

# **MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—continued**

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the very outset I congratulate the Madam Prime Minister who, with a great deal of dexterity, has carried to a successful conclusion the Friendship Treaty with Russia. Sir, I also express my appreciation of our Foreign Minister, indefatigable Sardar Swaran Singhji, who, time in and time out, proves his efficiency in handling any subject given to him and acquits himself with credit. Now, too, Sir, he has come out with flying colours in carrying on the negotiations. The 15-Year Friendship Treaty is nothing new but only a continuation of the 1971-Treaty that we made with Russia. In 1971, when we were facing an aggression, Russia came to our help and as a result the Treaty was made. Now, in 1973 we don't face an external aggression but our economy is in great shambles and Russia has once again come out stretching its hand of friendship to help us out. The present agreement, I should say, is a comprehensive one. It covers the entire economic field. From a cursory glance, I should say that there are not many points that the opposition may be in disagreement with the Government. Many of the salient features as published are in our best interests. But, mark my words : 'agreement as published' I say, because we have not been taken into confidence in discussing all the details of the Protocol on economic and on technical details of the agreement. We get news piecemeal—so far so good. But, God alone knows what are the other details withheld. I would be thankful if our Sardar Swaran Singh assures the House that all the aspects of the agreement in mi-

nutest detail are given to the general public to whom we all still owe a debt. But for their votes, none of us, however great we may be, would have been here.

Sir, there are some stories circulated in the capital regarding Comrade Brezhnev's visit. They say that he came here with four objectives. I do not want to repeat the stories, but as I heard the stories, I think it is my duty that I should tell them here, one after another. No. 1 is that he wanted to take India in its friendly fold as against China, since there is an improvement of Sino-American relationship. No. 2 is to associate India with Russia for an Asian collective security pact. The house knows that next to China, India is the largest country population-wise. So, India population-wise, is asset to any power, be it Russia or America. So, that was the second objective. The third one is the party matter. I do not know how far I am right in disclosing in Comrades like Shri Bhupesh Gupta, Dange and others are very unhappy that no successor of the calibre and type of late Mohan Kumaramangalam has been appointed in the Cabinet. They want a person in whom they could repose their confidence as they reposed in late Mohan Kumaramangalam. Madam had not obliged our comrades. So they are unhappy. It was in order to pacify Bhupesh and Dange groups that Comrade Brezhnev had come—so far as the story goes I do not know how far it is correct.

The fourth is the last but not the least. Sir, Comrade Brezhnev came here, according to the story, to patch up the differences between CPI and CPM and to forge a united front against the rightist elements both in and out of Congress itself. I do not know whether it is

[Shri S. S. Mariswamy.]

true or not. So far as our Tamil Nadu is concerned, I am very glad Mr. C. Subramaniam is here and he will also be interested in knowing the fact that, so far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, I know for certain that CPI and CPM along with a celluloid hero have come and formed a joint front as against DMK on the one hand and against Congress (R) and Kamaraj on the other hand—who has recently formed a united front to fight Pondicherry elections to Parliament. I believe that our Prime Minister is going to discuss the Pondicherry elections on the 7th at 6 o'clock and I am quite sure, Mr. Subramaniam would have been one of the invitees. Let him also bear in mind that the new front is formed to fight Mr. Subramaniam. So that is the position. So far as Congress (R) and CPI...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Does it become part of the international affairs ?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Yes, it becomes, because it is very relevant. So far as Congress (R) and CPI alliance in Madras is concerned, their honeymoon is over in Madras. So also the Congress (R) after joining hands with Mr. Kamaraj has thrown overboard the celluloid hero, as usual, to the Income-tax Enforcement Directorate people. They are at their mercy. I believe he is repenting for having left the party believing in the mirage of Delhi, thinking that they would come to his help. Now what has happened ? He is absolutely disillusioned, disheartened and frustrated and now he feels sorry for having taken in his party all and sundries abundantly found in by-lanes and side-lanes of Madras. So this is the posi-

tion of Madras. I do not know whether Comrade Brezhnev had anything to do with this. So far as I am concerned, I am absolutely clear in my mind that Comrade Brezhnev had nothing to do with the so-called alliance that has come in Madras. What has come in Madras is the alliance between CPI, CPM and this celluloid party. The result is the frustration that they feel after their innumerable jaunts to Delhi, presenting numberless memoranda against the DMK Ministry and having got no substantial help from Delhi. They are frustrated. Now, Sir, these are all the rumours that are afloat in the capital city. But I will be very happy if the hon. Minister rebutes all these rumours and says that these rumours are not to be relied upon and...

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : With your permission I want to say straightaway that all these rumours are unfounded.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : I am very glad that he has said so.

The third point is, Comrade Brezhnev spent quite a time here. He received many a reception. He deserves all those things. There is no doubt about it. But the way in which the affairs were conducted, is not good. Both the Government and the ruling party treated Comrade Brezhnev as their own guest and visit to Delhi, they thought, was enough. This is absolutely a wrong approach. Sir, Delhi alone is not India. India is a great country and he should have been taken around the country. He would have been greatly impressed with our progress and would have been happy to see that India is keeping up its tradition of democracy as a part of its life. The Government should have sent him to Madras and also to other

parts of the country, specially to Madras where the only non-Congress Ministry exists. And he would have found a lot of difference between India and East European countries.

Instead of doing like this they treated him as their own party guest. I saw the beautiful photo of Comrade Shankar Dayal Sharma sitting with Comrade Brezhnev sipping coffee or tea or whatever it was because I saw only the jug there and...

AN HON. MEMBER : Vodka.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : ... God only knows what it contained. News came that they discussed party matters. It is none of my concern; it is not for me to poke my nose into their party matters but what perplexes me is the fact that this particular photo was not released by the Congress Party office but by the Press Information Bureau, which is a branch of the I&B Ministry. This is a very dangerous trend; the dividing line between the Party and the Government should remain in tact. We should not erode it as we have eroded our Constitution. India has its own way of life; we have various parties and ideologies here in our country and there is unity in diversity. But life in Russia is different. They don't believe in diversity. They want more than unity, that is, uniformity. That why when Mr. Madhu Limaye met him and offered greetings on behalf of the Opposition parties, Comrade Brezhnev wondered about the necessity of Opposition parties in India. For them the Party is Government and Government is Party. For us Government is different from the Party; they are two different things. Let us not mix both the Party and the Government and get a monolithic form of Party and Government. The Press Information Bureau has absolutely no right to publicise the photograph of

Comrade Brezhnev and Comrade Shankar Dayal Sharma. Mr. Sharma may be a good man, an intelligent man. Let his photo adorn the Office of the Congress Party but the Press Information Bureau has no business to circulate

Finally, I would like to urge that we should with the same vigour and enthusiasm carry on talks with China and the USA. I was very glad when I heard from our Foreign Minister that our relationship with the USA and China was improving. It should improve further more. Whatever may be the past, we cannot ignore the fact that China is a great Power in Asia. Our association with that country is an age-old one. No country had such a close cultural contact with China as we had. Our relationship with China dates back to several centuries. During the early 1950s we were so close with China that there was this Hindi-Chini-Bhai-Bhai slogan all over the country. Later on due to some border dispute this slogan of Hindi-Chini-Bhai-Bhai disappeared and China-Murdabad came into vogue and so also they started abusing us. Now let us bury the past and open up a new era so that we cultivate friendship with China. So also we must not forget the fact that America is also a friendly nation. During 1962 when China attacked us we had no friends and it was America that came to our assistance. We solicited their help and they gave it in a big way and the country is thankful to America for that. So we must see that the same friendly relations are maintained with America as well as with China.

Finally I must say that I will be failing in my duty if I did not make a reference to Pakistan. Whatever might be the past, they are our brothers, they are our immediate neighbours. Because of

[Shri S. S. Mariswamy.]

the quarrel between us many big Powers try to play one against the other. And now we have become a pawn in the hands of the big Powers all because we do not have good relationship with Pakistan. The moment we come to an understanding with Pakistan, the moment our ties become close you take it from me the moment India, Pakistan and Bangladesh forge a unity we will be the most powerful sub-continent in the whole world. Our ties are closer; ours is an old relationship. It is true that minor differences are there but we being the bigger nation we must take up an attitude of live and let live. We must be generous and we must not fight over small matters. I want the Government to take up that kind of attitude. Now, we heard of some anti-Indian demonstrations in Bangladesh. I do not know whether there are genuine fears on the part of the Bangladesh people or whether there are some anti-social elements working in the garb of pseudo-patriots of Bangladesh. I see some sinister hand in the demonstrations. I would be very happy if our hon. External Affairs Minister throws some light on these repeated demonstrations that take place in Bangladesh. So far as India is concerned, we can be very proud of the fact that we have no bad designs on any country. So far as we are concerned, as once Mahatma said, our creed of non-violence is enough to get laurels for us. If at all we sell anything outside, we will sell our love and our creed of non-violence to other nations. So, with an open mind we can approach any nation and try to keep cordial relations. Now, we need not join this bloc. or that bloc. I am very glad that Madam has taken a very correct stand in refusing to be a party to the Asian collective security pact. It is absolutely. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mariswamy, I would like to request you hereafter not to mention just 'Madam', but Madam Prime Minister would be better.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Thank you, Sir. Madam Prime Minister's stand is correct. There is absolutely no meaning in joining other nations in signing an Asian security pact. Last time in 1955 when we had some conference in South East Asia, it gave some wrong impression to other people, that we were trying to usurp the leadership of Asia. I am told this was one of the reasons why China attacked India and started this border dispute. Border dispute is nothing new so far as China is concerned. It has a dispute with us and with Russia on the northern side. So far India is concerned, we can be friends with all the nations in the world. Let us not take a partisan attitude of being very close to Russia as against China or very close to China as against Russia or the USA for that matter.

Thank you.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, since yesterday the debate on the international situation is going on. The opening made by our Minister of External Affairs, though brief, contained every essential thing. We are fortunate to have in him a person who, so far as foreign affairs and foreign relations are concerned, is an encyclopaedia, but as you know, we require many revisions and editions of an encyclopaedia. His mind has something in it which makes it up to date every day. This moving encyclopaedia has also some computer in it and we are proud to have such a person as our Minister of External Affairs. Our difficulty is that we do not try to understand and realise the

importance of our own people around us. That is because we were a slave nation for quite a long time and we do not see virtues or qualities in our own men. He made a very sound and good exposition and I thought that things would be taken and discussed in a spirit of friendliness, co-operation and understanding. But I was very sorry to hear rather fantastic things against the decision reached by our Government and Soviet Russia and about other matters. One of the most fantastic things ever said was that it is a matter of dispute whether Soviet Russia is an Asiatic country. Sir, anyone knowing elementary geography will tell you that two-thirds of Soviet Russia—I say with all sense of responsibility and knowledge—lies in Asia. Therefore, this country is not only Asiatic in that sense but European also since one-third of it lies in Europe also. So it is both an European country and an Asian country. Anything which we do in Asia has relevance with Soviet Russia also. That we cannot ignore.

Sir, I heard about foreign affairs from the mouth of the great Pandit Nehru on many occasions. I started my early life with the Congress freedom movement when Pandit Nehru came from the Anti-Imperialist Conference which he attended in Brussels in 1927 or 1928, were gathered in the Madras Congress. There also the Congress discussed international relations in its resolutions. The Congress had developed international outlook from its very inception but Pandit gave a new direction and content to it. Therefore, our fight for independence was not an isolated fight of India for freedom but it was a part of the fight in the international context, of those nations who were being ruled by others, which were colonies about which Lenin referred in his speeches. He ad-

mired in his speeches what India was doing and what others were doing in other countries. So Pandit Nehru, 20 years before India become free, stood for independence for all. And when we became free we continued to be on that path. Pandit Nehru and his father had been to Soviet Russia. He wrote a book on their visit. I had the privilege of reading that book. When the Soviet Revolution took place I had been a lad of 18. We then used to get a Hindi daily, *Bang Basi* which was a big fire paper. It used to refer to Russia as the Russian Bear as *Rus ka Bhaloo* because British imperialists called Russia that way. The paper used to give in its columns news about evil things and murders that were alleged to be taking place then in Russia.

Sir, in my boyhood I used to enquire from my father and teachers about the Russian Revolution but my thirst was not quenched. Then I consulted others who were in politics and I was told—and I still adhere to that—that after the French Revolution Russian Revolution was quite a big event in the world. I would like to tell you what happened in China. When Chiang-kai-Shek went away and the Communists came to power it was a contrast to the French and Russian Revolutions. What happened in China? Mao Tse-Tung went on fighting inch by inch and winning and then he came to power. China's was not a revolution of either the French type or the Russian type. Mao Tse-Tung went on giving land to the peasantry with the help of his army and fighting inch by inch succeeded in rising seiaing power. Therefore, it was quite different from what happened in Soviet Russia or France. When Lenin went to Russia he was a Bolshevik and had only minority backing. In a dextrous and revolutionary manner he captured power from

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha.]

Kornsky History will, however, record it as one of the most exemplary and revolutionary things which has ever happened. After that whatever Stalin might have or might not have done, we know that he brought bread and cloth to the poor. What is to be seen in our country? What is happening in our country? We see here men, and children in tattered clothes and women in unwomanly rags Sir, the other day a friend of mine was telling me of an incident. He lives in one of these areas He had taken his food outside When he returned he found that his servant had already cooked his food So he went to the road-side. He saw a woman sleeping on the footpath with two children He said :

ए बच्चे रोटी लो । मा भो कहती है  
रोटी, रोटी, रोटी ।

They shouted in exclamation. This is the country we belong to. And this is how Soviet Russia was Lenin brought butter, bread, cloth, honour and dignity to the poor people. So long as humanity lives, Lenin's name will live. That is what Jawaharlal Nehru wrote in his book in 1927 Sir, I am not a new recruit to the Congress or politics I did not join politics just to become a Member of Parliament.

SHRI IOACHIM ALVA (Nominated): And old freedom fighter

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : We joined it to face the bullets of the British. Sir, I say with all sense of responsibility that this Congress Party under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi will never swerve from the path of democracy, come what may. We will never swerve from the path of socialism, come what may We will never prejudice the independence

and sovereignty of India, come what may.

Sir, I have a grievance against my great friend, Mr. Swaran Singh, a grouse against the External Affairs Minister. And what is that grouse? The Prime Minister spoke something at the airport. I heard it on the radio. I did not go to the airport because I had to be here to see that there was quorum in the House, to see that the dignity of Rajya Sabha was maintained So I heard her on the radio. The speech of the Prime Minister was marvellous. She said : "We will do things as decided by us". Why has that speech not been distributed to Members of Parliament? She made a still bigger point in the plenary Banquet speech and much more in the Red Fort speech where she said : "As Mr. Brezhnev is going from one country to another preaching his views, we and leaders of free India go about from one country to another preaching our own views". Everybody clapped at this. Sir, I would like to tell you one thing. Please bear with me because I seldom speak I would beg of you to be a little patient with me.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra): Are you begging or threatening?

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : You know that threatening is neither in your nature nor in my nature We have been nurtured together for 40 years since we formed the Congress Socialist Party in 1934 You know me Please do not talk that way You are being very unkind to me or perhaps you want to be jovial.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Take it with a little humour.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : Yes, jovial We know

each other. I have the greatest regard for you.

श्री सीता राम सिंह (बिहार) : अपनी ज़बान में बोलते तो अच्छा होता। आप तो पराई ज़बान में बोल रहे हैं।

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : Because Mr. Muniswamy and other friends from the South would not like it. I want that I should be liked and loved by everybody. Today I am here. One day I shall not be here. But there should be some goodwill for me in the House. For that goodwill I am talking in this House in English.

Sir. I was telling you that these speeches should be distributed. Then I have the agreements before me. I have read them three times. Do they compromise our position as an independent country? Far from that. The declaration asserts and affirms our position as an independent country. Mr. Brezhnev came and addressed Members of Parliament. This is a free country. He has the right to say anything he liked. He said that it is high time that the concept of collective security was discussed because it is a very important thing not only for Europe but for Asia also. But, Sir, in the declaration this concept does not find a word. Why? I personally accept that concept. But the applicability is far away. As I accepted many things which Gandhiji said, I accept this; but this cannot be applied, as, for instance, non-violence. We accepted non-violence; yet, we have an army. Collective security: Yes. But how can it be? Two-thirds of Russia is in Asia; China is not friendly either to Russia or India. Some of our friends said that every effort should be made to see that China becomes our friend. We have made all efforts. Even though they

humiliated us, invaded us, and stabbed Nehru in the back, our Prime Minister, this great lady, has never spoken a word against China ever since she came to power. But it was this lady, when people were running away from the northern part of Assam, Tejpur, it was this lady who went there in the midnight and brought every man to stay on there by her encouragement. Is it that lady who will bow before Brezhnev or anybody?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : Why midnight? Why not during the day?

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : All the time.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : Mr. Pitamber Das, you are a poet. A woman moving about in the midnight has greater bravery than her moving about in the day light. My friend, I love you, I regard you, because of your human touch. But I hate your political views. I love you, I love your poetry, I love your culture, I love you personally, but I am opposed to your views. I am a Congressman hundred per cent. And I tell you, any party, any declaration, be it anything, cannot swerve this party from its path. Brezhnev came. He came as our friend.

(Interruptions by Shri Sasankasekhar Sanyal)

We are old. Both of us are friends. I am 67. I think even Swaran Singh is my younger brother. Jagjivan Ram is my younger brother. Chavan is my younger brother. Except two, all ministers are my younger. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and the Home Minister are my elder brothers. They are elder to me. I think Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is 72 and Umashankar Dikshit is 73 or so.

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha]

Anyway, what I was saying was I have read everything this time about plans, I have read them. Soviet Russia has its plans for its development. (*interruptions*). We want that thing, we want this thing, and we say to Russians please supply us this thing. But according to this plan, they have not manufactured it. So it takes one year to manufacture it. We got our products we will offer to Russia that in advance. So we want consulting in our plannings. What is wrong about it? I cannot understand how we have compromised our independence. “अब तेरी हिम्मत की चर्चा गैर को महफिल में है” What India did yesterday, others are doing today. Today I heard on the Radio that the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom is going to. . .

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SAN-YAL (West Bengal): You talk of yesterday only. Why not talk of tomorrow?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt him.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: He has every right; he is my elder brother. Sometimes...

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SAN-YAL: Who said I am older? You are older

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA ME-NON (Kerala): He refuses to be older.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Sir, anyway, I heard on the radio that 10-year economic and cultural agreement is going to be signed very soon between the U.K. and Soviet Russia. Who is following whom? I want to know that. Has the United Kingdom surrendered its freedom? No. We have 15 years pact with Soviet

Union. What is the harm in having it? We are the gainers. I say with all sense of responsibility as a man who has served this nation, that by this pact India has become hundred percent strong. Russia has also gained and their gain is the love and admiration of the people of India which is of immense value to them. Their politics and diplomacy is so chisalled. In this joint declaration, they have not mentioned a word about the joint security. You do not find it here. Why? Because, they thought it was better to speak to Members of Parliament about it. Why raise this issue in the discussions between the two Governments? It is a concept. Why should a concept find a place in the joint declaration? After all we are the masters of both the Houses. We will tell our Government: Do this and do that. So, Brezhnev appealed to Members of Parliament. Look at that gesture. Look at the beauty and excellence with which they approach things. I am proud of these Russians. I am not a Communist. I can never be a Communist. But our friendship with Soviet Russia is one which will remain so long as the leadership of India is sound. I must tell you that we are proud of our leadership. (*Time bell rings*) Two minutes more.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi has both the blessings of Mahatma Gandhi and the training and inspiration of her great father. And within a few years we will see that the world will acclaim her as it did both Gandhi and Nehru. I may tell you how she gives a heavenly touch to the mundane things. How cheerful godliness she reveals while dealing with mundane things. I have experienced it. Whenever I go to her or seek an interview with her, I have seen she never speaks from a high pedestal. She never speaks even from an equal pedetal. She



speaks to me as a senior Member of Parliament or her senior brother. That is the greatness. I never go to her to tell her: "I agree with you". Whenever I go, I go to give her some headache. I say: "This is wrong; that is wrong". But she always welcomes my criticism and when we part, we part with friendly smiles. When we say that our position is undermined or Soviet Russia is not a friendly country or wrong things are done, it only shows that we do not believe in ourselves. So far as our Party is concerned, we know that at no cost we will give up leave democracy; at no cost we will serve from the path of socialism and at no cost we will compromise our freedom. This entire document is a proof of what India stands for and what the leader of our country Indira Gandhi stands for and what she has said at the airport, at the Red Fort, at the Banquet and at the time of Brezhnev's departure from the basic stand of ours.

**SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, the foreign policy of a country should take into account its history, its geography, its traditions and its experiences. Therefore, when we take these factors into consideration, we will find that during the period before and after our Independence, the Soviet Union has always stood with us in our travails and difficulties. This is a fact of history and this is a fact of our experience. From the time of 1953 Pak-American pact and earlier also when the issue of Kashmir came in the United Nations, it was the Soviet veto which saved our position. Later on, from the time of the 1953 US pact, our country has been faced with the threat of American expansionism and aggression through, no doubt, Pakistan and it is our firm friendship and understanding with the Soviet Union

that helped us through these difficult years. Even in the latest incident of the Bangladesh war, in which our country was involved in a life-and-death struggle, it was the Soviet assistance and help and the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation that stood us well in our difficulties and we kept the American blackmail in its place. Therefore, any foreign policy that has to take into account the interests of the country in their totality definitely to be based on a firm Indo-Soviet friendship. But it has also to be anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist because, Sir, it is not only our experience now, but also our experience before independence, that our country has suffered from colonialism and from imperialism and, therefore, it has to be anti-imperialist. Now, from this standpoint, the declaration issued after the visit of Mr. Brezhnev, signed by Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Brezhnev, is a welcome document because it takes into account all our past traditions and our experiences. It says:—

"The Prime Minister of India highly appraised the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, consistently aimed at consolidating international peace and rendering support to the peoples struggling against colonialism and for the strengthening of the political and economic independence of their countries."

Again, Sir, this declaration says at another place like this:

"At the same time, they noted the persistence of areas of tension in some regions of the world and stressed the need to continue the efforts to liquidate the remaining vestiges of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and the policy of *apartheid*."

Now, Sir, these are all the policies which are very dear to our country and to

[Shri K. P. Subramania Menon.]

our people and it is a good thing that they have been incorporated in this declaration. Again, our people have had great feelings of love and affection and also admiration for the people of Vietnam fighting against the American imperialism and the acts perpetrated by the US there. The declaration takes note of this fact also and says that India and the Soviet Union believe that the restoration of peace in Vietnam on the basis of the Paris Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam of January 27, 1973, as well as the signing of the Agreement on Restoring Peace and Achieving National Concord in Laos create conditions for a healthier climate in Asia and throughout the world. Now, Sir, this declaration is replete with such pronouncements and, no doubt, it will gladden the hearts of every Indian that such a statement has been issued. However, Sir, it has to be understood that the Soviet friendship with and concern for India and the Indian people, not only the Indian people, but the people who have suffered under colonialism, is not a new thing at all. And, Sir, it is not with Mr. Brezhnev alone. As far as back 1909, when Lenin wrote his famous thesis on imperialism, he said the conflicts within imperialism and the development of imperialism itself would lead to a situation when the people of the colonial countries would no more constitute the reserves of imperialism and no more would they be adding strength to imperialism, but they would be slowly becoming the reserves of socialism and the reserves of revolution. Now, this is the farsightedness of Lenin and it is on the basis of this that his great theory of proletarian internationalism, seeking the co-operation from and also helping the countries suffering under colonialism, was made. Therefore, Sir, the whole

Soviet policy from the time of Lenin and Stalin and other leaders has been based on this fundamental principle that the people of the erstwhile colonial countries will always be on the side of progress, on the side of democracy and on the side of socialism, and therefore, the socialist countries and the Soviet Union have always been on their side. You will remember that in 1950 when our country was faced with a serious famine as today, Prime Minister Nehru sent a word to Stalin whether he can supply us some grains. Without asking for any condition, without asking for any price, without anything of the sort, within one week the Soviet ships were there in Bombay with foodgrains. He did not wait even for negotiations to conclude a contract. So it has always been the Soviet policy to help India—not only India but all the under-developed countries. The Soviet Union has helped the Middle East, Viet-Nam, etc. Therefore, Sir, what I want to stress on this occasion is that it is a good thing that this communique has been issued and our country has once more declared its identity of views on many of the current international problems with the Soviet Union. But, all the same, Sir, I would like to remind the Government of India that this accord with the Soviet Union for our development, for our peace, can be effective and can be utilized only if the Government of India is willing to fight, and is prepared to fight, imperialism at all levels. Well, it is here that I find that the Government, while speaking highly of these principles, very often does not stand up to those principles in its action.

