

[Secretary-General]

(Special Courts) Bill, 1976 as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 20th May, 1976."

Sir, I lay a copy each of the Bills on the Table.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, we are happy that this debate gives us an opportunity to discuss the present international situation and also to consider the tasks that face us. A very significant improvement in the international situation has, undoubtedly, taken place in the recent period. Big steps have been in the direction of mankind's cherished desire for peaceful co-existence, the principles for which we in India have always been striving. The successful conclusion of the all European Conference on security and co-operation held in Helsinki last year, has produced the final act of that conference which embodies the principles of peaceful co-existence more or less on the lines on which we had operated some years ago our great and unforgettable Panchsheel. This development itself is a landmark in the growing climate of detente. Improvement in the international situation and detente have vastly and greatly limited the possibilities of aggressive action by imperialism and, at the same time, given a tremendous fillip to the forces of national liberation, the forces fighting imperialism and neo-colonialism including those in the third world countries like ours. Therefore, the detente or the climate of detente has a very direct bearing on the developments in the third world countries as, indeed, on all other forces striving for peaceful co-existence and for international co-operation for the happiness and well-being of mankind.

The steady victory of the Vietnamese people has been a major contribution

to bringing about this change in the situation. Today, Sir, we are all happy that the great Vietnamese people are on the threshold of the unification of their country and there will emerge on unification, in a matter of weeks, the Socialist State of more than forty-three million people on the Asian soil which had displayed such courage and heroism that mankind will always be grateful to them. Vietnam's independence and the triumph of the Vietnamese people has been at the same time, a great factor in reshaping the world in the direction in which we would all like it to be. We are happy, only last week Madam Binh came to this city to be received by this Government as not only an Ambassador or a representative of the Republic of South Vietnam but she came as a victorious envoy of national liberation. And we received her as such. I must express my satisfaction at the sentiments which Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Chavan, expressed to her. They symbolize the spirit in which the relations between our country and Viet Nam should, in the coming days, develop. Sir, we have every confidence that the fine and excellent sentiments of friendship and co-operation that were exchanged last week here in our Capital would be translated into tangible action, political, economic and otherwise for cementing the traditional friendship between the Indian and Vietnamese people. Sir, in Asia, it is of utmost importance for the Asian people and for people all over the world striving for peace that these two countries, India and Viet Nam, should develop, to the utmost possible extent, their friendship and co-operation for the cause of humanity. Sir, here again, another very important development has taken place. This is the triumph or victory of the Angolan people under the MPLA. This victory is significant not merely due to the fact that another African country has won its independence, but it has also dealt a blow to the interventionist forces of the United States of Ameri-

ca, the racist regime of South Africa, as well as, I say, to my eternal shame, the forces that were sent by Peking to help the counter-revolutionary and treacherous forces in Angola. In this connection we cannot but pay a very high tribute to the manner in which the Soviet and other socialist countries—notably, I should mention in this connection, Cuba had rendered assistance to the oppressed Angolan people, despite constant threats by Mr. Kissinger and his allies. Mozambique has also won its freedom.

If we leave this region and come to Europe, we find that there have been other developments also. The recent elections in Portugal have shown that the Portuguese people have not only buried fascism, but they also want to shift to the left and the conditions have been created. If only the Socialist Party behaves properly and gives up its anti-communist stance, it would enable the establishment of an alternative Government in which the socialists and the communists could play an important role despite the threats of Mr. Kissinger and other interventionist forces.

Here again, we find that in Europe, although detente is very dominant, certain other factors are operating. There are certain other forces which are trying to interfere with detente. This is reflected, to some extent, in the postures of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, namely, the Bonn regime.

We know very well that another factor which is causing us worry is the Cyprus problem. This problem should have been solved long ago. But the imperialists would not like the solution of this problem. On the contrary, they would like to create tension there and retain it as a tension spot so that they could operate

from there against detente and peace in the world.

Imperialism is in a crisis today, economically, politically and morally. In every way, imperialism is in a crisis. It has suffered military reverses, it has suffered political defeats and it has been in a gripping crisis, economic and otherwise. We see the cultural degradation of the forces that imperialism represents today. It has given confidence to the people who are fighting imperialism. All the more so, when the anti-imperialist forces are getting united and, above all, when the countries of the socialist community, with the Soviet Union at the head, the making tremendous progress, as has been revealed at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Party Congresses of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. Therefore, Sir, this strengthening of the position of the socialist community directly helps the national liberation forces undermines the forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism, the forces that stand for aggression and the forces with colonialistic and neo-colonialistic trends.

Sir, in bringing about this favourable situation India has played an important part. Whereas we should not exaggerate what we have done, yet it is to be admitted that the part that our country has played has indeed been a notable one. No wonder, Sir, Comrade Brezhnev recognised the role India played at the 25th Congress of the Soviet Union which I attended as a member of the delegation of our party. There, Sir, special words of praise were reserved for our great country from the leader of a friendly country. He said in the Report of the Central Committee to the Congress:—

“To begin with, a few words about our many-sided co-operation

[SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA.]

with India. We attach special importance to friendship with that great country. In the past five years Soviet-Indian relations have risen to a new level. Our countries have concluded a treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation. And even this short period has clearly shown its tremendous significance for our bilateral ties and its role as a stabilising factor in South Asia and the continent as a whole.

Close political and economic co-operation with the Republic of India is our constant policy. Soviet people appreciate and, more, are in solidarity with India's peace-loving foreign policy and the courageous efforts of her progressive forces to solve the country's difficult socio-economic problems. We wish the people and government of India complete success in these efforts."

Such are the words of friendship and sincerity coming from Comrade Brezhnev, the leader of the great country, Soviet Union. Sir, I mention this because Indo-Soviet friendship and co-operation is no longer a bilateral proposition; it has a wider international significance in strengthening the forces of peace all over the world—in all continents—and creating the climate of still greater struggle against the forces of imperialism. Therefore, we are legitimately proud to say that we in India too have played an important part in bringing about the change in the international situation by our policy of peace and non-alignment which has been assailed from these benches year after year.

Sir, we cannot but mention, in this connection the historic contribution made by the Peace Programme of the 24th Congress of the Soviet Union which, at its recent 25th Congress has proclaimed will be carried forward into a still more gigantic peace initiative and efforts for the prosperity and peace of mankind. Sir, our task

is to march in step with the Soviet Union and the countries as good and loyal friends—indeed we are so.—so that we can reach the common goal of durable peace on our planet and, if possible, in our life time; and that is a possibility today.

Sir, Europe has been hot bed of war all the time but today the dominant trend there is not cold war but detente. Realities of the last World War had been recognised by the Western powers and conditions had been created for peaceful co-operation between the East and the West and in the conditions of detente some steps are being taken. At the same time, we must be vigilant because there are aggressive forces which are interested in destroying detente. Hostile propaganda is being conducted from West Germany and other Western countries against the Soviet Union. They want to drown the spirit of detente in a shameful and vicious anti-Soviet campaign which is sometimes echoed in the monopoly Press in our country—censor or no censor. They are maintaining points of tension also. What is note-worthy and somewhat disturbing in this connection is that Dr. Kissinger is directly threatening to interfere in the internal affairs of France and Italy. He had made it known by public statements that he would not like the Italian people to accept the participation of the Communist Part of Italy in the government of Italy. The Italian Government itself—and the Government leader—says that nothing in Italy can be solved by this dis-counting of the Communist Party of Italy because it has not only obtained 33 to 34 per cent of the votes of the Italian people, but it is also a mighty, powerful, influential force in the Italian life, especially among the Italian working class. Mr. Kissinger is similarly intervening in Portugal and in France with similar threats to them saying that changes of Governments or formation of Governments in European countries must be determin-

ed by the gentlemen in Washington. Sir, we should come out in forthright condemnation of such blatant interference in the internal affairs of other countries because such a development will strengthen the forces of peace and undermine the position of the dying imperialism in the region.

Sir, the Arab liberation forces are making great advances today, but at the same time Mr. Kissinger is at pains, by his so-called policy of step by step settlement of the disputes between the Israel and Arab nations, to divide the Arab people. And, Sir at the same time, in Cairo we find unfortunately Nasser's spirit being undermined. anti-Soviet Unionism being revived and concessions are being given to Americans, and new agreements are to be signed with U.S. imperialism with friendship to West German Imperialism to arm the Egypt from their point of view. These negative developments in Egypt are most tragic. We all feel sorry at heart. The Egyptian people are our traditional friends, and such negative developments cannot but cause us extreme pain and despair. We do hope that sooner or later Egypt will be back to the rails of Nasser and Nasserism shall be the unconquerable spirit guiding the people of that land of the Nile into their great destiny, playing their heroic and leading role in shaping not only the destinies of West Asia, but also of the entire region. Sir there, in that region, the USA is supplying arms to Israel Arms worth 4 million dollars, i.e. 4,000 million dollars, have already been supplied to them. They are also arming Saudi Arabia which up to this year up to now has received arms worth 33 billion dollars i.e. 3,300 million dollars, compared to about 3 billion dollars only 7 years ago. Sir, the continued occupation of the Arab territory is another source of danger, and equally the denial of national liberation rights to the Palestinian Arabs who must have a right to form their own State. Therefore, I say that the so-called step by step diplomacy, or shut-

tle diplomacy, or step by step solution is no solution at all the problems in West Asia where 50 per cent of the arms supplied to the developing countries are being dumped mostly by the United States America, with a view to keeping tension there and preventing the Arab people from gaining their rights and also re-occupying the territories which have been occupied by Israel through wars of aggression. Sir, about 90 per cent of the territory in Sinai still remains under the occupation of the Israeli aggressive forces, in addition to the Golan Heights, and Ghaza Strip on the West Bank These are all facts. I hope the Indian Government will take still bolder steps to support the Arab people to gain their rights and also get back the territories which had been taken away from them.

Coming to our own region, Sir, we are very happy that only last week a settlement had been arrived at at Islamabad between India and Pakistan at the official level. May I, Sir, take this opportunity to congratulate our officials who have shown excellent wisdom in arriving at the settlement in this manner? Equally, Sir, I must congratulate the Prime Minister of India and also Mr. Bhutto, in spite of all my criticism against him in other matters, for the plain realism due to which this settlement could be arrived at. Still there are some 1 P.M. people who say that the Simla spirit is dead. The Simla spirit can never die so long as the spirit of friendship and co-operation, urges and aspirations lives in the hearts and minds of millions of people on this side of the border and on the other side—the Indian people and the people of Pakistan. The Simla spirit must be made a way of life. And this agreement shows that within the framework of this spirit and according to the principle of pursuing the course of bilateralism we can solve all our problems I think follow-up actions

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

will be taken one after another with generosity and magnanimity, with realism and with a sense of confidence, so that we start writing on a clear slate, and a new leaf must be turned in Indo-Pak relations. Let us completely forget the past—We cannot forget the past perhaps historically—but in the making of the future well, let bygones be bygones. And here is an occasion for us to take confidence from what we have achieved at Islamabad.

Unfortunately, I cannot say so about the Bangladesh developments. There again, certain negative developments are taking place following the tragedy of last year. There, the anti-Indian forces are gaining the upper hand. Unfortunately, it seems that the regime led by Ziaur Rehman is trying to consolidate itself by rallying on the communal forces like the Muslim League and the Jamaat and also Peking-ites of all varieties and hues have been used in order to build up his position. The result is, of course, instability. But what concerns us, the neighbouring country, is the most vicious viriolic anti-Indian campaign. Lately, Farakka has been utilised and exploited whereas we stand for a realistic solution. And I welcome Mr. Chavan's statement in the Lok Sabha some time back, and that provides the basis for the solution of the Farakka and Ganga water problem. Unfortunately, this is exploited by the anti-Indian forces and behind them there is the backing of the USA. I do hope that we shall pursue our course of good neighbourliness towards Bangladesh. We shall extend our hand of friendship and co-operation, and we shall not be readily provoked by them. We wish them well. And we, as private Members from this side of the House, never hide our sympathies for the progressive, democratic and secular forces in Bangladesh who are our friends. And to-day we remember those friends who are persecuted, who are being killed, who are being harassed and hunted out by those hooligans who have been let loose in Bangladesh today, and this is something which not only disturbs

the future of Bangladesh, spells ruin to them but also threatens the peace and security of this region. Yes, we must have our composure and courage and stand....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you take more time?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Another half an hour.

Sir, we should make a start. By and large I am happy that the Government of India is pursuing a very correct course. I would urge upon them to maintain that position. And Mr. Chavan deserves a word of congratulation in this connection also.

Sir, here again, I must say with reference to Bangladesh that the removal of that Minister—he is exiled or he has left the country—is a good step. But from that, let us not conclude that the character of the Government has changed. He was aggressive, he was anti-India, he was the rallying point for the worst reactionary forces there. And he even was instrumental in bringing back the Mujib killers. But now they have left the country along with him. But even with this the basic situation has not changed basic. Therefore, with all our friendliness towards Bangladesh, we have to remain vigilant. We wish them well. But it is a matter for the people of Bangladesh to settle. It is for them to settle. We seek no interference or intervention at all. It is lying propaganda against us by the enemies of our country that India wants tension, that India wants to interfere in the internal affairs of Bangladesh. The internal affairs of Bangladesh are such that they cannot but arouse the interest of the whole world and at the same time, they cannot but lead the people of Bangladesh to-day or to-morrow or the day after to rise against what is wrong, that is to say, the conspiratorial bid, the continuous bid to destroy the last traces of the Mujib tradition.

Now I come to our relations with China. I think a few observations are called for. As far as we are concerned, Sir, we stand for normalisation of relations with neighbours. Indeed, we as part of the international Communist movement, stand for relaxation of international tension, international co-operation and hence normalisation of relations between countries on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence, despite their adherence to different systems. We would like it to happen but the question is: Would it be possible? Because normalisation of relations is something which cannot readily be achieved by merely exchanging Ambassadors. They may send an Ambassador here or you may send an Ambassador there. But that does not mean that relations are normalised. That must be based on certain policy changes. But there is no indication in China, for all that is happening in that State, that there is going to be such policy change. Their big power ambitions are coming in the way of normalisation of relations between India and China. We have not departed from the principles of *Panch Sheel*. It is China who assassinated the principles of *Panch Sheel*. Our State makes no territorial claims. It is China who has made territorial claims running into tens of thousands of square miles against most of the neighbours. It is China who is supporting the NATO. It is China who supported the Chilean Fascist Junta and even sent its experts to Angola to side with the Americans and others and help the counter-revolutionaries. How can we normalise relations with such countries? China wants the presence of the US forces in the Pacific Ocean. In fact, China is supporting the new doctrine of Gerald Ford, the new Pacific Doctrine which wants to perpetuate tension in Korea by maintaining the US troops in aggressive posture in South Korea. Anti-Sovietism is the sheen-anchor of the Chinese foreign policy. No matter what happens, no matter how things go, their main policy is anti-Sovietism. They seek international relations on the basis of anti-Sovietism.

That is why we find that our Rightist friends in the country seemed to be quite happy when the announcement was made that normal diplomatic relations at the ambassadorial level would be restored. Sir, we hope China will return to the path of *Panch Sheel*. As a member of the Communist movement, we have always appealed to China to return to the policy of peaceful co-existence, and at other levels, to the positions of Marxism and Leninism. But I am not now concerned with the ideological part of it. I am concerned with the aspect of it which relates to international relations. It is possible for China, if she so desires, to establish relations with all the countries, including India, on the basis of peaceful co-existence. The road is open to them. We have kept the road open always. But unfortunately so long as the present Chinese policy of big power chauvinism, of big power ambition, of anti-Sovietism and of support to the reactionary regimes in Chile and Angola and other places and of support to American imperialism continues, how can you develop relations with China? I cannot understand. Sir, the Indian Ocean is a major problem today with the establishment of a military base in Diego Garcia. Sir, here again China supports the establishment of a military base in Diego Garcia. Sir, I do not want to say many things. Only in conclusion I would like to make a few suggestions for the hon. Minister to consider. The first thing for us to do is to extend and deepen *detente* and make it irreversible. And, Sir, that should be our policy and I am sure that the Government is doing it and I am not saying that the Government is not doing it. I am mentioning it now because we are participating in a debate of this kind. Sir, we are seeing how the imperialists are trying to destroy the principle of *detente*. Of course, that is going to be a superficial and a temporary thing. We know that Dr. Kissinger had put out a threat, the threat of using nuclear weapons on a regional basis. Twice he has repeated the threat against the African people and he has threatened us also and every-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

body knows it. We also know that there is the threat of destabilisation which has been in operation for some years and he has added a new threat, the threat of regional use of nuclear weapons. How then, Sir, can we think of having any decent human relations with the United States of America particularly when, at the UNCTAD Conference recently, they came out with their sinister proposal in support of neo-colonialism and exploitation and plunder and rejected the Manila Declaration to which Mr. Chavan had been a very powerful party? How can it happen? Now, that chapter is there. Therefore, the principle of *detente*, in order to be made into an irreversible one, must be matched and backed by military *detente*. Sir, I am very happy that the Government has done something for the cause of peace and for ending the arms race and there should be a dialogue with the people all over the world at public level who are ready to strive for ending the arms race and I am very happy that the Government of India has given support to the Stockholm talks and I congratulate the Government for its support to this.

Then, Sir, as for the spending of about three hundred billion dollars on armaments today, it is more than the total combined income of the developing countries of Asia and Africa and the United States has now, in its latest budget, allocated another 112 billion dollars, an all-time peak figure, for military preparations whereas, in the Soviet Union, the military expenditure is being reduced. Further, the Soviet Union has also proposed to the United Nations that there should be a ten per cent cut by the permanent members there on their military budget so that the funds could be diverted for developmental purposes. Sir, I think this proposal deserves the support of the Government of India.

