

[Dr. K. Mathew Kurian]

Some of these employees have more than three years' continuous service in these offices and this type of massive retrenchment will affect a large number of people in various parts of the country. I therefore, request Shri Om Mehta to convey this to the concerned Ministry to ensure that all these employees, particularly those who have a continuous service, are absorbed in various departments against possible vacancies. In fact I have already written to the Prime Minister and to the Home Minister to ensure that something is done.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA): I assure the honourable Member that I will convey this to the concerned Ministry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

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

Sir, I have no intention to make any long statement by way of opening remarks and I would prefer to be benefited by the observations of the hon. Mem-

bers and at the end of the debate, I will try to sum up the debate and try to answer any points that might be raised and also I might like to bring the House up-to-date on certain matters. Even at this stage, with your permission, I would like to say a few words. In this hon. House we debated the international situation in November last year and after that many significant events in the international world have happened and I would, just to initiate the debate, try to give a brief account of these significant events.

I would first of all like to say that in our own region, in the Indian sub-continent, things have changed considerably over the last 13 months that have elapsed after the last debate.

In November, 1972, the Simla Agreement was being implemented; but the withdrawal of troops had not been completed. That stage is over now and that was a significant step towards normalisation of relations in the Indian sub-continent. Many humanitarian problems had been created by the unfortunate conflict, a conflict which should never have taken place, a conflict which was not of our seeking, and that conflict had left unresolved several humanitarian problems. The most significant of those problems was that there were hundreds and thousands of people, members of the armed forces, civilian employees, ordinary civilians, etc., who found themselves in territories other than their own and this problem had to be resolved and for that we again took the initiative, and convened the meeting for bilateral talks, talks in which Bangladesh did not participate by sitting in the conference, but the House is fully aware that Bangladesh was kept fully informed and all steps were taken after very close consultation and agreement with the Government of Bangladesh. This re-

sulted in the Delhi Agreement and the Delhi Agreement is now being implemented.

Sir, the essence of the Delhi Agreement is that those persons who were in territories other than their own should return to their own territories. As a result of this, three categories of these unfortunate people are now being repatriated. The prisoners of war who were in India under the joint custody of India and Bangladesh, are now being sent back to Pakistan and this process is continuing. The Bengalis who were kept in Pakistan against their wishes are now being sent back to Bangladesh. There were Pakistanis who were in Bangladesh and who had expressed a desire to be sent back to Pakistan and who had also said that they were Pakistani nationals and they are now being repatriated to Pakistan. The pace of the repatriation could be a little faster. But even then we must not forget that over 80,000 persons belonging to these categories have already gone back to their respective countries and this process is continuing. In between some problems arose with regard to the verification, with regard to the claims, and these were resolved by our getting in touch with Pakistan.

It may be mentioned at this stage that regarding the question of 195 prisoners of war who were not repatriated in the first phase, those against whom there are charges, criminal charges which are to be further investigated, their future has been agreed to be determined in tripartite talks in which India, Bangladesh and Pakistan will participate and Bangladesh has made it clear—and this is a part of the agreement—that they will be able to participate in tripartite discussions only on terms of sovereign equality. This is the present stage of

the process of repatriation. It is proceeding in a reasonably smooth manner; but it will take some time because the numbers involved are fairly large.

The question of the future of the repatriation of Pakistanis who would still be left in Bangla Desh after the first phase of repatriation is over, has also been agreed to be discussed between the three countries in the same manner as I have indicated with regard to the 195 prisoners of war, who will in the meantime continue to be in Indian custody.

Further steps for normalisation of relations between India and Pakistan can be taken up at any time, and there are a large number of steps that will have to be taken—re-opening the communications in various forms, restoration of over-flights, normal commercial relations, and so on including the eventual restoration of diplomatic relations. These are matters which can be considered only after this phase is over.

About our relations in this region with our other neighbours, I would like to say only in one sentence: They are very good. With Bangla Desh we have excellent co-operation and understanding. With our neighbours in the north, Bhutan and Nepal, our relations are excellent. We have recently had the visit of His Majesty the King of Nepal, and our traditional friendship and cooperation have been reiterated. There are some commercial matters about which some questions were answered the other day. These are matters which were handled appropriately by my colleague, the Minister of Commerce. When commercial relations are involved, then there can be differences of opinion. But our general approach for resolving this or any other matter which may arise is one of understanding and cooperation

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

and mutual goodwill and of trying to settle these matters in a bilateral manner, in a spirit of mutual goodwill and cooperation.

So far as the rest of the world is concerned, I would even at this stage place before this House a broad review of the situation as we see it from India.

In Europe, the process of detente, about which I made a mention when the debate took place on the last occasion, has been further consolidated. It is not just an expression of desire to resolve the differences and a desire to live in an atmosphere free from tensions, but some concrete, tangible steps have been taken during this interval. The most significant step was the conference on Security & Co-operation held in Helsinki only about two or three months back. This was a significant conference because the Foreign Ministers of almost all European countries, after a long time, had gathered together in a conference, and, after a long time, they were not talking of wars, they were not talking of conflicts, they were not even talking of balance of power, but they were talking of steps that should be undertaken in order to consolidate the forces of peace, in order to encourage a spirit and an attitude of cooperation and not of conflict.

It will not be correct to say that all problems have been resolved. But it is a significant fact that the Foreign Ministers of the European powers got together, they got over one important stage and they have also agreed now to make further preparations for a summit meeting which will be attended by heads of Governments.

Already discussions are taking place at two places, in Geneva in the context of preparations for the next summit of

the European countries and at the same time other very significant negotiations and discussions are taking place in Vienna. These are about the efforts that should be undertaken to bring about a mutual reduction of arms and forces. It is a very difficult and complicated subject and I cannot give all the details because it will take too long and also because it is a highly technical and complicated subject. But the fact that these talks are taking place—although at the present moment no significant progress has been made—is by itself an important event and this type of handling of the situation by the European powers is likely to consolidate the process of detente and relaxation of tensions in Europe. These trends are positive as any disturbance, any conflict and any confrontation in Europe has its ramifications in the rest of the world. It is, therefore, a matter of considerable satisfaction that in Europe the process of relaxation of tension is taking shape and is actually being strengthened from almost month to month. I wish I could say the same thing about Asia. During this interval, that is after our last debate in this House, the greatest event of highest importance and significance and a matter of concern in Asia has been the Arab-Israeli war, a war that shook not only the Arab world. Israel and her close supporters, but it had its effect on the rest of the world. We are too near the event and the House has been kept informed about the various steps that have been taken in this connection. The most significant step has been that the United States and the Soviet Union got together and both of them worked in cooperation and succeeded in bringing about a ceasefire. I would like to add that not only the ceasefire has been brought about, but also a broad framework in which peace could be stabilised in this region has been worked out. The

relevant Security Council Resolution has been accepted by the parties directly concerned in this conflict. This Security Council Resolution which had been evolved as a result of the joint efforts of the Soviet Union, the United States of America and the other Members of the Security Council has been accepted by Israel. It has also been accepted by the three countries directly and immediately concerned with war, namely, Egypt, Syria and Jordan. It has also been accepted by several other Arab countries. But it has not been accepted by all Arab countries. The essence of this Security Council Resolution is that the Arab lands in Israeli occupation should be vacated and these should be restored to the countries concerned. Secondly, it has also been agreed that negotiations should start between the parties concerned. And in this peace conference, other matters will be discussed which might make peace in the Middle East more stable. Several important conclusions can be drawn from the last conflict. The world was, perhaps, progressively forgetting the Middle East problem; before the present war started, it was a matter, perhaps, which was not of high urgency. There were, of course, references to the Middle East before the present war, calling upon the Israeli Government to vacate those territories which they had occupied as a result of 1967 War. But there was no serious effort to implement the Security Council Resolution of 1967. And as the Arabs have put it, a condition of no-peace no war had emerged, a situation which was not to their liking, a situation which did not attract the attention of the international community with the seriousness that the situation deserved. This war has de-frozen that situation and now the problem that has to be resolved can be divided into two parts—immediate effects of war, that is, with-

drawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied-Arab territories, and secondly, the discussions, may be in a peace conference, about which some talks are going on even now to make the peace durable, meaning thereby that reliance on force by either of the two sides to be replaced by acceptance of the realities of the situation, and to bring about peace in that region. There are political implications and connotations about—I need not elaborate. But this is the significant outcome of this war.

Our sympathies in this case quite naturally were with the Arabs because we firmly believed that justice was on their side. It was the Arab land which was under the aggressive, illegal occupation of Israel. This had to be vacated. We had always taken the view that there should be stable peace in this region and the realities should be accepted by all the parties concerned. This efforts of ours continues and I would also like to say that in the international community now, there is much greater support for the Arab cause, there is much greater realisation about the correctness of the Arab stand today. Even in Europe, particularly in Western Europe.

On an earlier occasion they had taken a somewhat ambivalent attitude with regard to the Middle East problem. Off late, the ministers of the European Community countries have put forward a joint statement fully supporting, almost fully supporting the Arab cause that all the Arab lands should be vacated and also that the rights of the Palestinian people should be restored to them and these rights should be respected. There is in the international community, in the diplomatic sense, a very strong support for the Arabs, for justice being rendered to them, and for getting the Arab territories vacated.

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

The other significant fact which I would like to mention in this connection is that oil as a political weapon has been used for the first time in this conflict. It is having its effects, it is having its far reaching effects. That is a very important aspect and the hon. Members may, perhaps, have some contribution to make in order to give their own assessment of the long-range ramifications and the unravelling of all that is connected with it. Sir, the countries which were dependent on oil from Arab countries—a fairly large number of them—have already started feeling the pinch. In the United States of America and in Europe the effect is already there. Then, the other aspect of oil which, in a sense, is having a powerful impact on the thinking in the international life is the continuous increase in the price of oil, which, in a sense, is not connected with the Arab-Israeli conflict. The oil producing countries are separately taking some steps in order to get higher price for the crude that they supply. That also has an impact upon the international situation. This is an aspect which you may like to consider during this debate.

As you know, Sir, we ourselves did, for a short while, experience the pinch, but I was confident that this will be corrected and it was corrected within a few days, when Saudi Arabia made a clear statement that India will be treated as a friendly country and any differential cuts will be imposed only on those countries whom Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries considered as hostile to their interests, that India would not be in that category and that the cuts of a differential character will not be applicable to India.

At the present moment I should say that cease-fire is still fragile. One of the essential conditions of the Security

Council Resolution was that parties should return to the positions occupied by them on the 22nd of October, the date on which the cease-fire became effective. That has not yet been implemented. Talks are still going on. The preparations for the holding of the peace conference are afoot. One could broadly say that the chances of a peace conference being held at the present moment are more bright than the negative aspects of the situation and it is hoped that as a result of that—though the negotiations are likely to be very hard and very difficult—the chances of an atmosphere of understanding being restored in the Middle-East appear to be somewhat better today. There may be many difficulties, there may be many pitfalls, but, on the whole, one could say that these trends are somewhat less disquieting. I cannot say that they are very favourable, but, they are, at any rate, less disquieting and there is some chance of cease-fire being stabilised and there is a reasonably good chance of peace conference being held. Of course, the discussions and negotiations at the conference are likely to be long but, it is good if the parties talk rather than that they shoot at each other and, from that point of view, it will be a positive development.

Sir, the situation in Indo-China has to a certain extent improved because in Laos also the parties have entered into an agreement and the desire of the international community is that all parties to the agreement should honour that agreement. There are still some difficulties but an agreement has been entered into and there is a chance of an all-party Government being installed in Laos.

Sir, in Cambodia the situation still continues to be one of concern and the war-situation still continues and the matter of great concern is that at the

moment there is no real dialogue even being established between the regime in Phnom Penh and those who are opposed to this regime and those who are fighting. We have contacts with Prince Sihanouk. Our Prime Minister had very good exchange of views with Prince Sihanouk in Algiers. We have every sympathy for Prince Sihanouk and it is our earnest desire that the peace-loving people of Cambodia may be enabled to decide their future in accordance with their own wishes.

During this interval there have been two important Conferences, the Non-aligned Conference and the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. The facts about this have been reported to the House. I would say that the Non-aligned Conference this time was very significant. Our Prime Minister participated in that Conference. It was attended by a very large number of Heads of Governments, Heads of States and the essentials of non-alignment, their understanding on international issues, their determination to strengthen the economic content of this group—these were brought into focus as a result of declarations and the documents that were approved at the end of this Conference. The Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference also was significant from two points of view. Firstly, for the first time the new Prime Ministers of Australia and New Zealand, Prime Minister Whitlam and Prime Minister Kirk, adopted an attitude which was more in tune with Afro-Asian opinion in respect of liquidating the remnants of colonialism, in relation to racist regime in Rhodesia, also about the problems of apartheid and racist policies in South Africa. This was a very refreshing contrast to the attitude of the earlier Governments of Australia and New Zealand. Then for the first

time the important Caribbean leaders played a significant role in this Conference and they made a very constructive and good contribution in several matters of great importance. The true multi-racial character was prominent and the Canadians, particularly Prime Minister Trudeau, played a pivotal role not only in organising the Conference but in giving it a right trend in order to produce the best results as a result of these discussions and these deliberations.

We have recently had two very important visits, the visit of General Secretary, Brezhnev and the visit of General Secretary—Husak. Secretary-General Husak is still in our country. He is now visiting other parts of our country. The discussions have been concluded and the joint declaration and other documents that have been signed are intended to be published today by the time the House rises today. It is my intention subject of course to the mechanical side of preparing sets of copies being completed, to place them for the information of this House. The documents that were issued at the end of General Secretary—Brezhnev's visit have already been placed on the floor of the House. This is a topical matter which is fully known to the House. General Secretary—Brezhnev addressed a joint meeting of the Members of the two Houses and most of the hon. Members attended that. They heard the speech of General Secretary—Brezhnev, the sincerity and the very sincere tone in which he talked about the abiding friendship between India and the Soviet Union, a friendship which has stood the test of time, a friendship which has been found to be suitable, based on principles and which has helped us in a variety of ways on occasions when we faced some real difficulties whether they were of a poli-

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

tical character or of a general economic character. Our relations with Soviet Union are cordial, are close, are friendly and this mutual co-operation in fields, political, economical and technological is very much to the mutual advantage and benefit of the people of the two countries and also there is identity of views in important international affairs about issues of peace and war, about ending the remnants of colonialism and about strengthening the forces of peace and progress. It is our belief that these visits have resulted not only in strengthening further the bonds of friendship that exist between India and Soviet Union but this visit has also strengthened the forces of peace and progress in the whole world. The visit of General Secretary—Husak from very friendly country, Czechoslovakia, over the last two days has also been a very welcome one. This has afforded opportunity to the two sides to exchange views at the highest level on important issues of a bilateral character in the political field, in the economic field, in the technological field, on co-operation in the commercial field, and also about the general international situation and we greatly value both these visits as they are from the leaders of friendly countries, leaders of countries who have stood with us through thick and thin and whose co-operation is very valuable to us in every field, economic, technological and political. I need hardly say that the co-operation that was available and the help that was extended to us from USSR in developing certain basic industries in our country, steel, oil, power, heavy machinery and several other industries is of very great importance and it has established firmly the base of our further economic development. Similarly, from Czechoslova-

kia also we have received help and they have also promised further help and co-operation.

These are, Mr. Deputy Chairman, some of the broad observations that I thought I should make while initiating this debate. I will with great interest hear the views of hon. Members and towards the end, with your permission, I will try to wind up the debate.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR : Sir, I move—

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the objective of our foreign policy must be to make India a super power in her own right by achieving economic and military self-reliance.'"

