीय हित की उपेक्षा करके कोई दल चल नहीं सकता।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is our only hope, only safeguard against you.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी . यह ठीक है कि परिणाम चाहते हैं। मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। हम विश्व में एक नई अर्थ रचना के हामी हैं। औद्योगिक राष्ट्रों में और विकास राष्ट्रों में खाई बढ़ रही है। विकासशील राष्ट्र जिनमें से अधिकांश गुट निरपेक्ष आन्दोलन के सदस्य हैं, गरीब हैं। उपनिवेशवाद ने उनका शोषण किया। अपने

साधनों का भी वह अपने विकास के लिए उपयोग नहीं कर सके। यह चिन्ता की बात है कि यह खाई बढ़ती जा रही है। लेकिन उप-सभापति जी, मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या केवल औद्योगिक राष्ट्रों के विरुद्ध एक भीषण भाषण देकर एक नई अर्थ रचना के उद्देश्य की प्राप्ति की जा सकती है? हम अपने विचार असंदिग्ध शब्दों में बिना किसी लाग लपेट प्रकट करते हैं लेकिन ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which peace-making is more difficult—Charan Singh-Morarji Desai or India-China?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Peace making between the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party (Marxist). Now you have got it. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I am younger to you. I am junior to you. But I have also learnt a few tricks of the trade from you while I was in the Rajya Sabha.

उपसभापति जी, क्या कह रहा था। केवल उग्र शब्दों का प्रयोग करके सभी समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं हो सकता। आज औद्योगिक राष्ट्र भी आन्तरिक आर्थिक संघर्ष से ग्रस्ता है। मुद्रास्फीति है और बेरोजगारी की वृद्धि हो रही है। मुझे कुछ पश्चिमी देशों में यह देख कर ताज्जुब हुआ कि मजदूरों के संगठन जिन्हे सचमुच में नई अर्थ रचना के निर्माण में सबसे आगे होना चाहिये था, वे यह मांग कर रहे हैं कि बीमारों खड़ी को जाएं जिसे विकासशील देशों का माल उन देशों में आकर कहीं उन्हें बेरोजगार न कर दें।

मुझे पेरिस सम्मेलन में भाग लेने का मौका मिला था। हमने प्रयत्न किया कि सम्मेलन में से कुछ निकाले। केवल भाषण देकर हम अपने कर्तव्य को इतिश्री नहीं कर सकते इसलिए मैंने सिर्फ यह नहीं कहा कि रिजल्ट ओरिएण्टेड पालिसी होना चाहिये। मैंने यह भी कहा कि हम मात्र पोस्चरिंग नहीं कर सकते। वरन् एक समस्या पर हमने अपने

8 P.M.

विचार प्रकट कर दिये और अपना बस्ता बांधकर बिस्तर बोरीया लपेट कर हम रवाना हो गये इससे हमने अपने लक्ष्य की प्राप्ति कर ली ? नहीं बैलग्रेड के सम्मेलन में भारत ने जो भूमिका अदा की है उसमें अपने मुह मियां भिंटू बनने वाली बात नहीं है। लेकिन बैलग्रेड में इस बात की आशंका थी कि कहीं गुट निरपेक्ष आंदोलन टुकड़ों में न बट जाए और मुझे खुशी है कि सब देशों ने उसका समर्थन किया भारत केवल श्रेय नहीं ले सकता यह कहना भी ठीक नहीं है कि हमने युगोस्लाविया के कहने पर कुछ लिख दिया। मैं अपना भाषण यहां से लिखकर ले गया था या युगोस्लाविया में पहले ही कह दिया था कि ऐसा लिखकर लाना ऐसा नहीं होता है। प्रो० रशीदुद्दीन साहब अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन में जाते रहते हैं। मैं नहीं समझता वह किसी के कहने से अपना भाषण लिखते हैं।

(Interruptions)

प्रो० रशीदुद्दीन खान : हम तो करते हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : लेकिन हमारी विदेश नीति जहां मतभेदों के कारण टूट की आशंका होती है वहां हम तोड़ने का नहीं, जोड़ने का काम करते हैं। गुट निरपेक्ष आंदोलन की एकात्मकता को बनाए रखना आवश्यक है। कुछ शक्तियां हैं जो आंदोलन में फूट डालना चाहती हैं। अलग-अलग

विचार धाराओं के मानने वाले अलग समाज व्यवस्था के हमी अलग-अलग रूप रंग के देश गुट निरपेक्ष आन्दोलन के सदस्य उन सब को साथ लेकर एक समान उद्देश्यों के लिये हमें कार्य प्रवृत्त करना है। इसमें किसी एक सिरे पर जाकर बात करने से लाभ नहीं होगा किसी मध्यम मार्ग का अवलम्बन करके हमें और सब को जोड़ कर रखना होगा और फिर जो समान उद्देश्य है उन के लिये प्रयत्नशील रहना पड़ेगा। जब मैं कहता हूं कि हमारी विदेश नीति फलदायी होनी चाहिये तो इसका अर्थ इतना ही है। यह नहीं है कि हम भिद्धान्तों को ताक पर रख दें और फल नहीं खाली फल के पत्तों के पीछे दौड़े। यह कभी नहीं होगा। भगवान हमें ऐसी बुद्धि कभी न दे। यदि सदन सजग रहता है और सब का स्नेह और विश्वास मुझे मिलता है तो मुझे भरोसा है कि भारत की विदेश नीति सही रास्ते पर चलगी और राष्ट्रीय हितों का संवर्धन करने के साथ-साथ यह नीति विश्व शांति नई विश्व की रचना, भय और भूख से रहित संसार के निर्माण में सहायक होगी। धन्यवाद।

श्री उपसभापति : अब सदन की कार्यवाही कल प्रातः 11 बजे तक के लिये स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at four minutes past eight of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday the 9th August, 1978.