Now, Sir, I am coming to the last point which is about the third world countries. The third world countries play an important role and Comrade

Brezhnev has commended the great role played by the third world countries in this world and, in this connection, I would like to say that there is a special word of praise for our own country, India, and we are no doubt, very happy to be praised by all the peace-loving forces. But this puts on us a very great responsibility also. We must strive for establishing that economic order which was declared, which was proclaimed three years ago in the summit conference. Now, another summit conference is going to take place in Colombo in August this year, Sir, and about this Fifth Non-Aligned Nations' Summit, I would like to make one or two observations here. This is going to be a very great event. There are forces in our country today and there are forces in the world which are trying to distort the non-aligned movement and there are elements which are by no means interested in non-alignment and which do not understand it or do not like to see it succeed, and these forces and elements are trying to penetrate into the ranks of the non-aligned forces and I think Peking is trying to interfere in this matter and wants to see that this summit does not materialise. As far as the United States is concerned, everybody knows that it would be interested in this. Sir, we are disturbed to learn that some countries—I would not like to name them here—are now coming together somehow or other only to distort the Colombo non-aligned summit which is to take place in August this year. But we must make it a success. For that two things are very important. First of all, the co-operation between the non-aligned nations themselves, on the basis of anti-imperialism and anti-neo-colonialism, must be there and there should not be any vacillation in this. We do not like the manner in which the Commerce Minister made his initial speech at the UNCTAD Conference recently in Nairobi where he forgot the Manila Declaration and prepared the inte-

grated commodity programme and acted as if he was the wise man from the East. That is not necessary. Mr. Chavan and others have been a party to the Manila Agreement, Manila Declaration, and the UNCTAD Secretariat proposal of an integrated commodity programme was a common commitment by all of us. Our task is to implement it. Therefore, I say, at the Non-Aligned Conference it is very very necessary that India, Sri Lanka and others should co-operate to strengthen the co-operation among the non-aligned countries.

Another important factor, and that is being attacked by Kissinger and others, and Peking in particular, is the co-operation between non-aligned nations and the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. Sir, can we imagine the great advance of the non-alignment movement apart from our strength, our anti-imperialism, anti-neo-colonialism, our mutual co-operation, bilateral or multi-national co-operation in the third world, on the one hand, and on the other the co-operation of the third world countries with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community? No wonder, Sir, in our country the anti-Soviet campaign is being carried on by some sections of the Press just on the eve of this Conference. Sir, I mention this non-aligned summit at length, because India is expected to play a great part. Non-alignment must remain a movement. There must not be an attempt to institutionalise it in a particular manner by setting up this or that kind of organisational arrangement. Sir, it is not perhaps wise. What we are insisting on to strengthen non-alignment as a movement, is to strengthen it as an anti-imperialist and anti-neo-colonial position.

There remains pending the implementation of the Algiers Economic Programme. I am sure that will be discussed there, and that programme

will be taken up. Our job, Sir, is to take counsel with one another and go ahead.

In this connection, Sir, the collective efforts for Asian security remain. I am not saying that everything can be done at the non-aligned summit. It can create a climate where similar efforts are called for. Viet Nam is our loyal friend today. More and more countries are taking anti-imperialist positions. Sir, we should create a situation, together with the peace forces all over the world, for making non-alignment a dynamic force, much more powerful, and also for making serious efforts for establishing and creating a situation when we can say that we have also found our way to detente, in the form of an effort for the security of the Asian region. Sir, that is very, very important.

As far as this Ministry is concerned, I have not discussed it. I have some criticism to make about this Ministry. But I am not doing so today. By and large, I must say, before I sit down that India has gone far ahead in the field of struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. Our contributions for the cause of world peace today, for international *detente* for security and international co-operation for the cause of the Asian people, and for the cause of national liberation, are more and brighter than ever before. This is a tribute not to any individuals or to the Government alone. This is a tribute to our great nation, to our great tradition of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism to our great culture and civilization. And I do hope, today, Sir, that the Government will carry forward with still greater confidence and courage the highest traditions of the Indian people and their civilization, for the cause of peace, for the cause of mankind, and for national liberation.

Sir, we are on the high road to prosperity in the world and durable peace. But our path is one which

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

summons us to great and glorious unity and struggle.

I do hope that in all peace efforts, India will rise to the occasion, play a still greater part and reach a situation in which we can say that we are on the threshold of a durable peace when war shall be banished from this planet and mankind shall be in the condition of an ever-lasting peace. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.15 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at twenty-one minutes past two of the clock, **Mr. Deputy Chairman** in the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, with apologies to you I want to mention, that when I was speaking before lunch you were looking at me frequently and just out of nervousness I forgot to mention one point and it is this that people all over the world are looking forward with great confidence and hope to the Prime Minister's forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union. It will be a landmark in the history of Indo-Soviet relationship as Mr. Brezhnev's was about three years ago.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Shri V. B. Raju.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this House has witnessed in the past few years lengthy debates on our foreign policy, on our external relations and on the world situation obtaining from time to time.

Sir, the world has moved very far in the last three decades, from the position in which we used to explain the world as being a by-polar world. From that position we have come to a situation where we find many

centres of power and what the experts call the multi-polar world. What it might mean or might not mean is a different thing but the world being parcelled between two big powers, that situation is not there. This is very heartening and in fact this shows the progress that humanity has made from confrontation to conciliation. Sir, the policies pursued by the Government of India from the very inception of our independence reveal a measure of consistency and also a great measure of independence. Whatever might have been our internal situation, our economic situation or our dependence on rich countries for our development and whatever compulsions had been there because of the intransigence pursued by some of our neighbours, near neighbours, our Government has been able to face boldly and has established this fact that the policy pursued by India in her external affairs has injected a moral tone in the country's politics. This is not a small achievement. We cannot measure it in physical terms but the impact that our policy has left on the so-called mature minds of the mature nations has been very considerable and significant.

Sir, to understand our policy we have to know our countrymen, we have to know very well that this policy is not a party policy. It goes to the credit of Pandit Nehru that he has built up a tradition in his times with the result that our foreign policy could be a national policy and I am happy to say that this attitude is being maintained and I am also thankful to the Opposition parties for having responded to this approach. Now, there are many features of our policy, there are many ingredients of our policy. It is not one single item but broadly it could be said to be our policy of non-alignment. In fact, this first seed that was planted by Pandit Nehru—I should put it—in September 1946 has not only blossomed into a sturdy tree, in the words of a writer, bearing the fruit

of just and equitable relationship between nations but over the years it has evolved into a way of life among the civilised nations. Non-alignment is not neutrality, it has been repeatedly said. Non-alignment does not mean watching the situation standing on the side lines. Now, non-alignment has actually evolved itself into a way of life with certain nations for a civilised activity.

Sir, Nehru's concept of combining economic growth with social justice on the national stage for the domestic requirements was, at the beginning, to be accepted as a basis for restructuring of economic relations between the developing and the developed world. Sir, our foreign policy, particularly our emphasis on non-alignment, has shaped today, or has contributed, I should say, to the foreign approaches or the foreign relations in economic content. It is not merely for power relations. It is not for the purpose of balance of power and it is not purely for the purpose of security but it has gone beyond that and it is to provide an economic content to the political activity. Now, this again, is no small achievement. Whatever may be our internal difficulties, to repeat, we shall not actually lose ground on this matter particularly.

Sir, the second aspect or the second feature of our foreign policy is the desire to follow the Indian tradition that right means should be adopted to achieve the desired ends. It is not the opportunistic approach that we have been making hitherto for this so-called enlightened self-interest but we have always been employing the right means to achieve the desired ends. This is another feature of our policy.

Sir, again, the whole strategy—or you might call it a policy—is that we rely more upon the negotiating factor rather than a threatening approach. Now we have brought in a certain measure of sophistication into the settlements of the disputes through negotiations and we have been patiently doing it not only with our immediate neighbours but actually at the world

level or the international level. We have been advocating this method of negotiation and this reveals, as I said earlier, a level of maturity. Now, this nation which had a tremendous potential as a State—with all pride I would say—has become a power. I congratulate the Government of India and particularly the Prime Minister of the country, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our Foreign Minister, Shri Chavanji and the officials of the Foreign Ministry and also other Ministries which are associated with trade, with commerce, with culture. All of them deserve congratulations of this House for having brought in this sort of approach accepted by the world's civilised nations.

Sir, I have heard very patiently and with interest the speech of Shri Bhupesh Gupta. There is a lot of agreement on the approach. But I would also say that we shall not, even for the slightest reason, or even for a moment, give this impression that we are moving or we are catching hold of the apron strings of any particular power. It actually contributes to the personality of this nation and to our independence if both in our thinking and in our action we time and again demonstrate our independence, judging the things on their merit and with a sense of objectivity. Now, Sir, here when we talk about our foreign policy, it is always judged by the achievements in our relations with the immediate neighbours. The most important thing is actually the relationship with the neighbours, for a big country like ours. It is a common feature that small neighbours do entertain certain suspicions. The success of this great nation depends upon the confidence it could create in the immediate neighbours which are small countries. That we have achieved. Now the relations that we maintain with our immediate neighbours are very much improved. It will be very significant to recall what we have achieved in the past one decade. Take Sri Lanka and how peacefully and satisfactorily we have been able to resolve the Kachativu affair.

[Shri V. B. Raja]

Then, there is the agreement on the question of continental shelf, demarcation of the boundary with Indonesia and Burma and the improvement in our relations with Bhutan. The relations between India and Nepal have also improved tremendously, though they were somewhat strained in the past. The latest agreement is with Pakistan.

I am happy to make this observation that with Mr. Chavan at the helm of affairs, in the External Affairs Ministry, we have been able to achieve a big breakthrough and we have also been able to bring about a thaw in our relations with Pakistan. This has also helped remove certain apprehensions in our minds.

I was trying to follow what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was saying about our relations with China. We need not go into their vagaries. Whatever be the type of Government they have, whatever be the type of State they have, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta says, we do not go by the ideological approach. Our relations are on a State-to-State basis. Mr. Chou-En-lai was there. Today, somebody else has come. Mr. Mao is also there. We take note of it. We have got affinity for the people of China and all avenues must be explored to improve our relations with them. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta really cautioned us that we should not lose patience in regard to Bangladesh. I would advise the same thing in regard to China also. Whatever be the type of State and whatever be the type of Government, we are friendly to everyone. We have made no secret of it. We do not adopt an ideological approach in our relations with other countries. We do not apply the same measuring rod to all the countries. But it does not mean that we do not have an attachment to our principles. The principles are there. We stand by our principles. Mention has been made about colonialism and neo-colonialism.

In fact, it is the greatness of this country that it has identified itself with all the freedom movements of the

world. We recognised Angiola at the appropriate time and helped in bringing about stability. The manner in which we conducted ourselves in regard to South Vietnam is a matter of pride to us. Therefore, let us advise our Government that in our attitude towards other Governments, we should maintain the same consistent policy, watch the developments patiently and take advantage of them for improving our relations with other countries. I am sure with the passage of time, the other Governments, whoever might be at the helm of affairs, would see the reason in our approach and would come much closer to us. Even in regard to the big powers, we are not very much worried. We also want them to be friendly towards us. We never took objection when the United States of America looked friendly towards the Chinese Government. They might have objected to our soft-pedalling the situation in 1954-55. But we did not take any objection when the United States of America improved its relations with China. We hope Russia would also improve its relations with China. We would be too happy to help them in this regard. Therefore, this policy has got to be emphasised upon.

We have been able to achieve great success through our approach. It has been a good strategy to settle our differences through bilateral negotiations. This is good. But it is not the end of it. Let us look at the world. We cannot sit in isolation. The trend in the world today is towards regional economic co-operation. In fact, many of the petty and small problems could be easily eclipsed by widening the area of co-operation. Today, the other developing countries look to us, not only for their security, but also for succour and economic assistance.

We shall certainly help them. Similarly we need assistance from other countries too. Therefore, the idea which the Shah of Iran put forth some time ago is actually of regional economic co-operation. Now there is the EEC which has emerged as an economic colossus and we are dealing with it now. Now there is the other group, ASEAN, in the East though it

has not developed in the same manner. Again there are other groupings also. The Arab League is there for political purposes; we have been dealing with them in a friendly way. The Organisation of African Unity is there. Therefore, for political purposes and economic requirements there is regional grouping. The configuration we find in the world today is not in the nature of the world being divided into two compartments but emerging as groups in the regions for economic co-operation.

The future will open many avenues of prosperity. Now science and technology have really brought the nations of the world nearer and made the world very small and, therefore, from bilateral approach it has come to multilateral approach. In fact, I can quote an instance. Bangladesh, Pakistan and we sat together and tried to solve the problems in the sub-continent. Therefore, I am not suggesting this particularly to politics. For economic requirements also I might suggest a bold and forward approach.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to request the House and the Government of India to take note of the larger matter that we have to emphasise in the world to see that our aspirations are fulfilled. We are all for world peace. But what is happening today? When we talk about disarmament, we mean that the big powers should not arm themselves beyond a point. But it has gone beyond that. They are arming not only themselves but are also arming others. Supply of weapons has been one of the biggest commercial propositions. Even small countries—which I do not want to name—are collecting weapons beyond their means and beyond their requirements. And the manufacture of weapons has been a menace to this world. How to face the situation now? Even in the neighbourhood—though not the immediate neighbourhood—weapons are being dumped by exchanging oil. This situation, if allowed to continue, may jolt all our high-level thinking at a particular point of time. Therefore, we have to highlight this point in the region. Particularly the recipients of the weapons must be

made conscious of the fact that this is a menace so that we shall not dump this region with weapons.

Sir, I have taken much time of the House and in the end I would only say that it gives us great pleasure to congratulate the Government of India and thank the Government of India, particularly the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs.

SHRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the way our foreign relations are being dealt with is a matter of pride for all of us. If emergency has brought about a sense of solidarity and a healthy economic order within the country, it has, in the outer world, given a new dimension to our diplomacy with those countries who maintained an unfriendly attitude towards us. Sir, our recent achievement is normalisation of relations with Pakistan and China.

Sir, we remember, in the year 1972 we concluded an agreement with Pakistan known as the Simla Agreement. It is in consonance with the spirit of that Agreement that an agreement of greater significance has been reached between the two countries. Sir, we think at this juncture that Pakistan, having realised the logic of the situation and having realised that it is not good maintaining unfriendly relations with India, will also take care to see that this Agreement is implemented in its spirit. So with China we have concluded talks for the restoration of embassies. Certainly, after 1962 when the Ambassadorial relations between these countries got severed, this is a big achievement. And the person who is going there, Mr. R. K. Narayan, who was till recently heading the Policy Planning Division in the Ministry of External Affairs, has the necessary knowledge and vast experience; and being an erudite scholar, he should be able to shape well as Ambassador of this country in China. But, Sir, there is one thing. As is usually emphasised, restoration of Embassies does not mean that relation between the two countries will always be as they are desired to be. It is unfortunate that in the outer world these two countries, Pakistan and China, had carried on a

[Shri Maqsood Ali Khan]

propaganda which was very much unfriendly towards us and on very many occasions we had to face the odds in the international situation on account of this propaganda. Even today, China goes on propagating in her own way in the African countries and in the Latin American countries. Sir, while normalising our relations with China, we have to be careful to see that in relation to these countries we project our image in such a manner that no enemy of ours, if I may use the word, is able to distort our image.

Sir, one thing that we have made clear by these two agreements with China and Pakistan is that we stand for co-operation, we stand for good will, we stand for good relations with the third world. As has been emphasised by my predecessor, Mr. Raju, right from the days when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru took up External Affairs in his hands up to this date, there has been found a sort of consistency in our relations with other Governments. He has very rightly said that to our foreign policy we always lent a moral tone and we wanted that this moral tone should have an impact upon other countries also. Sir, if it can be said that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the architect of the policy of non-alignment, then it will be rightly said that Prime Minister Indira Gandhi is the consolidator of this vital policy. Sir, we have seen that within this decade our relations with the outer world, and especially after the proclamation of the emergency, our relations with other countries are growing up in the friendliest fashion.

Sir, I now come to our relations with the Arab world. This is a matter on which I want to attract the attention of the honble Minister who is present here. Sir, looking into the Annual Reports of the External Affairs Ministry of the last 10 years, we find that the Arab world was somehow much neglected by them. Take up the Reports right from 1965 up to this date. You will hardly find one or two pages

being devoted to West Asia and North African countries. If there was any mention, this was only that of Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the UAR. The UAR had a special affiliation with India. It was because of the two personalities who always thought on the same lines—in India, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, and in the UAR, President Nasser—that the relations between the two countries were so friendly; They could come together and achieve consensus between themselves on any matter concerning the world. But, apart from that, the Annual Reports never gave a picture that India was trying hard to see that other Arab countries would also come nearer. Sir, in 1962, in the background of the hostilities which Pakistan had with us, our image suffered in the Arab world. And the propaganda that was carried on by Pakistan was that India is not a secular India, that India is a Hindu India which would not like to safeguard either the interests of the Muslims inside the country or the interests of the Muslims who are living outside India. And they said that the Indian support to the Arabs was a hoax.