In this context, I will refer you to two important events which have taken place recently, that is, the Algiers Conference and the last UNO. These two

conferences are much different from the past conferences, including the UNO, because for the first time you will find that at Algiers as well as in the UNO, the under-developed countries, that is, the developing countries, as a whole, the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, have stood as one man against imperialism everywhere and have adopted certain principles which it would have been unthinkable to adopt about three or four years ago. On the Cambodian question, the Algiers Conference unanimously passed a Resolution that the Royal Government of the National Union of Cambodia and P.R.G. be recognized. This is a significant thing. We are a signatory to this Resolution. This Resolution was passed. But our Government is still hesitating to give effect to this Resolution, to which we were a party. I do not know why the Government is still hesitating. Here I would like to remind you, Sir, that India did not take the initiative for this move. This is not a good thing. There was time in the 1950s when on all these issues India took the initiative. On the Viet-Nam Peace Conference in Geneva it took the initiative. On the Korean issue it took the initiative. It took the initiative when Egypt was attacked by Britain, France and Israel. But, for some imperceptible reason, I find that in the Algiers Conference, on this crucial question, India took no initiative. India was almost willy nilly forced to agree to the Resolution. But we have still not given effect to the Resolution. The Royal Government of Cambodia controls 80 per cent of the territory and the Government of Sihanouk has announced that his Government will be functioning from Cambodian territory. Therefore, the last objection to recognising the Royal Government of Cambodia no longer exists and the Government of India should recognise it. (*Time bell rings*) I just started, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken 15 minutes.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: I started at 12.40, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You started at 12.38.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: Again, in the U.N.O. 31 countries tabled a resolution on the recognition of Cambodia and that resolution has been accepted by the Political Affairs Committee. It will come up. India is not one of the signatories to the resolution, but, of course, India agreed to the resolution.

Then, I come to Guinea Bissau. Why is it that the Government of India is not taking any initiative to recognise the Government of Guinea Bissau and why is that the Government of India is not taking serious interest in the matter? It is true that the Government sides with other countries which are taking interest. But I find that there is a hesitancy on the part of the Government of India to take any action.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We have already recognised the independence of Guinea Bissau. We were amongst the first few countries which did it.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: Thank you. I was misinformed on that. We have not recognised the PRG even though the Algiers Conference has called for it.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of ~~task~~ force in the Indian Ocean. People in this country talk as if all the big powers are there which is not a fact. It is only the U.S.A. and the U.S.A. alone which is in the Indian Ocean. They have got two bases, one in Diego Garcia and the other on Makara Coast

[Shri K. P. Subramania Menon.]

in Iran. They are having two aircraft carriers, a number of destroyers and a number of missile carriers, for that? Here is a report in the U.S. News and World Report dated August 28, 1973. Before the conflict in West Asia started, it carried a report about the training of marines in "arid high desert country of Southern California". The name of the project was "code-word Alakli Canyon 73". The magazine which is close to Nixon administration reports that "the leathernecks are looking hard at problems they might face should the U.S. become involved against desert forces, presumably in North Africa or the Eastern Mediterranean." Again, Sir, a few weeks ago, a U.S. energy expert, Robert Hunter, wrote an article in the New York Times magazine, warning the Arabs against an embargo in the supply of Arab oil to U.S.A. He wrote: "A possible use of American military power or some subtle act of force majeure is an implicit factor in the situation." He reminded the Arabs of the fate of Mossadegh. This is the sort of power that we are dealing with. It is a perfidious and treacherous power which is out to subdue the people of the world and which is blackmailing the Arab countries. It is sending its fleets to the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean Ocean because the Arab countries ask them to vacate their territories.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you will have to wind up.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: My last point, Sir. What is the use of saying that all the big powers are there in the Indian Ocean. They are not there. Only one power, the perfidious American power, is there. Why is it that the Government is not taking a strong action or making a

strong statement against these things? The Government is wishy-washy about the whole thing. Our Ambassador in Washington says, "We are trying to improve our relations". All right, improve relations, but it should not be at the cost of our peace and our security.

(Time bell rings)

My last point, Sir...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your last point was the last point.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: Sir, I have not taken more than 12 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are a number of speakers and we have to finish the debate today. In the afternoon, I will have to cut down to 10 minutes.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: Regarding Vietnam, Sir, these Americans and their puppet regime there have killed about 40,000 Vietnamese prisoners. They have committed 250,000 violations of the cease-fire agreement. And 24,000 Americans are working still in South Vietnam in the name of civilian advisers. Therefore, Sir, the Americans are still trying to get out of their commitments for peace in Vietnam. They are trying to infiltrate and create troubles there, and create a hot bed of tension in South Asia. We have to take a strong position on this issue because security and people in South Asia are very vital to our country. In any case, any attempt by the Americans to re-establish their presence and their hegemony in this part of the world is a danger to our country because history proves that during the last 20 years, on every issue, the American imperialism has stood against our interests. They tried to sabotage

our efforts of national reconstruction and, therefore, I hope the Government of India will act according to what they themselves declared in the Declaration. Thank you, Sir.

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA** (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the simplest definition of any Government, I believe, is that its primary business is to see that law and order is maintained at home and its interests are advanced abroad. Basing on this definition, I must congratulate the Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister for steering the ship of State since we last discussed the international affairs in this House in November last, taking care of hazards both at home and abroad. Our foreign policy, in my opinion, has been consistent throughout on the principles and concepts laid down by the great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who in turn was inspired by his great mentor and master, Mahatma Gandhi. I was surprised when my friend, Mr. C. D. Pande, accused that the Government has given up the line of non-alignment.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS:** He was appreciating the dynamism of it.

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA:** I am coming to what I understood of him. Let me illustrate it by a simple example, probably he thinks of non-alignment as an orthodox Brahmin of the 18th century, a touch-me-not type of person who thinks that coming into contact with everything is a sin. That is his concept of non-alignment.

1 P. M.

Sir, as I understand non-alignment, he is a highly enlightened thinker who interpretes history, specially the gospel, with relevance to the modern times, and he not only responds to situations but has a capacity to create historical situations also. That is our non-alignment.

We continue to study what is right and what is wrong and we act accordingly.

Sir, another point that Mr. Pande pointed out was whether we were influencing the Soviet people as they were trying to influence us. I do not know what he means by that word 'influence', because that also becomes a relative term when we talk to people like him. Sir, when two great people come together, they are bound to influence one another in a subtle way and that is definitely good for both the people and both the countries.

Sir, my friend, Mr. Subramania Menon, my previous speaker, spoke many things about the Soviet Union coming to our help and all that in time of need. We believe in the axiom 'A friend in need is a friend indeed'. Mr. Mariswamy also said many things. I do not say that he belongs to American lobby or is an admirer of America. But, a few years back when you talked of China, it was sedition to them. Now, it has taken a very subtle turn after Kissinger's and Nixon's visits to China. Now, whenever they mention America, they do not directly mention it, they mention also China. But, Sir, we have never left the Bandung spirit. We have pursued it consistently and from the floor of this House, as a Congress-man, I can say we have no enmity towards China. China is taking a wrong course and definitely history will say that it is not we who failed her but she failed us.

Now, what about the role of America or those countries where a type of new imperialism has developed. What interest has America in Indo-China or in Vietnam—thousands of miles away. Its only interest then was to contain China within her borders. That was the philosophy then. Now, after Mrs. Nixon's

[Shri Brahmananda Panda.]

visit to China, to my friends and admirers here, everything has become sacrosanct, nothing wrong, and they want to utter China and not America directly.

Sir, in 1962, when we were attacked, when there was an aggression on us, why did the Americans come to our help. It was not out of pure love for India. It was because they thought that India was then in a difficult position that after receiving military and other type of help it could be used a pedestal or a spring-board for attacking China. But, we have been consistent in our policy. We never wanted aggression. We never coveted the territory of others.

Sir, when we talk of change, I take change in its totality. I do not mind a false step here or some misconception there. The world is definitely shaping a new type of humanity. Internationalism of yesterday has become dormant. Therefore, people are more concerned in their countries about nationalism. Therefore, bilateralism is the result, and nationalism, not internationalism, is bound to develop in the coming decades, which will be built more on world peace and amity amongst nations. There will be trouble-shooters, but there will also be people who are terrified by history, there will be people who will be brave enough to create history and hence this conflict in the mental, intellectual and mundane sphere will continue for a time and ultimately a world will emerge where India's role will be appreciated and India is bound to play a big role in that world.

Sir, when Pandit Nehru went to the United States in those days, arrogance of power and arrogance of money was displayed before him both at Washington and at New York. In the inner circles of the State Department he was considered a Communist. So, it is not surprising if the western press now des-

cribes our great Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, and our great Prime Minister as Communists and says that Congress Party has merged with the Communist Party. These are generalisations of our glorious people by those who do not try to understand history objectively and do not view future with a brilliance of mind. Sir, what I say is this. If we talk at Government level about co-operation and other things what is wrong if we develop friendship at party level also. There is nothing wrong. I do not mind if my friend, Shri Pitamber Das, builds up friendship with Comrade Brezhnev. It is only a question of understanding. When I love Sardar Swaran Singh, Sardar Swaran Singh naturally will come nearer me. It is a question of your views, your attitude towards life, your attitude towards international situation and the ideas you have ahead for world peace and amity among nations. India and the Soviet Union, by destiny, are bound to come together and stay together for more years to come. Mr. Pande may ask how we are influencing them. We will definitely tell them not to imbibe the qualities of our Opposition. They also will not try to influence us saying that instead of democracy, you have one-party government. It becomes childish. I tell you an instance may be it is a digression but it is really funny. Prime Minister at one time probably thought that instead of her often unwell Ambassador car, she could take a ride from South Block to her residence in buggy. She has given her explanation as to why it was not feasible as there were security matters and other things involved. Now what is the immediate reaction of my friends in Jana Sangh Vajpayee came in a bullock-cart...

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: It was just to tell her that others are also capable

of such stunt-mongering. It is not her monopoly.

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA :** I am telling how childishly their mind is working. Tomorrow if the Prime Minister is given an elephant to come here, I am confident Mr. Advani will run to the nearby small town washerman to ask for his donkey to ride on. That is way type how the Opposition mind is working. I have every respect for individuals here but not for the way they function. We cannot ask Comrade Brezhnev : "Well, Comrade Brezhnev, you have come to us, we are good friends. However, imbibe the qualities of our Opposition."

**डा० साई महावीर (दिल्ली) :** पांडा जी, समझा यह दीजिये कि बगधी में जाने का तात्पर्य क्या था ! आगे एक मोटर पीछे दो मोटरें—इसका भाव क्या था यह समझा दीजिये । उनको हाथी पर बिठाइये या किसी और पर, यह अलग सवाल है ।

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA :** I will tell you. Instead of taking a bullock-cart and making a show of it, your leader or yourself could have written to the Prime Minister that it is not possible because there will be security hazards.

**डा० साई महावीर :** वह लिखने के लिये आप हैं ।

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA :** No, I am talking of the childish way you people reacted. Therefore, in the international situation...

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Yes, come back to the international affairs.

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA :** I am coming back. I said I am digressing a little to show that these are chil-

dish actions. (*Interruption*) you will never understand us and you will never try. I am a normal man because I have learnt to live with the great, the contemporary great. You are yet to understand and the living with the contemporary great, Sir, here also is disadvantage. Everything looks so normal and so natural. That is very difficult to view things from a historical perspective. If my friend cannot see that historical perspective, it is waste of time on my part to explain to him.

**DR. BHAI MAHAVIR :** Since when did you see this historical perspective ?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** You will not interrupt, Dr. Mahavir. Mr. Panda, you finish whatever points you have.

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA :** Sir, he has taken three minutes of my time.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** That is why I say you come back.

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA :** During the last war with Pakistan cries were raised in the House two days before the Indo-Soviet Treaty was placed on the Table of the House and Members were shouting, who is your friend, tell us one in the whole world. I do not see Mr. Mishra here now; I see only Mr. Mariswamy and some others. They were all shouting, who is your friend ? You are friendless in the world. And immediately the Indo-Soviet Treaty was declared, they all said the Soviet Union is a real friend; they have come to our aid in time of distress and this friendship has to be cultivated, this has to be maintained. Now when we try to develop that friendship further in the field of technical and other collaborations in order to take India to the level with other technologically advanced countries of the world,

[Shri Brahmananda Panda.]

they raise the cry again and say, no, no; only thus far and no further. Here Sir, I am reminded of my early days. When I was in the High School I had taken to writing poetry. There was a cultured lady, she was my neighbour. Whenever I wrote a small poem I used to read it out to her and she used to appreciate my poetry and encourage me. But once my name appeared in a magazine. Once my writing saw the light of day, she had no interest in my poetry. She had an impression probably that throughout my life until she lives I will be writing poetry and only reading it out to her. It is how some of our friends here view this thing. And that is why they say, thus far and no further. When we think of going further and developing the friendship, they say, no, no, the country is going red. I do not know how far these inhibitions be there and how long they will continue to be in a nightmare.

डा० भाई महावीर : उसके बाद आपको कोई महिला मिली कि नहीं कविता सुनने के लिए ?

श्री ब्रम्हानन्द पंडा : मुझे तो बोलने दो और सुनो। पहले की बात नहीं इधर की कहो। Sir, even about Arabs when there were differences between us and Pakistan culminating in confrontation, they were shouting, what is this? You were unnecessarily siding with the Arabs against poor Israel. Now see what the Arabs are doing; they are not condemning Pakistan. Everything that you do is wrong. But now when they find that we, as one of the countries considered friendly towards the Arabs, are not to be deprived of oil, they now say, it is very good, there is nothing wrong. So I will appeal to the Opposition; there

are intellectuals there, there are people who try to understand things but do not show that they understand, I would appeal to them to view the changing international situation in an objective manner because if they try to remain as prisoners of history they will not be in a position to help create history. A time will come, I am confident very soon when the world will be populated with a higher type of humanity. Mr. Dutt yesterday, at the fag end of his speech spoke about the coming together of peoples for peaceful development. He could not be clear about it. But I can see clearly that at least by the end of this century a new world will be emerging based on love, amity among nations and peace because with the developments—I am limiting myself to earth now—in this planet, a different type of humanity is being evolved and I think we in India are proceeding on right lines. I need not take much of your time because many will be repeating the same arguments and perhaps also will be talking something new and I will be a patient listener. I will not have all, if I do not end with a small prayer for the health of my friends in the Jana Sangh :

Oh Lord in Heaven, excuse them; for They do not know what they are thinking;

They do not know what they are talking;

They do not know what they are doing.

Amen

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The House stands adjourned till 2.00 P.M. today.

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



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

डा० भाई महावीर : उपसभापति जी, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर विदेश मंत्री जी के भाषण को मैंने पढ़ा। दुर्भाग्य से मैं उपस्थित नहीं था, इसलिए पढ़कर ही विश्व की वर्तमान परिस्थितियों के बारे में उनकी जो टिप्पणी थी, उसको देख सका। उन्होंने स्वाभाविक रूप से शिमला समझौता, दिल्ली समझौता, इन की तारीफ की, जिम को अंग्रेजी में कहते हैं कि ये समझौते तो उनकी सन्ताने थी और उनकी तारीफ करना उनके लिए वाजिव भी था और कुछ जरूरी भी था। परन्तु इस सारी तारीफ के सिलसिले में उन्होंने अगर कुछ प्राप्ति, कुछ उपलब्धियां बनलाई, तो यही कि नार्मलाइजेशन हो रहा है।

भारत की जनता और भारत के जवान, जिन्होंने कुर्बानियां दी पाकिस्तान के साथ हुए युद्ध में, तो वे इससे कुछ ज्यादा ही अपेक्षा रखते थे इन समझौते से। क्या समझौते केवल इसलिए किये जाते हैं कि स्थिति सामान्य हो जाय? क्या समझौते सिर्फ इसलिए किये गये थे कि एक दिन हम कैदियों को और जीतों जमीन को वापस कर दें और फिर कह दें कि पहली जैसी स्थिति ठीक-ठाक हो गई है? समझौते और युद्ध द्वारा देश के अंतिम राष्ट्रीय हितों के संवर्धन करने की बात होती है और हमें अभी तक यह नहीं बतलाया गया है कि इन समझौते से किस तरह से वे हित प्राप्त किये गये हैं? जो दिखाई देता है वह यह है कि भुट्टो साहब फिर से तैयारी कर रहे हैं, षड-यंत्रों की आग फिर से सुलगवाई जा रही है, काश्मीर के अन्दर घुसपैठियों का असर फिर से नजर आ रहा है और काश्मीरियों को गुरिल्ला ट्रेनिंग के वास्ते भुट्टो साहब पेशकश कर रहे हैं। हमारे रक्षा मंत्री और दूसरे मंत्री भी अपने जवानों को और वायुसेना के लोगों को कह रहे हैं कि वे सावधान रहे, फिर शरारत हो सकती है और फिर खतरा पैदा हो सकता

है। यानी सारे समझौतों के बाद हम फिर वही पर आ गये हैं जहां पर पहले थे? पाकिस्तान हथियार जमा कर रहा है, पाकिस्तान दोस्त तैयार कर रहा है। भुट्टो यदि अमरिका जाते हैं तो सिर्फ इस मकसद के लिए कि वे वहां से हथियार लायें। अपने आदमियों को चीन भेजते हैं तो एक ही लक्ष्य से कि हिंदुस्तान के खिलाफ उन्हें तैयारी करनी है। जब आप अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति की चर्चा करते हैं तो यह कम से कम बताते कि किस तरह से जो आपने अब तक किया था, जो अपेक्षाएं आपने रखी थी, पाकिस्तान के साथ हुई बात-चीत और समझौते से जो कुछ आपको फल पाने की आशा थी वह कहा तक प्राप्त हुई और अगर नहीं प्राप्त हुई तो क्यों नहीं प्राप्त हुई। मंत्री जी ने यह बताने का कोई प्रयत्न नहीं किया। नार्मलाइजेशन बहुत बड़ा एचीव-मेंट उन्होंने बताया है, लेकिन मेरी दृष्टि में वह बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि नहीं है।

फिर उन्होंने अरब-इजरायल युद्ध की बात की और उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी सहानुभूति "क्वाइट नेचुरली" अरबों के साथ थी। यह "नेचुरली" शब्द किस अर्थ में है, मैं नहीं जानता पर शायद उन्होंने इस अर्थ में उपयोग किया कि न्याय का पक्ष उनका है, न्याय का पक्ष अरबों का है इस वास्ते हमारी सहानुभूति अरबों के साथ है। यह बात जहां हम कह सकते हैं और सरकार कहती रही है, वहां पर प्रश्न यह उठता है कि हमने अपने नीति से अरबों का कितना हित किया, उनके साथ मित्रता हमने निभाई है या मित्रता के सबंध जो हमने बनाए हैं या बढ़ाना चाहते हैं वे क्या एकतरफा हैं या दोनों तरफ से निभाए जाने वाले हैं। इसके बारे में मंत्री जी ने कुछ बताने का प्रयास नहीं किया। जो दिखाई दिया और जो हमने देखा वह यह था कि युद्ध के समय हम जितने चुस्त थे अरबों के पक्ष में अरब स्वयं उतने नहीं थे यानी हम वे बातें कहते हुए दिखाई दिए जिनका दावा स्वयं उन्होंने नहीं किया था। इजिप्शन ने स्वीकार किया कि

[डॉ० भाई महवीर]

उन्होंने लड़ाई शुरू की, उन्होंने अपनी फौजों को आगे बढ़ाया, लेकिन हमारे सरकारी प्रवक्ता कहते रहे कि पहल इजराइल ने की यानी मोर लायल देन दि किंग हिमसेल्फ । यह नीति क्या अरबों के हित के लिए है ? दे केन टेक अस फोर ग्रान्टेड, जो कुछ वे करे भारत उनके साथ रहेगा ही, इस तरह का इम्प्रेशन देकर क्या हम अरबों का हित कर रहे हैं या भारत का हित कर रहे हैं ? मैं यह समझता हूँ कि इस तरह का पक्षपातपूर्ण रवैया हमें अरबों के साथ भी सच्ची मित्रता निभाने लायक नहीं छोड़ता । बहुत सारी परिस्थितियाँ ऐसी हो सकती हैं कि हमें दोनों की मित्रता निभाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए । यह झगड़ा वास्तव में उनका झगड़ा है और वे अपने आप उसको निपट रहे हैं । वहा सीज-फायर हो रही है । उस सीज-फायर पर वे दोनों तैयार हो जाएंगे, लेकिन हम बोलते रहेंगे कि इजराइल को वह क्षेत्र छोड़ने चाहिए जो अरबों के उन्होंने अपने कब्जे में किए हुए हैं । हमारी सरकार ने शायद कोई कसौटी बना रखी है कि किसी दूसरे की भूमि पर जो कब्जा करके बैठा है उसको हटाए वगैर कोई बातचीत या कोई सीज-फायर नहीं होनी चाहिए । यह नियम वैसे तो बड़ा अच्छा है, लेकिन शायद यह नियम सिर्फ औरों के लिए है । हमारे देश की भूमि पर कोई विदेशी बैठा रहे, चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, चाहे चीन हो उसके लिए हम शर्त नहीं लगाते कि जब तक वे हमारी भूमि खाली नहीं करेंगे तब तक बातचीत नहीं करेंगे । वादे भी किए गए, ससद के अन्दर घोषणाएँ की गईं, प्रतिज्ञाएँ की गईं, शपथें ली गईं, लेकिन इस सबके बावजूद भी हमारी भूमि दूसरों के कब्जे में है । इसको हम सह सकते हैं, इसको रैलिश भी कर सकते हैं, लेकिन अरबों की भूमि कोई क्यों दबाए इसके बारे में हमें शिकायत होती है । साथ ही जब हम लोग अरबों से अपनी सहानुभूति प्रगट करते हैं तो क्या जब हमारी भूमि पर दूसरा आक्रमण करता है, चाहे वह पाकिस्तान

हो या चीन हो, हम उनसे यह अपेक्षा नहीं रख सकते कि वे भी इसी तरह से हमारे लिए सहानुभूति प्रगट करें, हमारा साथ दें, जैसा कि हम अरबों के साथ करने के लिए तैयार हैं ?