The questions were proposed.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister of External Affairs dwelt at length on certain issues which are, of course, very important, but the most important thing the House expected to-day was touched by him in a cursory manner. Of course, there have been many achievements. The last fifteen days have been dominated by the visit of Secretary-General Brezhnev. We have seen a lot of political activity and we have also seen the agreement signed between the two countries. In these last fifteen days our Prime Minister made two significant observations and they led us to believe that perhaps we would not fall a prey to the blandishments of a power bigger than ourselves, and a friendly power—of course, Russia. Mrs. Gandhi said in one context that two super powers were arrogating to them-

selves the power to decide world issues and they ignored other countries, big or small. India may be a small country, but we were absolutely ignored. For example, in the case of the Middle-east, there was a big problem and it was a baffling one. These two super powers came to an understanding on what should be the *modus operandi* and things were settled. Now, it is a very good thing that they have brought the conflict to a stop, but these two powers are in the habit of deciding world issues arbitrarily, as far as the fate of the other people is concerned, without consulting them, even without consulting their own friends. I doubt if Mr. Brezhnev or Mr. Nixon consulted friends like our Prime Minister. I do not think so and I hope she will enlighten me on this point. The other thing she said was very heartening to a democratic man like me. I felt very much elated that our Prime Minister has taken a strong line on this point, but later on the agreement which she has signed has belied it. Our road to socialism is based on democratic institutions. We have got certain conditions. Our development Plans are conditioned by certain considerations which we hold dear. This has been stated in the House for a number of years. We could have chosen the easy Chinese way or Russian way to socialism or communism. No. We still hold on to democracy. Our institutions are conditioned by these considerations. Therefore, in the road we take, we cannot take the Russian road, however, efficient or good it may be. Now, in the light of the observations which the Prime Minister had made, I would like to put this agreement to the test. As far as the role of the super powers is concerned, I feel that now India can hardly say that it is non-aligned. When Sardar Swaran Singh goes to the United Nations, the other people will laugh in

their sleeves. We have lost identity as a really non-aligned nation, as we were some fifteen or five years back. Today, after the visit of Mr. Brezhnev, a different atmosphere has been built up. We have lost that image of being a non-aligned country. Whether it is the United States or Russia, we have tied ourselves to one super power. Then, Mrs. Gandhi says that we do not want interference or arrogation of power by them.

As far as the agreement on economic matters is concerned, i.e., the socialist method for the development of this country, I would like to know how far these things are justified. I will not go into many other aspects, but I will confine myself to two points. One is that we have signed an agreement for mutual co-operation with Russia. Now, it is said that our economic systems will be complementary. The guiding factor is that it will be complementary. At one time you say 'dovetailing'. Sometimes you say co-ordinating. Now, things have gone a little further. We have come to the stage of COMECON. There are five satellite countries in Eastern Europe. They are members of COMECON...

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I would request the hon. Member not to use the expression 'satellite'.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : These five powers are allied with Russia. They are East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria. Now, Rumania is not there.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Do not pick up blindly expressions used by Western journalists.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : I do not take it from journalists. I think you are mistaken. I listened to you very politely. I say have you no machinery to

[Shri C. D. Pande]

judge these COMECON countries? You must have paid many visits to these countries. How are they faring? In this 'complementality' they are doing something in Russia and some other thing in those countries. We are now reducing ourselves, not completely, to that status. They will now ask us to produce something and we will produce exactly that thing. Now, Russia, East Germany and Czechoslovakia, were highly industrially developed before the war. When the last two countries became Communists they joined the Russian camp. Now Russia is far ahead of these two countries. These two countries are not making as much progress as they were making before. East Germany was once a most industrialised country in the world. But today East Germany does not compare favourably with West Germany in industrialisation. Similarly Yugoslavia earlier developed much faster than Poland and Hungary. What I mean to say is if we reduce ourselves to the status of Czechoslovakia, Poland or Hungary, is it good for our economy? Therefore, your economic co-operation stands on the same basis. This is my reading. I may be wrong. We are a big nation. We may be small in military power but our problems are as big or bigger than that of Russia. Therefore, to be a part and parcel of the Russian economic system or a system like that of Hungary, Bulgaria or Czechoslovakia is not a very refined system for country of our size, strength and prestige.

Now this is one thing about the supplementary activities of our trade and industry vis-a-vis the Russian trade and industry.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I hate to interrupt. But on facts I hope you would accept what I say. I would

like to say that these countries which you have mentioned, namely, the G.D.R., Czechoslovakia and Poland after the second World War moved forward in industrialisation in a very, very rapid manner. So it will be wrong for you to give facts which are not correct.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: They have advanced but their advancement is not so much as the Russian advancement or as the advancement of some of the developed countries in the world. East Germany has advanced, no doubt. But compared to the pre-1939 level it does not come anywhere before the level of West Germany of today. The question is how much a country is advancing. India is also advancing and it has advanced considerably in the last 25 years. But we have not advanced to the level of Russia, U.S.A. or U.K. This is a comparative statement. I admit that East Germany has advanced but it has not advanced in proportion to its original capacity or the capacity of West Germany. Anyhow, this chapter is closed.

I now come to the dovetailing of planning. This is an important clause in the Agreement that was signed between the two countries. This clause is either redundant or it has got no sincerity. We are deluding ourselves that we are equal powers. We have established a joint Planning commission within our Commission. This Commission has got certain aims. The Consultative Committee will have a session here in Delhi and one in Moscow. On it there will be members of our Planning Commission and the Russian Planning Commission. But may I know whether there will be any reciprocity in the matter of giving advice when this Council meets? When our Planning Minister, Mr. D. P. Dhar, goes to Russia, will he be allowed to look into the Russian planning?

As the Russians can suggest and point out certain lacuna in our Plan, can he also point out certain lacuna in their Plan? As they have been advising to do a certain thing in a certain way, can our planners also advise them to do a certain thing in a certain way? That situation may be very embarrassing for us. Will they tolerate if we have to tell them at any stage that they have not made sufficient progress in a particular direction? They might suggest that our Bokaro is not doing well or Rourkela is not doing well, this, that and the other. Of course, in the Agreement between the two countries, agreement with Russia, to whom we are so beholden, we may be equal in status. But is that so in reality? I will read out a few sentences from the Agreement. They say "economic forecasting, methodology, all annual, medium and perspective planning, formulation of projects and programmes, methods of monitoring and evaluation" and so on. I only want to know whether it refers to planning in India or it relates to Planning in Russia also because I have never seen anywhere in the world any independent Government making a joint council for planning. Then tomorrow you will do it for foreign affairs and the day after you will do it for any other thing.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI (Maharashtra): Joint study.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: No, the question is: What is the purpose? What is the use of this? Do you think that your Planning Commission Members are not in a position to tell you what this country needs? We want Russian help; we want Russian aid; but we do not want to have a joint council. If a joint council is there, it should be on the basis of reciprocity. If they will

planning, we should also be in a position to tell them, "You should do this in your planning; you have got these defects."

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala): You are too presumptuous.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: It is too humiliating for us. I may be too presumptuous in my claim that India is equal to Russia. But I feel humiliated if this provision is made applicable to India and not to Russia. I will give you one example which will make the whole thing clear. Five years ago, Mr. K. K. Shah when he was Minister of Information and Broadcasting, went to Russia and when he came back, he said "We have now a pact with Russia whereby we can make publicity in Russia and Russia will be free to make publicity here". I asked him "What progress have you made in making publicity in Russia? We are flooded with Novosti things and other things. Everyday we are getting two or three pamphlets. What is the number of our publications there? How are our ideas of democracy propagated in Russia?" If you can give me even one-tenth of what you are doing there, I shall feel obliged. Again you may say I am presumptuous. They have got every freedom to make publicity in this country under that agreement that Mr. K. K. Shah signed with Russia. To-day the same thing will happen here with regard to the joint council. If we are to share Russian planning, Russia should be privileged to share our planning, so that in planning we are equals. If that is not so, I ask Mr. Swaran Singh, please explain what are the reasons for our agreeing to have a joint council when the joint council has no value. We can have Russian advice. We can ask for their experts. But you cannot say that there is joint planning for Russia and India and we can tell

[Shri C. D. Pande]

Russia to do this and Russia can tell us to do that. Either we are just putting it before the country that we are also equal to Russia or we are absolutely reduced to the status of a power which only wants Russian advice at every step. After all, if you put this clause in the treaty, either it does not mean anything or it humiliates us unnecessarily.

Now, of course, I must congratulate the Prime Minister on one issue. Mr. Brezhnev's main aim of coming to this country was to propagate his favourite thesis of collective security of Asia. Now this idea is being pursued by Mr. Brezhnev with the persistence and power that he possesses for the last five years. Once when Mr. Dinesh Singh was Foreign Minister, he mentioned it here and I objected to it at that time. I was in the Congress Party at that time, but even then I felt that I must oppose it. He said that economic co-operation would lead to security. Now, we want security and collective security is the best of all. The world is trying to have collective security. The United Nations is meant for that. There are so many organisations for it. Now when Russia makes a move for collective security of Asian countries, Russia's claim to be an Asian power is itself a matter of dispute; but there is no other country. Collective security means that there must be three or four or five powers which collect together to guarantee or work out a scheme of security. But no Asian power has come up. Whenever there is a proposal from Indonesia or Japan or Thailand or any other country, we say we will not touch that proposal with a pair of tongs. I am glad that Mrs. Gandhi has at least for the time being said that she is against any such proposal. And it is a matter of great

encouragement that she has stood against the blandishment. But even after talking with Mrs. Gandhi, Mr. Brezhnev made a very powerful case, according to him, when he addressed Members of Parliament. If this idea still persists, I tell Sardar Swaran Singh that he should never acquiesce in that proposal because it will reduce us to the orbit of the Russian power. You have already tried in a way to put yourself in the comity of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary by accepting the Brezhnev doctrine. Brezhnev doctrine is a pernicious doctrine. It means, if you accepted the Brezhnev doctrine, that Russia is entitled to interfere even in our internal matters. The House will remember—new Members may not be knowing it; old Members must be remembering it—what the sentiment was five years ago when Brezhnev Government attacked the liberation movement of Czechoslovakia. Did you, Sardar Swaran Singh, ask Mr. Husak, who has been here, where Mr. Dubcek is? Did you ask him that? What I mean to say is: Did you ask whether there is any freedom in Czechoslovakia? Did you ask whether they can conduct their affairs in their own country in the manner they want without joining any other country, without joining West Europe or East Europe? If they want to change the system of their Government, what is the difficulty, what is the obligation, coming in their way? Mr. Brezhnev said that it is my obligation and duty to interfere and gain socialism, we shall fight for the gains of socialism. Do you want that we should have that status of Czechoslovakia and Hungary in this country? Mrs. Indira Gandhi will be well advised not to accept that doctrine. I think she has stood the test and I hope she will persist in refusing to accept that offer, however persistently they may be making it.

Sir, I have nothing more to say. I had only these three or four points. I hope Sardar Swaran Singh will take those points in the light in which I have made them.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): Sir, the trends in the international situation in recent years have been characterised by a kind of contradiction in the sense that there is a definite move towards *detente* in Europe and also across the Atlantic, but conflicts continue in Asia and Africa and in some sense also in the Continent of South America. It is true that there is a mood for easing tensions in these areas. Nevertheless, these areas are not yet free from tensions and conflicts. In Vietnam, in that entire area, peace is yet to be stabilised. In West Asia efforts are being made to bring about a settlement. But we are yet to see what that settlement will be. In the whole of Africa racial conflict continues to be rampant. Colonialism and imperialism continue in that Continent in full vigour. In South America we have already witnessed how democracy was murdered in one particular country by certain external conspiracies, and, therefore, some kind of tension continues in that Continent also. Peace in Europe and North America, and conflicts and tensions in the rest of the world, this appears even now to be a measure of contradiction in the international situation. Even the peaceful Indian Ocean is sought to be converted into a zone of conflict and it is a matter of serious concern for us.

The second significant development in recent years is, while in the past there were two centres of world power, today there are five centres of power. After the Second World War we saw two giant powers and around them some blocs were built up. But today five

centres of power are emerging in the world, and when five centres of power are emerging, there is a stronger tendency to build up spheres of influence around such centres of power. This is also a situation which we have to take very serious note of.

The most dominating factor in the world situation today, in my opinion, is the ever widening disparity between the developed world on the one hand and the developing world on the other. Whatever efforts we might make for peace, *detente*, this and that in the world, ultimately peace cannot be established unless this disparity is removed between the developed world and the developing world. It is, therefore, in this background that we have to examine our policy of non-alignment.

I need not answer the critics of non-alignment. Shri Pande has just now said that we have given up the policy of non-alignment. I do not know what his understanding about non-alignment is. But if I have understood this policy, I think the policy of non-alignment has been very much vindicated to be the most effective and correct policy. Why do I say so? There is the disintegration of the original power blocs. There is a positive move towards *detente* and peace. There is today greater regard for the five principles of co-existence in quarters which were originally indifferent or hostile to them. There is today greater consciousness among the developing nations for rapid development and they are now asking for equality with the developed nations. These are the positive trends developing in this world today and these are the positive contributions of the policy of non-alignment, I would submit. After all non-alignment does not merely mean that we should keep away from this or that power bloc. Non-alignment means fight

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

against imperialism, fight against colonialism, fight against racialism, fight for the equality among nations, fight against war, fight for peace and fight for progress. These are the positive aspects of non-alignment. If you look at the whole world situation keeping these considerations in view, I have no doubt that anybody with an objective mind will have to come to the conclusion that non-alignment policy has made positive contributions towards building up a new world in our own life time.

Our policy has been explained very clearly by Sardar Swaran Singh. Therefore, I need not go into that. Our policy regarding colonialism, our policy about racial discrimination, our policy in West Asian conflict and our attitude towards the happenings in Chile have all been made very clear by the Government. Therefore, I do not think I should waste the time of the House by going into those matters.

The most significant contribution made by India towards peace is the success arising out of the Simla Agreement followed by the recent Delhi Agreement with Pakistan. Both Simla Agreement and Delhi Agreement have laid the firm foundation for the new principle of bilateralism in inter-national relations. This is a new contribution that we have made. This means that two nations, two countries, having differences must settle their differences among themselves across the table and no third power should be allowed to intervene. We have believed in this principle and we have tried to execute it and I think nobody can say today that we have failed in this matter. Everybody will have to admit that after the Delhi agreement, we have made definite progress in the direction

of peace and this principle of bilateralism also is born out of the basic philosophy of non-alignment.

My friend Shri Pande said something about the recent visit of Brezhnev and Dr Husak. Honestly speaking, I just did not follow what he said. I have also my doubt whether he himself understood what he said. His entire speech was based on presumptions, prejudices and, if I may be permitted to say, paranoiac postulates. If somebody goes on thinking in terms of prejudices and presumptions and lives in a dream world and if somebody refuses to see the changes all around, then I cannot help him; nobody can help him. I do not think Shri Pande made any point which deserves any reply from this side. Actually, it was a speech made out of total ignorance of facts, ignorance of history and ignorance of the recent developments in the world as a whole.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : You can say anything you like.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Sir, I think the recent visit of Mr. Brezhnev to this country is an extremely significant event and it has to be assessed in the background of the world situation as a whole and from the standpoint of our policy of non-alignment. Sir, I congratulate the Government of India for their joint declaration made with Mr. Brezhnev and for the agreements signed with the Soviet Russia. I would also congratulate the Government of India for the joint declaration and the agreements signed with the Government of Czechoslovakia today. And, Sir, since Dr. Husak, is still in our country, I extend to him our greetings, friendly greetings.

Sir, in my opinion, Mr. Brezhnev's visit to India is no less significant than his visit to the USA or the visit of

Mr. Nixon to Peking or Moscow. I do not think it is less significant than these visits. The visit of Mr. Brezhnev and the outcome of the deliberations between the Prime Minister of our country and Mr. Brezhnev have a tremendous significance not only for peace in this region but also for peace in the world as a whole and this is one thing which must be noted by everybody if he is a true patriot, if he really wants peace and if he really wants progress not only in this country, but in other countries also. Therefore, Sir, I would not go into the details of those agreements. But I would say that they are highly significant. I would particularly refer to a few points that stand out.