But, Sir, I should say that it is a matter of pride for this country and specially for the Muslims of this country that our Foreign Ministry during the last three or four years has worked in such a way that this propaganda of Pakistan—this big balloon—has been pricked, and today we find that all the Arab countries, whether they are in North Africa or in West Asia, are closer to us. It is because of two or three reasons. One reason is that the British protection which was there in support of these countries was withdrawn especially after the United Arab Emirates became independent in 1971, and later on, when the oil crisis came, these oil-producing countries came to realise that the impact of imperialism or colonialism was too much upon them. Actually, they were blind with this faith and they could not distinguish between their friends and enemies with the glasses of imperialism. For the first time in 1971 and later on in 1972-73 when the

oil crisis was there, they came to realise that there were countries in the world which looked upon them with friendliness. And the another thing that had an impact upon them was our support in favour of the Arab countries in the matter of the Palestinians, as against Israel. Sir, we lent our support in 1967 to the Security Council's Resolution No. 242; up to this day, we have been reiterating that the Middle East crisis cannot be solved unless the Palestinians are restored their legitimate rights and unless Israel withdraws from the territories of the Arab world that it is occupying. This is a stand which has been consistently advocated by us. And now the Arab world knows that it is not a hoax, that it is not for somebody's favour that we did it. Actually, this policy comes out of Indian ethos, as I would put it, and they know that when we mean this policy, we mean business.

As I said, in the first Annual Report, there was not much mention about these Arab countries. But the Annual Report for 1974-75 said—

"During the year under review, considerable importance was given to development of close ties with the West Asian States and the Gulf, particularly Iran, Iraq and the United Arab Emirates. A large number of high level visits were exchanged resulting in the affirmation of the traditional friendship between them and India. These exchanges also revealed a close identity of views on major international and bilateral issues, thus creating a sound framework for greater co-operation in various fields of endeavour."

This is a very important note in the sense that in 1974-75 we came to realise for the first time that not only our political interest but also our economic and cultural interests lay in the fact that we should develop these ties. Sir, to-day it is a matter of pride for India to say that we have joint ventures with all of these countries. As we know, Iran has come with a big help of about Rs. 447 crores or round

about Rs. 500 crores to develop the Kudremukh Project which is in my State, that is, Karnataka. Sir, we have succeeded in securing a global tender from Iraq for a huge railway line project with a cost of about Rs. 1,000 crores, if I am correct. These are the areas where I find that our economic prosperity would lie. Look at the balance of trade even. Barring one or two countries, all our trade with these Arab countries shows that the balance of trade is favourable to us and it can be even strengthened. It can be further improved. It can be further improved provided we make all the efforts.

Lastly coming to the working of our Ministry, Sir, while reading some of the papers which say something about these Arab countries, I have gathered that there is a lack of information on our part which could have been supplied to them to enable them to know what we are doing in India, what we mean to do and what relations we want to keep with the outside world. Sir, it is not only a matter of pride but of gratification also that All India Radio allows a greater amount of time for our propaganda, but so far as the written literature is concerned, I feel that some of the institutions in the country, who are taking up advanced studies, could have been made use of. My last point is about the appointment of a special envoy. Our Prime Minister thought it fit—and circumstances have proved that she thought very rightly—to appoint a special envoy to tour these countries. Sir, Shri Mohammad Yunis, who toured these countries, reports to us that he is heard with patience, that he is heard with respect in these countries. It was he who played a great part in bringing these countries closer to us. It does not depend only upon one man going to the outer world and projecting the image of India. Frequent contacts will have to be maintained not only through cultural delegations but through goodwill missions also. I think if we do that, we will be able to have greater prosperity in India and closer ties with the Arab world. Thank you.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति जी, पिछले एक वर्ष में हमारे देश की आर्थिक स्थिति में और आन्तरिक स्थिति में जो सुधार हुआ है उसका प्रभाव हमारी विदेश नीति पर होगा स्वाभाविक था। चीन से जो बहुत बरों से टूटे हुए राजनैतिक संबंध थे उनकी फिर से स्थापना हुई है और पाकिस्तान से भी 1971 के बाद जो राजनैतिक संबंध टूट गये थे उनकी फिर से राजनैतिक स्तर पर स्थापना हुई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें हमारे देश का वातावरण भी बहुत सहायक हुआ है। आज देश के अन्दर जो अनुशासन आया है और प्रशासनिक स्तर पर जो सुधार हुआ है, मेरा अपना अनुमान है और इसी आधार पर इन दोनों देशों के साथ हमारे राजनैतिक संबंधों में सुधार हुआ है। भारत ने राहसपूर्वक इस दिशा में अपना हाथ आगे बढ़ाया है। जैसा अपना वक्तव्य देते हुए विदेश मंत्री ने उस दिन कहा था कि हम इन देशों के साथ राजनैतिक संबंधों में सुधार का यह अभिप्राय नहीं मानते हैं कि हम अपनी शखंडता या स्वदेशाभिमान भावना की बलि दे दें। हमें विश्वास करना चाहिए कि इन देशों की पिछली जैसी पृष्ठभूमि रही है भविष्य में उसमें सुधार होगा और ये देश जाने-अनाने ऐसा कोई काम नहीं करेंगे जिससे संबंधों में किसी प्रकार की बाधा उत्पन्न हो। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूँगा कि हम ने जितनी पवित्रता के साथ राहसपूर्वक हाथ बढ़ाया है और राजनैतिक संबंधों में सुधार लाने के लिए जो कदम उठाये हैं, उनको इन दोनों देशों में अदृश्य ध्यान में रखा जायेगा।

मुझे अच्छी तरह से याद है कि चीनी आक्रमण के बाद एक बार मुझे शिंगापुर जाने का अवसर मिला और वहाँ एक भारत-वंशी सज्जन के साथ जो वहाँ के विदेश मंत्री थे, बातचीत करने का मौका मिला। उससे मैंने प्रश्न पूछा कि यह समझ में नहीं आता कि आपके देश के भौगोलिक संबंध भारत से अधिक निपट के हैं, लेकिन फिर भी आपका

झुकाव चीन की ओर अधिक क्यों है? तो उन्होंने बड़ी स्पष्ट सी भाषा में एक उत्तर दिया और कहने लगे कि देखो भाई, हम तो शक्ति के पुजारी हैं; अगर शक्ति का टेक उधर अधिक है तो हमारा झुकाव उधर है और जिस दिन शक्ति का पलड़ा आपका भारी हो जाएगा, हमारा झुकाव इधर हो जाएगा। तो मैं समझता हूँ, रत एक वर्ष में हमने जो सग्रह किया है, विशेष रूप से आर्थिक और प्रशासनिक क्षेत्र में, इसका प्रभाव निश्चित रूप से—जैसा प्रारंभ में मैंने कहा—हमारे वैदेशिक संबंधों पर भी हुआ है और आगे भी होगा, ऐसा हमें विश्वास करना चाहिए। लेकिन जहाँ मैं इसके ऊपर एक संतोष व्यक्त करता हूँ, साथ ही साथ मैं अपनी ओर से एक कष्ट की अभिव्यक्ति करना चाहता हूँ। अभी हमारे पड़ोसी मित्त देश के अंदर एक ऐसे भारत के मित्र की बेरहमी के साथ हत्या की गई—मेरा संकेत शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान की ओर है, उनकी हत्या से यह देश ही नहीं बल्कि विश्व की मानवता एक बार तड़प उठी। इस प्रकार का भयानक काण्ड भी कभी किया जा सकता है, जो व्यक्ति राष्ट्र का मुक्ति-दाता है, उसकी भी हत्या की जा सकती है। पर मेरा अपना विचार यह है कि इसके पीछे जो एक षडयंत्र उस देश के अंदर कायम कर रहा था, उनकी हत्या के बाद वही और भी अधिक रतिशील हो चुके हैं। जैसा आपने रिपोर्ट में लिखा है, संदेह और अविश्वास का जो वातावरण वहाँ नहीं बनना चाहिए, उस देश में भारत के प्रति धीरे-धीरे बढ़ता चला जा रहा है, मैं चाहूँगा यह कि उसके साथ संबंधों को अपनी ओर से सामान्य बनाने के लिए जितना प्रयास कर रहे हैं, उसमें आपको थोड़ा सा और भी आगे बढ़ने की आवश्यकता है। हमारा दुर्भाग्य है और यह पिछले इतिहास को देखने से भी लगता है—कि जिस देश के दुख में भी हम काम आये, न जाने क्यों आगे चल कर उस देश के साथ हमारे संबंध उतने मधुर नहीं रह पाये। पड़ोस में ही

हमारे नेपाल है, नेपाल में महाराजा त्रिभुवन को जिस समय विपत्ति के वातावरण से भारत ने उभारा था, ऐसा लगता था कि हमारी मैत्री और घनिष्ठ होती चली जाएगी। ऐसी ही स्थिति एक बार इंडोनेशिया के साथ भी हुई जब डा० सुकर्ण को निकालने में भारत ने योगदान दिया था। और भी कई देशों के साथ इसी प्रकार की स्थिति हुई। परंतु इसमें क्या कारण मूल रूप से बनते हैं कि जिन देशों के लिए इतनी बड़ी धन की हानि हमको उठानी पड़ती है, जन की हानि भी उठानी पड़ती है, फिर क्यों हमारे देश के संबंध उतने मधुर नहीं बन पाते? उन समस्याओं की तह में बैठ कर हमें जांच अवश्य करनी चाहिए।

एक छोटी सी बात जिस के लिए 'छोटी सी' शब्दों का प्रयोग मैंने जान-बूझ कर किया है—बात तो बड़ी छोटी है लेकिन हवा का रुख किधर है इसका संकेत देने वाली है; उसकी भी चर्चा मैं इस समय करना चाहूंगा। वह बात है सुरक्षा परिषद् की सदस्यता की। जब सुरक्षा परिषद् की सदस्यता के लिए हमने एक प्रतिनिधि को खड़ा किया और दूसरी ओर से भी एक प्रतिनिधि खड़ा हुआ। तीन बार मतदान हुआ और तीनों बार मतदान के बाद हमें अपने प्रतिनिधि का नाम वापस लेना पड़ा। मैं जहां इसमें एक कारण मानता हूं कि हमने स्थिति का पहले से उतनी गहराई में जाकर विश्लेषण नहीं किया जितना कि हमको करना चाहिए था, वहां यह भी कि सुरक्षा परिषद् की सदस्यता से जो हमारे प्रतिनिधि का नाम वापस लेना पड़ा उससे हमें थोड़ा सा अपने मित्रों के संबंधों पर भी फिर से विचार करना चाहिए। वह इसलिए नहीं कि सुरक्षा परिषद् की सदस्यता में उन्होंने हमारा साथ नहीं दिया बल्कि इसलिए भी हम उनके सम्बंधों का विश्लेषण करें कि कई बार जब हम विपत्ति के क्षणों में आए, जैसे चीन के साथ हमारा संघर्ष हुआ, पाकिस्तान के साथ 1965

में हमारा संघर्ष हुआ, तो ऐसे मित्र हैं जिनकी मित्रता के लिए हम दुनिया के बहुत से देशों को नाराज कर देते हैं, जब हमारी परीक्षा की बसौटी आती है तो उस समय हम खरे नहीं उतरते हैं। तो मैं चाहता हूं, हम निर्णय लेते समय इस व्यावहारिक नीति को भी अपने मस्तिष्क के ओझल न करें, यह भी मैं साफ़ स्वीकार करना चाहता हूं।

एक बात को देख कर मुझे थोड़ा संतोष भी है और प्रसन्नता भी है; संतोष इसलिए है कि पीछे रूस के साथ जो हमारी एक दीर्घकालीन मैत्री हुई थी, उसकी विश्व के अन्दर गलत-गलत व्याख्याएं हुईं और हमको कहने लगे कि हम उनकी जेब में पड़ गये हैं; कोई कहने लगा कि हम उनका संरक्षित प्रदेश होने लग गये हैं; कोई यह कहने लगा कि रूस हमारे आंतरिक मामलों में दखल देने लगा है। लेकिन अभी जो निर्णय हुए हैं उससे लगा है मैत्री होने के बाद भी हम अपने निर्णय स्वाभाविक रूप से और स्वतंत्र रूप से लेते हैं, यह स्पष्ट रूप से प्रकट हो चुका है। इसमें सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि जिनके साथ आज हमने राजनैतिक संबंध स्थापित करने के निर्णय लिए हैं, उससे यह प्रतीत होता है कि हम किसी की जेब में जाकर गिर नहीं गए, किसी ने हमारी नीतियों को अधिक प्रभावित नहीं किया है बल्कि हम राष्ट्रीय निर्णय लेने पर स्वतंत्र हैं।

इसी तरह से एक और घटना पीछे हुई है। मैं समझता हूं, उसका समाधान अभी पूरी तरह से नहीं हो पाया है। पीछे हुए और रूबल के विनिमय दर पर भी कुछ प्रश्न उपस्थित हुआ था। रूस चाहता था कि रूबल का मूल्य भारतवर्ष में इतने रुपए के बराबर कर दिया जाए, भारत को ओर से कहा गया कि रुपये की स्थिति पहले की अपेक्षा पुष्ट है, कैसे उसका मूल्य घटाया जाये। मैं समझता

हूँ, अगर हम किसी की जेब में जाकर पड़ गए होते तो शायद इस प्रश्न पर भी तत्काल निर्णय ले लिया होता। पर आज तक हमने उस प्रश्न को विचार की कोटि में रखा हुआ है। इससे भी यह प्रतीत होता है कि हमारा निर्णय लेने का ढंग स्वतंत्र है। वैसे भी उपसभापति महोदय, सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि आखिर में यही तो नहीं कि हमको उसकी आवश्यकता है, उसको भी तो हमारी आवश्यकता है। हम भी तो 60 करोड़ के मुल्क हैं, एशिया की राजनीति में हमारा भी अपना एक संतुलित स्थान है। तो इसलिए मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इन तमाम बातों का निर्णय लेते समय किसी की मंत्री—अथवा वह यह नहीं चाहते इसलिए—उस मंत्री की रेखा में या परिधि में आकर निर्धारित करेंगे; यह वहाँ होना चाहिए। हम स्वतंत्र रूप से निर्णय ले सकते हैं। हम यह देख कर चलें कि देश के 60 करोड़ लोगों का भविष्य किसमें सुरक्षित है? और इसी दृष्टि से हमको अपना निर्णय लेना चाहिए।

3 P. M.

हम स्वतंत्र रूप से दूसरे निर्णय ले सकते हैं इससे तो यही प्रतीत होता है। और यही देखकर हम रहना चाहते हैं। वैसे मेरा अनुमान है कि राजनीति में अर्थ तो होता है, इति कभी नहीं होती है। चीन और अमरीका के बीच कई वर्षों से आपसी सम्बन्ध बिगड़े हुए थे, लेकिन जब उन्होंने आवश्यकता देखी, परिस्थिति इस प्रकार की देखी तो दोनों ने निकट आकर और मिलकर अपने सम्बन्ध सुधारे। भारत और अमरीका के सम्बन्धों में भी काफी कटुता आ गई थी। लेकिन व्यापारिक दृष्टि से अभी दोनों देशों के प्रतिनिधि मंडलों के बीच आदान प्रदान हुआ है। हम और वे आपस में सम्बन्ध सुधारना चाहते हैं, लेकिन मेरी इच्छा यह है कि जहाँ हम व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध सुधारना चाहते हैं वहाँ राजनीतिक स्तर पर भी इसका विश्लेषण फिर से करना चाहिए क्योंकि हमारी स्वतंत्र नीति है और हम यह देखकर चल रहे हैं कि

60 करोड़ लोगों के राष्ट्र का भविष्य किसमें सुरक्षित है? उसी दृष्टि से हमें निर्णय लेना चाहिए। केवल चीन के साथ मंत्री है, रूस के साथ हमारी मंत्री है, जर्मनी के साथ हमारी मंत्री है, ब्रिटेन के साथ हमारी मंत्री है, यह बात दुनिया के दूसरे देशों के साथ प्रभावित नहीं करती है।

एक बात मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि कुछ देश इस प्रकार के हैं जिनकी समस्या बिल्कुल हमारी जैसी ही है, वे हमारी तरह ही गुलाम रहे हैं और जो हमारी तरह रंग भेद के शिकार रहे हैं। इस तरह के जो देश हैं वे खास तौर पर अफ्रीका और सहारा के देश हैं। उनकी स्वतंत्रता का आन्दोलन और भारत की स्वतंत्रता का आन्दोलन साथ-साथ चला। सौभाग्य की बात यह है कि हमारे देश की स्वतंत्रता के नेता महात्मा गांधी जी ने अपना राजनीतिक जीवन अफ्रीका देश से ही प्रारम्भ किया। लेकिन कुछ अफ्रीकी देश इस प्रकार के हैं जो स्वतंत्रता के कगार तक पहुँच चुके हैं, लेकिन अभी तक पूर्णतया स्वतंत्र नहीं हो पाये हैं। मैंने वहाँ जाकर देखा कि अफ्रीकी देशों में और भारत में कई मामलों में समता है। एक समता तो यह है कि विकास की दृष्टि से दोनों ही देशों की एक जैसी स्थिति है। सांस्कृतिक आदान प्रदान की दृष्टि से भी दोनों देशों की एक जैसी स्थिति है। यह हमारे लिए सौभाग्य की बात है कि अफ्रीका देशों को जब कभी टैक्नीकल विशेषज्ञों की आवश्यकता होती है, चाहे इंजीनियरों की होती हो, डाक्टरों की होती हो, वे भारत से ही प्रायः मंगाते हैं। जब कभी उन्हें अध्यापकों की आवश्यकता होती है, तो वे भारत से अध्यापकों को मंगाते हैं। वहाँ पर ये शिक्षक शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में कार्य कर रहे हैं चाहे वे पूर्वी अफ्रीका के देश हो या दूसरे देश हों।