महोदय, मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि राजनीतिक और युद्ध के क्षेत्र में आगे बढ़कर व्यापार में भी, वैज्ञानिक क्षेत्र में भी, अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में भी हम इजराइल को एक ऐसा अछूत बना कर रखना चाहते हैं मानो उनको स्पर्श करने से हमारा धर्म भ्रष्ट हो जायगा । हम अपने व्यापार मेले में उनको बुलाना नहीं चाहते, खेलों के अन्दर उनको निमंत्रित करना नहीं चाहते । इजराइल ने रेगिस्तान में खेती करने के अनुसंधान में काफी तरक्की की है । हमारे कुछ वैज्ञानिक---दो वैज्ञानिकों का तो मुझे पता है---उसका अध्ययन करने के लिए वहा जाना चाहते थे । इजराइल ने उनको सुविधाएँ देना स्वीकार किया, उनको निमंत्रित किया, लेकिन हमारी सरकार ने उनको जाने की इजाजत नहीं दी । यह एक नये तरह का अनटचेबिलिटी का अनुभव हम लोगों ने जो इजराइल के प्रति रखा है, मैं समझता हूँ यह जरूरी नहीं है । न अरब इसकी मांग कर सकते हैं और वह मांग करे भी, तो भी हमें देने के लिए तैयार नहीं होना चाहिए । दोनों के साथ मित्रता रखने की कोशिश में यह जरूरी नहीं है कि हम किसी एक की जेब में रहेंगे । हम सरकार की नीतियों को किसी की जेब में रखने को उचित नहीं समझते ।

महोदय, मंत्री जी ने तेल के बारे में कहा । लेकिन अरबों ने तेल को एक शस्त्र के रूप में इस्तेमाल किया है, इसका जिक्र भर उन्होंने किया, अच्छा है या बुरा, इसके बारे में उन्होंने राय देना भी उचित नहीं समझा । क्यों ? इसलिए कि अच्छा कहना मुश्किल था, बुरा कहे तो शायद अरब नाराज हो जायेंगे । अगर वह नाराज हो जाए तो हमारी नीति की जो मीनार है वह लड़खड़ा जाएगी । मगर तेल की राजनीति के लिए इतना कहकर समाप्त कर दिया कि थोड़ी देर के लिए हमें वह पिच

किया। मंत्री जी को पिच नहीं हो रहा हो, लेकिन लोगो से पूछिये जिनको पेट्रोल की ज्यादा कीमत देनी पड़ती है। मंत्रियों को वह पिच नहीं करेगा। (Interruption) जरूर कम करेगा। परन्तु मंत्री जी ने कहा कि अब हमे ऐश्वोरेंस मिल गया है कि भारत की सप्लाई कम नहीं होगी। अगर ऐश्वोरेंस मिल गया था तो फिर यह भूमिका क्यों तैयार की जा रही है कि दाम और बढ़ेंगे, पेट्रोल का राशनिंग होगा? क्या इसलिए कि आपके पास पेट्रोल और दूसरे सब तरह के साधन हों, दूसरो के लिए चुनाव के लिए जरूरी पेट्रोल भी न मिले, इसलिये? मैं समझ नहीं सका कि आप कैसे इसको उचित समझते हैं। अगर कल अमरीका गेहूं को राजनीति का हथियार बनाकर कह दे कि वह उन देशों को गेहूं देगा जो उसके समर्थक ह, तो आपको और हमको भी मानना पड़ेगा कि अमरीका में पैदा हुए गेहूं के ऊपर उसका उतना ही अधिकार है जितना अरब देशो का उनके यहा पैदा होने वाले तेल पर अधिकार है। लेकिन हमारी सरकार के मापदण्ड दोहरे या तिहरे हैं। मैं नहीं समझता इनको आप कैसे उचित ठहरायेंगे।

महोदय, विदेश मंत्री जीने जिक्र किया कि नान-एलाइंड सम्मिट हुआ था और उसका कुछ थोड़ा-सा उल्लेख उनके भाषण में हुआ। वहां पर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो भाषण दिया सरकार क्या उस भाषण के ऊपर आज भी खड़ी है कि नहीं खड़ी है, यह बतायें। उन्होंने कहा था कि दो महा-शक्तियां दुनिया को अपने प्रभाव क्षेत्रो मे बांटती हुए दिखाई देती हैं। यदि आप इसका मानते हैं तो कम से कम इतना तो स्वीकार कीजिए कि दो महा-शक्तियों के किन्ही रवैयो में आप समानता देखते हैं; दोनों के अन्दर बहुत बड़ा भेद और अन्तर तो आप शायद न कर सकें, लेकिन कुछ अन्तर जरूर होगा। लेकिन इसके बारे में उन्होंने नहीं कहा। न ही उन्होंने इसके बारे में कहा कि हिन्द-महासागर के अन्दर एक की देखादेखी दूसरा अपने अड्डे बनाने

या अपने देश की उपस्थिति कायम करने मे लगा है। क्या हम इसको अपने देश के हितों में समझते हैं? हम समझते हैं कि सरकार कहेगी नहीं कि अपने हितो मे नहीं समझते। हम समझते हैं कि मंत्री जी उन पर अपना प्रभाव नहीं डालेंगे, परन्तु आप अपनी राय भी नहीं दे सकते हैं? राय तो दीजिए। आज राय देने के बजाय हमने केवल गुणगान करने का काम शुरू किया और वह भी ऐसे समय कि जिस समय श्री ब्रेजनेव आये हैं, और अभी डा० हुसाक आये हुए हैं, उनके प्रति कृतज्ञता की पेंगें बढ़ाई जा रही हैं, बहुत तारीफ की जा रही है। मैं मित्रता के खिलाफ नहीं हूं और खासकर पिछले दिनों में हमारे देश के ऊपर जब एक आपत्ति का समय आया था, सोवियत संघ ने जिस प्रकार से हमे मित्रता के द्वारा सहायता दी और उस सहायता से हम अपने देश मे और बंगला देश के वास्ते एक न्यायपूर्ण युद्ध के सकट की परि-समाप्ति प्राप्त कर सके, इसके लिए हम वास्तव मे रूस के प्रति कृतज्ञ ह, लेकिन क्या उस कृतज्ञता को लेकर हम यह समझेंगे कि हमे अपनी आखो पर पट्टी बांध लेनी है? मेरे मित्र कल श्री बिपिनपाल दास बोले अडवाणी जी के वक्तव्य को लेकर कि अडवाणी जी ने कह दिया कि हमने देश को बेच दिया। जहां तक मैंने सुना है, उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा। लेकिन उनको तो एक शब्द चाहिए था। उसके बाद जितने विश्लेषण उनके पास थे वह उन्होंने लगाये जैसे मैलाफाइड, मीरचीक्स, पोलिटिकली मौटिवेटेड, हार्मफुल टु नेशनल इंटरैस्ट, वगैरह, वगैरह। उनके पास थियोरस होता तो 10-20 विश्लेषण वह और इस्तेमाल कर सकते और फिर उसकी रिपोर्ट उनके दल के नेता द्वारा प्रधान मंत्री जी के पास पहुंच जाती कि इन्होंने बहुत बड़ी गालियां दी है जनसंघ के लोगों को, यह बहुत बड़ा अचीवमेंट होता। लेकिन जनसंघ के लोगों ने क्या कहा। हमने कहा कि रूस से मित्रता कीजिये, लेकिन बराबरी की मित्रता कीजिये, आंखो पर पट्टी मत बांधिये और किसी भी बात पर दबाव मत सहन कीजिये। जब

[डॉ० भाई महावीर]

हमारे सामने यह स्थिति आती है कि क्या दबाव आता है कि नहीं आता है, तो कहना पड़ेगा कि ऐसे उदाहरण हैं कि जहाँ पर हम अपने अधिकारों को जैसे असर्ट करना चाहिये वैसे नहीं कर पाये। इसके लिए हम रूस को दोष नहीं देते, वैसे ही जैसे कि हम अमरीका को दोष नहीं देंगे। अगर अमरीका अपनी ऊँची और ज्यादा ताकतवर स्थिति का लाभ उठा कर के किसी दूसरे छोटे देश को दबाने की कोशिश करता है या अपनी शक्ति को मनवाना चाहता है, तो अमरीका को दोष देने के बजाय अपनी कमजोरी को, अपनी खुददारी की कमी को हम दोष देना चाहेंगे।

बार्टर ट्रेड के बारे में रूस के साथ हमारा व्यापार बढ़ रहा है, कम्युनिस्ट देशों के साथ हमारा व्यापार बढ़ रहा है और हम बड़े खुश हैं। जहाँ कोई कमी होती है तो हम कहते हैं कि रूस से समझौता कर लिया है। सेल्फ रिलायंस, विदेशी ऋण, विदेशी सहायता के बगैर हम अपने काम को चलायेंगे, ये सारी बातें हमने थोड़ी देर के लिए कोल्ड स्टोरेज में डाल दी हैं। हमें कहीं से थोड़ी-सी सहायता मिलती है तो हम अपनी पीठ थप थपाते हुये नजर आते हैं। आत्मनिर्भरता, सेल्फ-रिलायंस, ये सारी बातें थोड़ी देर के लिए छोड़ दी गई हैं। परन्तु मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जब हम दूसरे देशों से अलग हट कर के बार्टर डील से अपने आयात और निर्यात को जोड़कर रखते हैं, तो उसका एक परिणाम होता है जो हमारी सरकार को भूलना नहीं चाहिये। वह परिणाम यह होता है कि हम दुनिया में प्रतिस्पर्धा में खड़े होने लायक नहीं रहते, हम दुनिया के मुकाबिला के लिए सन्नद नहीं रहते और हम जो कुछ बेचते हैं वह प्रोटेक्टेड मार्केट में, सरक्षित मार्केट में बेचते हैं और वह जितनी देर रूस चाहे उतनी देर चलता रहेगा। जिस दिन रूस या कम्युनिस्ट देश किसी कारण से व्यापार चालू रखना नहीं चाहेंगे, वे स्वीच आफ कर देंगे और उस व्यापार के ऊपर जो

हमने अपनी उम्मीदों का महल बनाया है वह सारा चरमरा कर नीचे आ जायगा। क्या ऐसा दुनिया के अन्दर कभी नहीं हुआ? मेरा निवेदन है कि ऐसा हुआ है। जिस वक्त मार्शल टीटो और मार्शल स्टैलिन का झगडा हुआ, उसी वक्त रूस और युगोस्लाविया का होने वाला व्यापार समाप्त कर दिया गया। फिर जब थोड़ी-बहुत दोस्ती शुरू हुई तो वह व्यापार चलने लगा। हंगरी के विद्रोह के सवाल पर मार्शल टीटो ने समर्थन किया हंगरी का और फिर उस वक्त वही बात हुई। उनका व्यापार फिर खत्म हो गया। फिर रूस और चीन का जिस वक्त विघटन हुआ तो युगोस्लाविया और रूस की दोस्ती फिर शुरू हुई और फिर उनका व्यापार चलने लगा। यानी कम्युनिस्ट या रूस जैसे देशों का व्यापार जो है वह उनका पोलिटिकल आफ शूट है, उनकी राजनीति, उनकी विदेश नीति का एक उपाग है, ऐसा मान कर चलना चाहिये। आप उनसे बातचीत कीजिये, उनसे व्यापार कीजिये, यह सब ठीक है। आप रूस में भी कीजिये, और कम्युनिस्ट देशों से भी कीजिये, मैं उनके बारे में कुछ कत्ना नहीं चाहता। उनकी आंतरिक स्थिति के बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन मेरे पास ऐसे तथ्य हैं, ऐसे आकड़े हैं कि आज रूस दुनिया में शायद ऐसे देशों में से है जहाँ लोगों का विचारों के कारण फोर्स्ड हास्पिटलाइजेशन, फोर्स्ड साइ-कियाट्रिक हास्पिटलाइजेशन होता है। चार साल, छे साल, दस साल, बारह साल तक लोगों को एक्जाइल में, लेबर कैम्प्स में रहना पड़ता है। यह आज रूस के अन्दर हो सकता है। मैं रूस की आंतरिक स्थिति के बारे में कोई राय देना जरूरी नहीं समझता। वे अपने देश के बारे में कोई भी फैसला कर सकते हैं। लेकिन हमें जब रूस की शक्ति दिखाई देती है, उसके उपग्रह मंगल के पास गुजरते हुये दिखाई देते हैं, तो उस मंगल उपग्रह की छाया में रूस के अन्दर जो वहाँ के वृद्धिजीवी हैं, जो लेखक हैं, जो वैज्ञानिक हैं उनकी सिमकती हुई घुटन दिखाई देती है, जो उनका दम घुट रहा है

वह दिखाई देता है। क्या हम समझते हैं कि रूस के अन्दर उतनी उदारता और वैसा ही वातावरण है जैसा कि हम अपने देश के अन्दर रखते हैं। रूस के अन्दर यह जो कुछ होता है उस को वह सवारे, ठीक रख, लेकिन केवल बात यही समाप्त नहीं होती। रूस का यूगोस्लाविया के साथ, हंगरी के साथ, चेको-स्लोवाकिया के साथ, पोलैंड के साथ और रूमानिया के साथ जिस तरह का व्यापार चला है अगर उस का आप अध्ययन करेंगे तो आप को पता चलेगा कि रूस जो बेचता है वह दुनिया से ज्यादा दामो पर बेचता है और जो खरीदता है वह दुनिया के दामो से कम दामो पर खरीदता है। उपनिवेशवाद शक्तियां जिस प्रकार पिछले दिनों शोषण करती रही हैं उसी प्रकार के आकड़े आप को उस के भी दिखाई देंगे। वैसा ही वहां पर भी हुआ है और इस के बारे में मुझे कुछ ज्यादा नहीं कहना है, केवल इतना ही कहना है कि 1948 में सोवियत संघ ने यूगोस्लाविया की सहायता बढ़ करते हुए जो शब्द कहे थे वह मैं आप के सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। वे शब्द हैं :

“The Yugoslav leaders should also bear in mind that retailing this anti-Soviet attitude means depriving themselves of the right to demand materials and any other assistance from the USSR because Soviet Union can only offer aid to friends”

This is from the letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the Central Committee of C.P. of Yugoslavia. This is dated May, 4, 1948. और उसके बाद अल्बानिया के साथ जब झगड़ा हुआ तब भी यही कहा गया कि :

“It is understandable that the Albanian leadership cannot expect in future that USSR will help it as it has in the past with aid from which only true friends and brothers have a right to benefit.”

सच्चे मित्र और भाई जो होंगे उन के लिए वह सहायता है। जब तक रूस आप को सच्चा मित्र और भाई समझता है तब तक आप के लिए उस की सहायता है उस का ऋण है आप के लिए, तब तक आप के लिए तेल है, आप के लिए तब तक फर्टिलाइजर प्लांट है, लेकिन जिस वक्त उन के मन में यह आया आप के बारे में कि कोई दूसरी राय बन गयी फिर जो होगा उस की आप कल्पना कर सकते हैं। दूसरे देशों के साथ जो कुछ हुआ उस से हमें शिकायत हो सकती है लेकिन मैं उस शिकायत की बात यहां नहीं करूंगा, किन्तु मुझे कहना है कि हम जो खुश हैं कि रूस ने हमें यह दिया, वह दिया, उस सिलसिले में मैं केवल तीन प्रोजेक्ट्स के बारे में थोड़ी सी बात आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। अभी जो श्री ब्रेज्नेव के साथ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का एक वक्तव्य जारी किया गया बोकारो का, उस बोकारो की कहानी क्या है। महोदय, जिस समय उस का पहला अनुमान लगाया गया था दस्तूर कंपनी के द्वारा तो वह लगभग 559 करोड़ रुपये का था। उस के दो साल के बाद जो सोवियत डिटेल्ड प्रोजेक्ट रिपोर्ट आयी उस में 771 करोड़ रुपये से ऊपर का खर्च उस पर बताया गया और अब वह बढ़ कर 1004 करोड़ रुपये का हो गया है और उसके बाद भी अब डर यह है कि स्टील जो उस में पैदा होगा वह महंगा होगा। अपनी इकोनामी को ठीक रखने के लिए हम को जो जो वहां चाहिए वह वहां से हमें प्राप्त नहीं होगा। इस प्रकार से इन के खर्च बढ़ रहे हैं। कोई कह सकता है कि खर्च बढ़ रहे हैं इसलिए उस में उन का कसूर क्या? इस में उन का कुछ कसूर है और जो कसूर है वह मैं अपने शब्दों में कहने के बजाय, महोदय, जो पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग की रिपोर्ट आयी है उस के दो तीन वाक्यों द्वारा कहना चाहता हूँ। महोदय, पी० यू० सी० ने कहा है :

“The Committee were very much perturbed to find that the benefits of scales of production will not be

[डॉ० भाई महावीर]

available to the country even at 4 million tonnes production."

और इस के आगे :

"The Committee have found that negotiations with the Soviet were rushed through. The Committee feel that the Government ought to have insisted on having enough time considering the DPR and other connected matters and ought not to have allowed themselves to be stampeded into entering into important agreements without proper and detailed scrutiny."

आंखों पर पट्टी बंधी है। पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग कमेटी कहती है कि हमें यह करने की इजाजत किसी को नहीं देनी चाहिए, लेकिन हम ने क्यों इजाजत दी? इतना ही नहीं, फेज्ड डिलीवरी शेड्यूल तैयार नहीं हुए यानी कब कौन सा माल आयेगा यह उन्होंने डेट वाइज तय नहीं किया, उस के लिए कोई प्रोग्राम नहीं बनाया। नतीजा क्या हुआ कि जो चीज हमें पहले चाहिए थी वह आयी नहीं और जो चीज बाद में चाहिए थी वह उन्होंने पहले ही हमारे सिर पर पटक दी। दस हजार टन ऐसा सामान जो कि आना चाहिए था।

"On the one hand, the supplies were deficient to the extent of 10,000 tonnes, in the last blast furnace. Large number of rolling mills required much later have already been supplied."

तो यह पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग कमेटी जनसंघ की नहीं है। श्री आडवाणी की भी नहीं है। (Time bell rings) महोदय, मुझे थोड़ा सा समय और दिया जाय। मैं कोई इरिलिवेंट बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। कमेटी ने महोदय यह भी कहा कि:-

"The Committee were told that the Soviet authorities were not willing to accept Dastur & Company as principal consultants for the project. The Soviets were not willing to accept."

यानी विदेशी रूस सहायता करता है तो क्या रूस ही तय करता है कि कौन कन्सल्टेंट इंजीनियर हो यहां, परन्तु फिर कौन सैल्फ रिलाइन्स ला रहा है, क्यों ऐसा हुआ, क्यों हमने शर्त मानी? यह संसद है, लोकतंत्र है? प्रधानमंत्री बड़ी जागरूक है। हमारे बहुत सारे सदस्य उधर हैं वे खतरा मोल लेकर ऐसी बात कहते हैं तो फिर क्यों ऐसा हुआ? जो सेक्रेटरी, स्टील मिनिस्ट्री ने जबाब दिया है वह यह है :

"This Government were more or less compelled to accept the position because they were obliged to do so by the country giving foreign aid."

विदेशी सहायता देने की वजह से उनकी शर्तों को मानने के लिए हमें लगभग मजबूर कर दिया गया। यह अगर सेक्रेटरी का कथन है और यह सेक्रेटरी का कथन पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग कमेटी के सामने है, मेरे सामने नहीं, श्री आडवाणी के सामने ही नहीं। इस वास्ते मैं अपने विपिन पाल दास जी से कहना चाहता हूँ और श्री सरदेसाई जी से भी, वह यहां नहीं हैं मैंने उनका भी भाषण पढ़ा है मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कोई ऐसा मौका नहीं आया कि हमारा नेशनल इन्ड्रेस्ट सबोर्डिनेट नहीं किया गया। माईन्स एन्ड एलाइड मशीनरी कारपोरेशन की भी एक कहानी है। पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग कमेटी का कहना है कि वह एक कंसर्न है जिसने अपनी सारी कैपिटल खा ली और खा कर बराबर कर दिया। इस वास्ते वह कहते हैं

"It would be wise if this undertaking is wound up to avoid further drain on the public exchequer."

अगर यह एम० ए० एन० सी० की हालत हुई तो इसमें क्या हमारा दोष था, क्या हमारे कर्मों का दोष था। आज फिर टेक्नोलॉजी की बात आई। चेकोस्लोवाकिया की टेक्नोलॉजी अपग्रेड की जाएगी, यह बड़े-बड़े शब्द, ये बड़े-बड़े शब्दजाल ये शब्द आडम्बर कैसे दिखाई दते

है ? तथ्य यह है कि जो कैपिसिटी इस माइन्ज एंड अलाइड मशीनरी कारपोरेशन की है "It was fixed without any consideration of demand."

पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग कमेटी ने कहा :

"The tragedy is one of over-assessing requirements for coal-mining machinery about 15 times above the requirement..."

जिनकी जरूरत है उससे ज्यादा रिकवायरमेंट रखकर वह मशीनरी हमारे गले पर थोपी गई। जो फारेन एक्सपर्ट थे उन फारेन एक्सपर्ट की रिपोर्ट भी किसी इंडीयन एक्सपर्ट को चेक करने को नहीं मिली। कोई गुंजाइश ही नहीं रखी रशियन ने।

कमेटी ने एक बात बड़ी रोचक निकाली वह यह थी कि उसमें एक शर्त यह थी कि माल तुम्हारा पूरा मिले या नहीं पर दाम तुम्हें पूरे देने होंगे। पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग कमेटी ने फिर यह कहा है :

"The Committee are surprised to note that the agreement for the supply of equipment and material contained a clause according to which the full amount of Rs. 10,33,24,977 had to be paid even if the actual net weight of the equipment and material fell short of the total weight of 23,363 tonnes specified in the agreement. The Government was forced to make the full and final payment although about 80% of the contracted quantity still remained to be supplied."

यह कौन सा देश है जो इस तरह की बात को अपने स्वाभिमान के लिए चुनौती नहीं समझता? क्या हमारी सरकार को यह नहीं दिखाई देता कि इस तरह की परिस्थिति में हम अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों का संरक्षण पूरी तरह से नहीं कर पाएंगे। इतना ही नहीं कमेटी ने फिर कहा :

"The proliferation of specialists is making the Indian engineers more dependent and contributing to lack of self-reliance and confidence."

उनके इंजीनियर्स की इतनी भरमार है कि हमारे इंजीनियर्स अपनी बुद्धि का इस्तेमाल कर ही नहीं पाते। जो मसला होता है उनके हवाले कर देते हैं। इसी वास्ते मैं कहता हूं कि आप चाहे 100 साल बैठें रहें, हजार साल बैठें रहें आपकी सैफ रिलाइन्स नहीं बढ़ेगी आपकी डिपेंडेंस बढ़ेगी। इससे जो सही अर्थों में स्वराज्य, स्वतंत्रता दिखाना चाहते हैं उसमें आपको कामयाबी हासिल नहीं होगी।

ड्रग की बात आती है। आपको आई० डी० पी० एल० की बात कहना चाहता हूं। इंडियन ड्रग्स एण्ड फार्मेस्यूटीकल लिमिटेड के जो प्रोजेक्ट्स बनाए गए एक नहीं तीन प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं। उनमें से एक के बारे में है। चेयरमैन पी० यू० सी० ने कहा :

"The cost of production of Vitamin B was given as Rs. 100 per kg. while even in Russia it was not being produced at less than Rs. 750 per kg. Similarly, the cost of production of streptomycin was given as Rs. 63 per kg. whereas the production cost was not less than Rs. 200 or Rs. 220 per kg. anywhere in the world."

"The Chairman of the IDPL further said: I certainly can prove certain things which were accepted by them at that time which were wrong." And how the Government accepted such false estimates? ... शब्द कमेटी के नहीं हैं।

किस तरह से यह हुआ तो कमेटी का कहना है—चेयरमैन ने कहा, आन दि वेसिस आफ फेथ, हमने विश्वास कर के उनकी बात को मान लिया। इसके अन्दर भी बहुत बड़ी कैपिसिटी ज्यादा रखी गई, 50 टन की कैपिसिटी बनाई गई, हालांकि रशियन्स ने कहा था कि

[डॉ० भाई महावीर]

120 टन की कपेसिटी रखिये और हमारी जो जरूरत थी वह सिर्फ 15 टन थी, लेकिन सोडियम सल्फानामाइड की 50 टन की कपेसिटी बना दी गई। जब यह कहा गया कि इतनी जरूरत नहीं है तो कमेटी को जबाब मिला क्या :

“When it was found that the Indian doctors were not prescribing Tetracycline Hydrochloride, the question was taken up with the Russians, but they did not agree to reduce the capacity...”

और इसके आगे कमेटी ने यह भी देखा :

“Small-scale sector was producing some drugs and many instruments at cheaper prices and with better quality than the IDPL...”