Here is a case of a super power—they were called super power and they are still a super power—which, for the first time, turned to Asia with a message of peace and *detente*, thus recognising the need to extend the principle of *detente* to other continents also and to the whole world and not to confine it to Europe or to the zone of Atlantic alone. This is a very significant thing and this is a very significant development. I began my speech saying that the principle of *detente* applied to the conflicts in Europe should be extended to other areas also and here is the visit of Mr. Brezhnev which indicates that at least one super power has thought seriously of carrying the message of *detente* and the message of peace to the areas of conflict, at least to Asia.

Sir, it was highly dignified of Mr. Brezhnev not to have uttered a single word against, say, America or against China, from the soil of India. He made several speeches. But he never uttered a single word against those whom they are fighting in other spheres. This goes to show the tremendous amount of regard they have for this country, because he never uttered a

single word against any country from our soil. This is a very significant thing and this must also be noted.

All his speeches, whether in Parliament or on public platforms, were marked by a tone of sincerity and friendship and earnestness. Whoever has heard him cannot dispute this fact that there was a tone of sincerity and friendship for the people of this country.

Then, Sir, one must also note that whether in his speeches or in the agreements signed there was no touch of bossism or overlordism from the side of the Soviet Russia. Sir, it is a super power, it is economically strong and it is militarily strong and India is comparatively a weaker nation economically and militarily. But nowhere, neither in his speeches nor in the agreements, is there any trace of this feeling that Russia has been trying to boss over our country or overlord our country. This was absolutely absent. Everything was written and said in terms of equality and friendly accord.

Brezhnev's visit further emphasised and strengthened the role of Indo-Soviet cooperation in political, economic, technological and cultural spheres. Brezhnev expressed firm and unequivocal support to our policy of non-alignment—thereby again showing great regard for the integrity and independence of this country's foreign policy.

Sir, the Jan Sangh President, Mr. Advani—not here today, unfortunately—made a fantastic statement the other day. He said that by signing these Agreements with Mr. Brezhnev the Prime Minister of this country has sold out this country to Russia. I just cannot imagine how any man having the least sense of self-respect and patriotism can utter these words. Let Mr. Advani

[Shri Bipinpal Das]
remember that ours is a very great country, an ancient country with ancient civilization, a country which has evolved values, abiding values, deep-rooted values, through the centuries; such a country can never be sold away by anybody, howsoever powerful he may be.... (Interruptions). Those who have faith in the people of this country, those who have faith in the democratic system of this country, those who have faith in the leadership provided to this country by Mahatma Gandhi, Pt. Nehru and now Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, those who have faith in these things, can never imagine how a responsible member like Mr. Advani could utter such words. Since he has said this, my only conclusion is that here is a man leading a political party, who has no faith in this country, who has no faith in the people of this country, who has no faith in the system of this country, and, therefore, he thinks that this country can be sold out by anybody.

Mr. Pande has raised several questions. He is not here; he has gone out. My simple answer is this: Is it wrong to have mutual cooperation between two nations for economic development? Is it the first time that this is happening between India and Soviet Russia? Is there no international cooperation for development elsewhere? International cooperation is a perfectly legitimately thing. It happens and it is happening everywhere, not only between small countries but also big countries. There is a talk of such cooperation even between the USA and Russia or the USA and China. When these big powers can talk of cooperation in the economic field, in the cultural field, in the technological field, how is it wrong on the part of the Government of India to sign similar agreements for the development of our economy? This is the spirit behind the agreement, the spirit behind

the Joint Declaration. This is a spirit of mutual co-operation, on the basis of mutual benefit, on the basis of mutual respect, on the basis of equality, on terms and conditions which are quite consistent with our basic national interests. If such agreements, if such declarations are signed for such purposes, can anybody say that we have done anything wrong? I am surprised, I am amazed how anybody can say like that.

Sir, I need not go into their arguments any further. It is absolutely clear that the criticism made by Mr. Advani or Mr. Pande today is wholly *mala fide*, mischievous, politically motivated and harmful to our national interests. Sir, it is difficult, it is certainly very difficult, I know, for a person suffering from jaundice to see anything other than yellow.... (Interruptions). That is quite true.

Sir, Shri Pande has talked about Asian security. He has also paid compliments to our Prime Minister that the Prime Minister has not agreed to it. Then what is your grievance? What is your complaint? Only because Mr. Brezhnev talks of an Asian Security Pact, can you complain about it?

He has every right to propagate an idea. Of course, it is an idea and the whole idea is not clear even to me. He has not spelled out the whole thing even in this country. He made some oblique references. Now, a world leader has certainly every right to propagate some idea. But whenever an idea is propagated, Shri Pande jumps up and starts having all kinds of hallucinations just at the utterance of a certain idea.

So far as Asian security system is concerned, as some talk is going on about it in the country, I feel that I should express my views very briefly, although they may be premature. I feel

that the whole concept has not been spelled out fully. Normally, whenever you talk of a system, it creates apprehensions. The word 'system' creates apprehensions because of our memory of the blocks and the alliances. That happens. Any move for such a system in Asia must include all nations including Japan, China and all the other countries. All these things have never been made clear by anybody. Until these things are made clear, I do not think we can say either 'yes' or 'no' or go anywhere near it.

India's primary concern in Asia is to build up close friendship and co-operation with our neighbours and other Asian countries on the basis of the principle of bilateralism. This is our immediate concern and we are religiously pursuing this policy and it is the correct policy for India to pursue at the moment.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I will say only one word and this is about China. In terms of size, population and proximity, China is our biggest neighbour. Our efforts have been to build up friendship and co-operation with all neighbouring countries. Therefore, we also want to develop friendly relations with such a great country as China. There is no doubt that relations with China must be normalised and I know that our Foreign Minister and even our Prime Minister have made gestures several times. But, unfortunately, there is no response from the other side. If there are any doubts or prejudices across the border, some efforts will have to be made to remove them. We have to sit round a table and settle our differences. For that, both the countries must come forward.

China has differences with Russia with which we are not concerned. Chinese differences with the Russians

must not stand in the way of China coming forward and responding to our gestures for building up friendly relations and co-operation. Such relations can be and have to be built up on bilateral basis. If just like Indo-Soviet friendship, Indo-Chinese friendship can also be revived and built up on the basis of the five principles of co-existence, we will make a tremendous contribution towards peace, progress and prosperity not only of Asia but of the whole world. This, I feel, is a major task for India's foreign policy to achieve and fulfil in the next few years. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, our Foreign Minister has given us a brief resume of international developments since we last discussed this issue, which means in the course of 1973. Now, Sir, this year has undoubtedly been a year of extremely rapid and outstanding international developments of tremendous significance. If I have to state them in a few words, at the outset, I would say that they resulted in the retreat of the imperialist and neo-colonialist offensive in many countries of the world and a distinctive advance of the forces which fight for national liberation, forces which fight for peace, for peaceful co-existence, for detente and reduction of tensions. There are exceptions and I will refer to them later. But, by and large, when you look into the entire picture of 1973, a distinct change has undoubtedly come about, a change which is favourable to those who fight for peace and national independence, a change for which our country has always struggled, and a change to which our country has contributed during 1973.

So far as we are concerned, one of the most important international developments has been the visit of Comrade Brezhnev to India and also the various

[Shri S. G. Sardesai]

comprehensive agreements signed between India and the Soviet Union. I would say this is a land-mark not only in the relations, between India and the Soviet Union, not only in our mutual relations of friendship but undoubtedly for peace, for stability and development of national freedom in Asia as a whole. I will come to these points and elaborate them later. What I want to deal at the outset, and that is the way the Foreign Minister has also started, is that the significance and the outcome of the visit of Comrade Brezhnev to India, the significance of Comrade Husak's visit to India, are a part of a world process. I want to refer to this aspect so that our own achievements and tasks become very clear.

When I refer to this world process, at the outset, I want to state what I consider to be three very distinctive conclusions which have been emerging over the years but attained a boldness in 1973, arising out of the international developments. And then I will illustrate each one of them because these conclusions help us to strengthen our own policy and to make it bolder and clearer. What is the essence of this year's development? The first point which I would like to emphasise and the thing which came out during the course of 1973 is the process of detente between the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and the United States of America, between the socialist countries and the Western Europe. This process of detente in this period has not harmed but it has actually gone hand in hand with the strengthening forces of national independence in the newly developing countries, in the Afro-Asian countries, and in the third world. I can illustrate them. In passing, I would like to draw your attention to

one thing. There have been apprehensions expressed even in India, and expressed also in one of the statements accepted at Algiers that somehow or other this process of detente may harm the African and the Latin American countries or that they may transmit the European tension to this third world. This kind of apprehensions are there. Our actual experience has shown that simultaneously with that detente, those who struggle for national independence and those who fight for peace secure greater assistance and they themselves become stronger. They have received greater assistance from the socialist countries and they have advanced.

The second point which has already been there for a number of years and which stands out very boldly in the course of this year is that in all these international developments, without exception, the aggressor, the warmonger, the neo-colonialist spearhead has been the USA. We have been on the side of peace, for national freedom and liberation. I want to know whether there is any single exception when the socialist countries and the Soviet Union have not been on the side of India during this period. Take Vietnam, take West-Asia, take Chile, take Greece, take any of the major international developments of this period or take the Algiers conference. Who has been with us and who has been against us? In all these instances we find that invariably the cause of reaction, aggression or war has been the United States and our friend and ally has been the Soviet Union, the socialist countries. I am at the moment just stating facts and some people may like them or not. If my facts are correct, I think the conclusion should automatically emerge.

Now, I came to this vague and sweeping talk of super-powers. It has been

stated that the role of the two super-powers is very different. You cannot go on bracketing them all the time, when realities are different. Day after day, month after month and year after year in every corner of the globe you see the clear distinction between the role of the two super-powers. I will come to it later when I talk about economic co-operation and indicate which countries they are helping or not helping. All these things are there. The third thing I would like to say in this connection and that is very necessary particularly after people like my friend, Mr. Pande, spoke—though when Mr. Pande speaks, I am reminded of Goldsmith's *Deserted Village* about the School Teacher—who would keep on arguing, when vanquished. So, for Mr. Pande it is not important because he is vanquished because he would still go on speaking. That is a different point. I want to know whether it is or it is not a fact that one of the experiences which emerges once again the course of the last year is that this relationship between the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and the third world, the developing countries, the non-aligned countries, has not in any instance involved the subordination of the national interests or the sovereignty of any of these independent countries to the Soviet Union.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): What about Czechoslovakia?

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI: I am prepared to talk about Czechoslovakia separately and let you know what NATO was doing inside Czechoslovakia. We are dealing here particularly with newly independent countries, independent world.

What happened in Vietnam? On the one hand, it is a fact that Mr. Brezhnev went to the United States and people

said: Oh! He is going to the United States. Vietnam will be betrayed. Was Vietnam betrayed? Along with the visit maximum aid was received by Vietnam from the Soviet Union for their glorious national struggle. The American armies were defeated. Americans had to get out of Vietnam. They had to sign a peace agreement. But, meanwhile the fact remains that in this entire world process the national liberation forces in Vietnam in the socialist and in the Soviet countries have advanced, they have not retreated. Let us come to West-Asia. What is the biggest experienced. The biggest experience of West-Asia is that a new self-respect a new fighting capacity has developed which is fully supported and helped by the Soviet Union. They have grown. They can fight and fight effectively the Israeli forces, no matter what sort of American aid they get. Israel is not invincible. This is a new thing which has emerged. Mr. Nixon came out and gave a world alert. It was the Soviet Union which called the bluff and told America that it may give the world alert but if the 22nd October cease-fire was not going to be implemented, if Israel was going to continue its aggression, Soviet Union would also come into the picture. That helped the Arabs. It prevented further aggression. This also helped them. Not only that. This time, as the Foreign Minister very correctly stated, the Soviet Union and the United States not only came out with a cease-fire but they came out with a broad agreement proposed by Russia which Israel had to accept. Now, in this very process what has happened. Arab unity is now greater than ever before. All these years we were wondering whether Saudi Arabia, the Sheikdoms, this and that, would support the nationalist, progressive Arabs. But, at this time both have joined and used the oil policy as a pressure against

[Shri S. G. Sardesai.]

the Imperialist powers. Here again I am very happy to state what the Foreign Minister stated that they are refusing to send oil to Western countries, to the United States and others, but continuing supplies to India. Algiers I want to point out here. There are a 4 P.M. series of documents. I am surprised we do not go into these things. For the first time, in para after para, document after document, Algiers Conference nails down imperialism, imperialism as the aggressor, imperialism as the force committing aggression and openly it says that it is the socialist countries and all countries which are against colonialism that have got to co-operate. This is the kind of advance made.

Here in passing, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to say because that problem is also connected with this, that with the advance of these forces, socialism, democracy, national liberation, the crisis of imperialism has deepened and we should be happy that it has deepened. What is wrong about it? If Western Europe, Japan, United States, all of them are on the side of Israel, but as a result of greater unity of the Arab countries the Western European countries learn "You cannot go on supporting Israel if you want your oil; you have got to be on the right side", what is wrong about it? If that brings a conflict between Western Europe and the U.S.A. the world should be happy. What is wrong about it? If Japan gives an ultimatum to the United States and says: "No, in future we are going to support the Arabs" is it something good or bad? So in this crisis of internal contradiction of imperialism, I must say, Nixon had to face an impeachment. Does it not help the Arabs? It does help the Arabs because it weakens Nixon's capacity to help

Israel. So this is the kind of picture which we have on the one hand and all these kinds of forces coming together on the other hand. It is weakening imperialism; it is weakening the forces which go in for war and aggression and all that kind of thing.

But, Sir, India is the most important thing immediately for us and I want to come to that point. What is wrong, I just cannot understand. I read this document very very carefully. Now about economic co-operation, I do not know where is our sovereignty and where is our independence involved? First and foremost is the far greater co-operation in science, technology, industrial development and they help us increase our steel production. You know about the steel crisis. They help us in oil production and metallurgy. Has India become weaker or it has become stronger? I want to know. Have you become a Soviet satellite or you strengthened yourself independently? Particularly in today's conditions, you know there are certain international forces and internal forces; you know about the petrol crisis; you know how serious it has been. You know what a tremendous economic suffering it is causing. They gave you crude; they gave you kerosene; they gave you newsprint and they gave you food without any condition. What is wrong about it? Why should we be sorry about it?

Now I come to co-operation in planning. I cannot understand if on a big scale you want to develop your trade with them and they want to develop their trade with you, what is wrong if industrial production and these things are co-ordinated. We have to plan for the future; we have to plan for 15 years. If you are going to plan for 15 years, just as you want them to give you commitments for 15 years, they also can

sit with us and say: "You will have to carry out your part of the commitment". Without that co-ordination, you cannot have planning and if you want planning, naturally there will be mutual co-ordination and exchange of views. Also, what is wrong with regard to methods of planning? Mr. Pande should know. I have some personal experience that if somehow you go and tell the Soviet comrades that in the plan, we do not want something, they do not object. This is my personal experience.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri S. S. Mariswamy) in the Chair]

They do not object at all. Of course, they have a right to defend their position but they have never taken offence.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: You are a comrade yourself; what is that?