इन देशों में युगेन्डा में जो भारतवंशी लोग रहते थे, उनके साथ घटी घटना के कारण अनिश्चितता की स्थिति पैदा हो गई है। उनके मस्तिक में संदेह का वातावरण पैदा हो गया है। अफ्रीका का जो आर्थिक विकास हुआ है उसमें भारतीयों का प्रमुख योगदान था। पर अब जो लाखों लोग वहां पर हैं, उनका अस्थायी अनिश्चित हो गया है। हमारी अपनी स्थिति यह है कि हम यह कल्पना करते हैं कि जो वहां पहले से रहते आ रहे हैं, व्यापार कर रहे हैं, उनके सुख-दुख के साथ हमारा कोई सम्बंध नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रकार की जो हमारी नीति है, जो हमारा संचना है, उसमें हमें परिवर्तन करना चाहिए।

इसके साथ ही साथ मेरा यह भी कहना है कि अफ्रीका के देशों में जो हमारा राजदूत भेजते हैं, वहां पर इस प्रकार के राजदूत न भेजे जिन्हें यह पद पुरस्कार के स्वरूप दिया जाता हो या जिन्होंने कुछ अपनी सेवाएं दी हों। हमें खरस तौर पर ऐसे देशों में जो समस्याओं में उत्पन्न हुए हैं, पर जो हमारे निवृत्त जाना चाहते हैं, वहां पर से चरमकवर राजदूत भेजने चाहिए। मैं वहां पर नाम नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। पता नहीं मैं अपनी परंपरा से बाहर तो नहीं जा रहा हूँ। एक ऐसे व्यक्ति जिसकी शक्त तब मैंने आज तक नहीं देखी पर उनके वाणी और गुणों से मैं प्रभावित हुआ हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह के व्यक्ति इन देशों में जायें तो हमें बड़ी सहायता होगी क्योंकि इस तरह के व्यक्ति दोनों देशों की बीच की जो शृंखला है उसको सज्जत कर सकते हैं। उनका नाम है श्री अफ्फा पंत। मैंने उनको आज तक देखा नहीं लेकिन, मैं वहां भी गया, जिस देश में भी गया, इस व्यक्ति के बारे में प्रशंसा के शब्द ही सुनने को मिले, जो भी कहता था वही कहता था कि आप इस प्रकार के व्यक्तियों को भेजें। मैं नहीं

चाहता कि वहां किसी का नाम लूं—मैंने आज तक उनको देखा नहीं—लेकिन उनके गुणों से परिचित हूँ और इसलिये मैंने उनका नाम लिया। मैं चाहूंगा कि जिन देशों के साथ इस प्रकार की उत्कर्ष हुई समस्याएँ हैं वहां ऐसे व्यक्ति को भेजना चाहिए।

अफ्रीकी देशों के साथ एक दूसरी चीज भी है। उनसे हमारे व्यापार संबंध भी बढ़ सकते हैं। वे 1961 के बाद स्वतंत्र हुए। अभी तक वे अपनी समस्याओं से उत्पन्न रहे हैं। इन देशों के साथ व्यापार की सम्भावनाएँ पर्याप्त हो सकती हैं। इसलिये व्यापारिक सम्भावनाओं के संबंध में हमको संचना चाहिए। इस काम को विदेश मंत्रालय वरेशा या विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय करावा अच्छा कर सकता है यह आप जानें। लेकिन मेरी इच्छा इस प्रकार की है कि भारत वहां दूसरे देशों में अपने लिये मंडियाँ खोल रहा है वहां अफ्रीकी देशों में इस बात के लिये विशेष प्रयास करे। क्योंकि उन देशों के लोग यह समझते हैं कि भारत के लोग आयेगे या भारत से व्यापारिक संबंध बढ़ेंगे तो अफ्रीकों की तरह या दूसरे लोगों की तरह हमको चूसने वाले नहीं होंगे बल्कि मूल्य से, भई चारे के स्तर पर उनसे व्यापार संबंध स्थापित करेंगे। अगर यह बढ़ सकती है तो बढ़ने का प्रयास करना चाहिए।

जहां तक भारतवंशी लोगों की बात है मैं चाहूंगा कि भारतवंशी लोगों को तीन हिसाबों में रखकर उनकी समस्या पर विचार करें। एक तो वे हैं जिनके पास भारत का पारपेट है, एक भारतवंशी वे हैं जो उन देशों के नागरिक हो गये हैं और तीसरे भारतीय हैं जिनके पास ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट है। कुछ ऐसे भी हैं जिनके पास किसी का भी पारपेट नहीं है। लेकिन उनकी संख्या उमलियों पर ही गिनने लायक होगी।

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

ऐसे व्यक्तियों की चर्चा मैं नहीं कर रहा हूँ। जिनके पास इन तीनों तरह के पासपोर्ट हैं पहले मैं उनकी चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ। उनमें जो भारतीय लोग हैं जिन्होंने उन देशों की नागरिकता ले ली या जिनके पास ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट नहीं है, भारतीय पासपोर्ट नहीं है कई ऐसे व्यक्तियों से मिलने का मौका मिला। मैंने उनसे कहा आरक्षी अधिक स्थिति बड़ी अच्छी है, आरक्षी व्यापार अब तीजरी-चोरी मोड़ों में चल रहा है जब से आप इस देश में आये, क्या आपको भारत आने को इच्छा होती है। वे कहने लगे, जो शब्द उन्होंने कहे वही मैं आरक्षी सुनाता हूँ, उन्होंने कहा—

‘अति स्वर्णमयी लंका, न मे लक्ष्मण रोचते’
न नी जन्म भूमिश्च: स्वर्गादपि गरीयसी।’

इन शब्दों को सुनकर मुझे बहुत प्रभावित हुई। तीन-चार पीढ़ियाँ निकलने के बाद भी भारत के प्रति जो उनके हृदय में स्नेह है, अनुराग है मैं समझता हूँ कि उसका प्रत्युत्तर हमारी ओर से वैसा नहीं दिया जा रहा है। हम यह कल्पना करते हैं कि वे वहाँ के नागरिक हो गये हैं, वहाँ व्यापार करते हैं उनके सुख-दुख से हमारा संबंध नहीं है। उगाड़ा से भारतवर्गी लोग हटे थे, करोड़ों की संपत्ति छोड़कर हटे थे। एक-एक आदमी को 50-50 करोड़ रुपये की संपत्ति से हाथ धोना पड़ा था। जो संपत्ति वे छोड़कर आये थे उनके लिये आप कमनवेल्थ के लिये चर्चा कर रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब यह स्थिति अफ्रीका के दूसरे देशों में न आये। इसके लिये कोई सोहई का वातावरण अभी से तैयार होना चाहिए और उनके मस्तिष्क में जो अनिश्चितता की स्थिति है वह समाप्त होनी चाहिए। इस बात को मैं विशेषरूप से कहना चाहता हूँ इसलिये भी कि मुझे वहाँ जाकर यह पता लगा कि जब भी भारत के ऊपर कष्ट आया चाहे वह 1962 में हो, चाहे वह 1965 में आया,

चाहे वह 1971 में आया उन लोगों ने उसी तरह से हमारे कष्ट को अनुभव किया जैसे देश में रहने वाला कोई नागरिक अनुभव करना है और अपनी परिधि में रहते हुए दूर से जो सहयोग बन सकता था वह सहयोग उन्होंने देने का प्रयत्न किया। यह भी मैं आपके ध्यान में लाना चाहूँगा।

एक और बात सुनकर मुझे बड़ा कष्ट हुआ। अभी थोड़े दिन पहले मैं अफ्रीका के एक छोटे से देश में था। वहाँ भारतीय लोगों ने मुझे बताया कि उपराष्ट्रपति जत्तो जब यहाँ आये तब यह कहा गया कि जिनके पास भारतीय पासपोर्ट है केवल वही जत्तो साहब से मिलने के लिये आयें। मैं जब वहाँ था उन्होंने दिनों अमरीका का विदेश मंत्री वहाँ आया था और सनावार पत्रों में मोटे-मोटे अक्षरों में छपा था कि यहाँ जो भी अमरीकी नागरिक रहते हैं वे अमरीकी विदेश मंत्री को मिलने आयें। यह रेखा क्या खींची गई कि जिनके पास भारतीय पासपोर्ट नहीं है, भारत-वर्गी लोग जो वहाँ व्यापार करते हैं और जिनके हृदय में भारत के प्रति उतनी ही आत्मीयता है वे वहाँ न आयें। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस व्यक्ति ने यह किया अच्छा नहीं किया और इसके उन लोगों के हृदय पर एक चीट लगी। उनकी समस्याएँ आप उस स्तर पर हल न करें जिस स्तर पर आप भारतीय पासपोर्टधारियों की समस्याएँ हल करते हैं। लेकिन अगर वे लोग उपराष्ट्रपति के साथ भेंट करते और उनके साथ एक प्याला चाय पी लेते तो उसमें किसी को क्या दिक्कत होती। जिसने भी यह किया अच्छा नहीं किया। इस पर निश्चित रूप से ध्यान देना चाहिए।

एक बात और जो मैंने मारीशस में भी देखी। वह यह थी कि जहाँ-जहाँ भारत-वर्गी लोग रहते हैं—चाहे वे बहुसंख्या में हों या अल्प संख्या में—उन लोगों की इच्छा है और जिसको मैं आप तक पहुँचाना चाहता

हूँ कि जो उनको नई संज्ञा है उसको वे पढ़ने के लिये इंग्लैंड, कनाडा या अमरीका नहीं भेजना चाहते वह इस लिये नहीं भेजना चाहते कि हमारा जो भारतवर्ष के प्रति अनुराग है वह अनुराग हमारी संज्ञान के मन में भी रहना चाहिए यह उन की भावना है । इस लिये वह अपने बच्चों की शिक्षा दोक्षा के लिये, उन को डाक्टर, इंजीनियर या साइंट का ग्रेजुएट बनाने के लिये भारत भेजना चाहते हैं । लेकिन ऐसे विद्यार्थियों के लिये हम ने बहुत थोड़ी सीटें अपने यहां रखी हुई हैं । मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन के लिये सीटों की संख्या बढ़ा दी जानी चाहिए ताकि राजनैति से हट कर हमारा जो भावनात्मक संर्क है वह कायम रहे । यदि वे चाहते हैं कि उन के बच्चे दूसरे देशों में न जा कर यहां ही शिक्षा प्राप्त करें तो उस के लिये निश्चित रूप से हम को कुछ सोचना चाहिए ।

दूसरी बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ और मैंने विदेश मंत्री जी से मिल कर भी इस बात को कहा है । पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी के समय में इस प्रकार की चर्चा चली थी कि जितने भी प्रवासी भारतीय हैं—वह भारतवर्ष से पहले कभी गये थे, उन के दादा, परदादा गये थे, वह आज भी चाहते हैं कि उन के और भारतवर्ष के बीच में कोई ऐसा संगठन होना चाहिए कि जो श्रृंखला का काम करे । वह संगठन हमारी समस्याओं को उन तक पहुंचाये और उन के मन की बात और भावना को हमारे तक पहुंचाये । पंडित जी ने अपनी मृत्यु के दो दिन पहले देहरादून के सैक्रेट हाउस से पत्र लिखा था मुझे को, जिस में उन्होंने लिखा था कि मुझे तुम्हारा सुझाव बहुत पसंद आया है । उन्होंने यह भी लिखा था कि मैं मेहरचन्द खन्ना से कहूंगा कि वे प्रवासी भवन बनाने की व्यवस्था करें । इस संबंध में मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी से बात की है और आप से भी बात की है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि पंडित जी की उस इच्छा को शोध

पूरा किया जाय । उस को ज्यादा लम्बे समय तक टाला न जाय क्योंकि प्रवासी भारतीय भारत के निकट संपर्क में रहना चाहते हैं । भले ही वह बाहर किसी देश में व्यापार कर रहे हों या वहां किसी प्रकार की सविस में हों, लेकिन भारत के प्रति जो उन की आत्मीयता है उस आत्मीयता का उत्तर हम उस प्रकार दे सकें इस के लिये भी इस दृष्टि से हम को कुछ अवश्य सोचना चाहिए ।

मैं दो एक बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ । उन में एक बात तो यह है कि इंडियन कौंसिल आफ कल्चरल रिलेशन्स जिस को हम भारतीय सांस्कृतिक संबंध परिषद् भी कहते हैं उस को जो काम सौंपा गया है, वह खुशी की बात है कि वह अच्छा कार्य कर रही है । जो दायित्व उस को सौंपा गया है वह इस प्रकार का है कि जो लोगों के हृदय, मस्तिष्क और मन से संबंध रखने वाला है । राजनैतिक संबंध इतने लम्बे और स्थायी नहीं होते जितने कि सांस्कृतिक संबंध होते हैं । पहल तो यह परिषद् एक ऐसे व्यक्ति के हाथ में रही, इस पर एक ऐसा व्यक्ति बैठा रहा कि जिस ने इस परिषद् के करेक्टर को ही खत्म कर दिया और जिन की अपनी व्यक्तिगत अनियमिततायें इस प्रकार की थीं कि जिन के बारे में एक रिपोर्ट भी शायद आप के पास है । उस पर अभी तक आप कोई निर्णय नहीं ले पा रहे हैं । अब उन को यहां से हटा कर शिक्षा विभाग में भेज दिया गया है । लेकिन गलत आदमी तो हर जगह गलत है । वह शिक्षा मंत्रालय में बैठे या वहां बैठे, वह गलत ही होगा । या तो उस को आप ने कोई इन्क्वायरी नहीं करानी थी और अगर कोई इन्क्वायरी कारायी है तो उस की रिपोर्ट क्या है और उस पर आप क्या निर्णय ले रहे हैं इस का हम को पता होना चाहिए । लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह जो भारतीय सांस्कृतिक संबंध परिषद् है उस का अपना महत्वपूर्ण काम है । भारत

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

सरकार में ऐसा है कि थोड़े थोड़े काम बटे हुए हैं। विदेशों में सांस्कृतिक संबंध के कुछ काम विदेश मंत्रालय को दिये हुए हैं और कुछ शिक्षा मंत्रालय को दिये हुए हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि विदेशों में सांस्कृतिक प्रचार का जो काम है वह एक संगठन के पास रहना चाहिए और इस के लिये विदेश मंत्रालय ही कॉर्पोरेट अथॉरिटी होगा। इस लिये विदेशों में सांस्कृतिक प्रचार का काम विदेश मंत्रालय को सौंपा जाये और भारतवर्ष में यह काम शिक्षा मंत्रालय के पास रहे। इस में मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं लेकिन विदेशों के लिये एक संगठन होना चाहिए। दो जगह ये बंटे हुए नहीं रहना चाहिए।

दूसरे विदेशों में जो सांस्कृतिक प्रचारक भेजे जायें उस संबंध में मैं चाहता हूं कि वहां केवल नृत्य और संगीत की मंडलियां ही नहीं जानी चाहिए। अभी रामकृष्ण मिशन के स्वामी रंगनाथन जी भेजे गये थे। वैसे ही दूसरे अच्छे व्यक्ति वहां भेजे जायें उच्च स्तर के। जो वहां जा कर वहां की सांस्कृतिक समस्याओं को देखें और हमारे सांस्कृतिक संबंध आपस में बढ़ायें और सांस्कृतिक अदान प्रदान करें। बहुत से देशों में सनातन धर्म, रामकृष्ण मिशन और आर्य समाज के संगठन हैं। वहां गुहद्वारे हैं और हिन्दू मंडल बहुत स्थानों पर बने हुए हैं। मुस्लिम भाइयों के संगठन भी हैं। तो मेरा कहना है कि उन में जो अच्छे स्तर के विद्वान हैं, मौलवी हैं, पंडित हैं, ज्ञानी हैं, उन को वहां भेजा जाय। केवल नृत्य और संगीत ही हमारी संस्कृति नहीं है। इन विद्वानों के जो प्रवचन होंगे उन के द्वारा भी हमारा सांस्कृतिक प्रचार होगा ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है।

मैं अपनी बात को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाता हूं अन्त में यह कह कर समाप्त

करूंगा कि आप ने इस रिपोर्ट के पृष्ठ 105 पर लिखा है कि हिन्दी के विदेशों में प्रचार के लिये आप ने पासपोर्ट कार्यालय को भी कुछ सुविधायें दी हैं। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संधियां और करार और संयुक्त विज्ञापितियों में भी हिन्दी का प्रयोग होने लगा है। हिन्दी की पुस्तकें और चर्ट आदि भी विदेश भेजे जाने लगे हैं। मारिशस और फीजी में आप ने हिन्दी अधिकारी रखे हुए हैं। अन्तर-राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर हिन्दी को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये योजनाबद्ध प्रयास हो रहा है। लेकिन जैसा मैंने एक प्रश्न के रूप में उस दिन कहा था और मेरी बात समय न रहने से बीच में समाप्त हो गयी थी, मैं उस को फिर से दोहराना चाहता हूं। आप ही उस गोष्ठी के अध्यक्ष थे नागपुर में जिस में सुरिनाम, ट्रिनिडाड, गयाना और मारिशस के प्रतिनिधियों ने कहा, और यही नहीं, रूस और जर्मनी के प्रतिनिधियों ने भी कहा, चेकोस्लोवाकिया के प्रतिनिधि ने भी कहा, हंगरी ने कहा, पोलैंड ने कहा, सब ने यह कहा। जब 9 करोड़ लोगों की अरबी भाषा को वहां मान्यता मिल सकती है तो 60 करोड़ के देश ने जो अपनी राजभाषा मानी है उसको मान्यता क्यों नहीं मिल सकती है? मैं समझता हूं कि इस प्रश्न पर जो गति रही है, वह कच्छप गति है, इसमें तेजी आनी चाहिए। यह हमारे राष्ट्रीय स्वाभिमान के अनुकूल है। जिस दिन हिन्दी को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में स्थान मिलेगा उस दिन हमारा राष्ट्रीय स्वाभिमान भी बढ़ेगा। मैं आशा करता हूं कि आप निर्णय लेते समय इस बात का ध्यान रखेंगे और इसको राष्ट्रीय स्वाभिमान के अनुकूल ही गति देने का प्रयास करेंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ ही मैं विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करता हूं और आशा करता हूँ कि अगला वर्ष इस से भी ज्यादा अच्छा वर्ष होगा।