महोदय, रशियन भारत के लोगो को इस्पेक्शन न करने दे, सप्लाय के बारे में कोई टाइमटेबिल न तय करने दें, इक्विपमेंट की क्वालिटी की जांच न होने दे और अपने एक्सपर्ट को यहाँ पर लाये, हमारे एक्सपर्ट्स को एसोसियेट न होने दे, यह स्थिति किसी भी देश के वास्ते कोई बड़ी समाधान की स्थिति नहीं है। इसलिये महोदय हम कुछ कहते हैं तो आपत्ति की जाती है। महोदय, आज बाटर् ट्रेड होता है, रुपी ट्रेड है। इस रुपी ट्रेड का क्या है? जो माल इन देशों से आयेगा उसकी क्वालिटी नहीं पूछी जायेगी — जो उधर से जायेगा। और एक मजेदार बात देखिये, अभी चेकोस्लोवाकिया के साथ जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, जिन बन्धुओं ने उसे पढ़ा है उनको ध्यान में आया है कि यह रुपये की वैल्यू सोने के टर्म में देखी जायेगी, सोने के टर्म में जो वास्तव में रुपये का एकाउंट करके आयेगा वह कीमत अदा करनी पड़ेगी, लेकिन अगर उनकी मुद्रा की कीमत घट जाय तो कुछ नहीं। वन-साइडेड, एकतरफा सारी बात हो रही है और इसके बाद कहा जाता है कि कोआप-रेशन बहुत अच्छा है। हमारे मित्र सरदेसाई साहब कह रहे हैं कि कोआपरेशन में किसको तकलीफ है। हमको कोई तकलीफ नहीं है।

सहयोग में हमें कोई कष्ट नहीं है। कष्ट हमें नहीं है लेकिन सहयोग जब सहयोग नहीं रहता, जब एक का प्रभुत्व दूसरे के ऊपर छा जाता है, एक को दबाया जाता है और इस वास्ते दबाया जाता है—ये देश नये देश के लोगों से, छोटे देश के लोगों से या अविकसित देश के लोगों से अनुचित लाभ उठाना चाहते हैं—तब कष्ट होता है—उनसे शर्तें मनवा सकते हैं।

(Time bell rings)

महोदय, मैं आखिरी एक बात कह कर समाप्त करूँगा। इस सारी परिस्थिति में जब हमारे देश को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में अपना स्थान बनाना है तो क्या हमारी सरकार इसको बड़े गौरव की बात मानती है कि हम किसी भी समय एक महाशक्ति नहीं बनाना चाहते, हम अपने देश को बड़ी शक्ति नहीं बनाना चाहते। यह क्या कोई विनय की बात है, यह कोई ह्यूमिलिटी की बात है—साहब, आप ही बड़े हम क्यों बड़े बन, आप ही बड़े बनिये। क्या इस तरह का रवैया हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्बन्धों में रखना चाहते हैं? हमारे देश के हर एक व्यक्ति को अपने देश को महान देश, अपने देश को महाशक्ति और अपने देश की आत्मनिर्भरता को सही अर्थों में आत्मनिर्भर बनाना चाहिये, यह संकल्प लेना चाहिये। लेकिन हमारी सरकार का वहाँ पर भी विनय पहुँचता है, विनय के कारण और लखनवी अदा के साथ आप आगे चलो हम पीछे ही अच्छे हैं, वास्तव में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत के अन्दर कोई भी देश सही भूमिका अदा नहीं कर सकता जब तक कि वह अपनी जरूरतों को स्वयं पूरा कर के आगे नहीं बढ़ता। आज की टेक्नालाजी हम वहाँ से लेगे। टेक्नालाजी ले कर हम कहीं पहुँचे हैं। हमारी योजनाये बड़ी हैं, बढ़ रही हैं और बेकारों की तादाद भी बढ़ रही है। अभी भी हमारी योजना लेबर इंटेसिव नहीं बनाई जाती है।

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please finish I am calling another Member to speak.



डा० भाई महावीर : अभी भी हमारी योजना लेबर इंटेन्सिव नहीं बनाई जा सकी। महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार मित्रता करे लेकिन रूस से मित्रता करते वक्त आखें खोल कर रखे, दूसरे देशों से भी मित्रता करते समय आखें खोल कर रखे, अमेरिका भी कोई देवता नहीं है, उसके लिये भी वही बात है, हम अमेरिका को पूरा परख चुके हैं। तो रूस के बारे में, सब के बारे में यह विचार सामने रखिये, हम किसी समय भी यह न समझे कि जो हमारा हित है उसके बारे में चिन्ता किये बगैर कोई समझौता करें। वैंग्स का डील हमें बताता है, फॉटिलाइजर्स हमें कोई कम्युनिस्ट देशों में प्राप्त नहीं हो सका।

(मय की घंटी) (Time bell rings.)

महोदय, इस सारी परिस्थिति में आज अपने देश के सामने जितनी जागरूक सरकार होनी चाहिये मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार उतनी जागरूकता वरते।

**SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA** (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, we must be grateful to our esteemed Foreign Minister for a brief but very lucid speech he gave yesterday. He reviewed the situation in the Indian sub-continent. He reviewed our relations with our neighbours. He gave a picture of the European detente. He reviewed the West Asian situation. He gave an account of the situation in Indo-China. He made a reference to a meeting in Algiers between our Prime Minister and Prince Sihanouk. He also made a reference to the Commonwealth Conference where the Australian and New Zealand Prime Ministers showed an entirely new approach to world problems. He also referred to the visits of Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Husak to our country. He said that they were leaders of friendly countries who stood by us through thick and thin. He appreciated U.S.S.R.'s role in building up the basic industrial base for our further economic development. It was a superb analysis.

6-42 RSS (ND)/73

He emphasised that in pursuing its foreign policy, India always keeps before its mind its international role for advancing the cause of freedom against anti-colonialism and for peace.

But, Sir, there is a story in our language. When Ramayana was recited and the whole Ramayana was over, the listener did not know who was Rama and who was Ravana. That is exactly the case with our friends opposite. Yesterday, we had the performance of Dr. C. D. Pande and today we have been regaled to a very nice performance by Dr. Bhai Mahavir. We sympathise with Dr. Bhai Mahavir because his days in this House are numbered. He will be out in March 1974 and we do not mind if he shouts a bit. I am reminded of the late unlamented Bourbons of France. It is said about them that they never learnt anything and they never forgot anything. These people whose minds stopped working quite a few decades ago, see in Brezhnev's visit, in the words of Dr. C. D. Pande, 'a blandishment of Indira Gandhi and India by a super power.' Somehow he found that our Prime Minister did not fall a 'prey to this blandishment.' Their geography is very poor. Their history is poorer still. They go on repeating Russia and Russia. There is not Russia. There is U.S. S.R., Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. Russia is only a part of the U.S.S.R. Some gentlemen of your party who are surcharged with anti-Sovietism and anti-communism continue calling U.S.S.R. as Russia. Now, your mentors of the U.S.A. have started calling it U.S.S.R. or Soviet Russia. So you better learn. Our friends, Pande Ji and Dr. Bhai Mahavir have talked about G.D.R. and Yugoslavia.

डा० भाई महावीर : किसी आर्गुमेंट का भी जबाब दीजिए—फार ए चेन्ज।

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Did you talk anything about international affairs? You were reading the Public Accounts Committee report. That shows your ignorance. He is a great Hindi *Dharam Dhwajayi*, a great upholder of Hindu religion. I would like to read out for his edification a passage from Kothopnishad.

(Interruptions)

That passage says :

“अविद्यामन्तरे वर्तमानाः

स्वयं धीराः पण्डितं मन्यमानाः

दन्द्रम्यमाणाः परियन्ति मूढा

अन्धेमेव नयिमाना यथाब्धाः”

“Persons who, though steeped in ignorance, regard themselves as wise and learned, are really fools desirous of pleasures, and are like those who are guided by the blind, and like the blind ones they roam about stranded, tumbling and falling.”

डा० भाई महावीर : यह कहां से पढ़ा आपने ?

श्री हर्ष देव मालवीय : कठोपनिषद् से ।

डा० भाई महावीर : उपसभापति जी, आज इस सदन के सदस्यों को पहली बार पता लगा होगा कि कोई कठोपनिषद् भी है । रशियन मेन्टर्स ने उपनिषदों के नाम को ठीक से नहीं समझाया, धन्य हो ।

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : The whole point is this that these are very weak-hearted men. I am sorry it will be very difficult to regard them as good Indians. They lack faith in themselves they lack faith in the people of India, and they lack faith in the destiny of our country. They think that the Soviet Union or Brezhnev or any country will dominate us. This is essentially an entire lack of perspective, entirely an absence of faith in the history and destiny of India. Nobody can dominate

us. Dr. Mahavir's grouse is—he has referred to the Public Accounts Committee, and I shall come to that later—that we are entirely getting dominated by other people. Probably, their second childhood has begun and they are trying to learn. I hope they will learn further.

Sir, the architect of India's foreign policy has been Jawaharlal Nehru. He had a great historical perspective. With his great mind, with his great perspective of history—as early as in 1929—he saw capitalism entering the imperialist stage and the imperialism entering the fascist era. Shri Nehru was in Czechoslovakia and Spain. After coming back from Czechoslovakia, at the Lucknow Congress of 1936, he gave a new orientation to India's foreign policy. He saw human society fighting for freedom and he saw the essential unity of all anti-imperialist and anti-colonial forces. He observed in the Soviet Union along with great Rabindranath Tagore a new civilization coming out of the old, a new society being born out of the old, and he saw a new world being built.

Sir, I will read out for your information and for the education of our friends the observations made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in a presidential address at the Conference on Peace and Empire, organised by the India League and the London Federation of Peace Councils on July 15 and 16, 1938. He was talking of fascism. He said :

“By consolidating the forces of progress against reaction—this is how we can meet them. And if those who represent the forces of progress are inclined to split up and argue too much about minor matters, and thereby endanger the major issue, then they will be incapable of effectively resisting the Fascist and imperialist menace.”

He says further, "Now only a joint front, not a national joint front, but a world joint front can achieve our purpose. And out of the horrors we have gone through, the most hopeful signs that come to us are those which point towards the consolidation of the forces of progress and peace all over the world."

Further, he said, "If we think in terms of a real commonwealth, we must necessarily abandon the ideas of imperialism, and build afresh on a new basis—a basis of complete freedom for all peoples. For the sake of such an order, each Nation should be prepared to shed, in common with others, some of the attributes of sovereignty. On this basis we can achieve collective security and establish peace."

So, these were the ideas which have shaped our foreign policy. More than a century ago, Karl Marx said that a spectre is haunting Europe, a spectre of Communism. That spectre has shifted from Europe and found a place in the minds of Dr. Mahavir and Dr. C. D. Pande—the spectre of Communism.

Sir, Mahatma Gandhi—and I hope they have still some respect for Gandhiji—wrote in the *Young India* of 1928 that, and I quote :

"There is no questioning the fact that the Bolshevik ideal has behind it the purest sacrifice of countless men and women who have given up their all for its sake; an ideal that is sanctified by sacrifices of such master spirits as Lenin cannot go in vain, the noble example of their renunciation will be emblazoned for ever and quicker and purify the ideal as time passes."

We may well say that Lenin was the greatest man of action in our century and, at the same time, most self-less.

What can we do if our minds are closed? Even after 55 years of the existence of the Soviet Union and the advancing borders of the socialist world, if they cannot see things, what can we do. There were interventions in 1919-1921, but the Soviet Union stood its ground against the imperialist world. Socialist world expanded itself and it has become a force and a power for entire humanity. That these gentlemen cannot see.

I would appeal to our opposition Members to be a little objective and to get free from inhibitions. Sir, 28 years have passed since the Second World War and 55 years have passed since the First World War. During these 55 years and especially after the Second World War an increasing number of countries in the world, a number of former colonies, have been liberated. Today the number of people still under colonial domination is not more than twenty millions, if I am not wrong. Now, these newly free national liberation movements have seen two worlds competing side by side. They have seen the Soviet, socialist world and the American, French, etc. The capitalist Western world.

AN HON. MEMBER : Now, what have they seen ?

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Take the case of Algeria, take the case of Indo-China, take the case of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau. Take the case of Korea. Take any other case. Take our case, the case of Bangla Desh. Who stood by us? It is proved beyond doubt. Whole world understands it. Countries, of the national liberation movements, who were till the other day under colonial domination and are now free and are struggling to build their own countries, know who is their friend and who is their foe. You say that India should be self-reliant. Do you know how a country becomes self-

[Shri Harsh Deo Malaviya.]

reliant? A country becomes self-reliant when it has an independent economy. An independent economy can come only on the basis of independent industrialisation. A nation which can build its steel plants, which can build its machine-tool plants, a country that is economically free can also become politically free. Who is helping us to build our heavy industries in Bokaro? We went to your mentors also, the USA but they refused and then we went to the Soviet Union. A country can become economically independent can become self-reliant when it has its own basic industries. Let us see who helps us.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: How does a country's economy become self-reliant by having it dove-tailed to the economy of any other country?

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA: A *bhoot* has entered your head and it cannot get out. There is a *bhoot* in your head. (*Time bell*) (*interruptions*). Sir, you gave them 20 minutes, I have just started.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was their Party time.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA: Sir, by their own experience and by the experiences of their own history, the newly liberated countries have opted for a new path, a non-capitalist path, which is socialist in content. Mr. Brezhnev in his speeches at Alma Ata, at Tashkent, and in his speech at Moscow World Peace Congress and again in his speech here at Red Fort has recognised the leading role which India has played in giving a new direction to the trend in the newly liberated countries. Therefore, this is a new situation. A new alignment of forces is coming in this world. The old world of imperialism is crashing. A new process, a new unity of the

socialist community of nations, headed by the Soviet Union, and of the newly liberated countries is coming into existence and all the progressive democratic forces in the Western world too are coming together. There were 3,500 delegates from 140 countries in the Moscow World Congress of Peace forces recently and this new trend is becoming powerful and the days of imperialism are numbered. What we are proud of is that in this consummation which is coming before the world, our country, under Nehru's direction, under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi and under the able pilot-ship of our respected Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, is playing a glorious role what can we do if you close your eyes. But please open your eyes and mind also. You are saying that we are selling ourselves by these Agreements but I can say that we are not selling ourselves. We are not selling ourselves, concede that. I concede to you that you are a patriot. I never say that you are a traitor and concede that to us. The reason is the coincidence of the vital interests of the Soviet Union and the newly liberated developing countries. It is the coincidence of interests between the Soviet Union and India.

I do not want to take much of the time of the House. There has been a lot of talk about China. I would like to say that we want friendship with China but China wants a world which is torn by animosity and conflicts; that suits them. China today is under plan 'Chauvinism'. Under 'Chauvinism', they seek benefit from these conflicts. They try that other countries should remain under conflicts. We will continue to try our best to have friendship with China. We are not unfriendly with China but the Chinese only respect power. So, we have to build up our own strength.

On other points, while I endorse our Party's, our Government's foreign policy, I will certainly like to refer to two or three points. There is the question of Cambodia. I will certainly support what Mr. Subramania Menon said with regard to our attitude towards Cambodia. We must openly support Cambodia, not the Government of, but Prince Sihanouk and his no representative Government. We must give recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government in South Vietnam. I will appeal to the respected Foreign Minister to give a consular representation to the PRG. Then there is the question of Korea. It is a divided country under the influence of the American imperialists. But a new process has begun and India has supported the peaceful re-unification of Korea.

Then there is the question of the Indian Ocean and U.S. naval presence there. The question of the Indian Ocean is becoming increasingly important. The U.S. aircraft carriers, USS Oriskany, the Hancock, and a Ship Vancour and other carriers are reported to be cruising about 320 km. off the coast of Muscat and Oman. About 80 aircraft are there. It is significant that soon after the Indo-Soviet agreements, these aircraft carriers of the USA have started appearing into the Indian Ocean. It is a serious thing. We cannot take it easy. We have to forge our unity and I suggest again as I have suggested before in this House that our Government should take initiative to call the States of the Indian Ocean in order that the growing threat of the US in the Indian Ocean is met. Thank you.

DR. V. B. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, on a point of order.

While my colleague, Shri Malaviya was speaking, a gentleman from the

other side called him 'A Russia's agent'. Is it parliamentary?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I did not hear that.

DR. V. B. SINGH: You may ask the reporters.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you insist on that? It is out of record.

DR. V. B. SINGH: This may be expunged.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If that is not on record, what is to be expunged? Yes, Mr. Goray.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Sir, the House has the opportunity of discussing foreign affairs after a lapse of a year and I thought that this debate would be very fruitful and it will lead to certain conclusions which will be helpful as guidelines to this country. But somehow I found that this debate is getting lopsided because of the fact that some of the Members are obsessed with Indo-Soviet Treaty, some of them for it, some of them against it, and the other reason is that when the Foreign Minister described the picture of the international situation as it exists today, so far as description was concerned it was unexceptionable but he did not tell us what sort of projections the existing situation is likely to develop into, what sort of new trends are likely to emerge and because of these two factors I think that this discussion will not be as fruitful as I thought it would be. He talked of the detente in Europe and in other places. Sir, it is true that the European detente is there and it is one of the major factors in international politics in this decade but it will not be doing justice to describe this decade or the last five years and

[Shri N. G. Goray]

the next five years as years of detente alone. There are certain other things which are happening alongside. The other thing is that while there is a detente between the two Power blocs new conglomerations of multi-national economic units are emerging. By this I refer to the European Economic Community. I would even go to the extent of saying that it is because of the emergence of the European Economic Community this detente has been possible, because Europe tried to disentangle itself from the two-bloc rivalry and to the extent Europe succeeded in that detente became almost inevitable. That is number one.

The second thing is because of the West Asian crisis one of the major factors that has come up or emerged is the bloc of Arabian nations, a multi-national bloc, for the first time in history realising the force that the Arabs have has at their command. This is another force that has emerged. The third force is the COMECON countries. Now I would like to know from the Foreign Minister, what does he feel the shape of things will be in view of these new forces that are emerging. When he talked of Asia, I am one with him when he said that we have supported the Arabs in so far as we insist that Israel should vacate the conquered territory. I agree with him but, Sir, we must try to understand whether it will be possible at all for peace to prevail in West Asia if certain conditions are not fulfilled. Sir, I do not think that Israel will agree to any permanent settlement if it is not given assured or credible frontiers, secondly if Suez Canal is not opened for Israeli Trade and thirdly if the Gulf of Aquaba does not allow free access to Israel. If these conditions are not fulfilled I do not know

how you expect Israel to agree. It is no use saying that there was no Israel before and Israel was created on Arab soil. That is true; that is history but once it is created you should respect its existence; you must see that it is allowed to exist. Therefore, I would like to know what the Indian position

3 P.M. is. Does India's position amount to this that whatever the Arab countries want, we shall support them? Today's position has been reached because of the six-day war. Had not there been that war, then today's position that Israel has extended its frontiers, its territory up to the Suez Canal would not have come into being. When you ask Israel to go back, naturally Israel wants to know whether the Arab countries are aiming at its total extinction. That was what was said before the six day war. That is what is being said by the Palestinian guerillas even today. That was what was said by President Nasser at that time. So, I would like to know from the Government of India whether it is the position that we totally support the Arabs whatever be their demand. Will it be fruitful or not if we develop some contact with Israel also and tell them that if you want to exist and if you want to have our sympathies, then you will have to do certain things, provided, of course, you are given credible frontiers?

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA: They have unjustly taken more and more Arab land.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Alva Sahab, you can speak when your turn comes.

Now, so far as China is concerned, so many people here have voiced the feeling that we must have a dialogue with China, that we must have better relations with China. I for one stand for this development. We are told that

China is not responding. We are told that the Chinese leaders have time and again accused India of expansionism. They have said that Indians have their internal quarrels and internal tensions and, therefore, so far as modification of the relations with India is concerned, it does not occupy top priority. All these things should not be considered to be a sort of hurdle between us and China. We should know that communists always talk in this language. It is their style. There was a time when in this House we knew what Russia was saying about us, about Pandit Nehru and about Mahatma Gandhi. Even in their encyclopaedia they did not hesitate to write that they were the running dogs of British imperialism. Therefore, what I am saying is that though they accuse us of certain things, we should not be deterred from making our own efforts. I wish we had a Kissinger amongst us. I know that our External Affairs Minister is not a Kissinger. He is very suave and sober, but the sort of diplomacy that Mr. Kissinger is playing is not his cup of tea. I know that, but try to understand that this new type of diplomacy that has come into being is completely unconventional. It is a sort of hurdle jumping diplomacy, if you want to call it or leap-frogging diplomacy, if you want to call it. It is something unconventional. If he wants to have a dialogue with Moscow or Peking, he directly goes there and tries to understand what their mind is and he does not mind what the other differences may be, or how, history has thrown up certain hurdles between the two countries and how relations are strained in this particular sphere or in that particular sphere. If possible, India should follow this type of diplomacy. I would say why not try to have a dialogue with China. I am quite sure that Russia will have no objection to it because we have

been assured that this treaty does not prevent us from developing good relations with others. Taking advantage of this, let us try to find out whether it is possible to have good relations with China, whether some of the misunderstandings could not be cleared and whether new bridges between the two countries could not be built. My reason for this is that when you are thinking of Asia, you just cannot ignore, China, just as you cannot ignore the Arab States. From Saudi Arabia to Japan, including India, there are about 200 crores of people. And if you exclude India still there are about 125 crores of people, such a big mass of population, with aspirations of their own, who are on the march, how can you neglect them? And will it be possible without them to have a new Asia or a resurgent Asia, an awakened Asia which is becoming more and more independent, self-contained, self-reliant. Therefore, when some hon'ble Members talk of the concept of Collective Security of Mr. Brezhnev, I would like to say that instead of just saying that we shall have none of it, we should project some other concept. It is not enough to reject a particular theory or a particular concept. Comrade Brezhnev feels that this is the concept that will deal with the situation. Have we got another concept? I feel that if India were to take the lead to invite all the countries from Saudi Arabia to Japan, it will be possible to say that here is another concept to which we are trying to popularise. Let India give the lead. Let India convene a conference of these people saying that there are economic interests which are common to all of us. We have got raw materials. Arabs have got oil. We have got coal and iron. Japan has technical expertise. If we could all come together it would be possible to give altogether a new look to the Asian aspirations. This

[Shri N. G. Goray]

is what I would like to happen. Of course, I know that it is difficult. But I would like India to resume the lead which Pandit Nehru was aiming at that time. It was he, Sir, who called the Bandung Conference. It was he who called the third World nations to come and assemble at Delhi. Constantly he was trying to take the initiative, trying to give to the under-developed countries. Therefore, I suggest that with the high prestige that our Prime Minister enjoys it should be possible for her to give the new lead.

Sir, so far as the Indo-Soviet Treaty is concerned I am amazed that some Members have described it as a sellout *silhouette*. On the other hand some have praised it skyhigh. But so far as I am concerned, I think all foreign relations are needbased. When people enter into foreign relations everybody has his own selfish interest or national interest; if you do not want to call it selfish interest call it national interest. But, Sir, to say that because of this Treaty India has become a client's or a satellite is completely off the point. It is not so. I have also tried to understand the Treaty. I have read it. When Mr. Pande described this Treaty as a sort of sell-out, I thought he was reading too much between the lines. It is not there at all. He is trying to read too much between the lines. But my fear is, Sir, that India may become a satellite if we do not fulfil our own obligations to the Treaty.

Yesterday, Sir, Comrade Sardesai asked: Do we not want more cement? Do we not want more fertiliser? Do we not want more steel? Do we not want more paper? Do we not want more petroleum? The answer to this question is, "Yes, we do want all this".

But, Sir, I would like to tell you that all the assistance that Russia is going to give us a sort of a mechanical act. They can expand Bokaro. They can expand Bhilai. They can expand our copper mines. They can add to our petroleum research. But, Sir, if the situation in India remains as it is, that is, we have the capacity to produce 30,000 wagons but our actual production is only 9,000 wagons, if our capacity is to produce so much steel but the record is that we are producing only 35 per cent. of it, if we find that all our transport systems are grinding to a halt, as somebody said that within the next 15 years the entire railway system will be grinding to a halt, then what will be our position? If this happens, then whether it is written in the treaty or not, India will have to play second fiddle to any power with which it comes into contact. Russia may not have the intention of subjugating us. It may not have the intention of reducing India to a satellite or client State. But our whole economic system would be such, it would be so thrown out of gear, that for everything we shall have to depend upon a foreign power. Therefore, Sir, when we are discussing foreign affairs, which means that we are discussing our relations with foreign powers, what is of greatest importance or basic importance is to understand our political stability and our economic stability. This particular aspect, I suppose, nobody is trying to emphasise. It is as if Russia is going to play godfather, a sort of *dues ex machina*; whenever we are in difficulties, they will come and help us out of it. It is a very wrong position to adopt. It is a very wrong policy to accept. This Indo-Soviet Treaty can be turned to good account if with all their technical help, we in India grid up our loins to see to it that every single rouble or every single machine that comes from Russia is utilised to the



optimum. If that is done, then it is quite possible for our country to take help from others and still be independent. You have got the instance of the Marshall Plan. What happened in Europe? America pumped money, pumped finances, into Europe. And within 15 years we find the European nations talking of an European Economic Community. Not only that, during the West Asia crisis, they dared to go against the wishes of America. They asserted themselves. This could happen only because people in West Germany, people in France, people in Italy, people in other countries overrun by Fascist hordes, had the courage and foresight to see that they could not go on depending permanently on resources from foreign powers. America may be an ally. But after all, the goal of European countries was to get rid of the strings that came inevitably with every dollar that came into Europe. The same must be our attitude.