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI: That is true, but, perhaps, they will be more blunt towards a comrade than to you. My point is, that is a question of principles. They will defend their policy but they will never object to others and say: "No, I do not think your policy is correct." So, friends, the point is this economic Agreement is a powerful instrument for the strengthening of our economy. I want just to read two or three sentences. The Prime Minister has gone on record in the joint statement where it says, "The Prime Minister highly praised the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, consistently aimed at consolidating international peace, strengthening peaceful co-operation among States, and rendering support to the peoples struggling against colonialism and for the strengthening of the political and economic independence of their countries." This is what the joint declaration says. With regard to foreign policy to which the External Affairs Minister just now made a reference, it

speaks of the 'coincidence and proximity of the positions of India and the Soviet Union on major questions of international situation.' About that I may have something more to say later. It also speaks of the readiness of the Soviet Union and India to participate together with the States concerned, on an equal basis, in finding a fair solution to the question of making the Indian Ocean a "Zone of Peace". So we are to co-operate with each other to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. Again and again in the joint statement there are constant reference to peace, stability and mutual co-operation between States in Asia. Now I would like to tell my hon. friends that Mr. Brezhnev has never used the expression "Asian Security Pact". Time and again what he has said is, we want to stabilise peace, stability and mutual co-operation. Naturally this will lead to Asian security. And that is all over here in these documents. I for one have not been quite able to understand why this expression "Security Pact" should stick in their throats and why there should be so much of controversy about it. If you do not want to use that expression that is all right but the concept is clear. All through these documents you will find precisely that. What else is it? You say national independence must be strengthened, imperialism must be liquidated, mutual co-operation should grow. All this means only that concept. I am very happy that is there. While on this point I would like the Government also to explain why they are so much afraid of using the expression "Security system". We are doing nothing in secret. We are saying it openly. Time and again we have said it is not against anybody; it is not against China. So what is wrong there? So we have to work together for Asian security. That is the most important thing. Now I want to

[Shri S. G. Sardesai.]

place before this Government one thing. All our experience in international affairs leads us to certain conclusions, which strengthen our policies, which give more effective guidance to our policies and which enable us to carry forward our policies. It is not a question of giving up your policies; it is not a question of carrying out certain policies which are somebody else's because of some pressure on you. It is merely a clearer statement of our policy which has been there all the time.

Now I would like to make a formulation here about which I would request the Minister of External Affairs when he replies to express his opinion. Experience of this year much more than that of the past has shown that all over the world the forces which stand for peace, for national independence, for democracy, for socialism, for socio-economic progress in the newly developing countries are friends and allies. I will repeat this for the benefit of the House. All over the world whoever wants peace and national independence, whoever wants democracy, whoever wants socialism, whoever wants socio-economic progress in the developing countries, they all co-operate. This is the experience and they have to co-operate against the forces of imperialism, against the forces of neo-colonialism, against the forces of war. And this is what you see here in these documents and so far as I have been able to understand Nehru this is what he meant by non-alignment; this is the positive content of non-alignment. What else is the positive content of non-alignment? And this is what most of the time you do. They have not stated like this; if you had stated it like this and given a positive enunciation everybody will understand. Now, does all this mean that there should be no ne-

gotiation with America? Who said so? Nobody has said that. Of course there should be negotiations but you have to be aware who are your friends and who are not. Americans stand for imperialism, for colonialism. Again is it the same thing as dealing with Brezhnev? Now there is this question of economic co-operation. I want to know whether the United States will sign a similar statement with you. If not, why not? Put it to them. Place this very document before Mr. Kissinger, when he comes here. Ask him to sign it. Will he sign it? He will not. So, the point is which are the forces which come together for the purpose of peace? All the time you know which are the international forces which work for peace. India has played its part and we are proud of it. I will not take much of your time. If this clarity is not there, then I have to say, with respect but with a certain sharpness of criticism, that very often very responsible circles, very leading members of the Government, people who speak in the name of the country go on talking in a sweeping fashion about super powers. I want to understand how this talk of super powers fits in with the joint statement which these two countries have signed. In your statement itself you say that in the Indian Ocean we will co-operate together to see that the Indian Ocean remains a zone of peace. After that you come forward and say that there is rivalry of super powers in the Indian Ocean. I do not understand it. Where is the question of rivalry? I find that even the Times of India has admitted that all this talk about the Soviet Union having bases in the Indian Ocean or India willing to give bases to the Soviet Union is wrong. The Times of India has stated it. If that is all wrong, you should together try to establish a peaceful zone in the Indian Ocean. In such a context

a new task force of the Seventh Fleet is coming into the Indian Ocean. After this, are we going to denounce it and protest against it? Or after this, are we again going to say that we are against super power rivalry in the Indian Ocean? I want the Government of India to note which are the countries which are helping you and on what conditions. What strengthens the Indian economy? I would like to know any representative of the Government of India saying that the American economic aid to India has strengthened our economy and strengthened our political independence. This is precisely what you say in these common documents, that our co-operation with the Soviet Union has strengthened our economic and political independence. The manner in which the PL-480 funds have been used, have they strengthened our economy? Have they strengthened our political independence? This kind of thing continues. My point is...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY): You have taken more time.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI: My final point is this. Though normally it does not fall within the discussion on international affairs, it is clear from the documents themselves now that the internal economic problems of a country are also very much connected with the foreign policy of that country. The documents themselves prove it. That is why I want to stress that in this mutual economic co-operation, of course, India also will give something to the Soviet Union. I am not of the view and I do not think anywhere Mr. Brezhnev has said that India alone is going to gain. The Soviet Union is going to gain. Of course, they are going to gain. It is

mutual co-operation. But we are going to get so much kerosene, crude oil and newsprint. (*Time bell rings*). May I frankly state that these should not go into the black market? This is our responsibility. In stating this I am neither denigrating this country nor Mr. Brezhnev. It is a question of responsibility. This Government has to come out very firmly in respect of certain economic exploitation. Otherwise, mere steel will not carry us forward, mere factories will not carry us forward. It is a question of the internal economic forces involved. We have to undertake this new responsibility, if the common agreement is going to be in the interests of the common people and the common man. It is not for the purpose of strengthening some of these reactionary forces. I am just ending. All that I would say in the end is that this kind of policy will really be helpful to India. And as far as any weakening of this policy is concerned, then the dangers actually come in. Dangers do not come to India because of Indo-Soviet co-operation. The dangers of weakening come to India if we go on vacillating to any point, compromising with reaction and such sort of things. Reaction has never excused those who are afraid of reaction. Reaction knows only those who fight reaction. Therefore, let us go forward on it. As I said in the beginning, I say once again there is no doubt that India has played its independent role which is not the role of the satellite of any other country. Let us know who are our friends. Let us know who are our enemies. Let all these friends come together along with us and we will go forward in a far better way than we have done in the past.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are very grateful to the Minister of External Affairs for having given scope to this

[Shri V. B. Raju]

House to take into consideration the changing international situation even though we are very much pre-occupied with our domestic economic situation. Sir, we cannot separate domestic affairs from the international situation and we cannot prevent the impact of the international situation on our domestic affairs.

Sir, the international situation has been changing so rapidly that it hardly gives any scope for discussing security. In fact the events are overtaking us. This is a decade of detente. Peace is indivisible. In fact I had occasion to observe a year ago at the United Nations and here also that a relaxation of tension in the Far-East, in Indo-China or elsewhere shall not result in creating tension in some other area. Sir, unfortunately, the action in terms of peace being extended all over the globe was prevented by the happenings in the Middle East. One significant factor is present in all these happenings that either peace or war, either the establishment of peace or the conduction of war is taking place without the concern of the U.N. It is mostly being done outside the U.N. Premises, or without the supervision of the United Nations Organisation. If the big powers had to come to an understanding in the Vietnam affair, or if the European security and peace are sought to be established through holding a conference, or if the war has taken place again between the Arab world and Israel, in all these three cases I find the U.N. is not in the picture, the U.N. is not taken seriously. It seems as though the United Nations is not the agency which is establishing peace but it is the Agreement between the big powers that is responsible for the establishment of peace or conduction of war. Now, I want a significant change in this trend. I want a change

in such a situation. What role we can play is the most important thing. It is no use criticising anybody by calling him on bad name. It does not pay us. In fact our policies must have meaning. We must have our objectives clearly visible to us and we must always measure the progress in the march towards the achievement of those objectives.

Sir, we want peace in the world in our own self-interest also because we do not want that in a poor country like ours the growth of the defence budget should be at the expense of the toiling millions. The minimum requirements of the toiling millions shall not be denied to them by the increase in the military budget. Therefore, we want relaxation in tension not only in the country but in the whole world because, as I said in the beginning, peace is indivisible. The basic thing here is, we are talking about disarmament, we are talking about understanding and co-operation. But are we talking in terms of reduction in the manufacture of weapons as such? Sir, this is the most significant thing, the most important thing, that we have got to highlight. Now, in certain highly developed countries, their economy is dependent upon the defence industry. If there is no war in any part of the globe, there might be unemployment emerging there. So there might be pulls or pressures on the Governments to see that their interests do not suffer. And to that extent, those Governments contribute to increasing tensions. The basic thing, as I understand, is that we have got to build up world opinion and rouse world conscience on the question of manufacture and supply of weapons.

Sir, you will find that as time passes on, the tension is not only mounting but is coming nearer to our borders. What is happening in West Asia? Even the small countries are stockpiling weapons

beyond their requirements—countries like Kuwait, Iran and Saudi Arabia. They have got the purchasing capacity; they have got the scarce fuel with them. Now, when stockpiling takes place, we do not know what will happen at a future date. We are friendly with them now, there is no immediate danger. But we cannot be blind to these realities. When Mr. Pande says that we have discarded the policy of non-alignment, he should, first of all, understand before making that observation, what meaning it had. Non-alignment does not mean a passive expression. Non-alignment does not mean that we should be a helpless or a meek spectator of world happenings, when the world is moving in a wrong direction. When something is happening in our neighbourhood which is going to throw the globe into a confusion, we cannot keep quiet. How did non-alignment take its birth? The world has now gone far away from those days when the world was parcelled into two blocs between the two big powers. Not aligning ourselves with any one bloc was, we thought, non-alignment. But now there are no blocs. There are no military groupings. The world has moved far away from that position. The centres of power are now many. What will happen with regard to the oil crisis in the next one decade, we do not know. What is going to happen to the military capability of industrially developed countries like Japan and countries of Western Europe, we do not know, because oil forms a very important ingredient in all these activities, industrial or military. So today we have to look to our region, to our neighbourhood. You know what happened in 1962. At that time many friends had remarked that India had no friends, that the policy of non-alignment had resulted in not having any friends in the world. It was a remark made

by some parties at that time. To-day we make some bilateral arrangement for peace, friendship and co-operation. Again the same friends criticise that we have become aligned. What needs to be done is not only a reaction to a particular situation but also a positive act. Now, can Mr. Pande, or for that matter any other friend in the Opposition, say that there has been any inconsistency in the policies pursued in the last decade and a half? Can any friend criticise that there is deviation from the policy that Nehru had presented to this country—Nehru, the father of our foreign policy? I should say there has been perfect consistency. Even though some friends criticised us in the heat of the moment, later on they fell in line with us. Take the case of Bangla Desh. I was present in this House and I saw how friends were pressurising the Government to recognise Bangla Desh even before the appropriate time came. I know how they were pressurising the Government, how some big countries criticised us that we made a military intervention in that country. But today a large number of countries have recognised Bangla Desh though technically it is not admitted into the United Nations. And many countries came forward to help in its rehabilitation. Take the latest case of the Middle-East. In the war between the Arabs and the Israelis we stood by the Arabs—for a just cause. What does Japan say today? What does West Europe say today? When oil has been used as a weapon, through coercion they are acting. But not by coercion we have agreed. Out of our own volition, out of our own voluntary nature, because of our consistency in our policy, we felt that areas cannot be acquired by aggression. Therefore, what is wrong with our foreign policy? Our friendship with Soviet Russia does not prevent us from improving our relations

[Shri V B Raju]

with America or our relations with China. Therefore, at a particular point of time in history we have to act, and we have acted correctly. Then geography dictates that we and the USSR have got to share peace here. It is a destiny. It is a compulsion. The responsibility lies on this nation and the USSR, to try for establishing a durable peace. And in fact, Mr Swaran Singh has been addressed as a person contributing for a durable peace or working for a durable peace, and he has been addressed as a durable Minister also. I am sure his efforts will be crowned with success definitely. In fact, what in Nehru's time and Lal Bahadur Shastri's time we could not secure—relations with Pakistan as such—today our relations with Pakistan are much better off. Of course, there is much more to be done, I know. Therefore, what we have to take note of is the changed world situation. In this world situation what I find today is regional stability, regional peace, regional understanding. From a global aspect to a regional position we have come to. It is not going back. So we are looking to our neighbours. Does not Mr Pande agree that we are having more friendly relations with our neighbours and that our neighbours look to us with a better appreciation of our stand? Does he not recognise that fact? It is true that we have not been able to mend fences with China. But I do not know what hostility is there between China and India. Everytime we talk about it in this House. We have still diplomatic relations. We have not broken off diplomatic relations. The only thing is a technical matter that we should send an Ambassador there and they should send an Ambassador here. What else is there? I do not think that we should talk as though there is some deep hostility between that country and this country.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE (Uttar Pradesh) It is not so simple

SHRI V B RAJU In the past we used to consider that whoever supported us on the question of our relations with Pakistan was our friend and whoever did not support us on that matter was our enemy. It is not a correct attitude. Every country has its own reasons and its own peculiar interests to be friendly or not to be friendly and what degree of friendship it should have with other countries is their affair. You cannot compel them. So today if we can succeed in improving our relations with Pakistan, if we are able to build up an area of peace in our immediate neighbourhood, we need not worry about our relations with China. China itself will be anxious to secure our cooperation. If we are seeking Russian co-operation and if we need it and if we had it, it is for the mutual benefit. Even Soviet Russia requires our co-operation in their approach to Asian affairs. So, it is mutual. We should not say that we have sold ourselves. How does the question of selling arise? It is not a military pact under which we leave all our defence establishments and military installations to the care and supervision of any other country. That will be degrading ourselves and it deserves self-condemnation. What I would plead is that our foreign policy has been consistent and it is correct. Our attitude to our neighbours should continue to be positive and this bilateralism or our entering into certain agreements with other countries for economic, technological and cultural co-operation, understanding and development is what every civilised nation should do. There is nothing wrong about it.

Lastly, this country which has stood consistently for the establishment of peace should be able to speak from a

position of strength. Our internal strength should give us capacity to influence our external relations. Unless this country is economically strong, our voice would not be listened to in the forums of the world. Now our external relations are excellent. It is time that we take advantage of our relations with friendly countries to improve our economy and to put our economy on even keel so that we can influence the world affairs.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, from the introductory speech of the Minister of External Affairs one finds that at the international scene there are some hopeful signs as well as some ominous signs.

The hopeful signs are peace in India — also called sub-continent, a term which is used by the Minister of External Affairs and which appears almost on every page of the reports of the Ministry of External Affairs. 'Sub-continent' is a term that is unknown to physical as well as to political geography. This word was used by the British in order

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. B. Raju) in the Chair]

to boost their importance and prestige as bearing the white man's burden in India's sub-continent. Therefore, they used that word. Why should we go on using this inelegant word is something which I cannot understand. Geography knows India only as a peninsula and it is a great peninsula. The word 'peninsula' should be substituted for the word 'sub-continent' which is an ugly-looking word and unknown elsewhere. The hopeful signs, as I said, are peace in the Indian peninsula, peace between Pakistan and India, peace between India—not only peace, but friendship and active co-operation—and Bangla Desh. The rest of the hopeful signs are movement towards detente between Russia and West Germany, of course

at too high a price of recognition of East Germany by them, detente between USA and Russia and detente between China and the USA. These are all hopeful signs, pregnant with hopes of peace in the future.

But there are also ominous signs. First of all, war in West Asia.

That war in West Asia served to increase the political prestige of India, the international prestige of India, because, Sir, by the Government of India's support of the Arabs against the Israelis in this recent war, India has made eternal friends with the Arab States and this is because of the fact that by the Government of India's support the morale of the Arab States was greatly increased and they recovered the military prestige that was lost by them during the previous war. Therefore, the Arab States will be eternally grateful to India and we have already gained by this gratitude of theirs because oil is coming freely to India unlike other countries.