SHRI SARDAR AMJAD ALI (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the Foreign Affairs Minister here for giving this House an opportunity to discuss the working of his Ministry. Sir, the Department of External Affairs in any Government works as the connecting link between that country and the rest of the world in accordance with the policy formulated by the Government as such, the tradition that the country and the people follow, the ideology which the people of that country believe in Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I should say that the working of the External Affairs Ministry here, in our country, during the last few years, has been, by and large, quite in tune with the policy which has been formulated by our great leaders. It has advocated the cause of the country abroad and has taken the stand in accordance with and in pursuance of the policy of non-alignment. It has effectively implemented and rather pursued the policy of non-alignment with regard to other countries which believe in this policy. It has taken able steps, quite satisfactory steps towards the promotion of goodwill and co-operation of understanding in matters of mutual interest. I have no hesitation in saying that matters having serious international political impact and having direct impact on our national interest have been very ably sorted out by the Department of External Affairs. Along with this, on very complicated issues like those of Cyprus, the Middle-East situation and the Indo-China problem, the Department of External Affairs has taken an able stand in accordance with the policy formulated by our great leaders.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, excepting certain pitfalls here and there, I believe that the work that our External Affairs Ministry is doing is quite satisfactory so far as the question of making the stand of this country understandable to those countries which have a different outlook, so far as the question of political approach to the solution of complicated issues and so far as the question

of making a country self-sufficient and self-respected, is concerned. Coming to our close neighbours, I believe it will not be out of context if I say that the issues which were of very great importance, have been very ably sorted out with our close neighbours. I would like to mention the most cordial and good relations which we have with our neighbour Afghanistan. Perhaps, amongst all our close neighbours, the best of relations we have with Afghanistan. The Ministry of External Affairs could pursue with the Government of Afghanistan to take a political stand along with India at a time when the United States of America lifted the arms embargo on Pakistan. It was not a mean achievement that the Government of Afghanistan in tune with the Government of India resented the decision of the United States of America for lifting the arms embargo.

As regards our relations with Bhutan, it is worth mentioning here that in the developmental programme of Bhutan, we have contributed about Rs. 34 crores in their fourth Five Year Plan out of the total expenditure of Rs. 40 crores. So is our relation with Maldives, Nepal and as some of my colleagues here stated, our relations with Sri Lanka. We have sorted out our problems with Sri Lanka on Kachativu and about the persons of Indian origin.

With regard to our close neighbours, it is, of course, a great achievement that our diplomatic relation which had to be severed after a long confrontation with Pakistan, is going to be restored. But, as far as our close neighbour are concerned, I believe two main challenges are there before the Ministry of External Affairs. The first is about Bangladesh. Although we have very good relations with Bangladesh, I believe, Sir it will not be out of context if I say that the Farakka problem is an important one as far as our relations with Bangladesh are concerned. This remains to be solved. Although we have taken an open stand in accordance with our tradition of

[Shri Sardar Amjad Ali]

solving the problems by bilateral negotiations and peaceful talks, it is unfortunate that the stand taken by the Bangladesh Government is sometimes not very congenial. With regard to Pakistan, the problem of Hunz and the setting up of a new Council for the so-called Azad Kashmir are the problems yet to be considered, while we restore our diplomatic relations with Pakistan. We all believe that the impact of Simla agreement will be carried on by the Pakistan Government and they will try to realise the situation and the stand taken by the Government of India to sort out problems which we still have with them.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, coming to our relations with the countries in South East Asia, I find that it is the best of the relations that we have with the countries in the South East Asia region. As I try to analyse the situation from the report, perhaps, on the economic co-operation aspect, I find that we are having the best of relations with the countries in that region. Take for instance, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Australia, Philippines, Fiji and other countries. It is worth mentioning here that with Indonesia, in the economic field, we are having about 17 joint ventures. With Malaysia, we are having about 33 joint ventures. We have joint ventures in all the very important sectors of industrial activity of both the countries.

In regard to our relations with the East Asian countries, the major development is our decision to normalise our relations with China. The decision has been cordially welcomed by the Chinese Government. As the hon. External Affairs Minister disclosed in this House the other day, the news media in the Western countries have also expressed their opinion. While we take into account the observations made by the Western countries, we should also take into account the feelings and the sentiments of the people of this country in regard to the territories which are still under the Chinese

occupation. While we normalise our relations with China, the External Affairs Ministry should also bear in mind that this does not mean parting with one's own territory. Although the negotiations are in a very fluid state, this has got to be expressed with deep concern.

Some of my colleagues here were emphasising much about our relations with the West Asian countries. It is a fact that we did not pay much attention to the Arab world earlier. But I do not agree with them that at present, we are not paying much attention to that part of the world. It has been the policy of the Government of India to support the cause of the Arabs and the PLO, not only inside the country, but also in all world forums. We have been extending support to the cause which they were advocating in the United Nations and in other world seminars and conferences. We hope that our relations with the West Asian countries would be pursued and strengthened for mutual benefit so that the co-operation in the field of economic and industrial activity is strengthened much more.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, there has been an unfortunate development as far as the West is concerned. There has been some misunderstanding in the European countries and the United States of America in regard to our nuclear explosion. Most of the countries in Western Europe, as well as the United States of America, have taken such an attitude as though India has done something wrong. Although the Ministry of External Affairs is taking steps to remove that impression, I think it is my duty to mention here that the performance of our external publicity division and our missions abroad has not been very satisfactory. Last December, I had been to Canada and I toured the whole country for about 15 days. People had a wrong idea about our nuclear explosion—and they were general, common people. They were given to understand by the Canadian Press—and it happened in some parts of America also—that India is going in for nuclear weapons.

It was not made clear to them that India believes in non-proliferation of nuclear arms and that India has always taken the stand to develop nuclear technology for its own developmental purposes. The Missions did not take the least trouble to remove this misconception from the minds of the people in those areas.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I believe the External Affairs Ministry needs to do some stock-taking as to how the External Publicity Division is working. Even in some of the West European countries I was rather very much surprised to note that people do not know that here in our country we have certain nationalised industries, that some major banks have been nationalised, that lands are being made available to the poorer sections. This only reflects that our diplomats and our Missions could not controvert the misconception which the common people in that part of the world have. (*Time-bell rings*).

Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is fortunate for us—and I am very happy to mention it—that we are having the best of relations with the East European countries. Not only in the field of economic co-operation but also in matters of political development of international importance, we have the best of understanding with the East European countries. Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Poland and other countries not only have high esteem and reverence for our leadership but also have good appreciation for the strides the people of our country are making.

Before I finish, Mr. Deputy Chairman I submit that India has taken, with all sincerity, noble strides in the liberation struggle that is going on in Africa. It has always supported the cause of the liberation struggle not only in that part of the world but in certain other parts also. That liberation struggle has got momentous support, tremendous support. Now when Angola has come into being, Dr. Augustino Neto has taken over the lea-

dership of that liberation struggle, and in that part of Africa it is becoming much more momentous. We have to make a review of the whole situation to see that Rhodesia and South Africa become free and we have to make a reassessment of our policy of support—reassessment in the sense of examining whether we can give our all-out support.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

श्री जगदीश जोशी (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति जी, जो आज की स्थिति है उसको देखते हुए यह समझना जरूरी है कि पिछले दिनों संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की बैठक में अफ्रीका के प्रतिनिधि मोयनोहान का तीसरी दुनिया के देशों के सिलसिले में बयान और उसके बाद...

[The Vice Chairman (Shri Ranbir Singh) in the Chair]

... किसिजर साहब के घमकी भरे बयान से अगर विकासशील देश हर मानले पर विरोध करेंगे तो हमारी सहायता भी उसी के अनुसार हुआ करेगी, यह किसी एक दूसरे काण्ड की तरफ इशारा कर रहा है। वैसे दुनिया की घुरियां चाहे कितनी भी बनें या न बनें, केन्द्र बने या न बनें, ध्रुव बने या न बनें, लेकिन एक सत्य आज स्थापित होता चला जा रहा है कि पिछले सहीने जिस प्रकार 200, 300 साल का इतिहास गोरी दुनिया का इतिहास था, उसके प्रतिकूल आज दुनिया का रंगीन हिस्सा अपना इतिहास बनाने की मंजिल पर चल रहा है। और उसका एक परिणाम हम लोगों को अभी मिला। अभी थोड़े दिन पहले कनाडा ने अपनी ओर से आणुविक सहयोग सन्धि को तोड़कर सहयोग को बन्द कर दिया। उनके बन्द करने से हमारे प्रयोगों में किसी तरह का कोई अन्तर नहीं पड़ता है, लेकिन उनकी यह मनोवृत्ति इस बात की परिचायक है कि वे समझ रहे हैं कि बाकी रंगीन दुनिया में भारत भी एक शक्ति के रूप में उभर ब

[श्री जगदीश जोशी]

जाये। वे यह सोच रहे हैं कि हमारा जो प्रभाव सारी दुनिया में छाया हुआ था सारी दुनिया में गोरे लंग रंगिन लोगों को गुलाम की तरह रखे हुए थे, वे लोग अब आगे बढ़ने की कोशिश न करें। इस तरह की भावना आज सारे विकासशील देशों में बाधित हो गई है। परमाणु बम के विस्फोट के सिलसिले में पश्चिमी यूरोप और अफ्रीका तथा दुनिया के हर गोरे मुल्क में इस बात पर बहस हो रही है कि आखिर हिन्दुस्तान ने परमाणु विस्फोट क्यों किया? उन्हें इस बात की परेशानी है कि जो देश इतने सालों तक हमारे नीचे गुलाम रहा हो, वह परमाणु बम बना कर पंच-छः राष्ट्रों की श्रेणी में कैसे आ गया है? उनके लिये यह एक बहुत ही आश्चर्यजनक बात बनी हुई है। जिस प्रकार से दुनिया दो हिस्सों में बंटी हुई है, उसी तरह से अफ्रीका का जो हिस्सा है वह यूरोप की गुलामी में था और एशिया का तीन चौथाई हिस्सा यूरोप की गुलामी में और पश्चिमी रंगिन दुनिया है वे गोरे लोगों के गुलाम बने हुए थे। आज अफ्रीका, कनाडा, लैटिन अमेरिका और आस्ट्रेलिया के जो आदिवासी लोग हैं, जिनके परिवारों की संख्या लाखों में थीं, वे सब समाप्त हो चुके हैं और उनकी केवल हम बर्तना ही कर सकते हैं। आज उनका कोई दिव्य देखने को नहीं मिलता है। ये लोग अब आये, कब बसे, कब इन्होंने सम्मति बनाई, यह तो दो सौ, तीन सौ साल का दिव्य है, उस पर जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब कभी दुनिया के रंगिन लोग तावतवर होंगे, तो फिर याद करेंगे कि हमारे किसी पुरखों ने अफ्रीका, कनाडा, आस्ट्रेलिया और लैटिन अफ्रीका को सम्मत्त देश बनाया और आज वहाँ पर गोरे लोगों का शासन चल रहा है। उनका जो वैभव है वह हमारी पुरखों के वैभव से ही मिलता हुआ है। इन लोगों ने मैक्सिको की सम्मति को नेस्तनाबूद करके

अपनी सम्मति बनाई। इस तरह का जो प्रसारवाद हुआ है, उसका इतिहास दो सौ और तीन सौ वर्ष पुराना है। ये लोग सम्मत्त रहे हैं कि जिन इलाकों को हम गुलाम नहीं कर सके, जिन इलाकों का हम शोषण नहीं कर सके, उनमूलन नहीं कर सके, वहाँ पर ये अब अपनी आर्थिक आतंक की दृष्टि से इन देशों की प्रगति को दबाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

मैं इसके साथ ही साथ इस बात का भी सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि विकासशील देशों में अपनी कुछ समानताएँ हैं, कुछ सांस्कृतिक समानताएँ हैं और कुछ वैचारिक समानताएँ हैं। जितने भी रंगिन देश हैं उनमें वहीं वहीं जो रस्मों-रिवाज हैं, रीति-रिवाज हैं, उपाचार पद्धति हैं, सामाजिक व्यवस्थाएँ हैं, अनेक सामाजिक व्यवस्थाएँ हैं वे हमारी तरह ही बनी हुई हैं। जिस प्रकार से अफ्रीका के आदिवासी पेड़ की पूजा करते हैं, वृक्ष के पूजक हैं, वृक्ष उनके लिए सबसे बड़ी तावत है, उसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान जैसे देश में भी वृक्ष एक पूजनीय वस्तु होती है। हमारा काफी सामंजस्य है इस पूरे परिवार से। हमारे सांस्कृतिक परिवार की शृंखला बहुत दूर तक फैली है। हमारी विदेश नीति की परिधि हमारे इस सांस्कृतिक परिवार को जितना अधिक बस सकेगी उतना अधिक सशक्त रूप से हमारी विदेश नीति दुनिया को प्रभावित कर सकेगी। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि आखिर विदेश नीति की जो सकलता है उसके मूल कारण को देखना जरूरी है। हमारी विदेश नीति राष्ट्रीय मूल्यों पर आधारित है। उन मूल्यों को हमारे देश में एक बड़े संग्राम के जरिये हासिल किया। उस संग्राम में जो मूल्य हासिल किये थे उन पर आधारित विदेश नीति दीर्घकालीन नहीं हो सकती है, जो अल्पकालीन सोपानों को पार करते हुए एक बड़े लक्ष्य को सामने रखा करती है। दूसरे देशों की विदेश नीति जो समय समय पर आलोचना प्रयासोचना या असफलता का शिकार होती है, मैं सम्मत्त

हूँ वे प्रभाववाद का शिकार हुआ करती है। अभी अमरीका के राजनिज बहस कर रहे हैं कि हमारी विदेश नीति दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया में आसन क्यों हुई, उतना कारण यह क्या है? लंबे चुनाव यह निकल आ है कि अमरीका की जो दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया की नीति थी वह प्रभाववाद की तरफ थी, एक अस्थाई समस्या को लेकर थी, एक निवेशवाद की नीति थी, तात्कालिक उन्मूलन की। हमारी विदेश नीति चमकती हुई न मालूम पड़े लेकिन दूरगामी है, दीर्घकालीन है और कुछ बड़े मानव मूल्यों को लेकर चलती है और मैं समझता हूँ वह सकलता के अखिरी चरण तक पहुँचेगी जहाँ वह दुनिया को एक करने में सकल हो सकेगी।

अब यह ताकत की जो धुरियाँ आज बन रही हैं एक ओर रूसी शक्ति की धुरी, दूसरी ओर अमरीका या पश्चिमी देशों की शक्ति की धुरी। इन दोनों धुरियों में कभी कभी गल-मिलीवल हुआ करता है। यह गल-मिलीवल की प्रक्रिया देते कि जरिये हुई है लेकिन यह गल-मिलीवल कितना कारगर हुआ है यह देखने की बात है। इस सबके बावजूद यह देश अपने अपने प्रभाव के क्षेत्र को बढ़ाने में निरन्तर प्रयत्नशील है। जहाँ तक गल-मिलीवल का मामला है मैं उससे सहमत हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे दुनिया में तनाव कम हुआ है। रूस की अपनी जो विदेशी महत्वाकांक्षाएँ हैं वे उतनी प्रसारवादी नहीं हैं, प्रभाववादी हैं। अमरीका की विदेशी महत्वाकांक्षाएँ प्रभाववादी तो हैं ही, प्रसारवादी भी हैं। दोनों की टकराहट होती रहती है और दोनों अपने प्रभाव के क्षेत्र को बढ़ाने के लिये अपना मोहरा दुनिया के रंगीन मुकों में लगाते रहते हैं। अलग अलग जगहों पर उनकी अलग अलग कूटनीति काम करती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर इस गल-मिलीवल के साथ दुनिया के अन्दर जो गरीबी और भूख है उसको मिलकर दूर करने का प्रयास हो सके तो श्रेयस्कर होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि

आगामी किसी भी देतों में या जो बड़ी शक्ति के गल-मिलीवल हों वहाँ भारत के विदेश मंत्री इस बात का प्रयास करें कि जिस प्रकार कैंसर के उन्मूलन के लिये रूस और अमरीका दोनों मिलकर प्रयोग कर रहे हैं, विज्ञान के, शोध के, स्वास्थ्य के कई क्षेत्रों में दो परस्पर विरोधी राष्ट्र मिल कर काम कर रहे हैं उसी प्रकार दो तिहाई दुनियां से गरीबी, अमानता और भूख को खत्म करने के लिये दोनों राष्ट्र, दोनों शक्तिशाली धुरियाँ कहीं मिल जायें ताकि एक नई दुनियां बन सके।