Sir, I am happy that we have got good relations with the Arab countries. But can you say that if there is another confrontation with Pakistan—God forbid it—the Arab countries will go on supplying us oil? The answer is very obvious. I have a hunch that these new curbs on oil that have been put by the Government are perhaps with a view to saving sufficient oil for a contingency like this. It is quite possible. Therefore, we will have to think in terms of having as many friends as possible. I do not share the views of these friends who are, in season and out of season, criticising America. America has been nasty with us; there is no doubt about it. But you must understand that it is an open society where the good and the bad mix. If there is a Watergate, there are also journalists who are not afraid of tearing open all the secrecy

and revealing to the world all the running sores with which the American body politic is infested. Sir, it is a democratic country in the real sense of the term where everybody has the right to say what he likes, to act as he likes. Therefore, I would say: Do not be prejudiced against America. Let us remember that even this little grain that is coming here was purchased by Russia in America. Therefore, if we want to have the fruits of science, there should be no hesitation on our part to get them from America if it is possible to do so without losing self-respect. So with America, with China, with Japan, we must have the best of relations. We must take the initiative. I think with such an outstanding Foreign Minister it should be possible for us to develop very friendly relations with all these countries. Take, for instance, Japan. I think really India should develop close association with Japan, because if India is to learn something, it can learn a lot of things from Japan, not from other countries. Soviet Russia has not made a success of agriculture which America has, which Japan has. So let us try to learn from them. Let us have equally good relations with China, if it is possible, because China has undergone all the troubles which a developing country has to undergo. It has tried to weld a tremendous population into a nation that naturally affects their style of working. I just would like to tell you an instance. When Nixon and his party went to Peking, what did they see? They drove from the airport to their residence, and there was not a soul on the streets. All the streets were empty. All the shutters of the windows were down. After three days, one fine morning, a million people came out, men and women, cleaning the entire city. That is how they make their identity felt. And how do we react? We react as if

[Shri N G Goray]

some saviour has come here Hossaras were sing 'Flagging' wrong was there We felt as if we were in a quandry and somebody has come out of the blue sky and he is going to take us out of it These are the two styles Therefore, when you say Indo-Soviet Treaty and Peking-Washington Treaty, there is a lot of difference between the two India is not enjoying the same status, the same position, as China with its Treaty with America, because it is trying to show to America, "Well, if we want you, you also want us, and we will go along our own style, we will exert to the utmost" This is the lacuna that I find in India We are not able to convince the world that we are doing our best, that we are trying our utmost, to lift ourselves by our bootstraps whether you give aid or you do not give aid, we are not seeking it This is not the impression we are conveying to the world Therefore, there is a basic weakness in our foreign policy that whenever we have any relations with a foreign country, it is they who appear to be superior and it is we who appear to be at the receiving end I do not want this picture to exist Therefore, I would request the Foreign Minister, I would request the Prime Minister, to understand this that I am not finding fault with their Treaty at all, such Treaties are welcome, especially with a country whose trustworthiness has been tested I am grateful to Russia I have no hesitation in saying that I am grateful to Russia for the help that they have given But that help should warn us, should put us on our guard, that this is not something that can continue and should continue for an indefinite time The sooner we get out of it, the better And then alone the Indo-Soviet Treaty will be a Treaty between equals Till that time Soviet Russia will enjoy a prestige and with which we cannot hope

to compete That is the only word of warning I want to give That is the only thing I would like to say on this occasion For the rest of it I have no quarrel with the Government for having entered into this Treaty I do not consider this as a sell-out at all I would only say India should earn for herself a status of equality with the other contracting party

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA Sir I would like to quote Gandhiji and Nehru, the statements they made about our relations with foreign powers Gandhiji warned in April, 1942 in 'Harijan' "We know what American aid means It amounts in the end to American influence if not American rule added to the British" Nehru made a statement in the Lok Sabha on 21st February, 1963 "There is no question of stationing foreign forces in India India has to be defended by her own forces Anything else like the one suggested like the Air Umbrella is altogether wrong" The successor Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said at the time of our war with Pakistan that we are buying arms with our own money 'Buying arms' is an expression of strength She also mentioned at the airport when Mr Brezhnev arrived here over ten days ago that we would go on our own These are the cardinal statements that we have got before us And Shri Goray speaks about Israel, America and Japan He has been a great fighter and had been my jail companion in Nasik for two years in 1932 He had also been on the Goan front fighting against Portuguese aggression and was jailed there for a few years But I feel some times he is in the wrong company I have seen him on the same political platform shared by my another Nasik jail companion, namely, Shri Minoo Masani And you know what politics

Shri Masani has got. He is all for America and does not worry about India. But Shri Goray does not go thus far! But when you talk of foreign politics, these are things which we cannot stomach. He talked of Gulf of Iran. But he forgets what Britain has done. He forgets how that white power has subjugated Middle East how they had been in Gulf of Iran, how the West had been in Syria and nearby countries, how they were in Palestine and everywhere! Shri Goray talks about Israel. He forgets what Mahatma Gandhi said about Israel. He said: "We cannot allow Israel to come up at the cost of the existence of Arabs." He was a great seer. He was the greatest seer of the world. What did President Roosevelt tell Arabs, including the Saudi Arabian monarch Feisel, the father of the present King Feisel, when President Roosevelt went down somewhere in the Middle East. He said: "That the West would not enter into any agreement with Israel which would harm the Arabs." But what did President Trueman say? He made a simple, downright statement. He said: "Well, there are no Arabs in my land; but there are Jews here in U.S.!" He recommended recognition of Israel. This is the position, so far as Israel is concerned.

Now let us go to China. China is befriending Pakistan. China was our friend. China should not have done that. We are not sure what China may do to us. She may mount the hills of Tibet and fire a gun at us! We are not sure of Iran. Iran told Pakistan: "The moment you are attacked, we will go to your help." Even today Iran is helping Pakistan Government in their trouble with Baluchis. And China says what Iran does is correct. China says: "We support Iran." China treated us badly in the United Nations. But we fought

for China there for years together and we stood by China. But they humiliated us! Yet, we always speak well of China because our country is influenced by, Mahatma Gandhi and Hinduism which teaches tolerance. That is why we still say that we are prepared to shake hands with China.

Soviet Union today has broken the idea of containment. This was the rotten idea of John Foster Dulles. This idea is preached by President Nixon. But that theory has been broken by whom? By the Soviet Union. China today has the largest number of fighter aircraft. Russia has 33 divisions on the Chinese border instead of 15 divisions which they had four years ago. It is good that we have treaty with the Soviet Union when things are so dark for us. On one side we have Iran. On the other side we have China. And USA is a rude power. Why do we say so? Dr. Kissinger is a charming man. You know what he says in his book on Nuclear Power? I remember his wife told me that she wrote the whole book; now they are separated. She said she typed it out. And in that book he says to this effect: 'We shall use nuclear power at some time or other.' Now can we carry on with such a power? We cannot carry on. Dr. Kissinger talks like a charming man. But when he writes his theory he says that he will use nuclear power sometime or other. If he writes like that, it is time that we take it up with some other countries. When Pakistan attacked us, we declared that we were going to be self-reliant and independent and they were going to manufacture arms in ten years and everything that we wanted. We held that whatever we do not have we would buy with hard cash and that we would not beg at the doors of any other country. We declared our economic

[Shri Joachim Alva]

salvation; in every other way, we would have to work hard and develop our country in the right way.

Now, the idea of Asian security gets round and this idea is getting round now and everybody talks about it. Dr Kissinger talks of one idea and another person talks of another. Mr Nehru talked of this and after the Chinese attack this is gaining ground. Now, the living wage of the people cannot increase without production and unless we produce more, we cannot put the country right and unless we produce more in conjunction with the Russians who have transformed their country, who have given to their country bread, plenty of bread *plus* arms, we cannot progress. So, the Indo-Soviet relation is something to work for. They have given us millions of tonnes of kerosene and crude. Mr. Brezhnev's is not an ordinary visit and let us be clear about it.

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

Sir, Mr Brezhnev made many significant speeches which nobody had delivered in our Parliament before. He made a beautiful speech in Parliament here and the idea of Asian security never came up for our adoption in his speeches. You will remember that when the American "Man of War" was near Bangladesh, the Soviet submarines stayed there and the Americans were in jitters and ran away. During the last war, Mr Churchill tried to do the same thing with regard to Singapore surrounding it with British Warships, but the British empire had to give way later on. And, Sir, if the Americans think that way, think that they can frighten us by sending a warship or some such fearful thing, they are sadly mistaken. We will never be frightened and we are ready

to face anything. We have a noble lady as the Prime Minister and will not be frightened. The Soviet submarines may be there against the American ones in the Indian Ocean. But India does not want in the Indian Ocean the presence of anybody; India wants the Indian Ocean to be an area of peace, to be a zone of peace.

Now, Sir, China is no more willing to make friendship either with India or with Russia. But we like the Chinese. They are an ancient nation; they are an ancient race and they have a very ancient civilization. I had been to the Buddhist temple in Ulan Bator in Mongolia, the most beautiful temple, a Buddhist temple. I have seen the Buddhist temple in Bangkok. The Mongolian temple was built with contacts from Tibet. They said that they got Buddhism from Tibet and they built this temple. Indian influence was the source. But where is Tibet now? Tibet is gone. We find Mongolia an independent country keeping herself strong and going on. But we know how China has destroyed the religion and culture of Tibet.

Now, Sir, India needs many things. It needs paper and newsprint. As we grow in literacy, the needs also grow and we need paper because more and more people begin to read and write and try to understand things and we need more paper and more newsprint. And, Sir, we have to get it from somewhere, either from our own sources or the sources of other countries. That is the way we have to go about and we have to get it from Russia which they have offered. Otherwise, we cannot put our country right.

Now, on this side, Sir, we have Iran where the Shah rules. He is a monarch who does not know that kings who have ruled the nations have gone to the dust.

a monarch who does not know that the kings and Queens of Europe have mingled with the dust and a monarch who does not know that the rajas and maharajas who have ruled this country for thousands of years have gone and this monarch, the Shah of Iran, thinks that by arming Pakistan he can arm himself and become invincible. I think he is wrong. I told the Shah of Iran once, "you talk as you do and you do as you talk!" Why do you say? he enquired. I then explained how my son was treated when he hitch-hiked from Amritsar to Londia. In Iran he was treated with love and money; so also Turkey. But in Germany my son and his companion were to be arrested as Vagrants; they had to sleep on graves and had to steel eggs for food. Iran was on top of hospitality. Real Asian spirit! Iranians are very sweet people to talk to.

What about democracy in England? In England the Labour Party brought a resolution for nationalising the coal mines. Where is democracy in England? Where is democracy in England when it owns the largest mines in South Africa? I have got the figures and I can give.

The British Superlords own mines in Africa, and they take away about 150 millions every year and a pittance for black African workers. Where is Socialism? Is it Socialism? We talk of Socialism. We cannot talk of Socialism. Time will come when we have to bring a spirit of compulsion in our country. We cannot set our people right. We cannot set our nation right. We cannot, set our boys and girls right! Our boys and girls are today all the time fond of cinemas, which former Marwari financiers produced. They are making them see dirty pictures. What is hap-

pening to our new generation, to our young boys and girls? ... (*Interruptions*). 'Bobby' is a wonderful picture. I liked it. A good picture...

(*Interruptions*)

What I mean to say is that we shall have to produce a spirit of compulsion in our country. A spirit of compulsion will have to come. I want to know? Where is Socialism? Where is Socialism in the USA? Take the case of Negro girls. What is Socialism? They refuse to give their residential address. Wonderful people! I can live with somebody for a long year, but he will not give his home address. The British war Pilots give their home address in British Defence PRO letters.

Our democracy is of a different type. But we have to bring a compulsion for our boys and girls, on our young men, our women. We are a religious country. We have to be religious but will have a spirit of compulsion! You may not believe me. My speeches in Parliament have been quoted by foreign authors. Pardon me for saying so.

Now, there were 75 military divisions between Britain and France in 1939. There were less than thirty with Germany, with Hitler. There were 75 divisions with Britain and France, and they remained inactive and Germans blew up and there had been a war. Germany invaded Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union—and also India, if it had succeeded. A boy and a girl told me in Moscow that the Germans were right at their door during the war, but that they finally held them out! In the war, twenty-five million lives were lost in the Soviet Union, Seven thousand towns and villages were destroyed. We are proud to be associated with such people. The Americans talk of preserving peace, but

[Shri Joachim Alva]

have tortured Viet Nam in a most shameless manner. What is this democracy? In Britain, the Labour Party has demanded that twenty-five leading private, top industries be nationalized. Poverty still exists there. What is this democracy?

Then Sir, Dr. Bhai Mahavir said that our Prime Minister is only a stooge of Russia. Sir, we have a very lucky woman, a very brave women, an important woman, the most important woman in the history of the world, assisted by an able Foreign Minister and a equally able Minister of State.

Finally, Sir, I would like to repeat once again that we will have to bring about a spirit of compulsion in our country, then we shall do better and better.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

منفردی جیتی جیتی - (جوں ایند کشیں)۔

وہاں چھوڑیں صاحب - میں جوتا تھا جب میں نے گاندھی جی کو دیکھا تھا وہ انگریزوں میں باتیں نہیں کرتے تھے سر میں نے جب پیرخان کو تو انہوں نے برائی مالک میں کہا تھا۔۔۔

"Hate the sin and not the sinner"

کوئی کچھ کہے - پوزیشن دانی کچھ کہیں لیکن بری ہر چیز میں آیا کہ اگر میرے اندر کوئی خرابی ہے میری کوئی غلطی ہے تو ہم ان سے نفرت کریں - ہم پاپ سے نفرت کریں لیکن پاپ سے نہیں - پاپی تو بدل ہی سکتا ہے۔  
"Everything is subject to variation"

میں محسوس کرتا ہوں کہ گاندھی جی جب آئے تو کس روپ میں آئے جب ان سے بات ہوئی تو انہوں نے کہا کہ ہماری بنیاد جو ہے وہ ظالم کے خلاف ہے وہ ایک لیبر کے خلاف ہے جو ہمارا مال لیتا ہے

اور انہوں نے جو کچھ سکھایا اس میں یہ بتلایا تھا کہ ان دشمنوں سے ہوشیار رہو یہ جو دو تو کم گا نخریہ دینے کی ذمہ داریہ اپنے رول کی پالیسی اس کو رجسٹر کر دو اور مجھے آج یاد آتا ہے کہ یہ

جی نے ان کے بنائے راستے کو ایک عملی شکل دی تو آج میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ یہ کونسی ہر بات یاد آتی ہیں دیسٹریکٹ ماسٹروں کو ہمارے پوزیشن سے وہ سٹوڈ کو - کیا وہ ہر بات یاد آتی ہے کہ جب انہوں نے ہم لوگوں کو لڑوایا تدبیر کیا - بچے یاد ہے کہ جب معزز بزرگوں بیٹھیں ہیں تو ہم لوگوں نے گدہ دھن اور دیو کی طرف مارا جگیا - اس وقت بچے یاد ہے۔۔۔

It was on December 18, 1961, that the Indian forces marched into Goa, Daman and Diu and liberated them. On that day, Brezhnev was in Bombay. That very day, the United States of America submitted a resolution in the U.N. Security Council demanding India's withdrawal from Goa and seeking, in effect, to brand India as an aggressor.

اس وقت ہم کو ابگر لبرٹیا گیا اور اس کے برعکس رہیں پراکٹمنٹ نے ان کو تار دیا ماسکو ہے جس کو میں تو دٹ کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔۔۔

"A big contribution to the cause of the noble struggle of the peoples for complete and immediate abolition of the disgraceful system of colonialism."

کونسی ہر بات یاد ہم یہ - ایسی - اسے کی یاد کریں دوسری ہر بات اگر آپ اسے ہر بات کیسی تو میں تو اسے ہر بات نہیں کہوں گا - چینی حملہ کے وقت کی تھی اس وقت ان لوگوں نے کہا۔۔۔

"China committed aggression on our northern borders."

بلکلیں ماسکو نے یہ - ایسی - ایسی آر وائون نے ہم کو کہا کریٹ دیا کہ

"A great force in the large group of young sovereign states actively participating in the struggle against colonialism and that bloodshed cannot be allowed to continue."



خواہ راول پٹی کے بتائے ہوئے راستے جس سے  
شیخ عبداللہ صاحب آج روتھن نظر آنے لگے  
جسکے حالات بدل رہی ہے۔ اسی بات کی اور  
مبارک باد ہے شیخ عبداللہ جی کو جو تکلم کھلا  
کہتے ہیں کہ بھٹو آپ اپنے گھر کو سنبھالو  
آپ کو ہمارے ملک بددستوں کے اندر داخل  
دینے کی کیا ضرورت ہے۔ آج یہ حالت ہے  
اچن کی طاقتیں امن کی کوشش سیکولر  
نورینر سو شلٹنک فرسز جنہی کامیابی  
نے ایک طرح ابرہیت کا ہمیں ہر وجہ  
ابریست کیا اسی برنر ہو رہا ہے جس  
کو جیلیم کرنے کے لئے سکور ہتی کو سب سے جرجا  
ہی ہوئی۔ آج کو لونی بات آپ کو نظر آئی  
ہے جس سے ہمارے خلاف انٹروووش باس کیا۔  
ہمارے خلاف آرڈر دیٹ سیکورٹی کو لعل نے  
دہن کرنے کے لئے اس وقت آئے آیا ہو۔ اس  
اکیس آرکیوں کے علم سے وہ دی تھی آج  
دن رمانہ پٹی راجہ ہمارا جہ کی یاد تارہ  
کرے دے چارے بددستوں سے ہی رہنے  
ہی اور جابر داری کو بدست کرنے دے ہمارے  
بددستوں میں ہی رہنے ہیں اب ہی وہ  
دہرے ہیں وہ وہی خواب دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ  
وہ دلیلی آئین اس سماج واد کے اثرات  
کو ختم کرنے کے لئے ہمیں آئے بڑھا جائے  
ہیں فردا ہی چاہئے سماج وادی سکول  
کو بھی آئیسی کے اندر اتحاد رکھنا ہے بددستوں  
میں جو ترقی ہو رہی ہے ہماری جمہوریت ٹرو  
رہی ہے اور تمام دیا میں یہ سانیٹادی جا  
رہی ہے کہ بددستوں ایک صبیح راستے پر  
ٹرو رہا ہے۔

میں آپ کو مارٹ مسٹر صاحب کو اور تمام  
لوگوں کو جو یہاں اس پارلیمنٹ میں بیٹھے ہیں  
اسی بات کا لینی دیتا ہوں کہ موجودہ جنریشن  
جو ہے بددستوں کی جو سی پود ہے وہ چاہتی  
ہے کہ جن لوگوں نے ہمارے سرمائے پر قبضہ کیا  
ہے وہ ان کے باقوں سے جیسے کریم کو دیا  
جائے۔ چاہے اربن سیلیٹ کی بات ہو۔  
چاہے رورل برادرٹی پر سیلیٹ کی بات ہو۔  
چاہے ملک میں سٹائلزیشن کی بات ہو۔  
جتنے ہی اندام ہم کر رہے ہیں یہ موجودہ جنتا  
کی آواز ہے۔ تم کتنی دیر تک اور اسکا

ہو۔ آپ کا ٹیٹ ہو رہا ہے۔ پلٹن  
میں لوگوں نے دھت دیا۔ آج اب گرا رہا  
ہے۔ تمام رجعت پسند لوگ ہماری ریاست  
کے لوگوں کو پریشان کر کے جا رہے ہیں۔  
پی کا لیکشن کا گھوسٹ ان کو کھائے  
جا رہا ہے۔ جس گھوسٹ کو انھوں نے پیدا  
کیا ہے۔ یہی گھوسٹ کھائے گا ان کو جنہوں  
نے یہ پیدا کیا ہے۔

"Communalism and reactionary forces, they have to accept defeat."

اور جو ہی جنتا ہے نئی پود ہے وہ آئے آئی  
ہے ابھر رہی ہے اور جو پرانی طاقتیں ہیں جو  
دیکھ رہی ہیں کہ ہمیں امریکہ سے پیسے کی مدد  
پہنچے گی راجہ ہمارا جو کی مدد پہنچے گی۔  
ان لوگوں کا جواب دے رہی ہے آج یہ  
نئی پود۔ جہاں والا ان الفاظ کے ساتھ  
میں مبارکباد دینا ہوں اور اس بات کی  
یورپیسیٹ میں دیتا ہوں کہ ہماری پالیسی ایسی  
ہو رہی ہے کہ جو مسئلہ بدست ہونے حل کرنا  
میں شکیات محسوس کی تھیں میں بلا جھجک  
اور بلا خوف کہہ رہا ہوں کہ ان مشکلوں کو  
ان بڑے بڑے پیچیدہ مسئلوں کو حل کرنے  
میں ستری تھی مگر یہی کامیاب ہوئی ہے۔  
آج پاکستان پر۔ ایس۔ اے کے بل ٹوٹے پر  
ڈاکٹر رہا ہے۔ توجہ مسئلہ دلفی ویکے الگ  
ملک ہے۔ آج وہی شیخ عبداللہ صاحب  
جنہوں نے سیکولرزم کو ایک اصول بنا با  
تھا بددستوں کے لئے تو تیشون تصویر کے  
حالات آج وہی شیخ عبداللہ صاحب دیکھ رہے ہیں  
بددستوں کی سورتی کو بددستوں کی جمہوریت  
کو۔ کیا یہ اچھی نیت نہیں ہے کیا مسئلہ دیش  
ایک اچھی نیت نہیں ہے۔ کیا یہ اچھی نیت نہیں  
ہے کہ ہمارے پڑوس جو غلام تھے وہ آزاد ہوئے  
ہیں۔ افغانستان آزاد ہوا۔

جانتا رہا ہے کہ جسے لوگوں نے جن ہمارے دوستوں  
نے یہاں کیا ان سے یہی ادب سے کہوں گا کہ  
آپ کا ایک راستہ ہے۔ آپ مخالف پارٹی  
میں رہنے ہیں مگر میں کانگریس میں ہوں اور  
میں نے صفائی سے کہا۔ بائیل یہ ریلی ہے۔

Biggest tragedy is the denial of reality.



اگر کسی آگ لگائے ہو اگر کسی مظلوم کو تکلیف پہنچائے ہو اگر کسی غریب کو مارتے ہو تو یہ خطرناک کھیل ہے۔ آج بھی چین کی مدد پر ہی ہے۔ آج بھی سوشلسٹ دہشت گردی ہے۔ جہاں ہے اس پر دہشت گردی اور ملکوت کو۔ تو وہ نہیں سمجھتے کہ جہاں دوست کو مارے۔ بس یہی کہوں گی.....

Biggest tragedy is the denial of reality

جو چیز سننے اور دیکھنے سے منکر ہو نہ سمجھتا ہے محض تشریح ہے۔

Biggest tragedy is the denial of reality.

ہم تو یہ سب سے گہری کڑواہٹ.....

Realise the reality and go with the current, with the wave of the nation, with the programme of our country That is all.