Then, Sir, the international prestige of India is also proved and illustrated by the number of missions and visits that India has had, a procession of emperors, kings, Prime Ministers and other ministries, who have been coming to India to discuss problems of world peace, economic cooperation and other subjects. The latest of these peace visits, of course, is the visit of the Communist Party chief of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev. Sir, it looked very much like a lovers' feast, this visit, I mean and it was not a friends' corner, as is illustrated by the welcome address which was delivered to him at a joint meeting of the Members of Parliament when the address of welcome looked more like the pleading of a forlorn lover to an indifferent person loved. But love is not an element in politics, much less in international politics, because love is isolationist and will not tolerate any other rivals. So, what

[Shri M Ruthnaswamy]

is wanted is friendship between nations and, in fact, the essence of friendship is its many-sidedness. To depend on one friend is a dangerous move because if this friend deserts you, you are left with no other friends since others won't make up with you as you have depended on one single friend only. That is why while welcoming the treaty of friendship and economic co-operation with the Soviet Union, we, at least on this side of the House, will not be satisfied unless the treaties of friendship and mutual co-operation with the Soviet Union are balanced by similar treaties with the USA, with China and so on.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI He is not wedded to Russia

SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY Our relations with the USA may be described as correct, but not cordial. So, if we are to benefit by this treaty with the Soviet Union, there must be a balance of treaties, one treaty counteracting the effect of another and to be solely dependent on one friend alone is, as I said, a great danger.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI Who is the beloved here?

SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY In regard to the economic pact, the one objection that I have about it is that it is a pact with a highly industrialized country. The result of this pact will be a great leaning towards heavy industries, the basic industries as the Minister calls them, heavy electricals, heavy engineering goods. By an economic pact with a State like the Soviet Union, which is highly industrialized—and I would say the same thing about the USA because that is also a highly industrialized country—what we will get is greater emphasis upon production of heavy engineering goods and heavy industrial goods. This economic pact will be of no benefit to the rural population of India, to rural

public works, rural industries, village industries, cottage industries. These will not be benefited by this economic pact with the Soviet Union. The vast majority of the population will not economically benefit from this economic pact. I would much prefer such economic treaties between countries that are similarly situated like France, like Denmark which has specialized in cattle industry, in dairy industry, with Italy. There is Japan which has specialized not only in large-scale industry but also small-scale industry. There is Switzerland. Much of its industry is distributed among cottages and villages. Many of the parts for heavy engineering are produced in villages and cottages in Japan as in Switzerland. That is why we should prefer economic pacts with such countries.

Then comes the great problem of the Indian Ocean. I have always felt and said that it is no use prohibiting other countries from working in the Indian Ocean, because all oceans are high waterways and a great means of communication between continents. The Indian Ocean belongs to the world and any world power has a right to be active in the Indian Ocean. We cannot say that the Atlantic Ocean should be reserved for NATO powers, nor can we say that the Pacific Ocean should be reserved for the USA, because it has so many islands and settlements in the Pacific Ocean. Russia has brought its Navy in the Indian Ocean on friendly visits to Indian ports. And here I would like to say that in a recent article in October 1973 in the Swiss Review of World Affairs, a reputable international journal—in fact it was recommended by the great French publicist, Raymon Aron as being a very impartial and independent journal on international affairs—it was stated that there were Russian naval stations on the coast of India. I do not know whether it

is true I would like to have a contradiction of this fact. In the meantime, I have been relieved by the Prime Minister's statement, which also appeared not in an Indian paper but in the 'News week' of the USA, that she refused Mr Brezhnev's request for dock facilities for the Russian fleet in India.

SHRI C D PANDE That's very good.

SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY What I was saying is that together with the Russian presence and the USA presence in the Indian Ocean, the Indian presence in the Indian Ocean must be strengthened. Our naval strength, especially our coastal defences, should be strengthened. Our naval station in the Andamans should be strengthened. It would command entrance between the South-East-Asia seas and the Indian Ocean. With regard to the collective security pact which was also mooted by Secretary Brezhnev during his conversations with the Prime Minister and other leaders of the Government, I would ask why somebody else from outside Asia should take initiative in organising collective security in Asia. The lead should be taken by an Asian power and India on account of its population and military strength should take the lead. The London Times wrote that India was the biggest military power in Asia at present. India should have taken the lead in organising collective security in Asia. I am glad to know that although the idea was mooted by Secretary Brezhnev, the Government of India under the leadership of the Prime Minister did not go into the details and did not accept it as it was suggested. So, Sir, my conclusion in regard to international affairs and the Government's attitude to the internal affairs is that it should always take an independent and impartial attitude, not committed to any one power however friendly and great it may be because the friends of today become the

enemies of tomorrow. Therefore, our foreign policy should include, in its survey, the friendliness of as many powers as possible because then only India will be able to have an impartial and independent foreign policy and, as I said, one power will balance the other and keep India free from any commitment. I hope and trust that the Minister of External Affairs will keep this view in mind and then whatever policy we follow in regard to international affairs, it will keep India free and independent in regard to formulation of such an important subject of administration as our foreign policy is. Thank you.

DR VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT (Nominated) Mr Vice Chairman Sir, I should like to begin by welcoming certain features of recent developments on this sub-continent or on this peninsula as my hon friend would like to call it. May I add that a rose is a rose no matter what name you give it? I welcome the recent developments, particularly the efforts to break the impasse over an emotional human problem, the initiative taken by our Government, the magnanimity of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, good sense exhibited by Mr Bhutto and the resolution of the problem of the prisoners of war, of Bengalis in Pakistan and of Pakistanis in Bangladesh which have further diffused the tensions in this area. Sir, I believe that the awareness is growing among the people of all the three countries of this area that basically they face the same problems, overcoming the poverty, liquidating agricultural backwardness and emerging into a period of modern industrialisation. I know, and we need have no illusions, that there are going to be road blocks, the path will be strewn by difficulties. Mr Bhutto's recent statements on Kashmir are a rude reminder of the obstacles and the hurdles. I think the best answer to Mr Bhutto has already been given by

[Dr. Vidya Prakash Dutt.]

Sheikh Abdullah: "Physician, heal thyself. Put your own house in order first." The trouble with Mr. Bhutto or the trouble of Mr. Bhutto is that with his power base in Punjab, he is unwilling or unable to accommodate the rising demand of other regions for a place in the power structure of Pakistan and their increasing dissatisfaction at being treated like poor relations and second class citizens. Sir, if he can resolve that contradiction, he will not feel the need for diversionary moves, and the present statements on Kashmir are obvious diversionary tactics.

However, I submit, Sir, that our sights need not be lowered and our perspective need not be dimmed by these difficulties. There can be only one sensible policy for India: firmness combined with flexibility, open-mindedness and open-heartedness combined with vigilance and preparedness for all eventualities.

Sir, I also take this opportunity of welcoming the recent agreements with the Soviet Union, the visit of Mr. Brezhnev, and the Joint Declaration issued thereafter, as well as other agreements. I believe we need not be apologetic about our friendships, we need not be apologetic about a policy of extending the area of friendship, we, need not be apologetic about acquiring greater strength and leverage for ourselves.

I should like to draw your attention, Mr. Vice-Chairman and the hon. Members, to the principles that this Joint Declaration has enunciated, for governing relations among all Asian countries, in fact, among all the countries of the world. And I am sorry that there was so little mention of these principles while we went on tilting at the wind-mills, at phrases and words which are not there in the Declaration at all. And I should like to draw the attention of the hon. House to these principles, which I may sum up as broad development of mutually benefi-

cial co-operation and the strengthening peace and stability in Asia through common efforts by all the States of Asia, creation of conditions to permit the people to live in peace and good neighbourliness and use of man-power and material resources of the countries in this area for solving social and economic problems, and for the uplift of their economy and culture, renunciation of the use of force, inviolability of borders, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and broad development of economic and other co-operation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. Sir, no principle has been sacrificed here, and no policy has been violated. And the position of India has been undermined in no way. These are unexceptionable principles. These are the principles with which we can go to the Asian countries and for which we can work among the Asian countries for bringing about this kind of a situation which the Joint Communiqué has talked about. My hon. friend, Mr. Ruthnaswamy may be correct in saying that the Asian countries should take the initiative, and I do believe that the Soviet Union is also an Asian country. However, I do agree that the Asian countries should take the initiative but I am saying, here is the initiative and here are the principles enunciated by the Prime Minister of India along with the leader of the Soviet Union, the principles to which nobody can take any exception, the principles whose great merit is that they are not based on any negative approach, they are not based on any antagonistic approach to any other country. They are not based on a militaristic approach or on an approach of conflict and prejudice. They are based on an approach which I would describe as calling for broad economic co-operation and general friendship among all Asian countries. Now, this, I think, is something which nobody ought to take exception to.

Sir, I submit that there is no need to mix up the question of relations with the Soviet Union with that of relations with China. Unfortunately, we keep on doing that. Unfortunately, even my friends of the CPM whenever they mention the Soviet Union, they find it obligatory to mention the Peoples Republic of China also. I submit that there is no need at all for doing this. There is no need whatsoever for our mixing up the two. Our relations with the Soviet Union do not and should not stand in the way of our relations with China. Sir, China is a great neighbour of ours with an ancient civilisation and a great deal of current potential power. For the peace of Asia and the world, I am convinced that it would be in the interests of both the countries that they should have normal friendly relations. But, I should like to add for the benefit of those of my friends—who have gone away now and who are all the time mixing up the issue of our relations with the Soviet Union and China that our problem with China or Chinese problem with us has nothing to do with our relationship with the Soviet Union. It is not the Indo-Soviet Treaty or the Indo-Soviet Joint Declaration which stands in the way of normalisation of relations with China. It is Peking's primary and priority commitment to Pakistan which is the main obstacle at present. I can assure you that Chinese are not responding to our overtures not because of the Indo-Soviet Treaty but because they do not want to confuse and annoy Pakistani opinion at this time. They will respond when they are certain of the situation at that front. Therefore, Sir, I cannot conceive of anybody advocating a policy which says that by closing your existing options, you open up new ones, which says shut the door to a friend in order to have friendship with another country which says that the bird in hand is not worth two

in the bush that are more beautiful and therefore should be striven for. Well, Sir, I do not regard this policy as a reasonable or sensible policy for any country to adopt. In fact, the policy that all countries of the world are adopting is, that they are keeping existing options and opening ones, and keeping friends and reducing animosities with others. This is a policy which we also must adopt.

Sir, I should like to say a word or two about the Indian Ocean. There is no doubt that we are extremely concerned about the problem of the Indian Ocean, about foreign armed as now sailing up and down the Indian Ocean, about arms being inducted into this area far beyond the legitimate needs of the countries around it. Only yesterday I saw in the International Herald that the Defence Secretary of the United States had said in a statement on 30th November that the aircraft carrier Hancock and a task force of supporting ships sent to the Indian Ocean during the Middle-East war will be replaced soon by another task force commanded by the carrier Oriskany. Then he goes on to add "We are all aware of the growing interests that obtains in the Indian Ocean as a result of events that have occurred over the past four weeks. We intend that our visits to the Indian Ocean will be more regular."

5 P M

Now, Sir, I may say we are flattered with their intention to visit us but I would like to see a visit of a different kind. In regard to the question that my hon friend raised here the whole problem is not whether other countries should have access to the Indian ocean or not but what kind of presence they will have. Will they have their armada and warships sailing all round or will they treat this ocean for communications and for extending goodwill? Therefore,

[Dr. Vidya Prakash Dutt.]

I would appeal to the United States that they should visit us as friends and not with warships.

I am glad that the communique, the joint declaration that has been signed, is an advance on the previous Soviet decision. The Soviet Union has agreed with the Indian Government that they will work towards the solution of the problem of making the Indian Ocean a region of peace. I hope the Soviet Union will be even more forthcoming in the future so that all countries of the world can work together. In any case, all countries which are situated on the Indian Ocean region should cooperate with each other in seeing to it that the tensions do not increase.

Sir, I might add here in passing, I do not see what is humiliating if we have concluded an agreement by which the Bhilai Steel Plant will increase its steel production from 2.5 million to 7 million tonnes and the Bokaro Steel Plant from 4 million to 10 million tonnes. In other words, the total production there in the two plants will increase from 6 million to 17 million tonnes. Now, Sir, I do not see what is humiliating about it, as my hon. friend mentioned here. What is humiliating about the creation, construction and expansion of oil refineries, of copper mining complex, of petro-chemical complex, of electrical goods manufacturing enterprises and so on and so forth? Sir, these are the things which form the strength of a country and which will help us to be self-reliant and to be independent of other countries of the world, including the countries that they have in mind.

Sir, I would like to make the last point. I hope you will allow me a few minutes to mention this point because I would like to give a slightly different

perspective, a slightly different analysis of the international situation. Sir, I believe that every country, and certainly our country, must keep a certain conceptual framework for our foreign policy, that we must have a certain perspective for our foreign policy, that we must have clear goals and objectives and not fall in the trap of *ad-hocism*. Therefore, if we study the whole movement of contemporary international relations, the development of the international situation from the last two decades and project into the next two decades then I should submit with all humility to my hon. Minister and the hon. State Minister for External Affairs who are far more knowledgeable than I am, that the entire history of the last two decades and the projection in the next two decades show that it is a movement from the cold war in the past to detente at present to disengagement in the future, from alignment in the past to non-alignment at present to a general unalignment in the future, from by-polar in the past to multi-polar at present to a diffused power structure in the future. This is the perspective that, I believe, we should keep before us. This is the objective for which we must work and I must say that the vision of Jawaharlal Nehru approximates reality ever more closely than before.

Sir, all along in the last two decades the main effort of the big powers has been to control the international system, to manipulate the international system, interventionsim—structuring the external political, military environment and determining the behaviour of other countries either in collaboration or in conflict or in contention.

This has been the main underlying dimension of US policies and the policies of the big Powers. But, Sir, every development in recent times has shown

that the entire weapon system, the nuclear weapons, the ballistic missiles, all these have precipitated a movement towards unalignment, an inevitable disintegration of the old international system and the recreation of a new international system in which larger number of countries will play an increasing role. Therefore, Sir, without trying to simplify the issues and without ignoring the role of the military while we do keep our military preparedness in shape we must also have this larger perspective in view what is happening before us in the world today and what will happen in the coming years is that the rising cost of the application of power and the diminishing value of its effect and potency will bring about a transformation of the international situation. Today as a result of this realisation they have come to what is called a five-power multi-polar world, that is, United States, Soviet Union, France, Britain, Japan and China. I would like to submit that this is only a transitional phase; this is an interim period. We are moving on and we should have that perspective in mind that we are moving on to a period in which even this 5-polar world will dissolve and will be further diffused into a world of many powers.

I would therefore, finally suggest to the Government that keeping in view all this we must adopt a multi-dimensional foreign policy. Today I do not have the time to spell it out but I would like to say that there should be five ends of this multi-dimensional foreign policy. One end reaches out to our neighbours, South East Asian countries, Asian, African and Latin American community. This is the area where we with our strength and power consolidate their gains and where they with their power, whatever it is, come to our side. The second is our relations with the Soviet

Union; the third, our relations with the United States and China; fourth, our relations with Japan; and fifth, our relations with Europe. This is the Kind of multi-dimensional foreign policy with five ends that we should develop. Without going into details—I will use some other opportunity here and elsewhere to spell out these ideas—I would like to say that unless we develop with full complexity and finesse this multi-dimensional and multiple relationship we will not be able to face the challenges of today.

Thank you.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, within the very limited time available to me it is not possible even to touch the extensive panorama of external affairs that have been dealt with here. I shall therefore confine myself to a narrow compass, namely, the relationship of India with the Soviet Union which has been made the target of attack from that side of the House. The democrat, Mr. C. D. Pande—he was very particular to point out that he was a democrat so that we may not have any doubt on this point—made a serious attack against the Agreements and the Declaration which have recently been entered into and made at the time of Mr. Brezhnev's visit.

One of the points made is that by becoming closer to Russia we have abandoned our policy of non-alignment. As has already been pointed out by you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, up to this time the complaint was that being nonaligned we have no friends. Now, having got a friend, the complaint is that thereby we are abandoning our non-alignment policy. To me it sounds to be an extremely confusing conundrum. There must be an explanation to this conundrum.