रंगीन और गैर-रंगीन के फर्क की एक ओर बुनियादी चीज मैं आपके द्वारा कहना चाहता हूँ - चीन और रूस का विवाद। रूस और अमरीका का गल-मिलीवल कुछ गलत लगता है।

चीन और रूस की सैद्धांतिक आधार भूमि एक है। उनकी बुनियाद एक है, सोचने की दृष्टि अलग अलग है, उनके मार्ग अलग अलग हैं, एक दूसरे के भविष्य की शैली अलग अलग है, लेकिन मैं उस विवाद में पड़ना नहीं चाहता कि अमुक सिद्धांत के भाष्य में कौन सही है और गलत? लेकिन एक बुनियाद से निकलने पर भी रूस और चीन अलग अलग हो रहे हैं, पड़ती होने पर भी अलग हो रहे हैं और आपस में दूरी होने पर भी, रंग भेद होने पर भी रूस और अमरीका आज नजदीक आते जा रहे हैं। (Time bill rings) यह दुनिया के लिये एक अच्छी घटना है। इससे आशा है लड़ाई और बड़ा युद्ध कुछ दूर हो रहेगा। मैं जल्दी ही समाप्त कर रहा हूँ।

इसके बाद मैं विदेश मंत्रालय के सम्बन्ध में कुछ सुझाव मंत्रीय मंत्री जो को देना चाहता हूँ। अभी वैदेशिक प्रचार की बाबत कहा गया है। मैं उस राय से सहमत हूँ। आपात कालीन स्थिति के लागू होने के बाद और उसके पहले भी हमारा विदेशी प्रचार विभाग शिथिल रहा है और हम सही ढंग से

[श्री जगदीश जोशी]

अपनी बातों को विदेशों में प्रभावकारी ढंग से बता नहीं सके हैं। अपने देश में भी विदेशी सम्बन्धी को और विदेशों में भी विदेशी सम्बन्धों को पूरी तरह से हम परिचित नहीं करा सके, वस्तुस्थिति से लोगों को पूरी तरह परिचित नहीं करा सके और केवल यह कह कर कि सारे लोग हमारे खिलाफ हैं हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी से बरी नहीं हो सकते। उन सारे लोगों में कुछ लोग हो सकते थे कि जो हमारे साथ आकर हमारी बात की सत्यता को परखने को तैयार हो सकते थे। तो इस विभाग के इस हिस्से को माननीय मंत्री जी को और गतिशील बनाने की चेष्टा करनी चाहिये।

इसके साथ साथ मैं एक सुझाव और देना चाहता हूँ। राजदूतों के चयन में एक प्रक्रिया रही है और अधिकांश में विभागीय सेवाओं के लोग ही राजदूत पदों पर भेजे जाते हैं। जो प्रक्रिया है वह अच्छी है या खराब, मैं इस बहस में नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन दुनिया के बहुत से बड़े देश ऐसे हैं कि जो अपने यहां के विश्वविद्यालयों से, उनके अनेक अन्य विभागों से ऐसे मूर्धन्य लोगों को लाने का प्रयास करते हैं विदेश सेवा में कि जिनके जाने से उनका वजन बढ़ सके। अमरीका जैसे देश में हार्वर्ड और दूसरे विश्वविद्यालयों के बड़े बड़े प्रोफेसर्स इस बात के लिये तैयार रहते हैं और उनकी आवश्यकता पड़ने पर विदेश सेवा में प्रयुक्त किया जा सकता है। हमारे देश में भी विद्वानों की कमी नहीं है। ऐसा ही है कि केवल भारतीय विदेश सेवा या सचिवालय में कार्य करने वाले ही तमाम कार्यों में प्रवीण हैं। मेरा सुझाव है कि जो लोग इंडियन फारेन सर्विस में हैं उनको कुछ वर्षों तक भारतवर्ष में भी सेवा करनी चाहिये ताकि वह इस देश को समझ कर इस देश की संस्कृति और इस देश की पद्धति और इसकी प्रक्रिया को हृदयंगम कर लें ताकि बाहर जाने पर वे यहां का सूच्चा प्रतिनिधित्व

कर सकें जैसे आज चीन कर रहा है और उसके अधिकारी हर देश में काफी गहराई तक पहुंचे हुये हैं। आप देखें कि उनका एक्यूंपंचर क्यों पापुलर हुआ। हिन्दुस्तान के हर कोने में हर गांव में बात और गठिया का इलाज करने वाले लोग हैं। यह हमारी बहुत पुरानी प्रक्रिया है, लेकिन चीन के एक्यूंपंचर का इतना प्रचार हुआ है कि हम पागल हो रहे हैं कि हर जगह उसका अस्पताल बन जाय। लेकिन आयुर्वेद पद्धति जो कानिक बीमारियों के लिये बहुत उपयोगी है उसकी शिक्षा का भी यहां पूरा प्रबन्ध नहीं है। हम यह नहीं बता सकते कि हमारे पास भी कोई औषधि विज्ञान है जो काफी प्रभावशाली है। तो ऐसी बहुत चीजें जो प्रभावी हो सकती हैं उनको देने की क्षमता हमारे दूतावास के कर्मचारियों में नहीं है जिनकी अलग अलग जिम्मेदारियां हैं। तो इस प्रकार के विशेषज्ञों को भी अगर आप कौंसिलर की जगह के लिये सोचें तो वह उपयोगी हो सकते हैं और इस देश का परिचय दुनिया को देने में वह सहायक सिद्ध होंगे।

मैं अन्त करते समय इतना और निवेदन करूंगा कि पश्चिम एशिया में जो डेलीगेशन आप भेजते हैं, जिन विद्वानों को आप भेजते हैं उनमें अगर फारसी और अरबी के विद्वानों को आप इस देश से भेज सके तो बड़ा काम हो सकता है। हमारे देश में फारसी और अरबी के विद्वानों की कमी नहीं है और उनका उपयोग हम इस कार्य के लिये कर सकते हैं वह काफी कारगर और प्रभावी होंगे बशर्ते कि हम उन लोगों को वैदेशिक नीति की प्रक्रिया के बारे में थोड़ा प्रशिक्षित कर सके।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समझता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री जी ने जो इस बीच अपने पड़ोस से तनाव खत्म किया है, जो पाकिस्तान और चीन के साथ सम्बन्ध अच्छे किये हैं, ये सब अच्छे परिणाम लाने में सफल हो सकेंगे मैं खास तौर पर पाकिस्तान से अच्छे सम्बन्धों

का अत्यन्त स्वागत करता हूँ। वह दिन भी मैं चाहता हूँ जब हिन्दुस्तान, पाकिस्तान, बंगलादेश आदि मिलकर व्यापार, आवागमन इन सारी चीजों पर बैठकर बात कर सकेंगे और हम लोग जो हिन्द महासागर के परिवार के लोग हैं, एक शक्तिशाली एका के तौर पर दुनिया के सामने चल सकेंगे।

SHRI PATTIAM RAJAN (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when we discuss foreign affairs, the recent developments in India's relations with her neighbouring countries should be reviewed. The decision taken by the Government....

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Please speak a little louder.

SHRI PATTIAM RAJAN. The decision taken by the Government of India to send an Ambassador to China is indeed a very welcome start.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Please speak into the mike.

SHRI PATTIAM RAJAN: This is a demand which has been made by our party for the last several years. But this demand was denounced not only by the ruling party, but also by the Opposition parties including the Right Communist Party, our CPI friends. I hope that further measures will be taken to bring India-China relations back to complete normalcy and to resolve all the outstanding problems and disputes between the two countries. Then, Sir the agreement arrived at between India and Pakistan, which has resolved many issues of dispute pending between these two countries, is equally important. In the opinion of Pakistan, a dispute formally exists in relation to Kashmir. That too should not pose any difficulty in finding a solution for it because the internal situation in Kashmir has changed with the settlement between the Central Government and Sheikh Abdullah. I would request the Government that it should make every effort to further

improve the relations between India and Pakistan and put the Kashmir problem out of the agenda.

Sir, I also support the stand taken by the Government in Angola although it has, as usual, taken much time to take such a decision. The recent visit of the Foreign Minister of the PRG of Vietnam, Mrs. Binh, is of great significance to India, Vietnam and to all other countries of South-East Asia and the purpose of her visit is also very important. Her visit to India took place at a particular time, that is, at the time of the joyous unification of North Vietnam and South Vietnam. Their fight against the American imperialism is memorable. It is high time that we rendered all the material help for the reconstruction of their country. When we are discussing the foreign policy of the Government, I would like to point out some issues stressed by Mrs. Binh in her public speech in New Delhi. One is about the nuclear base of the American imperialist in Diego Garcia and it is really a threat to the whole of Asia. Diego Garcia is being developed into a full-scale nuclear base, military base, by the Americans who are defying the international opinion and the protest of the people in the littoral States in the Indian Ocean area. The US imperialists have even defied the UN resolution which calls for turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. India must take the initiative in organising an international conference on this issue. The Government of India should take into account the view of Mrs. Binh that we are not living in an age when imperialists could command and the world would obey.

Sir, what is our stand towards American imperialism? I feel it is really an obeying mentality of this Government. I would like to point two or three examples.

What we did when a motion sponsored by the non-aligned countries in UN General Assembly to ask Indonesia to withdraw its military interventions in East Timor, is that we voted against

[Shri Pattian Rajan]

that motion? We also know that Indonesia wanted to grab East Timor with the help of American imperialism and Western countries. Again, in the case of UN Resolution sponsored by the socialist and non-aligned countries demanding the immediate withdrawal of American forces from South Korea, we abstained from voting to please the American imperialism.

Lastly, the Government has set up a joint economic commission with the United States and have signed Indo-American agreement. The multi-nationals and the CIA have been acting together to subvert democracy, topple Governments which do not give much concessions, bribe political figures and parties to change policy in their favour. These are no secrets now. Therefore, the Government must take appropriate lessons from the activities of the multi-national corporations throughout the world. The Lockheed corruption has brought this truth to the world. There are reports that some top Indian officials were also involved in this scandal. I would like to know whether the Government has taken any steps to enquire into this matter. I would urge upon the Government that they should adopt anti-imperialist policy and strengthen the non-alignment movement. Thank you.

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the External Affairs Minister is finding the discussion a little tame. It might also, in a way, be a compliment to the consensus that has been achieved on the foreign policy of this country.

Sir, I would like to distinguish between the foreign policy and the working of the External Affairs Ministry. There is some distinction between the two. Before I say anything about the working of the External Affairs Ministry, I should like to say something about policies.

I should like to begin by congratulating the Prime Minister, the hon. Foreign Minister and the External

Affairs Ministry for the initiative taken by them in bringing about normalcy in the relations between India and China and India and Pakistan. Sir, India and China are neighbours, and they have to live in peace and friendship. One hopes that the Chinese authorities would also realise this elementary and fundamental truth. You will recall, Sir, that in this House some of us had the occasion of advocating continual probing through quiet diplomacy on a global basis, for normal relations between India and China. Somehow, the relations between India and China and between India and Pakistan have got tied up. It is not our fault. But it was the belief of some of us that when relations improve they will improve with both of them at the same time. And that has been borne out by facts. All the same, I suggest that it should be the endeavour now of our diplomacy, again through quiet diplomacy, to do further probing and enlarge the trade and cultural relations with China, which we should begin by having economic relations and cultural exchanges, so that the problems between India and China can be resolved step by step. These two neighbours can resume their friendship once again. At the

4 P.M. same time, I should like to sound a note of warning, not to the hon. Foreign Minister who is far more knowledgeable about these matters but to many of us in the House and perhaps to many in the External Affairs Ministry I should like to warn that some people think that foreign policy is a game of using one country against another, to set one country against another, to put China against another, to put China against Russia, Russia against China, so on and so forth. I would submit that this attitude belies the whole experience of the last 25 years of the international structure that such a policy never succeeds in the end. A policy must be based on certain principles and one of the principles is not to try to play one country against

another. There is one more important principle that I think we have been advocating and putting forward. It is that our relations with one country should not and need not affect our relations with another country. This is what we have been saying. Our relations with China do not affect our relations with the Soviet Union and our relations with the Soviet Union need not be an impediment in the way of normalising our relations with China. I think this principle must be held fast. Foreign policy is not a game of nations trying to balance one against another. There is a certain balancing. I am not saying that there is no balancing. But it should not be thought in terms of playing a game of China *versus* Russia, Russia *versus* China and China and Pakistan *versus* Russia. We must hold fast to opening up of our options of relations with all countries of the world irrespective of our relations with other countries. I submit to the hon. Foreign Minister that consultations, clarity, candour and co-operation should remain the hallmark of our foreign policy.

Sir, we were talking about China. China is in a state of ferment and in a state of flux. There is one thing that we must be cautious about. It is that appearances should not be taken for reality and propaganda should not be confused for actual developments. We need not uncritically accept the facile explanations being heard in the corridors of Western academic circles about China. We must look towards the possible interest of China and the way those interests are perceived in Peking in order to understand the possible course of events and the policies of China. There are certain fundamental things which I should like to make clear. There is the vastness of China. There is the unevenness of developments within China. There is the long history and tradition of China. All these things cannot be wished away. There are the deep divisions within the ruling Chinese Communist Party. We must not also forget that the

party is no longer monolithic. It is in a period of transition from the Mao era to the post-Mao era and, as we know, the history of such transitions takes a long way. That will be true of China also. It is also somewhat unique that the period of transition is taking place even while Chairman Mao continues to tower the party. It is because of his frail health and because of the deep divisions at the very top that there is a struggle for successions and there is a struggle for power. There is also a struggle for policy. There are groups within the bureaucracy and the army, supporters of the late Chou En-lai and the disgraced Teng Hsiao-ping and the group of Mrs. Mao Madam Ching Ching. Obviously, Chairman Mao hopes that the last group of Mrs. Mao would succeed them into power. But we must be aware of the complexity of the struggle. There is no single explanation. It is not just a question of who was offering how much money to the army. It is not a question of mechanisation of agriculture and who was offering how much to agriculture. It is a question of the whole gamut of industrialisation and modernisation and the policies that should fit into this framework of modernisation. It is a question of technology that China has already achieved and the most feasible policies for advancing China towards the higher technological and modern development. These are the questions and problems around which the struggle is going on. Then there is also a question of attitude towards the Soviet Union, attitude towards Africa, attitude towards the United States, attitude towards other parts of the world. All these are parts of the

[Dr. V.P. Dutt]
struggle and the struggle will go on for a long time.

Sir, today, no one denies, not even the most obstinate and diehard observers in the West that we have been gradually entering a new phase in world affairs. There are, of course, people who prefer the familiar—and comfortable for them—situation of a world divided between two powers, all supporters and allies and adversaries, a system in which the lines of conflict are sharply drawn. But, Sir, they also know that this is a thing of the past, a will-o-the-wisp of the future. We are heading towards a mixed international system. And I say our foreign policy must have a certain world framework in which to operate—non-alignment anti colonialism, anti-imperialism and peace. All these are the principles which were laid down by Jawaharlal Nehru. But at the same time, we must have an evolving world situation, framework of an evolving world situation in which to operate, and say that we are heading towards a mixed international system in which both the allies and the adversaries will be held in a situation of growing fundamental co-operation. We are in the midst of a transformation, certainly a drastic modification of the structure of international relations. To begin with, I will say, although there is plenty of violence at the local and regional levels, at the world level, the utility of violence is neither the same nor is the rationality of violence the same as it was a few years ago, so that violence and the threat of violence are not necessarily now as feasible as they were ten years or fifteen years ago. In other words, violence and the threat of violence have to be virtually ruled out at the world level. Secondly, I would say that the logic of world economy and technological development makes for the logic of integration, for the countries coming closer together whereas the logic of traditional international state policies is the logic of separateness. The balance of

power is now, even in the West, generally acknowledged to be as dead as a dodo. And what many in the West now fear is not the breakdown of the balance but the breakdown of the rules of co-operation. It is that what they are afraid of. And those in the United States, who were fed on the virtues of a bi-polar world, began to examine the merits of a tri-polar world. They regarded the international system in terms of the Soviet Union and China revolving round the United States in a new triangular relationship in which, of course, the United States was the apex balancer. Sir, this too was a chimera. The merging international structure was not tri-polar any more than it was bi-polar. But, then, their hopes and expectations were centred round a five-power balance; balance there must be of two powers, three powers or five powers, a five-power balance as it was put and I quote:

“A strong healthy United States, Europe, Soviet Union, China and Japan, each balancing the other in an even balance.”

[This reflected of course, the views of Dr. Kissinger, who is known for his admiration and penchant for the classical European balance of power. They were hoping and their policies were aimed at having three powers, then five major competing powers established to give a framework within which each would operate. This was patently an attempt to restore the Bismarckian system of the 19th century, the century of secret diplomacy. But Sir, if history affords any lesson then even Germany had to choose finally between the Russian and the Austrian connection that ended the Bismarckian attempt at being both master and part of the balance. This was the evil, the master and part of the balance at the same time. And if I might quote the most establishment-mind, Western authority of the establishment, the late Mr. Alastair Buchan, what he had to say about this five-power balance. He said and I quote:

"It also involved a somewhat naive conception of the international system in assuming that if these five-power centres could keep their relations and balance, the rest of the world would be at peace, which ignored the influence of India, the Arab States, Indonesia and many other significant international actors. The only capital where it was welcomed was Peking."