†[श्री संयद हुसन (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : वाइस चैयरमेन साहब, मैं छोटा था जब मैंने गांधीजी को देखा था। वह अंग्रेजी में बातें नहीं करते थे। मगर मैंने जब पढ़ा उनको तो उन्होंने बैरूनी ममालक में कहा था "Hate the sin and not the sinner" कोई कुछ कहे, अपोजीशन वाले कुछ कहे, लेकिन मेरी यह समझ में आया कि अगर मेरे अन्दर कोई खामी है, मेरी कोई गलती है, तो हम उससे नफरत करें, हम पाप से नफरत करें लेकिन पापी से नहीं, पापी तो बदल भी सकता है।

"Everything is subject to variation"

मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि गांधीजी जब आये तो किस रूप में आये, जब उनसे बात हुई - तो उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी बुनियाद जो है वह जालिम के खिलाफ है, वह एक लुटेरे के खिलाफ है जो हमारा माल लेता है और उन्होंने जो कुछ सिखाया उसमें यह बताया था कि उन दुश्मनों से होशियार रहो। ये जो दो कौम का नजरिया देगे, डिवाइड एण्ड रूल की पोलिसी, उसको रिजेक्ट करो। मुझे आज याद आता है

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

7-42 RSS (ND)/73

कि पंडित जी ने उनके बताये रास्ते को एक अमली शक्ल दी। तो आज मैं नहीं समझता कि ये कौन सी मेहरबानियाँ याद आती हैं। वेस्टर्न मास्ट्रो को हमारे अपोजीशन के दोस्तों को—क्या वह मेहरबानी याद आती है कि जब उन्होंने हम लोगों को लडवाया, तकसीम किया। मुझे याद है कि जब मिस्टर ब्रेजनेव बम्बई में थे तो हम लोगों ने गोआ दमन और दीव की तरफ मार्च किया—उस वक्त मुझे याद है—

It was on December 18, 1961, that the Indian forces marched into Goa, Daman and Diu and liberated them. On that day, Brezhnev was in Bombay. That very day, the United States of America submitted a resolution in the U.N Security Council demanding India's withdrawal from Goa and seeking, in effect, to brand India as an aggressor.

उस वक्त हमको एग््रेसर बताया गया और इसके बरअक्स रशियन प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने हम को तार दिया मास्को से जिसको मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ :-

"A big contribution to the cause of the noble struggle of the peoples for complete and immediate abolition of the disgraceful system of colonialism."

कौन सी मेहरबानियाँ हम यू० एस० ए० की याद करेंगे। दूसरी मेहरबानी अगर आप उसे मेहरबानी कहे तो मैं तो उसे मेहरबानी नहीं कहूँगा—चीनी हमले के वक्त की थी उस वक्त लोगों ने कहा —

"China committed aggression on our northern borders"

लेकिन मास्को ने, यू० एस० एस० आर० वालों ने हम को कहा, क्रेडिट दिया कि :

"A great force in the large group of young sovereign states actively participating in the struggle against colonialism and that bloodshed cannot be allowed to continue."

उस वक्त चीन और रूस की आपस में दुश्मनी नहीं थी लेकिन यू० एस० एस० आर० ने अपना साफ रास्ता हमको बताया कि वह हमारी मदद करना चाहता है। उस वक्त रूस की जानो

[श्री सैयद हुसेन]

दो तो नहीं थी या तो दुनिया में समाजवादी मुमालिक और साम्राज्यवादी मुमालिक का टकराव है। तीसरी बात—किस-किस मेहरबानी को आज आप याद करेंगे—अपोजीशन वालों से मैं गुजारिश करूंगा—

In March 1971, Pakistan declared war of genocide against the people of East Bengal. On April 2, 1971, the Soviet President wrote to the President of Pakistan calling for urgent measures to stop the bloodshed and repression and for a peaceful political settlement of the problem. When the influx of ten million refugees created serious difficulties for India...

उस वक्त कौन सी मेहरबानी याद आती है। सेवन्थ फ्लूट का हमारे समन्दर पर आना, हमको डराना और धमकाना याद आता है। मैं इसको मेहरबानी नहीं कहूंगा इसको इन्टरनेशनल कोन्सपिरेसी कहूंगा। यह समाजवादी जिन्दगी के खिलाफ और हिन्दुस्तान की असमत और जम्हूरियत के खिलाफ काम है। अब बंगला देश वजूद में आया। बंगला देश के वजूद में पिछले तेरह महीने की बात जो सरदार साहब ने फरमाई और जिसका उन्होंने जिक्र किया और प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो क़छ भी इन्टरनेशनल प्रोबलम्स के मामले में किया उसके लिए मैं उनको मुबारक बाद देता हूँ। उनको इसलिये मुबारक बाद देता हूँ—आज जितने भी साल साज़िश हमारे खिलाफ होती थी—केसेंजर साहब ईरान-पाकिस्तान-चीन जाकर कोशिश करते रहे वह एक आंख नहीं देखना चाहते कि हम अपने पांव पर खड़े रहें। मैं फिर मुबारकबाद देता हूँ सरदार साहब को और सलाम करता हूँ—समाजवादी लीडर प्राइम मिनिस्टर इंदिरा गांधी को। मैं किसी से वाबस्त नहीं हूँ मैं कश्मीरी हूँ मैं गांधीजी और जवाहर लाल को जानता हूँ। मुझे याद है कि हम लड़ाई के शिकार, मुसीबत के शिकार कई बार हुये—तीन बार हुये। मुझे बुल्गानिन और क्रुश्चेव के बहुत दिन याद है जब वे कश्मीर आये—उन्होंने कहा—आप अकेले नहीं हैं हिन्दुस्तान आपके

साथ है, हिन्दुस्तान के लोग आपके साथ हैं, समाजवादी ममालिक आपके साथ हैं। हम यू० एस० एस० आर० के लोग आपके साथ हैं। मुझे पता नहीं आपको कैसे उनकी दुश्मनी मताती है और यू० एस० ए० की दोस्ती आपको याद आती है।

बहरहाल मैं ज्यादा लम्बी चौड़ी तकरीर नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मैं एक बात का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ। गुज़िश्ता तेरह महीनों में जहां शिमला एग्रीमेंट हुआ, जहां दिल्ली एग्रीमेंट हुआ वहां इस बात का पक्का असर है कि हिन्दुस्तान ने पक्का रास्ता चुना है। देश ने जो सोशलिज्म और सेक्यूलरिज्म और डेमोक्रेसी का रास्ता चुना है इस रास्ते पर वह मजबूत है और कायम है। उन दिनों आप कहते थे कि बंगला देश को क्यों नहीं मान्यता दी जाती और मान्यता का मसला कैसे उठा। जब बंगला देश बना, और मान्यता दे दी गई। बड़ी बड़ी ताकतें, जिनकी मेहरबानियां याद आती हैं उनको आप कहते हैं कि छोड़ दीजिए, वे हार मानते रहे लेकिन यहां उनकी एग्रीसियां, उनके आदमी हैं, पैसे खर्च करते हैं। मुझे अफसोस इस बात का है हमारे काश्मीर के अन्दर भी—लेकिन हालात की रफ्तार इस क़दर बदलती जा रही है, इस क़दर इन्टरनेशनल सिचुयेशन बदलती जा रही है कि आज बलोचिस्तान वाले पाकिस्तान के भुट्टो के खिलाफ, पाकिस्तान की नौकरशाही के खिलाफ उठ खड़े हुए हैं। न सिर्फ बंगला देश अलग हुआ है बल्कि उन्होंने जो एक रास्ता निकाला है फसाद रोकने का न्यूक्लीयर वेपन्स, अनसीन वेपन्स को इस्तेमाल करने का, आज उनको ख़तरा नज़र आ रहा है। क्योंकि अरब में, वेस्ट एशिया में जो हालत हुई, जो दुर्गति हुई उनको देखकर। सोफिस्टीकेटेड वेपन्स कैसे होते हैं हमें इस बात का ज़रूर अन्दाज़ा है कि इस चीज़ को, इस ख़तरा को, इस असूल को, इस अहसास को लिए आखिर में कामयाब होंगे। साम्राज्य कमज़ोर हो रहा है, समाजवाद बढ़ रहा है—इस ख़तरे को महसूस करके आज पाकिस्तान परेशान है और बीखला उठा है और पंगेशान करना चाहता है हिन्दुस्तान को, इस मुल्क को इसकी अजीम जम्हूरियत को। लेकिन हमारा साफ रास्ता, सेक्यूलर रास्ता, सोशलिस्टिक रास्ता, डेमोक्रेटिक रास्ता जिसमें समाजवादी हमारे साथ थे। गांधी जी के बताये हुए रास्ते, जवाहर लाल जी के बताये हुए रास्ते,

जिससे शेख अब्दुल्ला साहब आज रोशन नज़र आने लगे जबकि हालत बदल रही है। इस बात की ओर मुबारकबाद है शेख अब्दुल्ला जी को जो खुल्लम खुल्ला कहते हैं कि भुट्टो आप अपने घर को संभालो, आपको हमारे मुल्क हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर दखल देने की क्या जरूरत है। आज यह हालत है—अमन की ताकतें, अमन की कौशिश, सेक्यूलर फोरसेस, सोशलिस्टिक फोरसेस, जिन्हे गांधी जी ने एक तरह एप्री-शिएट किया, जिन्हें नेहरू जी ने एप्रीशिएट किया इस पर फ़स्त्र हो रहा है जिसको चैलेंज करने के लिए सेक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में चर्चा भी हुई। आज कौन सी बात आपको मज़र आती है जिसने हमारे खिलाफ रिज़ोल्यूशन पास किया—हमारे खिलाफ आर्डर दिए। सेक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में वीटो करने के लिए उस वक़्त आगे आया यू० एस० एस० आर० क्योंकि हमने मदद दी थी। आज वह ज़माना नहीं राजा महाराजा की याद ताज़ा करने वाले हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में भी रहते हैं और जागीरदारी को पसन्द करने वाले हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में भी रहते हैं, अब भी वे जिन्दा हैं, वे वही ख़्वाब देख रहे हैं कि वे वापस आयें। इस साम्राज्यवाद के अमरात को ख़त्म करने के लिए हमें आगे बढ़ना चाहिए, हमें मदद देनी चाहिए। समाजवादी मुल्कों को, हमें आपस के अन्दर एतहाद रखना है। हिन्दुस्तान में जो तरक्की हो रही है, हमारी जम्हूरियत बढ़ रही है और तमाम दुनिया में यह मान्यता दी जा रही है कि हिन्दुस्तान एक सच्चे रास्ते पर बढ़ रहा है।

यै आपको, फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब को, और तमाम लोगों को जो यहां इस पार्लियामेंट में बैठे हैं इस बात का यकीन देता हूँ कि मौजूदा जनरेशन जो है, हिन्दुस्तान की जो नई पौद है वह चाहती है कि जिन लोगों ने हमारे सरमाया पर कब्ज़ा किया है वह उनके हाथों से छीन कर हमको दिया जाये। चाहे अरबन मीलिंग की बात हो, चाहे रूरल प्रापर्टी पर सीलिंग की बात हो—चाहे बैंक नेशनलाइज़ेशन की बात हो। जितने भी इकदाम हम कर रहे हैं यह मौजूदा जनता की आवाज़ है। तुम कितने देर तक

रोड़ा अटका सकते हो—आपका टेस्ट हुआ है एलेक्शन में लोभों ने वोट दिया—आज आप घबरा रहे हैं तमाम रजत पसन्द लोग हमारी रियासत के लोगों को परेशान करने को जा रहे हैं। यू० पी० का एलेक्शन का घोस्ट उनको खायें जा रहा है। जिस घोस्ट को उन्होंने पैदा किया है यही घोस्ट खायेंगा उनको जिन्होंने यह पैदा किया है —

“Communalism and reactionary forces, they have to accept defeat.”

और जो नई जनता है, नई पौद है वह आगे आ रही है, उभर रही है और जो पुरानी ताकतें हैं जो देख रही हैं कि हमें अमरीका से पैसे की मदद पहुंचेगी, राजा महाराजाओं की मदद पहुंचेगी। उन लोगों का जवाब दे रही है आज यह नई पौद। जनाब वाला, इन अल्फाज़ के साथ मैं मुबारकबाद देता हूँ और इस बात की एप्री-सियेशन देता हूँ कि हमारी पालिनी ऐसी हो रही है कि जो मसले पंडित नेहरू ने हल करने में मुश्कलात महसूस की थी मैं बिना झिझक और बिना खौफ़ कह रहा हूँ कि उन मसलों को उन बड़े बड़े पेचीदा मसलों को हल करने में श्रीमती गांधी कामयाब हुई हैं। आज पाकिस्तान यू० एस० ए० के बल-बूते पर अकड़ नहीं रहा है। आज बंगला देश एक अलग मुल्क है, आज वही शेख अब्दुल्ला साहब जिन्होंने सेक्यूलरिज़्म को एक असूल बनाया था हिन्दुस्तान के लिए, टू नेशन थ्योरी के खिलाफ, आज वही शेख अब्दुल्ला मान रहे हैं हिन्दुस्तान की सोवरेंटी को, हिन्दुस्तान की जम्हूरियत को, क्या यह एचीव-मेंट नहीं है, क्या बंगला देश एक एचीवमेंट नहीं है? क्या यह एचीवमेंट नहीं है कि हमारे पड़ोसी जो गुलाम थे वे आजाद हुए हैं—अफ़गानिस्तान आजाद हुआ ?

बाकी रहा यह कि जिन लोगों ने, जिन हमारे दोस्तों ने यहां कहा उनसे मैं अबदब से कहूंगा कि आपका एक रास्ता है। आप मुखालिफ पार्टी में रहते हैं मगर मैं कांग्रेस में हूँ और मैंने सफाई से कहा बिल्कुल यह रियेलिटी है।

Biggest tragedy is the denial of reality.

[श्री सैयद हुसेन]

अगर कही आग लगाते हो, अगर कही मजलूमों को तकलीफ पहुँचाते हो, अगर कही गरीबों को मारते हो तो यह खतरनाक खेल है। आज भी जग की तैयारी हो रही है, आज भी सोफिस्टीकटेड वैंपन्स सप्लाय किये जा रहे हैं ईरान को और मुल्को को। तो वे नहीं समझते कि हम रा दोस्त कौन हैं। मैं यही कहूँगा.....

Biggest tragedy is the denial of reality.

जो चीज सामने आ रही है, जो रियेलिटी है उसको न समझना यह बिग्रेस्ट ट्रैजेडी है।

Biggest tragedy is the denial of reality.

तो मैं अदब से गुजारिश करूँगा —

Realise the reality and go with the current, with the wave of the nation, with the programme of our country. That is all]

श्री भूपेन्द्र नारायण मंडल (बिहार) :

उपसभापति जी, मंत्री जी ने सदन के सामने यह प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया है कि लोग अपनी अपनी राय दें कि अभी जो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की नीति है जो कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में चल रही है और हाल में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र के सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ समझौता हुआ है उस पर पार्लियामेंट की क्या राय है, सदस्यों की क्या राय है इस बात को जानने के लिये उन्होंने यह प्रस्ताव रखा है।

जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने है उसके बारे में प्रायः मोटे तौर से सभी सदस्य समझते हैं कि काम अच्छा हुआ है लेकिन सोलह आने इसको अच्छा समझे ऐसी बात नहीं है। कुछ बातों को ले कर जो सदस्य हैं उनके दिमाग में कुछ सकोच है। यह बात तो निश्चित है कि आज के संसार में अमेरिका की ओर से जो कार्यवाही होती है वह कार्यवाही कुछ ऐसी हो रही है कि बहुत जगह कुछ इस तरह की बात अमेरिका की तरह से होती रहती है जिसका नतीजा होता है कि संसार में युद्ध की सम्भावना हो जाती है और अनेक तरह

के उपद्रव खड़े होते हैं। वीयतनाम में जो कुछ हुआ था वह तो समाप्त हो गया। और वह समाप्त जो हो गया वह अच्छा ही हुआ। लेकिन फिर भी, समाप्त हो जाने के बाद भी, वहा कुछ न कुछ उपद्रव अभी भी चल ही रहा है। अभी हाल में जो अरब-इजरायल युद्ध हुआ वह भी समाप्त हो गया है जो मैं समझता हूँ संसार के लिए अच्छा हुआ है। लेकिन यह स्थायी तौर से समाप्त हुआ है, ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता है। अभी हाल में जो अमरीकी बेडा हिन्द महासागर में आया हुआ है यह एक नया खतरा पैदा हुआ है। इससे एशिया के लोगों को यह डर हो गया है कि इसको लाने का अभी क्या मतलब हो सकता है? क्या यह मतलब तो नहीं है कि चूँकि तेल अरब देशों में है और उसके संबंध में वे देश अपनी नीति बदल रहे हैं इसलिए जबर्दस्ती उन देशों पर दखलदाजी की जाए, क्या यह बात अमरीका के मन में है जिसके लिए वह बेडा लाया गया है। या इसका मतलब यह है कि जो सब देश उनके खिलाफ रहते हैं, एशिया के दक्षिण भाग में या पश्चिमी भाग में, उन लोगों को समय समय पर तग करने के लिए यह बेडा लाया गया है? तो उसके लिए भी लोगों में चिंता है, जैसा कि बंगला देश बनने के समय भी हम लोगों ने देखा था, जब बंगला देश की लड़ाई चल रही थी और हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में युद्ध चल रहा था तो बे आफ बंगाल में अमरीका का बेडा पहुँच गया था। इस तरह संसार में युद्ध की परिस्थिति को पनपाने की एक बहुत बड़ी जिम्मेदारी अमरीका के ऊपर हो गई है— इसका क्या कारण है? इसका कारण है कि संसार में जो आगे बढ़ने वाली शक्ति है वह जो कमजोर शक्ति है, जो मजलूम शक्ति है, जो तकलीफ में रहने वाली शक्ति है, वह जब आगे बढ़ना चाहती है, अपने दुखों से रिहाई चाहती है, उनकी तकलीफ को दूर न करके जब सुख और समृद्धि में रहने वाली शक्ति उनको अपने कब्जे में रखना चाहती है तो इस तरह की जो दो शक्तियाँ होती हैं उनके बीच में,

हमेशा टकराव चलता रहता है और इसी टकराव के सिलसिले में जो समाज का विकास हुआ है उस समाज के विकास में पूँजीवादी आए और बीसवीं शताब्दी के पहले चरण में पूँजीवाद अपने पूर्ण रूप में पहुँच चुका था लेकिन उसका न्हास होना शुरू हुआ पहले विश्व-युद्ध के बाद, और जितने पूँजीवादी देश थे कर 'ब' करीब सभी खत्म होकर के सिर्फ 4 देश रह गए थे जो नाम गिनाने लायक थे—ब्रिटेन, जापान, अमरीका और फ्रांस। ये चार राष्ट्र थे। लेकिन दूसरा विश्व-युद्ध समाप्त होने के बाद ये सब देश इतने कमजोर हो गए कि सेकेन्ड रेट में हो गए, सिर्फ एक अमरीका रह गया, और मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ जो आगे का समय आने वाला है, निश्चित रूप से अमरीका की वह शक्ति आगे जाकर नहीं रहेगी क्योंकि ससार में जो गरीबों की शक्ति बढ़ रही है उस शक्ति को कोई रोक नहीं सकता है। कोई पार्टी या सरकार बीच में आकर भले ही कुछ देरी लगाए, कुछ गड़बड़ी फैलावे लेकिन उस शक्ति को आगे बढ़ने में रोक नहीं सकते, यह बात निश्चित है। यही वजह है, हम लोगो ने देखा जहाँ पहली लड़ाई के बाद एक सोवियट रूस का राज्य कायम हुआ था तब से हिन्दुस्तान में, अफगानिस्तान में, टर्की में, राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन हुए थे और वह पनपने-पनपते, दूसरा विश्व-युद्ध आते आते यह स्थिति हो गई कि सिर्फ रूस ही समाजवादी देश नहीं रहा बल्कि और भी कितने देश समाजवादी हो गए, और भी कितने राज्य स्वतंत्र हो गए। यह भी हम लोगो ने देखा है। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि दोनों शक्तियों के टकराव में—जो गरीबों की शक्ति थी, मजदूरों की शक्ति थी, काम करने वालों की शक्ति थी, और दूसरी पूँजीवादी शक्ति थी—उसमें जो कमजोर शक्ति थी, वह कमजोर होते हुए भी, आगे बढ़ रही है। इस लिए कहा जा सकता है कि अमरीका की शक्ति का भी न्हास होगा, और अभी भी जो घटनाएँ अंतर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हुई हैं वे इस बात का प्रमाण हैं कि उनकी शक्ति दिनो दिन कम

हुई है। लेकिन यह भी सही है कि इसमें रूस का भी हाथ है। रूस ने इधर बंगला देश के समय या उसके पहले भी और इस वक्त भी यानी इसरायल और अरबों के युद्ध के समय भी, जो पार्ट अदा किया, उसमें रूस ने अच्छा काम किया। इस बात को हम मानते हैं। अभी रूस की तरफ से श्री ब्रेज्नेव आये थे और उस सिलसिले में जो समझौता हुआ है, उस समझौते को भी हम अच्छा समझौता समझते हैं और इस माने में अच्छा समझते हैं क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान जब आर्थिक दृष्टि से कमजोर है, तो अपने को मजबूत करने के लिए अगर कोई उपाय करता है, तो वह ठीक करता है। लेकिन एक दोष हिन्दुस्तान में भी है और वह दोष यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोग इतने सेन्टीमैन्टल हैं कि वे अपनी भावना के बहाव में बह जाते हैं और इतने बह जाते हैं कि जितना कि उन्हें नहीं बहना चाहिये।

चीन के साथ जब सम्बन्ध कायम हुए थे, तो उस समय भी वे लोग अपनी भावना में बह गये थे, अन्तः सन्त भावना में बहे और अन्त में तिब्बत को खो दिया जो हिन्दुस्तान के लिए पीछे एक सरदर्द का कारण बन गया है। अभी और इसके पहले भी जो दोनों सरकारें संगठन बना रही हैं, मैं उसको नापसन्द करता हूँ। इसलिए नापसन्द करता हूँ क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान कमजोर है और रूस मजबूत है। मजबूत और कमजोर, इन दोनों का संगठन एक साथ होना यह बतलाता है कि जो इस संगठन में बलवान होगा वह ही डोमिनेंट करेगा। हिन्दुस्तान की आर्थिक स्थिति इस समय खराब है, आगे चलकर वह कब ठीक होगी या नहीं होगी, यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है। अगर नहीं सुधरी तो जो डोमिनेन्ट पार्टनर है, वह आगे जाकर नफा उठा सकता है या नहीं, यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है क्योंकि इस दूध को धोया हुआ नहीं कहा जा सकता है। हमने यह भी देखा है कि रूस के सम्बन्ध चेकोस्लावाकिया के साथ जो रहे, हंगरी के साथ जो रहे उसको हमने अच्छी तरह से देख लिया है।

[श्री भूपेन्द्र नारायण मंडल]

इसलिए दोस्ती होने पर, सारी बातें भूल जाना यह कभी अच्छा नहीं होता है। इसलिए हमें इस बात की सावधानी रखनी चाहिये कि हम जिनको भी दोस्त बनायें, हम भावनाओं में न बह जायें। हमें संयम से इस सम्बन्ध में काम लेना चाहिये। इसलिए आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम जिन से भी दोस्ती करे उसमें हमें यह ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि आगे चलकर किसी तरह की कोई कम्प्लीकेशन पैदा न हो। इसलिए मैं इस चीज को पसन्द नहीं करता हूँ।

जहां तक चीन का सवाल है, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार यह चाहती है कि वह चीन के साथ किसी तरह से मेल मिलाप कर ले। लेकिन किसी से मिलाप करने में भी समय की आवश्यकता होती है। हमारे इसी पार्लियामेंट ने प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि जब तक चीन से एक-एक इंच भूमि अपनी वापस नहीं ले ली जायेगी, तब तक हम चीन से नहीं बैठेंगे, तो हमें इस चीज का भी ख्याल रखना होगा और उसी के सन्दर्भ में हमें आगे बातचीत करनी होगी। हमें ऊपर लेवल से बात करना चाहिये, लेकिन ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि सरकार नीचे स्तर पर खुशामद कर रही है ताकि किसी तरह से उसके साथ मेल हो जाय। इस तरीके से मेल नहीं हो सकता है। अगर वह मेल हो गया तो फिर वह मेल इस ढंग का होगा जैसे मालिक और नौकर का होता है। इसलिए अभी जो पालिसी सरकार चला रही है, हम समझते हैं उसमें संयम होना चाहिये। कोई जेन्टलमैन एग्रीमेंट होना चाहिये जिससे ऐसा मालूम न पड़े कि हम तो उसकी खुशामद कर रहे हैं और चीन को उसकी कोई परवाह ही नहीं है। चीन को यह बात महसूस होनी चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मेल करना उसके लिए आवश्यक है। जब दोनों तरफ से यह बात महसूस की जाने लगे कि एक दूसरे से मेल करना आवश्यक है, तब उसके साथ मेल किया जाना चाहिये।