[Dr. V. A. Seyid Muhammad.]

to this confusing situation. The explanation is that certain words for which we have certain meanings, have different meanings to the democrat Mr. Pande and his party. When he says an unfriendly attitude towards a particular country, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know which country that is.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): I think this is an occasion when there is not a single Member of the opposition here.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD: When they use the expression 'committed to a particular country', we know what that particular country is. It is really an extremely sad situation. Whatever we do is wrong. It is like saying: heads I lose, tails you win. If we are friendly, we lose our non-alignment. If we continue to be non-aligned, we are losing friends.

Now, I come to the specific complaint made by him. I do not think my respected and hon. friend has spent any time analysing the conditions laid down in the various agreements. He has made particular reference to the agreement on planning between the USSR and India. His allegation is because of this planning we will become—the expression 'satellite' was not used in that connection, but it is obvious what is meant because by that time the hon. Minister of External Affairs objected to his using that expression in reference to other countries. What was meant was that by entering into this agreement we have become a satellite or a country subordinate to Russia. I do not know how that is so. What does this particular agreement, to which he has referred, say? It says in article 1 that there shall be a study group. Its function is to exchange experience and knowledge on

the subjects enumerated therein. He also used the word 'humiliating'. I shall refer to it later on. I do not know since when exchanging knowledge and information has become humiliating. As you know, this is a country where emperors have discarded their crown, sword and robe to go and learn at the feet of savants and imbibe knowledge. I do not know how exchange of knowledge has become humiliating. How does it make a country subordinate? How does it make country a satellite? I am unable to appreciate it. I shall point out what is meant by a humiliating act. In fact, regarding the visit of Mr. Brezhnev, the Newsweek of America, emanating from that Mecca of democracy, and of my friend, the democrat Mr. Pande, jubilantly said that Mr. Brezhnev has completely failed in his mission. One reason is he did not get port facilities in India and secondly the Asia Security idea was not sold here. That is the assessment of Newsweek which is emanating from the Mecca of democracy. Let us not try to be more loyal than the king. I can point out that when we try to be more loyal than the king, then we enter into a situation which is humiliating. Imbibing knowledge and exchanging knowledge is not humiliating. Now, we know very well who are our friends and who have been our friends consistently.

Since 1955 onwards in the Security Council whenever the Kashmir question arose Russia was with us. On a number of occasions Russia used the veto. Thus it prevented the American-sponsored and engineered attempt to pass a resolution wanting a plebiscite in Kashmir. Then again when the Goa question came and America declared that Goa is a province of Portugal thereby suggesting that even the operative clauses of the N.A. T.O. Pact could be invoked against India, at that time also that Russia

stood with us. I need not repeat the occasions. Whenever an occasion arose to uphold the prestige of India in the international forums, whether it is the Indo-China Commission, whether it is at the time of the Disarmament Conference, whether it is at the time when the American interference in the Lebanon and Jordan came, on all these occasions Russia stood with us and tried to back us to the hilt. In the United Nations in 1971 when the Bangladesh question was there, it is recorded history how Russia stood with us. And was the role being played by the democratic country and the friends of our democrat Mr. Pande? These are well known facts. Simply because we enter into closer relations how can it become objectionable and we become satellite immediately.

We have been studying the Asian Security idea. While agreeing on many points with Mr. Sardesai who spoke on the subject, he made an extremely earnest attempt to sell the idea of Asian Security. But I do not know how we can accept that idea. The idea of Asian Security started in 1969. The first time it was pronounced at the International Communist Conference. Then in Moscow Mr. Brezhnev made a speech. Subsequently also at the Soviet Trade Unions' Conference Mr. Brezhnev elaborated it. From all this what picture emerges? It is essentially the picture of the Bandung principles. In the international sphere it is the peaceful coexistence. In his speech which he made to the Joint Session of Parliament he brought out two points which he has not mentioned earlier. Those points are: (1) peace in the Indian Ocean, and (2) Furtherance of this idea which is only an elaboration of the previous idea. If that is so, it would show how much of it we have accepted and how for we

are wedded to the principles of peaceful co-existence. Then why this special appellation, "Asian Security"? That is what we fail to understand. If Asian Security is substantially the same as the previous principle which have been accepted as the Bandung principles, then why this appellation, "Asian Security"? There the difficulty arises. Mr. Sardesai asked what is our objection about "Security", why should we object to the word? I can remind him of one thing. I do not know whether he was a party to that discussion about naming the Communist Party. When a proposal came to name the Communist Party of India, there was a section which said that it must be the Indian Communist Party while the other section said that it was a dangerous thing and that the name should be the Communist Party of India. If the words have no meaning and no significance, why should his party object to it? Even though we accept the basic principles, the expression "Asian Security" has got certain other significance which we have to consider. Let us not be taken merely as persons who are really having a sort of jugglery with words.

It is not that we are taking objection unnecessarily to the words "Asian security". As I said, if those principles are accepted, why should it be sold in a new bottle called "Asian security"? Let us continue the Bandung principles. Why this new garb and why this insistence that the expression "Asian security" should be accepted? There is much more than mere wording here. The words have a significance. They have been deliberately used. Even though Mr. Brezhnev has declared more than once that it does not connote a military alliance, it does not connote a military bloc, it is a matter which India has seriously to consider. If the principles

[Dr. V. A. Seyid Muhammad.]

are the same, we have no objection to "Asian security". It is not easy for Mr. Sardesai or his party to say that because they accept these words, these words do not mean anything. They do mean something. That is our difference.

Then I must tell this House another thing. Now, regarding this agreement with Russia, the allegation has been made that thereby we are merely making this country a subject-country of Russia. When Nixon goes to China, it is good. When Nixon goes to Russia, it is equally good. When Mr. Brezhnev goes to America, it is excellent. But when Mr. Brezhnev comes here and we have a mutual aid agreement, it becomes subordination of this country. I do not understand this logic. I remember in this connection a joke which was prevailing about Mr. Churchill during the pre-independence days. It was said that if Mr. Churchill was occasions to use the word "India", he always gargled with potassium permanganate. Similarly, I feel that here the main objection is not the principle, not the terms of the agreement, not the effect of the agreement but that we should have nothing to do with Russia, which is abominable and objectionable to them. (*Time-bell rings*) I am sure most of our friends here, our democrats, have come here with a considerable quantity of potassium permanganate in their pockets so that immediately after the debate is over, they can go through the Churchillian operation. Thank you.

SHRI ABU ABRAHAM (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as has been already said, 1973 has been an important year in international affairs. It has seen the development of the *detente* between the United States of America and China. It has seen the

growing co-operation between India and Soviet Russia which was formalised and further strengthened by Mr. Brezhnev's recent visit to this country. This year also witnessed the war in the Middle-East. Whether this can be called a positive or a negative feature, speaking in the context of the broad pattern of history, will depend on the outcome of the negotiations that are to take place.

Internally 1973 was a very bad year for us. It has seen a kind of stagnation in the industrial and economic field and also much restlessness and violence among the people. Nevertheless, it is something on which we can congratulate ourselves, that our internal weaknesses have not diminished the strength of our foreign policy. Our foreign policy, Sir, has indeed shown in the last two years a steadiness and a maturity that in a way reflects our inner strength and the influence that India has gradually built up over the years in the international field. It can be said that our foreign policy is in effect a blend to-day of our basic ideals and a healthy pragmatism. To-day, if I may say so, it has a personality that is much more clearly defined than it was before. We are not a big power, but we have come to be in international affairs a big influence. And with the growing relaxation of tensions between the big powers, we have an opportunity to use this influence for achieving a lasting peace in the world and co-operation between nations. Our Government's policy in the West Asian crisis is, to my mind, a good example of how our self-interest has coincided with the ideals which we have always followed in world affairs. Despite much criticism from various quarters, our Government has consistently supported the Arab cause, and in doing so, I believe that they were not only morally and politically correct, but they were

also acting in the best interests of India and of Asia. But whether this policy is accepted by the vast majority of our people or not I do not know. But that should not worry the Government unduly. A foreign policy cannot be run on the basis of opinion polls. There are some people, of course, who argue that every decision the Government takes should reflect public opinion. It may be desirable if it can be so. But in international affairs it is not only not feasible, but can also be very dangerous. Therefore, the Government need not be too worried about the criticisms of the West Asian policy in a section of the press and from Opposition parties. The Jana Sangh seems to think that any country that does not support us in our confrontation or disputes with Pakistan should not receive any support from us. If this principle is followed what an extra-ordinary confusion and chaos it will create in our international dealings! If a foreign policy is as simple as that, that every country if it does not support us in this or that situation, we are going to be hostile to it, then there is no going to send our ambassadors or mission staff, what all we need to have a ministry of external affairs. No need to have ambassadors and expensive staff. All we have to do is to make a list of our enemies, our enemies' friends and enemies' enemies, and then say, we support this country or we do not support that country and so on and so forth. This is the diplomacy of the market place. It is a kind of gang warfare. I think the Ministry of External Affairs might consider taking some greater pains to educate the public on certain details of our foreign policy and the reasoning behind it. The Ministry spends much money on external publicity to project our point of view abroad. We also need some internal publicity on external mat-

ters. The man in the street in India assumes that all Arabs are Muslims and simply because they are Muslims they support Pakistan, and because of Pakistan we cannot support the Arabs. This is a crude way of choosing sides and deciding issues. In any case, we should remember that not all Arabs are Muslims. Many Arabs are Christians and they are no less opposed to Israel than their Muslim brethren. The Arab case is simple and fundamental. It is this that there was once a State called Palestine, one of the most ancient States in West Asia with a civilisation dating back to a few thousand years. And this State has now been virtually destroyed and the people displaced and their property taken away. Millions have been thrown into the desert to fend for themselves. The intellectuals and the well-to-do have gone to Lebanon and other neighbouring countries. The peasants, deprived of their lands, have been rotting for the last many years in the wild deserts of Jordan. They once lived in Palestine and cultivated their lands. They now neither land nor a nationality. I think this is perhaps the only instance in history where an entire nation has been eliminated and a new nation with a new population established in that region. What we think of certain Arab States or what certain Arab States think about us is quite irrelevant as far as the question of Palestine is concerned. In fact, this is not a dispute between the Arabs and the Israelis at all. It is not a dispute over a piece of territory which both sides are claiming. This is a case of the assertion of Palestinian nationalism and the attempt of the Palestinians, with the help of other Arab countries of course, to restore their rights. Surely this is a legitimate and fundamental aspiration. Therefore, we should not confuse our thinking by bringing in irrele-

[Shri Abu Abraham.]

relevant considerations like religion and religious loyalties into this question. If religion comes into the picture at all, it is only in the sense that there is much in common in the traditions of the Jewish, Christian and Muslim religions.

Palestine is important not only to the Jews, but also to Muslims throughout the world and also to Christians. In Palestine Christians, Jews and Muslims lived for centuries in peace and harmony and have shared the common history and culture of the region. Therefore, to discuss the Palestinian question in religious terms is to confuse the main issue which is, as I said, the restoration of Palestine to the Palestinians. But I agree, and most Arabs also agree today, that it is not possible to undo Israel or to rectify the original mistake of the establishment of Israel. But what world opinion and the big powers can achieve is to compel Israel to give up the territories they took by force in 1967 so that at least a smaller State of Palestine can be established where at least a proportion of those who have been thrown out can be settled again.

West Asian peace is linked with the future of the whole of Asia and it is of vital importance to the creation of a united Asia. Asian unity is an ideal that we should pursue, whatever may be the temporary difficulties. Ultimately such an ideal can be achieved only when Soviet Russia and China come to better understanding and co-operation

It could well be that India may have a role to play in this matter; but meanwhile I think it is important that we make our best efforts to improve our relations with China, no matter what the present relations between Soviet Russia and China may be. I do hope that the close ties that we have between

our country and the Soviet Union will not inhibit us from establishing better understanding with China and I hope that the Soviet leaders will also see that it is in their interest and in the larger interests of Asia that they should welcome better relations between India and China. Some friends of Soviet Russia in India are in the habit of saying that the time is not opportune for establishing closer relations with China. There is no opportune time for friendship and peace. All times are good enough. We should not be unduly hurt by some of the abrasive remarks coming from Peking. We should try and understand their point of view and some of their fears, which I think are legitimate fears and natural fears, and work towards the ideal of Asian unity and co-operation. May I also say that no matter how preoccupied we are with our relations with the larger powers, we should not lose sight of the fact that we have many smaller countries as our neighbours with whom it is necessary to establish better relations.

Australia, Sir, is not an Asian country. But under its new Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, it has shown a deep interest in regional co-operation and development. We should, therefore, develop closer relations with Australia.

Asian unity may seem at present a remote idea, but in a rapidly changing world, I think it can be achieved in our own life time.

I would like to conclude by quoting a passage from a book by the late Mr. Lester Pearson of Canada. He says:

The true realist is the man who sees things both as they are and as they can be. In every situation, there is a possibility of improvement—in every life the hidden capacity for something

better. True realism involves a dual vision, both sight and insight.

- -

شری ایم۔ اسعد مدنی (اُتر پردیش):

وائس چھرمین صاحب۔ ہمارے ملک کی جو ودیش نیتی ہے وہ حقیقت میں بہت اچھے اصولوں پر مبنی ہے۔ ہم نے آزادی سے پہلے بھی تمام دنیا کے ملکوں اور دبی ہوئی قوموں کا باوجود اس کے کہ اُس وقت ہم لوگ خود غلام تھے لیکن اپنی طاقت سے کوئی زیادہ ہی ان کی حمایت کی ہے اُن کا ساتھ دیا ہے۔ اس معاملہ میں ہماری تاریخ بہت شان دار ہے۔ اس وقت بھی انہوں اصولوں کو اپنے سامنے حکومت ہند رکھتی ہے ارد ایسی قومیں۔ ملک دو آزاد رہنا چاہتے ہیں اور آزادی رکھنا چاہتے ہیں، آزاد زندگی بسر کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ ایک دوسرے پر دباؤ ڈالنا غلام بنانے کے غلط طریقوں سے اپنا تسلط قائم کرنا اس طرح کی ان کی منشا اور پالیسی نہیں ہے اسے ملکوں کا ہندوستان ساتھ دیتا رہا ہے اور اس کی اس پالیسی پر پوری طاقت کے ساتھ پوری قوت کے ساتھ قائم رہنا چاہئے تاکہ پہلے زمانے میں اور آج ہمارے عمل میں کام میں فرق نہ ہو اور ہم ابداً ایک سچا سیدھا ریکارڈ قائم کر سکیں اور اس پر چلتے رہیں ظاہر ہے اگر ہمیں اس آزاد پالیسی پر حلفا ہے تو اپنے ساتھیوں کو دھونڈنا، ساتھ لینا اور ساتھ دینا پوچھا جو اس طرح کی انصاف پر مبنی پالیسی پر چل رہے ہوں اور اگر اس طرح کی کسی ساکھ کی وجہ سے ہم پر الزام بھی آجائے بدنام کیا جائے تشویش محسوس کی جائے تو اس سے ہم کو گھبرانا نہیں

چاہیئے جو لوگ ہمیں اس صاف سیدھے سچے راستے سے ہٹانا چاہتے ہیں ان کا اس میں کچھ ہمت ہے کچھ خاص غرض ہے مقصد ہے تو ہم کو صحیح الفاظ استعمال کرنا چاہئے۔ بدنام اور شرمندہ کرنے کی کوشش کرنا اس طرح سے ہم اپنے ضمیر کی آواز کو صحیح طور پر قائم نہیں رکھ سکیں گے اس لئے ہم کو اس بات کی پرواہ نہیں کرنی چاہئے اور ان معاملات کو اسی طرح دیکھنا چاہئے۔