Sir, this is the problem that I have mentioned and the problem precisely is that they want to be the master of the balance as well as a part of it. Old habits persist even when the old order heaves its death pangs and there are important people proclaiming that they were still the first in the world and that they still wanted to be the leader and teacher of the world.

Sir, today the most important, the most urgent, the most crucial and the most complex problem before the international community is the creation of a new world economic order. The rules of trade and finance that prevailed earlier were prescribed at Brettonwoods and at GATT and they were those as wanted by the United States. They established a donor-exchange standard and tolerated only those exceptions like the Common Market, which were expected to be beneficial to the Atlantic alliance. But this system, as we know, collapsed under the weight of the monetary crisis of 1971 and 1972. Now it is said that we should establish a more moderate international system but the irony of it is that still the current policy remains the current policy of the big powers, remains that of preserving and increasing their advantages in the new economic world order and, this, I believe, is the heart of the problem—eating your cake and still having it. The building of the economic world order, as suggested by them, smacks too much of new colonial thrust which would perpetuate the hold of the rich and the strong over the poor and the

weak in the world and that obviously is not a balance in the order in a situation that can be accepted by the developing countries, by the non-aligned world, by the poor and the weak. Sir, what is happening in the Indian Ocean and the Gulf region? They are trying to preserve and increase influence while we want to establish a new balance which is more moderate. Today, tensions are being created in the Indian Ocean, particularly in the Gulf region, in the name of stability, security, securing of oil supplies and securing of channels and lines of communications. In fact, today we see in the Gulf particularly, a policy of indiscriminate sale of arms, a policy of cold war, a policy of revival of spheres of influence. Sir, last year, the U.S. sold arms amounting to about 9 billion dollars. Of these arms worth 4.4 billion dollars were sold to a handful of Gulf countries. Fifty-six per cent of the total arms sale was made to a few countries in the Gulf region. In fact, Sir, virtually the whole of this military aid went to two countries, Iran and Saudi Arabia. In fact, this means that half of the arms sale virtually—not exactly, but virtually—of the world is going to the two countries of the world. Iran and Saudi Arabia. Then, Sir, last year, the Soviet Union and the East European countries agreed to supply 360 million dollars worth of arms to Iraq; France sold one billion dollars worth of arms to the Gulf States and Britain followed with 500 million dollars worth of arms; Germany with 120 million dollars worth of arms. Kennedy once said that this sale, this indiscriminate sale of arms far beyond the needs of these countries, will not promote stability in the region. Whether they promote the independence of the countries of this region or not, in fact what we are buying is not a future but an immediate instability and conflict in the region.

Sir, in this situation, we have said before and we would like to emphasise now that not only the developing

[Dr. V.P. Dutt]

countries but particularly the non-aligned countries have a major and a substantial and important and vital role to play because, as I said, the old balance is dead and gone and in the creation of a more just new world political and economic order, the non-aligned countries, through their principled stand, can promote not only the interests of all the developing countries but the interests of peace and justice in the world. . . :

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Wind up now.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Just two or three minutes, Sir, as you know, I will not speak in the rest of the Session. I assure you. Therefore, the most vital task before us, before the non-aligned countries is the strengthening of the unity of nations—unity of all non-aligned countries. That, I believe, is urgent because without that unity it will not be possible for the non-aligned countries to play their role in substantially altering the previous world political and economic order.

Sir, now, I come to the final point about the working of the External Affairs Ministry. Sir, I am not saying that the External Affairs Ministry is not working well, or is not functioning well. Obviously, when policies are good, certainly, the External Affairs Ministry also should be given credit for it. But I do believe that there are lacunae, there are gaps and there are many fields which need to be immediately looked into and re-examined. In the first instance, I am not sure if the External Affairs Ministry officials—I am not talking of one or two or three or a few here—there are some very brilliant people here, I have no doubt about it, and the people at the top particularly have vision and ideas...

But certainly, I would say that the Ministry of External Affairs should activate itself in the light of the vision which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru held before us. We must be sure of the

priorities. Apart from the principles that I have mentioned, namely non-alignment, anti-colonialism, anti-racism and peace and justice in the world, our priorities, which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru mentioned, are: the South-East Asian countries, the West Asian countries, the African countries, the big powers and the European countries. Our neighbours also include China and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is also a neighbour of us. These are our priorities. In the light of these priorities, the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs must be activated. Now that these changes are taking place, I would suggest that there should be a reorganisation of the working of the Ministry of External Affairs with a stress on efficiency, on division of labour and on this perspective vision and thinking. This is what has been lacking. There has been too much of adhocism in the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs. I would suggest that we should now be more methodical, more efficient and more logical in our functioning. I do not have enough time to elaborate this idea. I hope I will have another opportunity to do so.

There is one final point. While there are officers abroad who are doing a good job, who are alert and who know the policies of the country, there are also quite a few of them who are absolutely apathetic, who are inactive and who are not in sympathy with the basic policies and points of view of this country. I think the time has come to take a look at this issue. There must be some accountability. Our officers abroad must also feel that they are accountable for the good work that they do and also for the lack of initiative and for the lack of sympathy for the country's policies that many of them show. I think some accountability must be brought into the picture now. I know there are many who have been privately sniping at the recent developments in the country and whereas the diplomats of

other countries are active, some of our people sit at home, I will not say doing what. We all know what some of them do. But at the same time, this should not be taken to mean that there are not good and active officers; there are many. I am making a distinction between the two. At the same time, they must be made accountable for the kind of work they are doing and for the kind of work they are not doing and which they are expected to do. Sir, in conclusion, I would say that the hon. External Affairs Minister knows too well that yesterday's situation was one of central balance between a handful of powers and imperialism which pushed back the limits of the diplomatic world. Tomorrow's situation must be one of a complex balance of forces, not balance of power, of an emerging community, in which competition would still persist, of course, but in which the world community would decide that it would substitute the war against nature for the war against mankind as it is carrying on today. All our efforts should be bent towards fighting the first, namely, the war against nature and injustice.

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON (Kerala): Sir, I am very thankful to the hon. External Affairs Minister for this opportunity to discuss the working of his Ministry. As has been pointed out, two recent very significant developments stand out in bold relief, highlighting our policy of peace, friendship and cooperation and the fact that we have no permanent estrangement. These are in regard to the improvement of our relations with China and Pakistan. The proposed resumption of diplomatic ties with China and Pakistan and that of our broken communication and other links with Pakistan, has strengthened the links of understanding and goodwill. These are welcome changes. Sir, the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister deserve a special tribute from the House for the vision and tact with which such rapport has been established. I am not exaggerat-

ing the importance of these two events and to read into them that all our problems with these countries are over. All the same, a start has been made and let us hope that the overtures now being made will be the beginning of a fresh understanding and an era of more friendly relationship with these two countries.

This House has been persistently asking for such steps and we are deeply grateful that our hopes have borne some fruit at last. There is no doubt that India's stock abroad has gone up. There is a more sincere effort to understand our policy. The Commonwealth Conference held here in Delhi, I feel, had been very useful to show leaders of public opinion from outside as to what is happening in India. To quote Madame Jenny Lee, the British M.P., "Crocodile tears need not be shed for India". If anyone thinks our foreign policy is just a few ideologies, then he is very much mistaken. We have certainly held fast to our basic values. But while adhering to them, our policy has not remained a passive or a quiet one. It has been a very live policy, dynamic and quick to respond to changed situations. It is also closely linked with our defence and our economy. It projects our concern to prevent any erosion of our independence while stabilising our social, political and economic developments. Sir, as the Prime Minister stated, "We are neither blind to reality nor acquiesce to any challenge from whatever quarter it may come. Yet we are not senseless enough to give way to a feeling of littleness or irritation since nothing serious can come out of it."

The hon. Foreign Minister has often very correctly stressed also the fact that in all these developments the whole nation has backed the Government time and again, which shows the national strength and the clarity of our policy.

[Shrimati Leela Damodara Menon]

One feels happy that our early concept of non-alignment has become more mature and practical. Whereas then there were hardly 27 countries, today there are more than 100 out of the 144 members of the UN. Tried on the anvils of experience and events, the non-aligned countries have now expanded the content and scope of co-operation among themselves. Sir, the coming non-aligned meet in Colombo will be very crucial, coming in the wake of the UNCTAD in Nairobi. I feel that there must be some clear-cut programme of combined economic defence which will have to be chalked out before planning the economic infra-structure. The Special UN session had chalked out certain basic norms of economic co-operation. The UN Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States has laid down that economic relations based on equity, sovereign equality and inter-dependence of developed and developing nations contribute to a balance expansion of world economy. But the developed nations with 80 per cent of world trade, 95 per cent of the private investments and 70 per cent of global resources have spread their nets far and wide, and may be reluctant to show an understanding spirit towards the third world. Even the Helsinki spirit is now becoming dimmer. As our Prime Minister pointed out at Algiers in 1973, "There is an unconscious desire in small affluent sections of humanity to continue as an oasis of prosperity in the midst of vast wastelands of want. Threats and subtle persuasions are being used to prevent the developing nations from consolidating their strategy for development. India has certainly given a lead in contributing to the Special Fund at Nairobi. Let us hope there will be a more realistic appraisal of the problems of the poorer nations. International co-operation should enable us to do away with unfavourable trade practices and monopolies. We hope the Colombo Conference will take this point as one of the very important topics for discussion. Sir, in

the present-day world, based on scientific capabilities, new platforms are being made of political and economic pressurisation. I am not going into this matter further because it has been raised in this House more than once.

We feel that the agreements arrived at with Sri Lanka regarding maritime boundaries, settlement of the border disputes with Burma, agreements with Iran, Iraq, Indonesia, Nepal, Afghanistan and other countries mean a very impressive achievement, especially on account of the smooth and friendly way in which these agreements have been arrived at.

Many Members have already spoken on our support to the Angolan popular Government and our active sympathy with the coloured people of Rhodesian South Africa who are still suffering from inhuman policies of a racist white minority regime. Sir, that is in keeping with the fine and just spirit of anti-colonialism and anti-apartheid that we have been advocating for half a century. I agree with Shri Prakash Veer Shastri when he said that we should have more close contacts with African countries—that more than just political contacts, cultural and other contacts could be made with them.

The World Bank's tribute to India for having successfully contained inflation and increased food production, is not only a certificate to our economic restructuring after the declaration of the emergency, but it is also a fitting answer to those people who say that all is not well with India. We are a struggling nation with more than 200 million people below the poverty line. For the nation still not brought out of the evil effects of foreign domination, to have achieved this stupendous task of curtailing spiralling prices and containing inflation, increasing production, really shows the presence of national strength and solidarity. I am sorry to find that the Indians abroad do not realise this. Some of our politically frustrated leaders have gone abroad and are carrying on an anti-Indian Government propaganda,

It is a pity that Indians have gone abroad and used foreign platforms to carry on a tirade against India. Many of our Indians abroad have very little contact with the mainland for their individual reasons, and they do not often know what exactly is happening here from time to time. I think, it would be good if our Embassies called the Indians in their areas and gave them the necessary details, so that on their own they could carry on the propaganda that would really be an answer to the anti-Indian propaganda carried on by some of the Indians themselves and others.

We are shocked to hear of the new anti-Indian wave in the U.K. It may be a reflection of the U.K.'s own economic problems and the new awakened colour consciousness. But I feel that sufficient precautions should be taken to safeguard the lives of the Indians abroad where such prejudices make them vulnerable to physical attacks. We have been reading in the newspapers about the Indian students and others being attacked without their being aware of such happenings. Therefore, the lives of the people abroad should be protected and I think the Government of India should take necessary steps to discuss the matter with the U.K. Government. The Canadian decision to repudiate unilaterally an agreement which had been arrived at after a long discussion and detailed consideration has been an unpleasant surprise. I do not want to speak more about it because it has already been discussed in detail; I know that it would be receiving the consideration of the Government. But I do feel that the only answer to this is to gear up our own scientists to reach nuclear capability on our own. Our achievements in this respect have been very significant. And I think Dr. Sethna and his colleagues should be on this big task of giving an answer to the Canadian withdrawal by getting our own nuclear capability and seeing to it that no project of ours is halted because of this sudden decision of the Canadian Government.

I hope that our problems with Bangladesh would be discussed and that the Government of Bangladesh will also take up an attitude not of confrontation but of friendliness and thus, they would come to peaceful decisions. I am speaking particularly with reference to the Farakka problem. Then we would really have a feeling that our attempt to extend the hand of peaceful co-operation and of friendliness with our neighbour could be successful.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the External Affairs Minister and his colleague for the very good way in which they have conducted the affairs during these last few months.

I agree with Dr. Dutt with some of the things that he said. I read a report about curtailing the funds which we are now allotting to our Embassies abroad. But I hope that no funds will be curtailed which would be going into propaganda purposes. Every time we go to any foreign embassy, the main problem that we find is that there is not sufficient material with regard to the latest developments in our own country, which could be handed out to the people who want to know about them. I think this House will readily allot funds for increasing the propaganda medium of our embassies abroad.

I also agree with Dr. Dutt that some of the officials could be given an orientation with regard to what is happening in India. Some of them are more concerned with the problems in those countries where they are posted than with what is happening here. They might be a few in number but they could create trouble for us. Therefore I say that some sort of reorganisation in this regard should be there. At the same time I pay a tribute to many of our officers abroad who have done a very good job.

Thank you.

श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे (नाम-निर्देशित) :
माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, सबसे पहले

[श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे]

तो मैं जो प्रगति की रिपोर्ट वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बंध में विदेश मंत्रालय की ओर से प्रस्तुत की गई है, उसके संबंध में भारत सरकार को, विदेश मंत्रालय को, अपने प्रधान मंत्री को और अपने विदेश मंत्री को साधुवाद देना चाहता हूं। प्रश्न यह है कि आज जिस वैदेशिक नीति पर हम अमल कर रहे हैं, क्या कांग्रेस के लिए यह कोई नई वैदेशिक नीति है? मैं सिर्फ यह बतलाना चाहूंगा कि सन् 1935, 1936 और 1937 के बाद तमाम कांग्रेस के अधिवेशनों में जिस वैदेशिक नीति की उद्घोषणा की गई थी, हम आज भी उसका पालन कर रहे हैं। हम कोई नई नीति नहीं बना रहे हैं। हमारी यह नीति तब निर्धारित हुई थी जब कि आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी ने अपने यहां एक फारन डिपार्टमेंट खोला था और मेरे भाई डा० जेड० ए० अहमद जो यहां बैठे हुए हैं, उनको इसका चार्ज दिया गया था। हम उसी नीति का पालन कर रहे हैं। क्या आज कोई नयी दोस्ती सोवियत रूस के साथ हमारी हो रही है? पहले जब रवीन्द्र नाथ ठाकुर सोवियत रूस गए थे तो उन्होंने वहां की सोवियत संस्कृति को देखा, नई मानवता के निर्माण को देखा और प्रसन्नता से भर कर अपने जो पत्र यहां भेजे उसमें सोवियत नीति का समर्थन किया, सोवियत रूस में नयी मानवता जिस तरह से बन रही है उसकी प्रशंसा की, तो सारे देश ने उसको स्वीकार किया। मुझे याद है 1940-41 में और उसके बाद 1942 के बाद जब हिटलर की सेनाओं ने सोवियत रूस पर हमला किया था और सोवियत की सेनाएं पीछे हटती गईं तो गांधीजी बहुत चिंतित हुए, आगा खा महल की डायरी में उल्लेख आता है कि सोवियत रूस हार नहीं सकता, सोवियत रूस अजेय है; अगर सोवियत रूस हार जाएगा तो दुनिया में गरीबों का कौन बेली रह जाएगा। ये उनके वाक्य थे। शुरू में पं० मोती लाल नेहरू रूस गए, जवाहरलाल जी रूस गए और उसके बाद निरंतर हमारे

देश में सोवियत देश में जो नये मानववाद का गठन हो रहा था उस पर रोशनी पड़ती गई। लेकिन सोवियत रूस भी, मुझको जानकर आश्चर्य हुआ, 1962 में जब मैंने वहां के ऑरियेंटल डिपार्टमेंट के डाइरेक्टर से सुना मास्को में, कि उन्होंने गांधी जी की आत्मकथा प्रकाशित की है रूसी भाषा में। मैंने पूछा कि क्या आपने 1962 में पहला संस्करण गांधी जी की आत्मकथा का प्रकाशित किया, तो उन्होंने बड़े अफसोस से कहा कि कुछ हिन्दुस्तानी कम्युनिस्टों में जिनमें रजनी पाम दत्त और एम० एन० राय प्रमुख थे, गांधी जी की जो तस्वीर हमें दी वह गलत थी और जब हमने नए सिरे से इवैल्युएशन किया तो इस परिणाम पर पहुंचे कि गांधी जी के बराबर एक डाएनेमिक पर्सनेलिटी, जनता को ऊंचा उठाने वाली पर्सनेलिटी, भारत में कोई दूसरी नहीं है जिन्होंने कि भारत में करोड़ों करोड़ जनता को फीयरलेसनेस का पहला पाठ पढ़ाया और उनको तैयार किया इस हद तक कि दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी इम्पीरियलिस्ट पावर का वे सामना कर सके, निहत्थे होकर। तो माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इसलिए हमने यह देखा कि सोवियत देश में, जब भी आड़े माँके पर हमारी कोई समस्या आई, चाहे वह काश्मीर की समस्या हो चाहे पाकिस्तान की समस्या हो चाहे वह गोवा की समस्या हो, चाहे वह बंगलादेश की समस्या हो, सोवियत देश ने अपने वीटो को भारत के हक में इस्तेमाल किया। अगर वे भारत के हक में वीटो इस्तेमाल नहीं करते तो मालूम नहीं परिस्थिति क्या होती, कैसी विषम परिस्थिति बन जाती।