ہمارے تعلقات دنیا کے بہت سے ملکوں اور قوموں سے پہلے بھی رہے ہیں اور آج بھی ہیں۔ عرب ملک ہمارے ہندوستان کی پرانی تاریخ سے بہت زیادہ تعلق رکھتے ہیں اور ہم ان سے تعلق رکھتے چلے آئے ہیں۔ آج بھی بہت سے قسم کے تعلقات ہمارے اور عرب ملکوں کے ساتھ قائم ہیں۔ عربوں کو ایسا علاقہ ملا ہوا ہے جو دنیا میں بہت زیادہ اہمیت رکھتا ہے اور مختلف اعتبار سے۔ ان میں سے ایک یہ کہ دنیا کے درمیانی حصہ میں کچھ یورپ والے کچھ ایشیا والے آنے جانے کے لئے اس علاقہ سے گزرتے ہیں جہاں عرب لوگ آباد ہیں اور انہوں نے ہندوستان کے ساتھ اپنی پالیسی جو پہلے سے اچھے اصولوں پر دوستی پر قائم ہے اس کو برقرار رکھا ہے اور ہم کو بھی اسے قائم رکھنا چاہئے عربوں کے ساتھ پچھلے دور میں بہت بڑی ناانصافی ہوئی ہے اور مجھ سے پہلے میرے بھائی ابراہیم صاحب نے بھی اس کی کچھ تاریخ دھرائی ہے کہ لاکھوں عربوں کو فلسطین سے اجازت کر برباد ویران کر دیا گیا۔ یہ ان کے علاقہ پر غاصبانہ تسلط کرنا، فسطح کرنا اور برباد کرنا یہ سلسلہ برابر قائم ہے۔ اس لئے یورپین قوموں نے زبردستی وہاں

[شری ایم - اسعد مدنی]

دوسرے ملکوں سے لا کر اسرائیل قائم کرنے یہ ایک قسم کا جھگڑا اور فحش کرنے والی طاقتیں وہاں قائم کی ہیں جو اصل میں امریکہ اور دوسرے غلط قسم کی خواہشات کا مرکز ہے۔ اور اس کی وجہ سے وہ دنیا کے مشوقی اور ایشیائی قوموں کو دبا کر کے ایک کالونی بنانا چاہتے ہیں۔ گاندھی جی نے بھی جب یہ قائم ہو رہا تھا تب یہ کہا تھا کہ بھائی انگریزوں کو برطانیہ میں، امریکہ کے لوگوں کو امریکہ میں اور دنیا کی ہر قوم کو اپنے ملک میں رہنے بسنے اور آزادی سے زندگی گزارنے اور ترقی کرنے کا حق ہے تو فلسطین میں وہاں کے باشندوں کو وہ کوئی بھی ہوں اپنے دھرم اور آزادی سے رہنے ترقی کرنے اور اپنے ملک کو آزاد رکھنے کا حق حاصل ہونا چاہئے وہاں باہر سے آئے لوگ کہوں آباد ہوں کہوں تسلط قائم کریں۔ ہم نے عربوں کی جنگ میں ہمیشہ حمایت کی ہے اور آج بھی کرتے ہیں۔ جو لوگ مختلف قسم کی باتیں کرتے ہیں وہ اصول بھول جاتے ہیں۔ اصول کی ہی بنیاد پر ملک نے پچھلے دنوں ہنگامہ دیکھ کی تحریک میں وہاں کے عوام کی حمایت کی اور اپنی طاقت سے دسیوں گنا بوجھ اٹھایا اور آج ہندوستان کی معیشت ہے کہ اقتصادیات میں بہت بڑا بوجھ اس جنگ کی وجہ سے ہے جو ہنگامہ دیکھ کے عوام کی حمایت ہندوستان کو کرنا پڑی۔ لیکن اصولوں کی خاطر ہندوستان اتنا بڑا بوجھ اٹھائے ہوئے ہے۔ لیکن وہی لوگ جو اس کی تائید کرتے ہیں اب دوسری باتیں کرتے ہیں۔ یہ چھوڑ ان کی اپنی یہ بتا دیتی ہے کہ اصول کے بنا پر ساتھ نہیں دیتے۔ بلکہ ان کی خاص وجہ

سے اس وقت ساتھ دیا تھا اور جب وہی اصول دوسری جگہ استعمال ہونے لگا تو مخالفت شروع کر دی۔ بہرحال ہم لوگوں کو اپنے اصول پر قائم رہنا چاہئے۔

عربوں کا مسئلہ بہت اہم ہے اور قدرتی طور پر ان کو ایسی جگہ ملی ہوئی ہے کہ ہم کو ان کے ساتھ تعلقات بڑھانے چاہئیں۔ آج بھی ہندوستان اسی پالیسی پر قائم ہے اور ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ وہ عربوں کی آزادی اور خود مختاری اور بقاے باہمی یعنی ایک دوسرے کی آزادی کا احترام کے قابل بنائے رکھتے ہوئے ترقی کریں اور ہم بھی اسی طرح ان کے ساتھ رہیں کہیں کہ ان کی آزادی ہماری آزادی کے لئے نہایت ضروری ہے۔ اگر عرب ملک ایک بھی طاقت کے نیچے دب جائیں تو وہ چیز ہماری آزادی کے لئے بڑی خطرناک اور پریشانی کا باعث بن سکتی ہے۔ مثلاً جب پرتگال سے گوا کی آزادی کے لئے ہندوستان لڑ رہا تھا تو پرتگال نے فوجیں اور ہتھیار استیمروں کے ذریعہ پرتگال کو بھیجے تاکہ اس کو غلام بنائے رکھا جا سکے۔ اس وقت مصر کے جمال عبدالناصر مرحوم نے سوئیز نہر کے ذریعہ ان جہازوں کو روک دیا اور ان کے وہ ہتھیار اور فوج ہندوستان کے اس علاقہ کو گوا کو غلام رکھنے کے لئے یہاں نہیں پہنچنے دیا۔ تو وہ لوگ ہمارے ساتھ اس طرح تعاون کرتے رہے۔ اور آئندہ بھی تعلقات کی بنیاد پر اگر کسی وقت اگر کوئی ایسی حالت آئے جیسے موقعہ درست ویسٹرن ممالک گڑبڑ کیا کرتے ہیں تو یقیناً آزادی کی برقراری کے جذبہ کو یقین رکھنا چاہئے کہ یہ غلط راستہ اختیار نہیں کریں گے اور ہم کو اس کو برقرار رکھنا چاہئے۔

آج جب اس طرح سے ترقی کی باتیں چل رہی ہیں جو مختلف قسم کے کروڑوں بن رہے ہیں جو لوگ آزادی اور ترقی کی طرف چل رہے ہیں ان کو ایک دوسرے کے گروپ میں آنا چاہئے اور اگر وہ آزادی بنائے رکھنا چاہتے ہیں اور ترقی کرنا چاہتے ہیں تو ان ملکوں کو را میٹرل کی ضرورت ہوگی اور اپنی صنعتوں کو ایک دوسرے کے یہاں کھانے کی ضرورت ہوگی۔ ان دونوں لحاظ سے عرب ملک کافی اہمیت رکھتے ہیں اور اگر ہمارے تعلقات اچھے رہے اور بڑھتے رہے تو پھر ہماری بزنس، ہماری انڈسٹری، ہمارا را میٹرل اور ہماری بنائی ہوئی چیزیں جو ہمارے کارخانوں میں بنتی ہیں اس کے ذریعہ سے نقد فارن ایکسچینج یہ تمام سہولتیں ہندوستان کو زیادہ سے زیادہ عربوں کے ذریعہ سے حاصل ہو سکتے ہیں اور ہم ایک دوسرے کی مدد کر سکتے ہیں۔ ہم ان کو کہوا کر سکتے ہیں۔ ہم ان کو جن چیزوں کی ضرورت ہے ٹیکنیکل لوگوں کی اور معلومات کی اور اس طریقہ سے را میٹرل کی بنی ہوئی چیزوں کی وہ ہم ان کو دے سکتے ہیں۔ ہم بہت سی چیزیں ایسی دے سکتے ہیں اور دے رہے ہیں جس سے ہمارا ملک ترقی کرنا چلا جائے اور بڑھتا چلا جائے اور یہاں کی انڈسٹریز اور تجارت وغیرہ روز بروز بڑھتی چلی جائے۔ اس لئے ہم کو ان کے معاملات کی قدر کرنی چاہئے۔ اگر ہم کھیت میں رعایت نہ کریں تو ہماری انڈسٹری کو دھکا لگے گا۔ جہاں تک تعلق ہے ہم میں اور عرب ملکوں میں کوئی مناسبت نہیں ہے ہم کو اس طرح کی بات نہیں سوچنا چاہئے کہ ہم بڑھینگے تو وہ گریڈنگ اور وہ بڑھینگے تو ہم

گریڈنگ اس طرح کی کوئی چیز ہونی نہیں چاہئے۔ اس لئے ہمارے لئے ان کو بڑھانا اور ترقی دینا نہایت ضروری ہے کیوں کہ دنیا میں انہی بڑی آبادی ہے اور کروڑوں کی اس آبادی میں ان کا بڑا حصہ ہے اور اس لئے ان کے ساتھ جتنے بھی اچھے تعلقات ہوں اس میں ہمارا ہی بھلا ہے۔

انڈر نیشنل فیڈ میں یو۔ این۔ او میں ایشین ملکوں کی کوئی کمیٹی بنے، کانفرنس ہو تب اس لحاظ سے ہمیں بہت فائدہ ہوگا۔ آج بھی ہندوستان کی عرب ملکوں سے اربوں روپیئے کی تجارت ہے ان کو ایکسپورت کر رہے ہیں شاید ۸۰ کروڑ روپیئے کا ایکسپورت کو اسی طریقہ سے شاید ۵۰ - ۶۰ کروڑ عراق کو ۷ یا ۸ کروڑ کویت کو اور ۲۵ تیس کروڑ سعودی عرب وغیرہ کو۔ ہم ان ملکوں سے اٹیل اور دوسری چیزیں حاصل کر رہے ہیں۔ اگر ہم ان چیزوں کی فہرست میں جائیں جو ہمارے یہاں سے وہاں جاتی ہیں تو وہ بہت لمبی ہو جائے گی۔ یہاں تک کہ خلیج فارس کے ملکوں میں ہمارے یہاں سے سبزی، گوشت اور دوسری ضروریات کی چیزیں جاتی ہیں۔ ابھی ہمارے وزیر خارجہ صاحب نے خلیج فارس کے ملکوں کا دورہ کیا تھا۔ اس سے تجارت اور تعلقات میں بہت اضافہ ہوا ہے۔ اس لئے ہمیں ان چیزوں کا خیال کرنا چاہئے اور اپنے ملک کی بھلائی کو خیال میں رکھ کر عرب ملکوں سے تجارت کو بڑھانا چاہئے ہم جتنی تجارت بڑھائینگے اتنے ہی ہمارے تعلقات مضبوط ہوں گے اور اس سے عرب ملکوں کی اور ہمارے ملک کی اُنیدہ ترقی کے ایام اور انڈسٹری کا معیار بڑھنے کے بہت موقعے ملیں گے۔ میرے خیال میں ۲۰ ہزار

[श्री ایم - اسعد مدنی]

ڈاکٹر انجینیئر اور دوسرے کارکن عرب ملکوں میں مختلف جابس پر کام کر رہے ہیں - بہت سی فیکٹریاں بن رہی ہیں - بہت سا ہمارا سرمایہ لگ رہا ہے - اس طرح سے ہمارے لئے وہاں کافی میدان ہے اور اس میں ہم کام کر رہے ہیں - اس پالیسی کو ہمیں سامنے رکھنا چاہئے ظاہر ہے کہ یہ تمام چیزیں چاہتی ہیں کہ سیاسی تعلقات ہمارے مضبوط ہوں - جتنے سیاسی تعلقات بڑھینگے مضبوط ہونگے اتنا ہی زیادہ ہم ان کی مدد کرسکیں گے اور یہ ہماری مدد کرسکیں گے اور اس طریقہ سے ہماری اقتصادیات اور دوسری چیزیں ترقی کرتی جائیں گی اس کے مقابلہ میں جس ملک کی طرف سے مخالفت ہوتی ہے وہ اسرائیل ہے - ہمارے اور اسرائیل کے اقتصادی تعلقات مشکل سے چند لاکھ کے ہیں شاید امپورٹ اور ایکسپورٹ کا سارا کاروبار ۲۰ یا ۵۰ لاکھ سے زیادہ نہیں ہے جو عربوں کے مقابلہ میں پرسنت بھی نہیں ہوتا - وہ کوئی حیثیت نہیں رکھتا کس طرح سے بھی جتنی اس کی حیثیت ہے وہ صرف امریکہ کی وجہ سے - اگر ہم دو ملین لوگوں کو ایک چھوٹے سے ملک کو اور ۲۰-۵۰ لاکھ کے امپورٹ کو اہمیت دے کر کروڑوں عربوں ۲۵ یا ۳۰ ملکوں اردوں روپے کے ایکسپورٹ کو نظر انداز کرنے کی پوزیشن میں آویں اس کا پورا خیال نہ رکھیں اور سیاسی تعلقات بڑھانے کی طرف بے توجہی برتیں جیسا ہمارے پیر امریکن دوست بار بار زور دیتے ہیں تو یہ ملک کے ہمت میں کمی نہیں کھلائے گا اس لئے یہ جو ہماری موجودہ پالیسی ہے یہ ملک کے مفاد میں ہے ملک کی خاطر ہے اور اس کو مزید مضبوط ہونا چاہئے - ہمارے ملک میں بدقسمتی سے ایک

اسرائیل کا دفتر چل رہا ہے جس کو کوئی بہت اُنینٹی اختیارات حاصل نہیں ہیں لیکن اس کی جو سرگرمیاں ہیں جس طریقہ سے وہ پندرہ روزہ یا ہفت روزہ اخبار نکالتے ہیں اور اس میں برابر ایسا میٹریل شائع ہوتا ہے جو ہندوستان کے دوست ملکوں کو غلط فہمی پیدا کرے، ہمارے ملک کی طرف سے یہاں آتے ہیں میٹہنگ کرتے ہیں اور گڑبڑ کرتے ہیں وہ ہمارے ملک کے مفاد میں اتنا زیادہ نہیں ہے جتنا نقصان میں ہے - اس لئے گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا سے میں ریکویسٹ کروں گا کہ ان کو اس مسئلہ پر سوچنا چاہئے کہ اس چھوٹے سے دفتر کے نام پر ایک غلط فضا بنانے کی جو صورت بنتی جا رہی ہے اس پر نظر ثانی کرے - اور کیوں نہ ہم اس غفلت سے اپنے کو نکالیں اور بہتر فضا پیدا کرنے کی کوشش کریں -

تو پھر میں آخر میں عرض کروں گا کہ جو ہماری پالیسی ہے اس پر ہمیں قائم رہنا چاہئے - اور عرب ملک اور اس طریقہ سے جو آزادی چاہنے والے ملک انصاف پر قائم ہیں اور اصولوں پر قائم ہیں - انہیں جیو اور جیلے دو کے اصولوں پر قائم رہتے ہوئے آگے بڑھنا چاہئے - صحیح اصولوں پر قائم رہنے والے ملک ہی ترقی کر سکتے ہیں - اصولوں کو چھوڑ کر جو کام کئے جاتے ہیں وہ نقصان کرتے ہیں -

†[श्री एम० असद मदनी : वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, हमारे मुल्क की जो विदेश नीति है, वह हकीकत में बहुत अच्छे असूलों पर बनी है, हमने आजादी से पहले भी तमाम दुनियां के मुल्कों और दबी हुई कौमों का वावजूद इसके कि उस वक्त हम लोग खुद गुलाम थे, लेकिन अपनी ताकत से कोई ज्यादा ही इनकी हिमायत की है, उनका साथ दिया है।

इस मामले में हमारी तारीख बहुत शानदार है। इस वक्त भी उन्ही असूलों को अपने सामने हकूमत-हिन्द रखती है और ऐसी कौमों—मुल्क जो आजाद रहना चाहते हैं और आजादी रखना चाहते हैं, आजाद जिन्दगी बसर करना चाहते हैं, मैंने एक दूसरे पर दबाव डालना, गुलाम बनाने के गलत तरीकों से अपना तसल्लत कायम करना इस तरह की उनकी मशा और पालिसी नहीं है। ऐसे मुल्कों का हिन्दुस्तान साथ देता रहा है और इसकी उन पालिसी पर पूरी ताकत के साथ, पूरी कुव्वत के साथ कायम रहना चाहिए ताकि पहले जमाने में और हमारे अमल में काम में फर्क न हो और हम अपना एक सच्चा सीधा रिकार्ड कायम कर सकें और उस पर चलते रहे। जाहिर है अगर हमें इस आजाद पालिसी पर चलना है तो अपने साथियों को ढूँढना, साथ लेना और साथ देना पड़ेगा, जो इस तरह की इन्साफ पर मुबनी पालिसी पर चल रहे हों और अगर इस तरह की किसी साख की वजह से हम पर इल्जाम भी आ जाये, बदमान किया जाये तशवीस महसूस की जाये तो इससे हमको घबराना नहीं चाहिए। जो लोग हमें इस साफ सीधे सच्चे रास्ते से हटाना चाहते हैं उनका इसमें कुछ, हित है, कुछ खास गरज है, मकसद है तो हमको सही अल्फाज इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए। बदनाम और शर्मिन्दा करने की कोशिश करना इस तरह से हम अपने जमीर की आवाज को सही तौर पर कायम नहीं रख सकेंगे। इसलिए हमको इस बात की परवाह नहीं करनी चाहिए और इन मामलात को इसी तरह देखना चाहिए।

हमारे ताल्लूकात दुनिया के बहुत से मुल्कों और कौमों से पहले भी रहे हैं और आज भी हैं। अरब मुल्क हमारे हिन्दुस्तान की पुरानी तारीख से बहुत ज्यादा ताल्लुक रखते हैं और हम उनसे ताल्लुक रखते चले आये हैं। आज भी बहुत से किस्म के ताल्लूकात हमारे और अरब के मुल्कों के साथ कायम हैं। अरबों को ऐसा इलाका मिला हुआ है जो

दुनिया में बहुत ज्यादा अहमीयत रखता है और मुख्तलिफ एतबार से। इसमें से एक दुनिया के दरम्यानी हिस्से में कुछ योरोप वाले, कुछ एशिया वाले आने जाने के लिए इस इलाके से गुजरते हैं, जहाँ अरब लोग आबाद हैं और उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ अपनी पालिसी जो पहले से अच्छे असूलों पर, दोस्ती पर कायम है उसको बरकरार रखा है और हमको भी इसे कायम रखना चाहिए, अरबों के साथ पिछले दौर में बहुत बड़ी नाइनसाफी हुई है और मुझ से पहले भरे भाई इब्राहिम साहब ने भी इसकी कुछ तारीख दोहराई है कि लाखों अरबों को फिलिस्तीन से उजाड़ कर बर्बाद, वीरान कर दिया गया। यह उनके इलाके पर गसबान तसल्लत करना, गसब करना और बरबाद करना यह सिलसिला बराबर कायम है, इसलिए योरोपीयन कौमों ने जबरदस्ती वहाँ दूसरे मुल्कों से ला ला कर इसरायल कायम करके यह एक किस्म का झगडाल और गसब करने वाली ताकत वहाँ कायम की है जो असल में अमरीका और दूसरे गलत किस्म की ख्वाहिशात का मर्कज है और इसकी वजह से वह दुनिया के मशरूकी और एशियाई कौमों को दबा करके एक कालोनी बनाना चाहते हैं। गांधी-जी ने भी जब ये कायम हो रहा था, तब ये कहा था कि भाई अंग्रेजों को बर्तानिया में, अमरीका के लोगों को अमरीका में और दुनिया की हर कौम को अपने मुल्क में रहने, बसने और आजादी से जिन्दगी गुजारने और तरक्की करने का हक है। तो फिलिस्तीन में वहाँ के बाशिन्दों को वो कोई भी हो अपने धर्म और आजादी से रहने, तरक्की करने और अपने मुल्क को आजाद रखने का हक हासिल होना चाहिए। वहाँ बाहर से आये लोग बगो आबाद हो, कथो तमल्लत कायम करके हमने अरबों की जग में हमेशा हिमायत की है और आज भी करते हैं। जो लोग मुख्तलिफ किस्म की बातें करते हैं वह असूल भूल जाते हैं। असूल की ही बुनियाद पर मुल्क में पिछले दिनों बंगला देश की तहरीक में वहाँ के अबाम की हिमायत की और अपनी ताकत से दसियों गुनाह बोझ

[श्री एम० असद मदनी]

उठाया और आज हिन्दुस्तान की मईशियत है कि इक्तसादयात मे बहुत बड़ा बोझ इस जंग की वजह से है जो बंगला देश के आवाम की हिमायत हिन्दुस्तान को करनी पड़ी, लेकिन उसूलो की खातिर हिन्दुस्तान इतना बड़ा बोझ उठाये हुए है। लेकिन वही लोग जो इसकी ताईद करते हैं, अब दूसरी बातें करते हैं।

यह चीज इनकी अपनी ये बता देती है कि उसूल के बिना पर साथ नहीं देते, बल्कि किसी खास वजह से उस वक्त साथ दिया था और जब वही उसूल दूसरी जगह इस्तेमाल होने लगा तो मुखालफत शुरू कर दी, बहरहाल हम लोगो को अपने उसूल पर कायम रहना चाहिए।

अरबों का मसला बहुत अहम है और कुदरती तौर पर इनको ऐसी जगह मिली हुई है कि हम को इनके साथ ताल्लुकात बढ़ाने चाहिए। आज भी हिन्दुस्तान इस पोलिसी पर कायम है और हम यह चाहते हैं कि वह अरबों की आजादी और खुदमुख्तारी और बकायबहामी यानी एक दूसरे की आजादी का एहताराम के काबिल बनाये रखते हुए तरक्की करे और हम भी इसी तरह इनके साथ रहें; क्योंकि इनकी आजादी हमारी आजादी के लिए निहायत जरूरी है। अगर अरब मुल्क एक भी ताकत के नीचे दब जाये तो वह चीज हमारी आजादी के लिए बड़ी खतरनाक और परेशानी का बाइस बन सकती है। मसलन जब पुर्तगाल गोआ की आजादी के लिए हिन्दुस्तान लड़ रहा था तो पुर्तगाल ने फौजे, और हथियार स्टीमरो के जरिये गोआ को भेजे ताकि इसको गुलाम बनाये रखा जा सके। उस वक्त मिस्त्र के जमाल अब्दुल नासर मरहूम ने स्वेज नहर के जरिये इन जहाजों को रोक लिया और इसके वे हथियार और फौज हिन्दुस्तान के इस इलाके को गोआ को गुलाम रखने के लिए यहा नहीं पहुंचने दिया तो वे लोग हमारे साथ इस तरह से ताबुन करते रहे। और आइन्दा भी ताल्लुकात

की बुनियाद पर अगर किसी वक्त, अगर कोई ऐसी हालत आये जैसे मौकापरस्त वेस्टर्न मुमालिक गड़बड़ किया करते हैं तो यकीनन आजादी की बरकरारी के जजबा को यकीन रखना चाहिए, यह गलत रास्ता इख्त्यार नहीं करेंगे और हमको इसको बरकरार रखना चाहिए।

आज जब इस तरह से तरक्की की बातें चल रही हैं जो मुखतलिफ किस्म के ग्रुप्स बन रहे हैं जो लोग आजादी और तरक्की की तरफ चल रहे हैं इनको एक दूसरे के ग्रुप में आना चाहिए और अगर वे आजादी बनाये रखना चाहते हैं और तरक्की करना चाहते हैं तो इन मुल्को को राँ मैटिरियल की जरूरत होगी और अपनी सनतो को एक दूसरे के यहां खपाने की जरूरत होगी। इन दोनों लिहाज से अरब मुल्क काफी अहमियत रखते हैं और अगर हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे रहें और बढ़ते रहे तो फिर हमारा बिजनेस, हमारी इंडस्ट्री, हमारा राँ मैटिरियल और हमारी बनाई हुई चीजें जो हमारे कारखानो में बनती हैं इसके जरिए से नकद फारेन एक्सचेंज यह तमाम सहायियों हिन्दुस्तान को ज्यादा से ज्यादा अरबों के जरिए से हासिल हो सकती हैं और हम एक दूसरे की मदद कर सकते हैं। हम इनको खड़ा कर सकते हैं, हम इनको जिन चीजों की जरूरत है टेक्नीकल लोगों की और मालूमात की और इस तरीके से राँ मैटिरियल की बनी हुई चीजों की वह हम उनको दे सकते हैं। हम बहुत सी चीजें ऐसी दे सकते हैं और दे रहे हैं जिनसे हमारा मुल्क तरक्की करता चला जाये और बढ़ता चला जाये और यहा की इंडस्ट्री और तिजारत वगैरह रोज-ब-रोज बढ़ती चली जाये, इसलिए हमको इनके मामलात की कदर करनी चाहिए। अगर हम खपत में रियायत न करें तो हमारी इंडस्ट्री को धक्का लगेगा। जहा तक ताल्लुक है हम में और अरब मुल्को में कोई मुनासिबत नहीं है। हमको इस तरह की बात नहीं सोचनी चाहिए कि हम बढ़ेंगे तो वे गिरेंगे और वे बढ़ेंगे तो हम गिरेंगे,

इस तरह की कोई चीज होनी नहीं चाहिए। इसलिए हमारे लिए इनको बढ़ाना और तरक्की देना निहायत जरूरी है; क्योंकि दुनिया में इतनी बड़ी आबादी है और करोड़ों की इस आबादी में इनका बड़ा हिस्सा है और इसी लिए उनको साथ जितने भी अच्छे ताल्लुकात हों उसमें हमारा भला ही भला है।

इन्टरनेशनल फील्ड में, यू० एन० ओ० में एशियन मुल्को की कोई कमेटी बने, काफ़ेस हो तब इस लिहाज से हमें बहुत फायदा होगा। आज भी हिन्दुस्तान की अरब मुल्को से अरबों रुपये की तिजारत है उनको एक्सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। शायद 80 करोड़ का इजिप्त को इसी तरीके से शायद पचास, साठ करोड़ ईराक को, सात या आठ करोड़ कुवैत को और पच्चीस तीस करोड़ सऊदी अरब वगैरह को। हम उन मुल्को से आयल और दूसरी चीजें हासिल कर रहे हैं। अगर हम उन चीजों की फहरिस्त में जायें जो हमारे यहाँ से वहाँ जाती हैं, तो वह बहुत लम्बी हो जायगी। वहाँ तक के खलीज फारस के मुल्को में हमारे यहाँ से सब्जी, गोश्त और दूसरी जरूरीयात की चीजें जाती हैं। अभी हमारे वज़ीर खारजा साहेब ने खलीज फारस के मुल्को का दौरा किया था। इससे तिजारत और ताल्लुकात में बहुत इजाफा हुआ है। इसलिए हमें उन चीजों का खयाल करना चाहिए और अपने मुल्क की भलाई को खयाल में रख कर अरब मुल्को से तिजारत को बढ़ाना चाहिए। हम जितनी तिजारत बढ़ावेंगे उतने ही हमारे ताल्लुकात मजबूत होंगे और इससे अरब मुल्को की ओर हमारे मुल्क की आइन्दा तरक्की के अयाम और इन्डस्ट्री का मियार बढ़ाने के बहुत मौके मिलेंगे। मेरे खयाल में 20 हजार डाक्टर, इंजीनियर और दूसरे कारकून अरब मुल्को में मुखतलिफ जाबों पर काम कर रहे हैं। बहुत सी फैक्ट्रियां बन रही हैं, बहुत सा हमारा सरमाया लग रहा है। इस तरह से हमारे लिए वहाँ काफी मैदान है और इसमें हम काम कर रहे हैं। इस पालिसी को हमें

सामने रखना चाहिए। जाहिर है कि यह तमाम चीजें चाहती हैं कि सियासी ताल्लुकात हमारे मजबूत हों। जिनने सियासी ताल्लुकात बढ़ेंगे मजबूत होंगे, उतना ही ज्यादा हम उनको मदद कर सकेंगे और यह हमारी मदद कर सकेंगे और इस तरीके से हमारी इक्तसादीयात और दूसरी चीजें तरक्की करती जायेंगी। इसके मुकाबले में जिस मुल्क की तरफ से मुखाफलत होती है, वह इजरायल है। हमारे और इजरायल के इक्तसादी ताल्लुकात मुश्किल से चन्द लाख के हैं शायद एक्सपोर्ट या इपोर्ट का सारा कारोबार 40 या 50 लाख से ज्यादा नहीं है। जो अरबों के मुकाबले 1 परसेंट भी नहीं होता। वह कोई हैसियत नहीं रखता किसी तरह से भी जितनी इसकी हैसियत है वह सिर्फ अमरीका की वजह से अगर हम दो मिले लोगों को एक छोटे से मुल्क को और 40-50 लाख के इम्पोर्ट को अह्मीयत देकर करोड़ों अरबों 25 या 30 मुल्कों अरबों रुपये के एक्सपोर्ट को नजर-अन्दाज करने की पोजीशन में आवे इसका पूरा खयाल न रखे और सियासी ताल्लुकात बढ़ाने की तरफ बेतवजीही बरते जैसा हमारे प्रो-अमेरिकन दोस्त बार-बार ज़ोर देते हैं तो यह मुल्क के हित में कभी नहीं कहा जायेगा। इसलिये यह जो हमारी मौजूदा पालिसी है यह मुल्क के मफाद में है, मुल्क की खातिर है और इसको मजिद मजबूत होना चाहिए। हमारे मुल्क में बदकिम्मत से एक इजरायल का दफन चल रहा है जिसको कोई बहुत आइनों इश्बारात हासिल नहीं हैं लेकिन इसकी जो सरगमियां हैं जिस तरीके से वह पन्द्रह राजा या हफत-रोजा अखबार निकालते हैं और इसमें बराबर ऐसा मैट्रिगियल शायी होता है जो हिन्दुस्तान के दोस्त मुल्कों को गलत-फहमी पैदा करे। हमारे मुल्क की तरफ से यहाँ आते हैं, मीटिंग करते हैं और गडबड करते हैं वह हमारे मुल्क के मफाद में इतना ज्यादा नहीं है जितना नुकसान में है। इसलिये गवर्न-मेन्ट आफ इंडिया से मैं रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि उनको इस मसले पर सोचना चाहिए कि इस

[श्री एम० असद मदनी]

छोटे से दफतर के नाम पर एक गलत फिजा बनाने को जो सूरत बनती जा रही है उस पर नजर सानी करे और क्यों न हम इस गफलत से अपने को निकालें और बेहतर फिजा पैदा करने को कोशिश करे।

तो फिर मैं आखिर में अर्ज करूंगा कि जो हमारी पालिसी है उस पर हमें कायम रहना चाहिए और अरब मुल्क और इसी तरीके से जो आजादी चाहते वाले मुल्क इन्साफ पर कायम हैं और उसूलों पर कायम हैं, उन्हें जीयो और जीने दो के उसूलों पर कायम रहते हुए आगे बढ़ना चाहिए। सही उसूलों पर कायम रहने वाले मुल्क ही तरक्की कर सकते हैं—उसूलों को छोड़ कर जो काम किये जाते हैं वे नुकसान करते हैं।

JOINT INDO-CZECHOSLOVAK DECLARATION AND AGREEMENTS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Now the Minister of External Affairs to make a statement.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Sir, I have the honour to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Joint Indo-Czechoslovak Declaration, signed today, by the Prime Minis-

ter, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, on behalf of the Government of India, and Dr. Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and Chairman of the National Front of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, on behalf of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Apart from the Joint Declaration, the following other agreements were also concluded during General Secretary Gustav Husak's visit: They are—the Third Agreement on Economic Collaboration between India and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and a Protocol on Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation between India and Czechoslovakia.

Copies of these are also being laid on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library See No. LT-5903/73.]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M tomorrow, the 6th December, 1973.

The House then adjourned at fifty one minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 6th December, 1973.