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस समय पण्डित जवाहरलाल नेहरू से पूछा गया कि भारत की वैदेशिक नीति क्या हो तो उन्होंने ध्यान दिलाया कि, भारत की वैदेशिक नीति पर रोशनी डालते हुए, कि भगवान बुद्ध ने कहा था कि युद्ध से युद्ध का शमन

नहीं होता, हिंसा से हिंसा का शमन नहीं होता, नफरत से नफरत का शमन नहीं होता बल्कि प्रेम से और शान्ति से शमन होता है।

जब उनसे पूछा गया कि आपने अपने राष्ट्रीय झण्डे में अशोक का धार्मिक चक्र क्यों स्थापित किया तो उन्होंने यही उत्तर दिया था कि यह धर्मचक्र शांति का प्रतीक है, यह धर्मचक्र युद्ध के विरोध का प्रतीक है, यह धर्मचक्र ऐसी नीतियों का प्रतीक है जिन नीतियों पर चल कर विश्व में शांति कायम हो सकती है।

आप देखें उसके बाद जब देश आजाद हुआ, एक के बाद एक, हर एक पड़ोसी देशों से हमने दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया। बॉइंग सम्मेलन हमारा एक नया कदम था; उसके बाद बराबर सम्मेलन होते गए। हमारी जो नीति थी नान् एलाइन्मेंट की, पहले तो उसका मज़ाक उड़ाया गया; जब नान् एलाइन्मेंट की बात हमारे लोगों ने यू० एन० ओ० में की तो जोजफ स्टालिन ने उसका मज़ाक उड़ाया। लेकिन बाद में सोवियत रूस के दूसरे लोगों ने, दूसरे नेताओं ने—खुश्नोव ने, ब्रेज़नेव ने, और दूसरे नेताओं ने—उसकी कद्र की। उन्होंने उसको एक ऐसा अमूल्य राजनैतिक सिद्धान्त स्वीकार किया और खुद घावणा की कि बिना किसी देश की जीवन नीति में, जीवन दर्शन में, दखल दिए वहाँ की राजनीति में दखल हुए, हम उसके साथ मैत्री संबंध कायम रख सकते हैं और इसमें कोई बाधा नहीं पड़ सकती है।

दूसरी तरफ चीन के साथ जो सब से बड़ी मुश्किल आई वह यह थी कि चीन एशियाई देशों को अपनी परिधि के अन्दर लाना चाहता था। चीन यह समझता था कि जब तक एक भी देश कम्युनिस्ट परिधि से बाहर है तब तक कम्युनिज्म की लड़ाई जारी रहेगी यह लड़ाई रुक नहीं सकती है। आज हम ने पहले दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया है चीन के साथ। रूस के साथ भी हमने दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया

था और वह दिनों दिन पक्की होती गई। लेकिन चीन के साथ जो हमारे सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए थे उनमें व्याघात आया और यह प्रश्न उस समय आया जब हमारे देश के ऊपर हमला हुआ। किन्तु जब बर्टेन्ड रसैल ने अपना पैगाम भेजा। उस समय जवाहरलाल नेहरू जीवित थे। उनका मुझसे यह है कि बार्डर डिस्प्यूट को हल करने के लिए इवन नम्बर आफ चैक पोस्ट कायम किये जायें तो आसानी के साथ डेडलाक का मसला हल हो सकता है। पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने जवाब दिया था कि आप इवन नम्बर आफ चैक पोस्ट की बात कर रहे हैं, मैं तो जीरो नम्बर आफ चैक पोस्ट पर भी राजी हूँ। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि इस बारे में कोलम्बो पार्वस से सलाह मशवरा कर लिया जाए और अगर वे लोग राजी है तो मुझे इस बारे में कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन जब तक रसल के एमिसरीज सीलोन पहुँचे, जब तक उनके एमिसरीज यू० ए० आर० पहुँचे, उसी बीच जवाहर लाल नेहरू की मृत्यु हो गई और वह समस्या अपनी जगह पर ज्यों की त्यों कायम रही।

उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या लोग वह दिन भूल गये जब कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू चाहते थे कि सारी समस्याओं का हल शान्ति के साथ किया जाए। लेकिन हमारे देश के राजनीतिक दलों ने, दलों ने तरह तरह की बाधाएँ खड़ी कीं। वे लोग नहीं चाहते थे कि किसी तरह से कोई शांति कायम हो। उन्होंने शान्ति के रास्ते में रुकावट डाली और सुलाह के मार्ग में बाधाएँ डालीं। उन्होंने देश के अन्दर इस तरह का वातावरण पैदा किया जिसकी बजह से हम जो शान्ति का कदम आज उठा रहे हैं वे आज से वर्षों पहले ही उठ गया होता। उन देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध सामान्य हो गए होते आज हमें जिस परेशानी का सामना करना पड़ रहा है वहन करना पड़ता है।

उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न यह है कि हमारी विदेशी नीति की धुरी क्या है? हमारी

[श्री विश्वभरनाथ पांडे]

धुरी यह है, जैसे कि महाभारत के समय—भीष्म पितामह जब शर शय्या पर पड़े थे और जब सूर्य उत्तरायण में प्रवेश करने वाला था उस समय श्री कृष्ण ने युद्धिष्ठिर से कहा कि भीष्म प्राण त्याग कर रहे हैं, उन्हें चलकर प्रणाम कर लो और उनका परामर्श ले लो। भीष्म-पितामह ने युद्धिष्ठिर को जो उपदेश विदेश नीति के बारे में दिया वह शान्ति पर्व में दर्ज है। उन्होंने कहा कि विदेश नीति की धुरी यह होनी चाहिए कि सब से पहले अपना देश शक्ति सम्पन्न हो। यह पहली शर्त है। दूसरी शर्त यह है कि पड़ोसी देशों के साथ मित्रता के सम्बन्ध हों। तीसरी बात यह है कि अपने ऐसे राजदूत बाहर के देशों से भेजो, जो भारत की सभ्यता, संस्कृति, भारत का प्रेम, भारत का व्यापार और भारत के साथ दूसरे देशों के लोगों के साथ मित्रता को कायम रख सकें। वही नीति हमारी बराबर चलती आ रही है। वही नीति चन्द्र गुप्त ने अपनाई और वही नीति अशोक ने अपनाई जिसने दुनिया के कौने-कौने में भारत की मित्रता के सम्बन्ध कायम किये। उस समय भारत के लोग किसी देश की जीतने के लिए नहीं गये, किसी से लड़ने के लिए नहीं गये। उस समय चीन के साथ दो पड़ोसी देशों की तरह हमारे मैत्री सम्बन्ध थे। दो हजार वर्षों से इस तरह के सम्बन्ध बने हुए थे। हमारी सेना ने कभी चीन पर आक्रमण नहीं किया और न ही हमारे लोग चीन की सीमा के भीतर शस्त्र लेकर गये। हमारे देशवासी तो इस देश की कला, संस्कृति और सभ्यता को लेकर वहां गये। इसी वजह से भारत अजात शत्रु बना। भारत ने किसी के मन में यह भावना नहीं पनपने दी कि वह किसी का शत्रु है बल्कि भारत तो सभी का मित्र है। और आज वही नीति हम बराबर दोहरा रहे हैं कि भारत सबके साथ मैत्री सम्बन्ध रखना चाहता है। लेकिन क्या परिस्थिति थी 1965 में? लोग यह इल्जाम लगा रहे थे कि भारत का कोई मित्र नहीं है, भारत आज अकेला

है, भारत का कोई साथ देने वाला नहीं है। दस वर्ष के बाद जब कि भारत अपनी विदेश नीति पर दृढ़ता से डटा रहा आज कैफियत यह है हम दिल्ली में देखते हैं कि रोज नये नत झण्डे बदलते हैं, किसी न किसी प्रधानमंत्री का हम स्वागत करते हैं। आज यह मालूम पड़ता है कि भारत के आंगन में विभिन्न मित्र देशों के प्रधानमंत्रियों का मेला लगा हुआ है। मान्यवर, अध्यक्ष महोदय हमारी विदेश नीति अवसरवादिता की नीति नहीं है। हमारे कुछ सिद्धान्त हैं। जिस समय इजरायल का मामला आया, फिलिस्तीन का मामला आया दुनिया भर के यहूदियों को इस्राइल बसाने का मामला आया, गांधी जी पहले व्यक्ति थे जिन्होंने इसका घोर विरोध किया। उन्होंने कहा कि दुनिया भर के लोगों को वहां बसाया जाए और बहा के निवासियों को बहार निकाला जाए यह सिद्धान्त गलत है, यह ठीक नहीं है। गांधीजी ने यह बात उस जमाने में कही थी। उसी नीति का बराबर भारत पालन करता रहा है और उस पर डटा हुआ है। भारत हर एक के साथ मैत्री चाहता है।

इस सदन में कहा गया कि अरब देशों के साथ हमारी मैत्री बढ़नी चाहिए। भारत की मैत्री अरब देशों के साथ कितनी पुरानी है इसका लेख-जोखा नहीं किया जा सकता। हमारे यहां से कितने ही लोग वहां पहुंचे, साधू, संत और विद्वान वहां गये। मुझको हैरत हुई जब मैंने बहुत बड़ी संख्या में विदेशों के म्यूजियम में भारत के वे ग्रंथ रखे हुए देखे जिनका अनुवाद अरबी में किया गया था। अरब से ही भारतीय ग्रंथों का अनुवाद यूरोपीय भाषाओं में हुआ। उन्होंने भारतीय सभ्यता को दूसरे देशों में फैलाया। उदाहरण के लिए अरेबिक न्यूमिरल्स म्वय अरब बहते हैं वे अरेबिक न्यूमिरल्स नहीं हैं। अरब उनको 'हिन्दस' कहते हैं। यानी वे उसको हिन्दुस्तान की चीज मानते हैं।

हमारी विदेश नीति की धुरी क्या है। हमारे विदेश नीति की धुरी यह है कि हम

विश्व शान्ति चाहते हैं। दूसरा मुद्दा यह है कि हम निशस्त्रीकरण चाहते हैं। तीसरा मुद्दा यह है कि हम अपने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ प्रेम का सम्बन्ध चाहते हैं, चाहे उसमें हमें थोड़ा बहुत त्याग करना पड़े। चौथी चीज यह है कि हम बाहर के देशों के साथ, दूर फैले हुए देशों के साथ मैत्री सम्बन्ध कायम करना चाहते हैं और उसके साथ हर तरह का आदान-प्रदान करना चाहते हैं जिससे एक दूसरे को सहायता मिले। लेकिन भारत जहाँ दूसरे से आदान-प्रदान की बात कहता है दूसरे देशों से कुछ लेन-देन की बात करता है वहाँ पहली शर्त यह है कि हम बिना किसी स्ट्रिंग के सहायता लेंगे, हम ऐसी सहायता नहीं लेंगे जो हमको बांधे, हमको मजबूर करे, हम किसी खास काम करने को बाधित हों। भारत की विदेश नीति का पाँचवाँ मुद्दा यह है कि वह किसी भी कैम्प में किसी गुट में शामिल नहीं होना चाहता। छठी चीज यह है कि जो डेवलपिंग नेशन हैं उनको भारत सहायता देना चाहता है और जो भी टेक्नीकल नो-हाऊ उसके पास है वह उनके साथ शेयर करना चाहता है। अपनी दिक्कतें होते हुए भी वह इस तरह के देशों को हर तरह की सहायता देने में तत्पर रहता है। मान्यवर अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह भारतीय वैदेशिक नीति है जिसका पालन हमारी प्रधानमंत्री, विदेश मंत्री और विदेश मंत्रालय कर रहा है।

एक बात की ओर मैं विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाना चाहूँगा। 1962 में मुझको याद है जब मैं सोवियत रुम में था तब पहली चीज जो वहाँ प्रकाशित हुई इंडिया चाइना कन्फ्लिक्ट के बाद वह चीन के पक्ष की रिपोर्ट थी जो उन्होंने मास्को में वितरित की थी। हमारे राजदूत के पास वह रिपोर्ट नहीं आयी। मुझे मास्को यूनिवर्सिटी के एक भारतीय विद्यार्थी ने वह रिपोर्ट दी तो मैंने उसको ले जा कर कोल महोदय को दिया। वह बहुत खुश हुए, और कहने लगे कि हम

को इस की प्रति अभी तक नहीं मिली। लोग जानना चाहते थे कि भारत का पक्ष क्या है वह हम को मालूम होना चाहिए, लेकिन भारत के पक्ष की कोई चीज उन के हाथ में उम वक्त तक नहीं आयी थी। चार हफ्ते बाद भारत के पक्ष में एक सुस्तक निकली और वह उन के पास आयी। तो अगर ऐसी ढील होगी हमारे प्रचार में, हमारे पक्ष के समर्थन में, तो हमारा कैम्प डिफाल्ट में चला जाएगा। लोग क्या जानेंगे कि भारत का पक्ष क्या है? बहुत से ऐसे मामले होते हैं कि जिन पर अगर वक्त से रोशनी नहीं डाली जाती तो लोग एक राय बना लेते हैं हमारे पास पत्र आते हैं वेस्ट जर्मनी से, अमरीका से और दूसरे देशों से और उनमें भारत के सम्बन्ध में जिज्ञासाये होती हैं कि यहाँ तो टेलीविजन के जरिए, रेडियो के जरिए भारत विरोधी प्रचार किया जा रहा है। इसमें सच्चाई क्या है। तो इस का अर्थ यह है कि सच्चाई का पता उन को नहीं होता। मास्को यूनिवर्सिटी के विद्यार्थियों की सभा में, लेनिनग्राड की सभा में, ताशकन्द में विद्यार्थियों की सभा में, मैंने जब भारत का पक्ष बताया तो टी० एन० कोल साहब ने कहा था कि इस तरह की बात तुम बोल सकते हो। नान आफिशियल इस तरह का प्रचार कर सकते हैं। हमारे दूतावास के लोगो के ऊपर कुछ पाबंदियाँ हैं। हम इस तरह से लोगो को अप्रोच नहीं कर सकते। लिहाजा विदेश मंत्री से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि ऐसे लोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा नान आफिशियल तरीके से भेजे जाएं कि जो भारत की बात, सही बात, विदेशों में लोगों को कह सकें, समझा सकें और भारत के पक्ष का जोरदार

समर्थन कर सके और भारत के पक्ष में उन देशों में एक वातावरण बना सके। ऐसा न हो कि भारत का पक्ष जानकारी के अभाव में अछूता रह जाए और लोगों की गलतफहमियां बढ़ती जाएं।

आज स्थिति यह है कि मालूम नहीं कुछ लोग कुछ देश भारत के क्यों बेहद खिन्ना हैं। वे हमसे नाराज चले आ रहे हैं, और उनकी नाराजगी इस वजह से है कि हम उनके खेमे में दाखिल नहीं हुए। हम उनके अलबरदार नहीं बने। लेकिन यह कोई वजह नहीं है कि हम इस वजह से अपनी नीतियां बदले और उनको बदल कर जैसे वह चाहते हैं वैसे हम अमल करें। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने साफ-साफ कह दिया है स्वर्गीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने जिम समय हमारे पास गेहूं का बेहद अभाव था और हमारे ऊपर यह प्रतिबंध लगाया गया कि भारत को केवल एक महीने की सप्लाई अमरीका से मिलेगी तो लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने गेहूं लेने से इन्कार कर दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि हम आधा पेट खाएंगे, भूखे रहेंगे लेकिन अमरीका का गेहूं किसी शर्त के साथ कबूल नहीं करेंगे तो कुछ सिद्धान्त हमने अपनी वैदेशिक नीति में बनाये हैं और उन पर हमारा देश, हमारी सरकार और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और हमारे विदेश मंत्री अमल कर रहे हैं। यह कितनी खुशी की बात है कि हम ने सभी पड़ोसी देशों के साथ अपने मैत्री संबंध कायम कर लिये हैं। बेशक उस के लिये हम को कहीं लोगों के एतराज का सामना करना पड़ा, एतराज का मुकाबला करना पड़ा, हम कहीं झुके, लेकिन

उम झुकने में भी हम को ऊंचा उठाया है। लिहाजा हमको देखना है कि हम उसी वैदेशिक नीति पर दृढ़ता के साथ कायम रहें और उससे हम विचलित नहीं।

एक बात और मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि बहुत से देश जिन्होंने अपनी वैदेशिक नीति बदली, आप देखें कि आज उन की कैफियत क्या है। उन की कैफियत है, जैसा कि एक उर्दू शायर ने कहा है :

बस एक कदम उठा था गलत राहें शों में,
मंजिल तमाम उम्र उन्हें ढूँढती रही।

हमारे देश में भी एक लाबी है कि जो लोगों को गुमराह करने की कोशिश करती रही है। वह चाहते थे कि हम गलत कदम उठाएँ, लेकिन मैं अपनी प्रधान मंत्री और अपने विदेश मंत्री को धन्यवाद देता हूँ, बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने कोई गलत कदम नहीं उठाया और कह दिया कि हम उसी वैदेशिक नीति पर कायम रहेंगे जोकि हमेशा से, सनातन से हमारे देश में में चली आ रही है और उसी पर वह अमल कर रहे हैं।

आप ने मुझे इतना समय दिया इस के लिये आप को बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): The House stand adjourned till 11A.M. tommorow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 25th May, 1976.