अभी गोरे जी ने कहा कि सरकार के पास एक ऐसी पिकचर होनी चाहिये जो आगे चलकर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमको आगे करना है। उन्होंने जो पिकचर दी, वह बहुत अच्छी है और मैं समझता हूँ सरकार को उसके ऊपर विचार करना चाहिये। सरकार दुनिया के सभी राज्यों में अपनी पिकचर को प्रोजेक्ट करने की कोशिश करे और सब को एक मंच पर लाने की कोशिश करे। चीन भी एक बड़ा देश है और वह भी नेतृत्व करने के लिए आगे बढ़ेगा ताकि हमको इस चीज का श्रेय न मिल जाय इसका नतीजा शायद यह हो सकता है कि दोनों लीडरशिपों को एक साथ लाने की कोशिश करे और यह महसूस करे कि उसका भारत के साथ मिलना जरूरी है। ऐसी हालत में हम समझते हैं कि इज्जत के साथ दोनों का मिलन हो सकता है। इसलिए कुछ इस ढंग की बात होनी चाहिए।

4 P.M.

जहां तक आर्थिक स्थिति का ताल्लुक है, जब तक हिन्दुस्तान अपनी आर्थिक स्थिति को नहीं सम्भालता तब तक जो भी काम हिन्दुस्तान करेगा वह उसके लिए अच्छा सिद्ध नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि इस के साथ जो मेल कर रहे हैं और उसमें सरकारी स्तर पर जो संगठन बन रहे हैं उस तरह के संगठन न बने, हिन्दुस्तान अपने को मजबूत करने के लिए रूस से, अमरीका से, जिससे भी हो उससे मदद लेने की कोशिश करे, किसी एक के ऊपर निर्भर करना अच्छा नहीं है। हम लोगों ने देखा था कि जब चीन में युद्ध हुआ था उस वक्त अमरीका ने आगे आ कर हिन्दुस्तान की मदद की थी। जब पाकिस्तान से हम लोगों की लड़ाई हुई है तो रूस ने भी मदद की है, इस बात को भी हम नहीं भुला सकते हैं। हमको इस संसार में इज्जत के साथ रहना है तो दो काम करने हैं। एक तो अपने को सामरिक दृष्टि से मजबूत करना है और उससे भी बेसी जरूरी है कि हम आर्थिक दृष्टि से मजबूत हों। हम आर्थिक दृष्टि से मजबूत नहीं हो रहे हैं, 20-25 वर्ष के बाद भी नहीं

हो रहे हैं। अब जो रूस के साथ समझौता हो रहा है, उसके ज़रिए से हम कहां तक मजबूत हो पाएंगे यह नहीं कहा जा सकता क्योंकि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन करप्शन में इतना जकड़ा हुआ है कि रुपया पैसा जो भी आवेगा उसका फायदा इन देश को होगा और इसकी आर्थिक स्थिति सुधरेगी ही इसकी कोई गारन्टी नहीं दी जा सकती है। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि सरकार के जितने लोग हम सब बैठकर इस बात पर विचार करें कि किस तरह से आर्थिक स्थिति मजबूत हो सकती है। सिर्फ प्लान बना लेने से आर्थिक स्थिति मजबूत नहीं हो जायेगी। प्लान के साथ-साथ हमको यह भी देखना है कि सरकारी मशीनरी किस तरह करप्शन से रहित हो सकती है, एग्जीक्यूटिव का जो प्लान है, एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का जो मन्तव्य है उसका किस तरह से सही-सही इम्प्लीमेंटेशन हो सकता है। इस बात की कोशिश होने से सफलता मिल सकती है। इसलिए हमको दोनों बातें करने की ज़रूरत है, एक तो देश को आर्थिक दृष्टि से मजबूत करने की और दूसरे सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से देश को तैयार रखने की। ऐसा न हो कि सुरक्षा की तैयारी तो करे और आर्थिक प्रगति न करें। तब भी देश सफल नहीं हो सकता है। अगर आर्थिक तैयारी ही करें और सुरक्षा की तैयारी न करे तो भी देश खतरे से खाली नहीं रह सकता। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

**SHRI M. R. KRISHNA** (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, India's foreign policy has been tried and tested. Many hon. friends, who have preceded me and particularly from the opposition, have not discouraged the Government from entering into this agreement. All the time they tried to impress upon the Government and the Treasury Benches that India should be very careful in dealing with the USSR. At the same time, India should not lose the friendship of the United States

of America and also try to negotiate peace with China. Nobody has said that this agreement is detrimental to the interests of India. India's foreign policy has been tried and tested. Right from the beginning when the foreign policy of this country was designed and drafted and we were members of the Commonwealth, well many of our friends at that time wanted that we should not be members of the Commonwealth. When we were members of the Commonwealth, some of those who were interested in the Commonwealth did not like us to have any kind of association or negotiation with countries other than the British Commonwealth countries. Ever since then we have passed through various periods and many times we have been under very crucial crisis. Even at that time the Government of India and the people of India had the opportunity to find out who are their friends in the world. There is no occasion when the Government of India's foreign policy tried to be shortsighted, tried to adjust itself in order to get some benefits. Many of our friends said here that we have been unnecessarily supporting the UAR and other countries while we could have easily got lot of assistance had we supported Israel. That is definitely not the foreign policy of this great country. This great country's foreign policy is based on its internal policies. What are its internal policies? Its internal policies are to fight against exploitation. It does not like to encourage monopolies in this country. Similarly, when you go into the international sphere there is no occasion when the Indian leaders, either before independence or after independence, tried to support any nation, however, big and mighty it might be when it tried to exercise its control over other countries, when it tried to dominate over other

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

countries, when it wanted to enslave other countries and spread their sphere of colonialism. Many times we have incurred the displeasure of big powers, yet we did not give up our stand. Pt Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy is not just a brainwave of certain leaders of his times. If we could go well beyond, Swami Vivekananda and other great leaders have preached to the whole world that India never thinks that any country in the world should be inimical to India. That is our internal philosophy and our foreign policy is also based on that philosophy and I do not think this philosophy can ever be defeated and ever be misunderstood or be a failure in international politics.

Sir, I would like to give only small examples of the defence preparedness of this country after independence. The tendency in the Defence Services in this country was to go for British goods alone, nothing to criticise because they had been under the British master. Most of the troops in this country, including the big Generals, important leaders, statesmen, never thought of anything except British. Even if it were an ordinary belt, they would like to have it imported from U.K. Even in the matter of conventional weapons, which are now used by our Police force, there was no guarantee from any country that we would get all that we required from that country. Sir, just after the Chinese aggression we have exposed ourselves to many countries. We have given our shopping list to the countries which promised to help us. Many of our Generals and statesmen have been insulted. Yet we thought that we would have to save ourselves. Most of the leaders sitting here know probably—some of our friends in the Opposition have forgotten—the type of pressure that was brought on the Gov-

ernment of India to suffer and sacrifice some of their precious land in order to win the favour from Pakistan. Those were the days when the great leaders of this country proved that they were people with nerves of steel. That was the occasion when anybody could have forced this country to follow a particular policy in foreign affairs. But we did not submit to that. For that the Opposition will have to give credit to this Government. Our foreign policy was intact even at that time.

Sir, it is not an easy thing for one country to get whatever it wants from any other country. There are reports of the Public Accounts Committee that the Defence Ministry was not able to spend the money which had been earmarked for our defence preparedness. Many crores of rupees were left unutilised because countries were not prepared to give us what we wanted. Sir, self-reliance or self-dependence is a very important thing. This Government really deserves credit, for they have proved that they are capable of achieving that objective. To-day we are definitely far superior compared to many of our friendly countries, neighbouring countries. My elder statesman, Mr. Goray, gave a warning to the Government that we would have to be careful. That is a good warning because when we are friendly to a country, our Government, particularly the officials, dealing with foreign affairs, will have to be overcareful. We committed a blunder in dealing with China. We should not commit the same blunder again. That is the vigilance that the Government will have to keep. But one discordant note of Mr. Goray was not very good on this particular occasion. He said that this treaty is between unequals.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA  
He did not say that.



**SHRI M. R. KRISHNA :** He did not say that, but he implied it. He definitely said that he would like that it should be between two strong powers and we should try to build up our country. To-day if Russia is entering into an agreement with India, it is not because India is a weak country. When we needed their support, at that time they could have dictated to us. I do not know what would have been our fate at that time. But I am sure our Government would not have yielded whether it was Russia or America because every Indian Prime Minister, including Lal Bahadur Shastri, has proved that we just do not care for any big nation. They did not even like to meet some of the heads of Governments when they knew that those heads of Governments were not treating India with the respect that it deserves. Our Prime Minister is in no way inferior to anybody in the world to-day. Secondly, Sir, when we enter into an agreement, we have to see what the situation is. Are we a fallen nation? Are we in dire need of something? We may be asking for some newsprint. Mr. Alva, being a journalist, said that he would like to have newsprint. This country does not alter its policy, whether internal or international, just because some country is going to promise us something which we do not produce at the moment. That is not the consideration which weighs with the Government of India. We are really a proud nation. After the Chinese aggression, we have proved to the world that we might have been beaten, but we did not lose our nerves, we did not lose our courage. We told the world that there would be a time when we would show our strength to the world. The world is not ignorant about these facts. China may be having a big empire. They may be having a big population.

They may be dabbling in nuclear weapons. But India's policy is known throughout the world. There was a time when it was said that Indian scientists had already developed nuclear weapons and they were capable of testing them. But the policy of this country is disarmament. We have been pleading in international forums that the expenditure on disarmament will have to be stopped. Many of our friends here have given figures about what America is spending on armaments and what other countries are spending on armaments. But our concern is only to see whether we have got the capacity, whether we have built our nation, to meet our requirements in case there is any danger to our borders either from this side or from that side. To that extent I do not think there is anybody in this House who doubts our efforts or our achievements so far. I do not like to go beyond this Agreement. We have been depending upon various countries in order to prepare our five-year plans. Many times we have experienced that when certain things happened in the international situation, our plan was completely finished. We find that we cannot plan properly. Some times we will have to give a holiday to our plan. So this kind of a situation is going to be averted by this Agreement. Fifteen years' planning for a country like India is the most important thing. Many countries in the world become subservient and slaves because oil, steel and defence requirements are met by one country or other. Today in the Arab world it is mostly oil. America or Britain depends upon oil supplies from the Arab world. Some other countries depend upon yet some other countries for mineral requirements. So these are the things which weigh with them in order to decide their foreign policies. Here in this

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

country we are going to build our resources, exploit our resources, our mineral wealth, we are trying to meet our oil requirements, etc with the help of another country. We welcome it. We have agreements with various countries. And agreements such as we have with Russia, have proved to be helpful. In choosing various countries we have to depend upon experts. But we do not submit to them. One of our friends said when we get into an agreement with Russia, they do not allow our technicians to examine our projects. I do not know in what company or companies this has happened. He mentioned some company. But today it is not only Russia, not only West Germany, not only Britain, even America has admitted that India has got most efficient engineers, technicians, who can match those in other countries. But when certain items are picked up, there is this kind of an arrangement that we have to import technicians but with definite conditions, in some cases, those technicians come here and stay here even after our technicians are completely equipped, even after they get complete knowledge. In many of these projects what happens is the agreements are signed for two years. Within two years' time our technicians become well equipped with the requisite knowledge. They become experts even in less than a year. And after that they start feeling frustrated because according to the agreement the Russians will stay on here for two years and till they complete their period, they will not allow the Indian technicians to touch or deal with anything. This kind of frustration is bound to occur and it has occurred in many cases. But the country should be proud that we have entered into an agreement with the USSR and our experience is that we have definitely benefited out of

it. Even in the Defence field we have not been disappointed. We have been helped by USSR. There is no country from which we got a complete equipment as we got from the USSR. It is the only country from where we get our complete requirements. There also the Government of India will have to be careful because we have got this experience that we have got to become self-reliant and self-sufficient. We have to build our nation on all fronts, industrial, agricultural and also in the matter of defence. Therefore, even though we might have faltered in the beginning, we should try to move forward in the right direction and we should try to have better relations with other countries. Today if we have entered into this agreement it is for world peace. It is for world peace. I do not think anybody will have any dispute over the items mentioned in this agreement. There is no suppression of any nature. Even in regard to the friendship with China, there was a pre-condition before this agreement was signed. It was made quite clear that it is not to contain China. It is in the interests of Asia and to have peace in Asia as well as in the world. Therefore, at no stage the Government of India and the spokesmen of the Government have given out to any part of the world that by signing this agreement we are going to be the camp follower of a big nation. That is not our policy and that has never been our intention. It is in the best interests of Indo-Soviet friendship and it is also in the best interests of developing countries and it is also in the interests of peace in this sub continent.

PROF. RASHEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated). Mr Vice-Chairman, the recent visits of Secretary General Brezhnev of the Soviet Union and of Secretary General Husak of Czechoslovakia have

somewhat dramatically focussed the attention on the contour and direction of India's foreign policy. Therefore, this debate in the House acquires not only a topicality of interest, but also provides an opportunity to assess the range of opinions in the Parliament and in the country both on the specific aspects of our relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist world and on the larger formulations of our foreign policy.

What are the international implications within which a more meaningful analysis of our foreign policy is possible? I submit for the consideration of the House and of the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs that there are eight important developments at the international level which require our attention in order to have a posture of foreign policy relevant to our times.

Firstly, it is the well known collapse of western blocks morally and the diminution in the political and economic supremacy of the United States *vis-a-vis* the Western world.

The second aspect which is sometimes ignored, but which acquires more relevancy as we understand the complexity of power politics is the growth of the European community as a dominant power in international affairs acquiring an international identity of its own.

The third factor is the increase in the strength of the non-aligned countries which has also made a tremendous impact on the formulations of international peace, both within UN and outside.

The fourth is the rise of China as an important international power and as a very significant regional power.

Fifth is the survival of India—I am trying to state it as modestly as pos-

sible—as a stable, peace-loving, democratic power in the sub-continent.

Sixth is the emergence of, what I would like to say, Pentagonal power blocs and a shift from the erstwhile bipolar politics to a politics of five powers which are no more concerned with problems of an eventual third war, but are very much concerned with the problem of peaceful settlement of disputes and the problem of detente. These five powers are the old two super-powers of United States, and the Soviet Union, the third being the united Europe and China and Japan being the fourth and fifth.

Seventh is the well known problem of detente in Europe, detente between East and West and detente between the erstwhile ideological opponents.

Lastly, the occurrence to which Shri Bipinpal Das referred yesterday, namely, emergence of regional wars and development of tensions as in West Asia and Latin America.

What should be our foreign policy perspective and what should be our foreign policy courses of action within such an international framework? I suggest that in order to build a cohesive foreign policy we might have to look at three levels. Firstly, the important level particularly emphasized ever since our agreement with Pakistan at Simla, is the bilateral level. It means bilateralism between India and each country of the world.

Secondly, at regional level, particularly with reference to our immediate neighbours in South Asia and West Asia.

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

Thirdly, at global or international level, with reference to the major problems of peace, of the peaceful settlement of disputes, of support to the liberation struggles the world over, of support to the struggles against colonial domination, racial discrimination, racial regimes and unhealthy policies.

Indeed, at this point, Sir, it may be reasonably be recapitulated with some modest pride that the vision of the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and the perspective of India's foreign policy have been vindicated by our sustained attempt to remain independent within the complex of the power blocks. What indeed was the essence of alignment? The essence of alignment was a policy of polarisation, the essence of alignment was a policy of confrontation and the essence of alignment was a policy of freezing potential confrontation. And, Sir, I submit that it is necessary to keep in mind, when we speak of non-alignment the essence of alignment and the essence of non-alignment. The essence of non-alignment has three important aspects. One is refusal to depend on big powers, the other is the refusal to subordinate national interest to the interests of the power and the third is the refusal to accept an unequal position *vis-a-vis* any power in the world. Non-alignment has never been a substitute for foreign policy. And, Sir, non-alignment has not been the only framework of our foreign policy. But non-alignment has been the framework of our perspective, has been the framework of our course of action and it has been depending freely, especially when we are talking of the Indo-Soviet agreement and the Indo-Czech agreement, on the emphasis that we lay that the primary concern of a country's foreign po-

licy is to maximise her national interest. The primary concern of the foreign policy is to link domestic issues with the conduct of international affairs, rejection of alignment, rejection of arms race, rejection of colonialism, friendship towards the Soviet Union and the socialist world, attempts to build viable bridges between the socialist world and the third non-aligned world and developing businesslike relations with the West and the USA.

The specific issues which face us now are issues of our immediate neighbour, that is, the issues of the Indo-Pakistan relations. Sir, the Simla Agreement of 1972 and the Delhi Agreement of 1973 have acquired a national consensus. These agreements delineate the style and posture and the extent of accommodation which India is capable of showing *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. The speeches and occasional outbursts of leaders of Pakistan cast doubts on the validity of our approach. But the fact remains that we have no other choice as the largest peace-loving democratic power in South Asia. Sir, I suggest dual postures. I suggest dual postures *vis-a-vis* Pakistan, a posture in which we emphasise on peace and harmony with the people of Pakistan and we emphasise on the adherence to the letter and spirit of the Simla Agreement of 1972 and the Delhi Agreement of 1973 and no attempt at the appeasement of the elite at the expense of the people is to be allowed.

Then, Sir, the other important issue is the Arab-Israeli conflict. I think India's support to and solidarity with the Arab cause has been well-known. But what is important is that we have to build in this country a concerted and enlightened public opinion about their issues which are their struggle against

colonialism, their struggle against occupation of lands and their struggle against the myths of militarism and this has to be done not only as a part of the foreign policy of India, but also as definite base of our foreign policy. Support of UN Resolution 242 of 22nd November, 1967, and 338 of 22nd October, 1973, and support of the joint action of the United States and Soviet Union.

The South-East Asia's profile has been somewhat low. I think we have to examine the whole approach to South East Asia. We must shift our focus from mere passivity to what I would like to submit a measured activity.

China is an important power for a variety of reasons. China has also been an important factor in international politics. My submission is that our policy in regard to China should be: Keep our doors open, without knocking at China's doors at all times, because no amount of knocking at China's doors is going to change China. China's international perspective demands, as was indicated by Mr. V. P. Dutt, a certain aloofness from India, a certain stalemate with the Soviet Union, because it sees the relation of India and Soviet Union as a part of global strategy for a variety of reasons, which is not acceptable to China.

Japan has been fairly ignored. There is need for a wider range of multiple transactions with Japan on a very businesslike and pragmatic understanding.

Europe requires bold initiative, particularly with the entry of Britain into the ECC. India has to revise its entire attitude towards specific countries of Europe and towards the whole integrated Europe—specially France which has shown a tremendous understanding of our problems at the time of Bangla

Desh, West Germany and specifically Scandinavian countries.

United States also requires a fresh creative approach on our part. United States is involved, as I submitted earlier, not only at the third level, which is a global, international level, but United States is a super power at three levels, at the global, international level, at the regional level and at the bilateral level. I think we can have a differentiated policy *vis-a-vis* United States. Have a cordial, correct, businesslike, pragmatic policy on bilateral basis and oppose United State's colonial policies at the regional and international levels, but do not shut your doors, particularly from a power which is an important international power.

Sir, actually this debate acquires a seriousness when we speak of Soviet Union. Many opinions have been expressed, of course, usually stimulated from ideological considerations and sometimes from partisan considerations, although it is a fact that in the Press in India, both English and vernacular, I think, there is a consensus that what has happened in the last week or so has been a very positive gain in India as indeed it has been a positive gain also to the Soviet Union, as indeed it is a positive gain for the increase of detente and world peace.

Sir, my friend Mr. Sardesai mentioned yesterday, and I had an occasion to mention earlier, that in season and out of season we speak of two super powers in one breath. This is detrimental to our own interest. We will have to remember Soviet Union in terms of a nuclear armament in terms of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile as a super power but in terms of relationship at the bilateral, regional levels, which is a friendly super power. And I would like to

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

underline the word 'friendly'. We have made efforts to establish cordiality with the United States. I may also add here that here is a tremendous amount of goodwill in the United States towards India in certain sets of people; I am talking of academicians and I am talking of certain other sections of the people, of the United States. Let us support those elements in the United States, which understand. At a time when the United States is a big economic power and it should have supported us in building the infra-structure of our economy, it has, for one reason or the other, not done so. While speaking of the Soviet Union, we should not speak in a language of sentimentality. We should speak in a language of gratitude. We must recognise the fact that the Soviet policy is predicated on building a structure of peace in the world because the strategy of social development, which is the other name for socialism, is predicated by a peaceful world. Therefore, the two Agreements between India and the Soviet Union are the agreements which really stabilise the base of our economy and the infra-structure of public sector with all the weaknesses and the criticisms which my friend, Dr. Bhai Mahavir, has mentioned. Still the fact is that there is nothing wrong with the intentions and motives in the Soviet Union's mind. What is wrong is our own style of implementation. Let us examine our style of implementation. What is the essence of Soviet strategy towards India? The essence of Soviet strategy towards India is that they consider India important strategically, in terms of population and important for the purpose of reconciliation of opposite forces in Asia. Therefore, the two important agreements with India emphasise the augmentation of a

major industrial enterprise for building up an infra-structure and a self-reliant economic base. They emphasise that the Iron and Steel Plants at Bhilai and Bokaro should increase their annual production to 7 and 10 million tonnes respectively. (*Time bell rings*). I will take five minutes more, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY): Take one minute more.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Machine building plants in Ranchi, Hardwar and Durgapur are to be expanded. Refineries in Barauni and Mathura are to be strengthened and so on and so forth. I can understand if the Supreme Soviet asked Comrade Brezhnev as to why he made such a firm and widespread commitment to India. I could have appreciated the sentiments of the Members of the Supreme Soviet. But for the elected representatives of the people of India to complain that the Soviet Union have agreed to a very large amount of investment in order to give a self-reliant base in India is, to put it mildly, a corny approach to international policy. It is an approach which either is based on an exaggerated fear of the demonology of the Soviet Union or on a total lack of faith in Congress and in our own national independence. What has happened in the Indo-Soviet Treaty or the Indo-Czech Treaty? Jawaharlal Nehru has very correctly said, "Non-alignment is not a static principle. Non-alignment is a dynamic framework. Non-alignment is a policy of remaining nationally independent and yet having the maximum benefit from ideologically opposed powers" Mr. Brezhnev's visit is also important from the angle of Marxism ideology. In his address to the Members of Parliament, he called India as an "innovator of international

policy' Marxist ideology has clear cut divisions of the world in terms of the social production and the control of the means of production in the hands of the different groups. They spoke of us earlier as "bourgeois democracy". After the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, they started speaking of us as "Indian Republic". Comrade Brezhnev, in his speech in the Parliament, has gone a step further and called us "Indian Republic and innovator in international policy". Instead of patting ourselves on the back and having the modest pride, why are we again in the "melancholy of the Hindu" as Karl Marx said? Why is this "melancholy of the Hindu"? Let us understand and smile because in a heavily inter-dependent world, India's non-alignment itself will collapse unless it is supported by a friendly super power. This is the time to rejoice and not to despair. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SARDAR AMJAD ALI (West Bengal). Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, the history of mankind is war, that is what one war-monger, Winston said to the people of this planet. I do not know whether at this moment we have to discard the entire theory that the history of human society is war or not but the fact remains that even at this moment while this House is discussing the situation on international relations guns are still blazing on the bank of Suez that peace will still have to be consolidated in Vietnam, in Cambodia and in Laos. The fact remains that even in these hours the forces of exploitation are creating troubles in this planet, the people of this planet encountered the very ghastly assassination of a democratic government in Chile and the interference by the forces of exploitation in the copper zone of Zambia. The forces of exploitation have caused havoc in Mozambi-

que, Angola Rhodesia and South Africa. And at this particular moment, while this august House is discussing this theme, probably, it is a pity for us to see that the threat of war, the threat of tension all over the planet still remains hanging. And we have to view the entire international situation from that point of view.

Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, I find that this tension is also pervading between Sardar Swaran Singh and the hon colleague, Mr C D Pande. The tension on the one side is that probably the Indo-Soviet meet will dominate the entire Indian national spirit. That tension is on the part of Mr Pande. While Sardar Swaran Singh, the able External Affairs Minister of this country feels that there is no reason to apprehend like this and a stout man like him does not succumb to this apprehension whereas Mr Pande succumbed to it. Mr Pande has built up his entire argument saying that, while we have this agreement on cooperation between the Planning Commission of our country and the State Planning Committee of the USSR, probably, the USSR being a super power will govern and dominate the entire planning approach and the entire planning pattern of our country, and he says this by expressing his warning to the External Affairs Minister that we should be careful so that we do not fall victim to a super power. Sir, I should submit very humbly, as my hon colleague Mr Gorav has said, probably, he has read too much in between the lines of this Agreement. I can very humbly say that, probably, he has not read that Agreement at all. Sir, Clause (3)(i) deals with the main functions of the Study Group—the Study Group of the Soviet Planning Committee and also

[Shri Sardar Amjad Ali]

our Planning Commission. The Study Group will exchange experience and knowledge in the following fields—and certain fields have been enumerated here. It is simply an exchange of experience and knowledge, which can very well be projected in the Soviet planning and in our planning. Therefore, Sir, I do not find any solid argument or reason to express the doubt that this agreement will yield this country to the submission of a super power. When we are discussing the international situation, when we are discussing our foreign policy, I should submit that the foreign policy of a country should not be judged only from the point of view of politics. The foreign policy of a country will have to be judged both from the political angle as well as from the economic angle. So, from our political angle when we shape our foreign policy, we say that we are non-aligned and, at the same time, we categorically make it known to the entire world that we are against the forces of exploitation, that we are against the forces of neo-colonialism, and that we are against the forces of imperialism. In whatever field this question has come, the Indian nation, the Indian rulers, the Indian Ministers and the Indian Government has categorically stood against those forces that want to dominate upon others, upon their national independence and freedom. That is the reason why, Sir, we have condemned the activities of those forces when we found that a democratic Government was slain in Chile. That is the reason why, Sir, we have categorically said that we side with the Arab world, because we found that there was a very rude attack upon the motherland of the Arabs. That is why, we say that we extend our co-operation to the people of Cambodia. That is

why we say we extend our co-operation and thankfulness to the people of Vietnam. That is why we have severed our relations with those forces of exploiters, those who are exploiting the situation in South Africa, in Rhodesia, in Mozambique and in Angola. So, from the political aspect, I must categorically state and give expression that wherever there are forces of colonialism, wherever there are forces of exploitation, the foreign policy of this country has been in clear terms to denounce it and denounce it to the roof.

Sir, from the economic point of view also we have to judge this thing. While in our own internal situation we think that we have to condemn the forces of exploitation, we have to condemn those exploiters, who exploit the resources of other country in the international field also. We are to expose our stand so as to show that we can build up a nation that has a self-reliant economy. In order to build up a self-reliant economy, as my friend Mr. Goray was saying—I am very much thankful to him—we should go on taking help and co-operation from countries abroad, but our approach there should be and probably that was the approach of the Indian foreign policy, that we take co-operation and assistance from those countries which give it only with the gesture of co-operation and for friendship. There are forces in the world indeed, there are developed nations in this world, who give help to some under-developed countries, to the developing nations with a view to exploiting their situation in the form of multi-national corporations, in the form of arms and financial aid. With this background they go to the help of the developing and the under-developed nations. The total strategy in such cases of help is that they want to exploit the



situation of backwardness in the developing and the under-developed world. Therefore, from the economic point of view, we should accept assistance in the field of our technological development, in the field of our industrial development and in the field of our all-round development from those forces, from those countries which give this assistance and aid with the spirit of developing an under-developed nation into such a stature that it can equate itself with a super-power. From this angle and from this point of view I support and probably only from this angle of vision the entire country and the entire people of this planet have been supporting the non-aligned policy of the Government of India.

Sir, I find that the External Affairs Minister in his opening remarks has very clearly analysed the situation as it remains in the world today. But at this moment I must refer to him. Sir, I was very eager to listen to something, as to what the External Affairs Minister had to say, about these colonial powers which are still trying to have some military blocs all over the world. I was very eager to know something at least, as to what the Indian External Affairs Minister had to say, with regard to those powers which want to have some naval basis in Bahrain, who want to have naval basis into Diego Garcia, in Seychelles and in other parts of Indian ocean and Persian Gulf. I am sorry to say that the External Affairs Minister did not make any remark about that. Again, I was very eager to know that at least some remarks, at least some light will be thrown against or rather towards the activities of those powers which are still going on with arming Iran and Iraq again in return to Pakistan which, takes the stand of enmity

even on the face of Simla Agreement against India. Unfortunately, nothing has been said with regard to this. I believe, Sir, while he will reply to the debate, he will make certain points clear with regard to those things also. This is my submission.

Sir, as regards our foreign policy, I again want to reiterate to this House that definitely friendship and equality can go on with two equal powers but at the same time while we judge that we are going in for friendship with some super power, we are not definitely going in a small way. It is the economic consideration, it is the financial consideration, it is the consideration as to whether a country will be developed by way of assistance from a power which wants to exploit or whether this help and aid is given by the super powers which do not want to exploit. These considerations have to be given much more importance.

Sir, without making any lengthy speech, I should submit what my friend, my senior hon. colleague Mr. Goray, has made a suggestion to this House while he was making his debate, that all right, it is not selling out to make an agreement with Soviet Russia but then he has given a very nice suggestion, which has made some impression with me and that is why should not a country like ours take the lead in the field of economic co-operation with regard to all the powers in Asia so as to consolidate Asian security? He has very rightly pointed out that it is not only the emergence of these great powers that are playing the role of deterrent in the entire world atmosphere but it is definitely the economic power that is also playing the role of deterrent in Europe and in some other parts of the world. So, it is the nice suggestion that probably

[Shri Sardar Amjad Ali]

he has made and before closing, I should invoke the hon. External Affairs Minister to throw some light on these points.

With these observations, I am again thankful to the hon. External Affairs Minister for giving this House an opportunity to discuss the entire international situation and to clarify the foreign policy of this country through this House to our people as well as to the people abroad.

Thank you.

**श्री नवल किशोर (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, दो दिन से जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति और हमारी विदेश नीति के सबंध में चर्चा चल रही है, उसमें मैंने विदेश मंत्री जी को सुना और उन सब साथियों को जो इस तरफ बैठते हैं और जो उस तरफ बैठते हैं और उन्होंने इस विवाद में हिस्सा लिया, सुना। श्रीमान्, सब से पहले मैं माननीय गोरे साहब को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने आज बहुत ही कस्ट्रिक्टिव स्पीच इस संबन्ध में दी। इस मामले में जिन साथियों ने इस बहस में हिस्सा लिया उन सबको एक राय यह है कि आज अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति काफी तेजी के साथी बदल रही है और बदली है। इस में किसी को भी इन्फाकी नहीं है कि आज अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में टेन्शन कम हुए हैं और दो होस्टाइल ब्लाक्स जिन के मिलने की कोई सभावना नहीं थी—अमरीका और सोवियत रूस आज वह भी दोस्ती की तरफ अपना हाथ बढ़ा रहे हैं। यही नहीं चीन जो 21 साल से एक मायने में आइसोलेटिड था, उसके अमरीका के साथ गुड रिलेशंस शुरू हो गए हैं। आज जापान और चीन जिनके आपस में इतने ज्यादा झगड़े थे, आज उनमें भी अच्छे सम्बन्ध पैदा हो गए हैं। आज चीन, आस्ट्रेलिया, न्यूजीलैंड के संबंध भी अच्छे हो गए हैं। विदेश मंत्री जीने भी कहा कि आज ईस्ट यूरोप और वेस्ट यूरोप में सम्बन्ध अच्छे हो रहे हैं। उन्होंने इस बात की

भी जिक्र किया कि बहुत जल्द वहाँ यूरोपीयन सिन्कोरिटी कान्फ्रेंस होने जा रही है, जिससे उम्मीद है कि टेन्शन कमजोर होगी और यूरोप में शान्ति स्थापित होगी। ये बातें सही हैं।

मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज 26 साल की आजादी के बाद भी जबकि हिन्दुस्तान अपनी ताकत को बढ़ाता जा रहा है, अपने पांवों पर खड़ा होने की चेष्टा करता जा रहा है, तो क्या हमारी आवाज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में, क्या हमारा प्रभाव अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में वही रहेगा जो कि 50 में था? मुझे तो याद आती है जिस समय कोरिया की जंग चल रही थी उस समय पंडित जी ने अपनी आवाज उठाई थी कि कोरिया की जंग बंद होनी चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान का बहुत बड़ा कट्टीब्यूशन था वार को खत्म करने का, एक आवाज थी हमारी। जिस समय 1954 में इंडो-चाइना क्राइसिस हुआ उस समय हिन्दुस्तान ने अपनी आवाज उठाई, ५० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अपनी आवाज उठाई। और वहाँ की टेन्शन को खत्म करने के लिए हम काफी कामयाब हुए।

स्वेज कैनल का जब सवाल उठा तो हिन्दुस्तान ने एक मजबूत आवाज उठाई उसको खत्म करने के लिए। और वह वही का वही दबाया गया। सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी सौभाग्य से पंडित जी के बाद थोड़ा समय छोड़ कर बराबर हमारे देश के विदेश मंत्री रहे हैं। उनमें एक खूबी है कि जितना वह कहना चाहेंगे उतना वह कहेंगे उससे आगे कोई बात नहीं निकल सकती। क्योंकि मुझे यह महसूस होता है कि आज हमारे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में अगर कोई भी कारण है तो वह नहीं है जो कि पहले था। पहले कोई भी बात चाहे वह वेस्ट एशिया की हो, मिडल एशिया की हो, ईस्ट एशिया की हो उसके लिए हिन्दुस्तान की एक मजबूत आवाज होती थी। यह बात देखने की है। यह मैं इस लिए कहता हूँ; क्योंकि जिस समय वियतनाम में जंग चल रहा था, उस समय हिन्दुस्तान ने

बहुत सही तरीके से यह कहा था कि अमरीकन फोर्सेज वापस जानी चाहिए। जिस समय जंग खत्म हुई उसके बाद किसी ने हम से कुछ पूछा हो मुझे इसमें शक है। जो इंटरनेशनल कंट्रोल कमिशन था उसमें हमको घुसने नहीं दिया। वेस्ट एशिया में आपने बिलकुल ठीक किया, मुझे आपसे इन्फाक है। अरब काज को सपोर्ट किया। लेकिन जिम समय वेस्ट एशिया में जंग खत्म हुई तो सिर्फ अमरीका और रशिया ने संघियों को टर्म्स बनाई मुझे इसमें आपत्ति नहीं। तीन पक्षों जो सिव्यु-रिटी कौंसिल के मेंबर थे उन्होंने भी कहा हमसे पूछा नहीं गया। मुझे इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं।

महोदय, यह बात सही है कि हमारी पालिसी रेसीप्रोसिटी की है और जैसा देखने में आया है कि जब कभी भी अरब देश में कोई बात हुई तो हमने उनका साथ दिया जब कि पाकिस्तान की सपोर्ट सिलक्विटव थी और हमारी सपोर्ट अनक्वालिफाइड था। मैं उसको सही मानता हूं कि आपके सपोर्ट सही थी मगर यह हमारी बदकिस्मती है कि जब कभी जरूरत पड़ती है तो पाकिस्तान अरब कंट्रीज की कोई सपोर्ट नहीं करता है। जनरल नासर जन्मत में है। हिन्दु-स्तान के बड़े दोस्त थे लेकिन जिस समय 65 का जंग हुआ उस समय पाकिस्तान से उनकी दोस्ती में कमी नहीं आई।

आज यह बात सही है कि अरब देशों ने हमारे तेल में कटौती नहीं की। यह बात अलग है कि खबरें आती रहें कि पांच परसेंट की कटौती होगी। यह देखने की बात है कि जो नई इफेक्टिव आयल डिप्लोमेसी है यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में कहां तक सही है, कहां तक गलत है? मैं इस बात में जाना नहीं चाहता।

5 P.M.

श्रीमन्, मेरा निवेदन है...

श्री चक्रपाणि शुक्ल (मध्य प्रदेश) : आपकी क्या धारणा है, बतला दीजिये।

श्री नवल किशोर : मेरी धारणा यह है कि अगर कोअसंस और प्रेशर होगा तेल के मामले को लेकर तो यह आगे चल कर के अच्छी चीज साबित नहीं होगी।

श्रीमन्, अरब देश के अन्दर ईरान है हालांकि टेकनिकली वह अरब कंट्रीज में नहीं आता, हमारा उससे बहुत अच्छा सम्बन्ध है, कल्चरल सम्बन्ध है, वहां की प्रिसेज यहां आई थी अभी फारेन मिनिस्टर आयेंगे, सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह साहब से उनकी बातचीत होगी, मगर इसके बावजूद आज ईरान और पाकिस्तान की ज्वाइंट डिफेंस एक्सरसाइजेज चल रही हैं और जिस तरह से वह अपनी नेवी को बढ़ा रहा है, अपने हथियार को बढ़ा रहा है, तो अगर कन्फ्रंटेशन हुआ तो जैसा कि भोरे साहब ने कहा था—आपको तेल मिले या न मिले, भुट्टो साहब खुद कहते हैं—कि अरब देश पाकिस्तान को हथियार दगे, चाहे वह अमेरिका का हथियार हो, चाहे वह रूस के हथियार हों।

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

तो मैं सिर्फ एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी जो फारेन नीति है इसमें रेसिप्रोसिटी की बात होनी चाहिए।

आप युगांडा की बात लिजिये। हमारे अफ्रीका के देशों से बहुत अच्छे सम्बन्ध हैं। हमने अफ्रीकन कंट्रीज को फ्रीडम को सपोर्ट किया है और सही सपोर्ट किया है, आगे भी करना चाहिये लेकिन युगांडा एक छोटा सा देश है और उसने तमाम इंडियन्स को निकाल कर के फेंक दिया। सरदार साहब ने आश्वासन दिया था कि जो इंडियन्स वहां अपनी असेट्स छोड़ कर आये हैं उनकी हम हिफाजत करेंगे, हम जानते नहीं कि क्या किया और क्या नहीं किया, हिफाजत हो पाई या नहीं हो पाई है अगर मैं कोई गलत बात कह दूं तो सरदार साहब हमें ठीक कर दें। अब देखिए कि कीनिया के अन्दर यह स्थिति है। मिलोन हमारा पड़ोसी देश है, जब वहां इमरजेंसी हुई

[श्री नवल किमोर]

तो हमने अपनी नौवी, अपने जहाज भेज दिये और जो मदद मागी वह दी मगर आज भी इंडियन सिटीजंस का जो सवाल है वह अपनी जगह पर अटका हुआ है, चल नहीं रहा है।

(Time bell rings)

श्रीमन्, यह बात सही है कि अमेरिका ने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जो अपनी नीति बरती वह निहायत बेवकूफी की नीति थी, एक बैकफ़्ट पालिसी अमेरिका की थी, उसने हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान को ब्रैकेट किया पाकिस्तान के साथ बल्कि पाकिस्तान को प्रायरिटी दी हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर। यह बात सही है, लेकिन कभी कभी अनजाने में हमसे ऐसी बात भी हो जाती है कि खामख्वाह हम उसको नाराज़ कर देते हैं। मैं एक एज़ाम्पुल देता हूँ, सिर्फ़ एक एज़ाम्पुल। चिली में कूप हुआ, वहाँ के जो मिनिस्टर अजेडे साहब थे उनकी मौत हुई, मारे गये, जो कुछ भी उसके अन्दर हुआ बहुत बुरी बात हुई मगर हमने यह भी कहा कि इसमें अमेरिका का हाथ है—मैं उस बहस में जाता नहीं कि अमेरिका का हाथ है या नहीं लेकिन हमको यह बात कहने की ज़रूरत क्या थी। मैं इस बात को कहता हूँ आपसे। अफ़गानिस्तान में भी कूप हुआ, ग्रीस में भी कूप हुआ, पेरू में भी कूप हुआ, अफ्रीका के अन्दर बहुत जगह कूप हुआ, हमने यह नहीं देखा कि किसका हाथ था किसका हाथ नहीं था। तो अननेसेसैरेली हम किसी को एंटेगनाइज करें ऐसी बात हमारी तरफ़ से न हो तो यह अच्छी बात है।

अब, भुट्टो साहब के बारे में मैं क्या कहूँ। इसमें शक नहीं कि सरदार साहब की अपनी पेशेंस की हद है, उन्होंने अपनी पेशेंस की हद कर दी है, अगर किसी को पीस का नोबुल प्राइस मिलना चाहिये था तो सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह को मिलना चाहिये था मगर हिन्दुस्तान भी अजीब है और यह दुनिया भी अजीब है, पीस नोबुल प्राइज किसको दिया—किंसीजर साहब को और वह जो कि वीयतनाम के जेनरल थू हैं

या क्या ह उनको दिया। एक देश ने इस कदर बम्बार्डमेंट किया कि दुनिया की हिस्ट्री में किसी देश ने न किया होगा और वहाँ के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव को पीस प्राइस मिला और जिस देश के ऊपर मुसीबत थी उसके रिप्रेजेंटेटिव को मिला।

(Time bell rings)

श्रीमन्, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में सरदार साहब कोशिश करते करते थक जाते हैं और उनको कुछ नहीं मिला—मैं नहीं कहता कि उनको कुछ दिया जाता, मैं कहना यह चाहता हूँ कि आपने शिमला का एग्रीमेंट किया, ठीक किया, आपने ज्वाइंट बंगला देश डिक्लेरेशन किया, बिल्कुल सही किया लेकिन क्या यह सही नहीं है कि भुट्टो साहब जो कभी कभी बहक जाते हैं वह चीज भी है। आप कह सकते हैं कि हम क्या कहें उनके बहकने के लिये लेकिन अक्सर वह बहक जाते हैं, काश्मीर के मामले में भी वह बहक गये, स्ट्राइक की बात कही। उन्होंने कहा कि शेख अब्दुल्ला साहब ने जवाब दे दिया, मुनासिब बात है, शेख अब्दुल्ला साहब का भी थोड़ा कायाकल्प हुआ है, उनका दिमाग सही होता जाता है मगर शेख अब्दुल्ला साहब ने इतनी बात तो कही लेकिन क्या यह नहीं कहा कि काश्मीर का मसला काश्मीर के लोग तय करेंगे। लेकिन न हिन्दुस्तान को दखल देना चाहिए, न पाकिस्तान को दखल देना चाहिए। वह पता नहीं कब क्या बात कहते हैं, उसके बारे में हम नहीं कह सकते। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, आज भी भुट्टो साहब की तरफ़ से जो अग्रीमेंट हुआ है उसका लिटरेली पालन नहीं हो रहा है।

(Time bell rings)

श्रीमन्, दो-तीन शब्द और कहना चाहूंगा जो मिस्टर ब्रेज़नेव आए, उनका स्वागत। उनका आना अच्छा हुआ और मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि रूस हिन्दुस्तान का एक बहुत बड़ा दोस्त है और एक मौक़े पर नहीं आए दिन सन 1962 को ठीक, जब चाइनीज एग्रेशन था, तब तो उस संबंध में उनका कहना था कि एक

हमारा दोस्त है, एक हमारा भाई है—जब कभी कोई मौका आया है, रूस हमारे साथ खड़ा हुआ है, और—ए फ्रेड इन नीड इज ए फ्रेड इन्डीड—इसमें मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। जो रास्ता खुशेव्च ने शुरू किया और आयरन कर्टन को तोड़ कर “दे-ता” की नान् कम्युनिस्ट कन्ट्रीज से, मिस्टर ब्रेजनेव ने उसको बढ़ाया है और इंटरनेशनल डिप्लोमेसी में एक फ्लेक्सिबिलिटी पैदा की है और साबित किया है कि डिफरेंट कन्ट्रीज विद डिफरेंट पैटर्न्स आफ गवर्नमेंट एण्ड डिफरेंट आइडियालाजी एक साथ हो सकती हैं।

मगर मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ सरदार साहब से कि मुझे कोई शक नहीं किसी की नीयत में, मगर जो आपका काम्यूनिक आया मैंने इसको पढ़ा, इसमें वही प्रिन्सिपल इन्कारपोरेट किया है जिस पर हिन्दुस्तान खड़ा है—एन्टी इम्पीरियलिज्म, एन्टी कोलोनियलिज्म, एन्टी फासिज्म, एन्टी नियोकोलोनियलिज्म, ... —यह बात सही है, मगर दिक्कत आज क्या है? मैं नान एलाइनमेंट की बात भी ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि नान एलाइनमेंट के मानी भी आज बदल गए हैं, मगर यह बात सही है कि आप रूस के साथ इलाइन्ड नहीं हैं, अगर कोई कहता है एलाइन्ड है तो गलत बात है, एब्सर्ड बात है। परन्तु नान एलाइनमेंट का जो ओरिजिनल मानी था, उसमें थोड़ा डाइल्यूशन हो गया है। मैं दो-तीन बातों को पढ़कर उनका उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ ...

**श्री उपसभापति :** अब आप समाप्त कीजिए, पन्द्रह मिनट हो गए हैं।

**श्री नवल किशोर :** मेरे ख्याल में नहीं हुए अगर मेरी घड़ा ठोक है तो खैर मैं दो मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूँ। यह जो चेकोस्लोवाकिया से आपका अग्रीमेंट हुआ है इसमें भी करीब करीब सबस्टेन्स एक ही है कि—

“They welcome the trends towards international *detente* and the positive changes which have taken place in

the international arena resulting from the endeavours and initiatives on the part of the socialist countries” and so on

और उसके बाद फिर कहा गया है :

“Both sides welcomed the growing *detente* in Europe and emphasised the important role played by the socialist community in the convening of the All-European conference on security and co-operation for ensuring peace, security and co-operation on that continent.”

मुझे इसमें आपत्ति नहीं है जब आप सिर्फ सोशलिस्ट इंडिया, सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज, की बात करते हैं क्योंकि इन्डाइरेक्टली आज दूसरी कन्ट्रीज का भी इनिशियटिव है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि अनकाशसली कुछ थोड़ा सा इन्फ्लुएन्स, कम्युनिस्ट कन्ट्रीज का इन्फ्लुएन्स, हमारी कन्ट्री पर बढ़ता जा रहा है।

आखिरी बात कह कर खत्म करता हूँ। आपने दोस्ती की बात की। मुझे विश्वास है हिन्दुस्तान की भी अपनी इन्हेरेन्ट ताकत के ऊपर और अगर आप में स्टेट्समैनशिप है तो यह ट्रीटी एक्सप्लाइड हो सकती है हिन्दुस्तान की अच्छाई के वास्ते और जैसा गाने साहब ने पूछा कि वह तो देगे टेक्नालाजी लेकिन हम क्या देगे? लेकिन फिर भी हमको जहाँ भी हो सही तौर पर इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए [चाहे जौइन्ट इन्डेवर्स की हों या उनके साथ कोलेबोरेशन की हो या इन्स्टाल्ड कैपेसिटी तक जाने की हो]। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ आपके आप्पन्स ओपन हो—ईक्वेलिटी के ऊपर हमको व्यवहार करना चाहिए और कोशिश करनी चाहिए, यह नहीं हो कि किसी के आगे सरेन्डर करे, जाहे वह जापान हो, चीन हो, अमरीका हो। जो भी दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना चाहते हैं उनकी तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना चाहिए।

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we are at the end of the two-day debate and I would like

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

to say that I am very much satisfied and happy with the general trend and tenor of the debate. There have been outstanding speeches, as usual, in accordance with the high traditions of this House, both from Opposition benches as well as from this side. I would like to pay my tribute to the great deal of thought that had gone in when these speeches were thought of by the hon. Members. It is not easy for me to handle a debate of this nature by way of reply because I notice that there could be only two speeches which could be said to be highly critical—one, the opening speech by Shri C. D. Pande, belonging to the group of our former Congress colleagues who now sit in the Opposition, and the other, which was the first speech after lunch-time to-day, by Dr. Bhai Mahavir. When I say that it is difficult to handle the debate, what is in my mind is that Dr. Mahavir is not present here even to listen to the replies to the points that he raised. I will be striking in the air when I try to pick up all the points and then try to build an argument in reply to them.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS** (Uttar Pradesh): I will convey it to him.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH**: Thank you very much. Like a wise leader you will certainly convey it to him, but we would like him to get the impact of the speeches of others also. Sir, it is also very interesting that Dr. Bhai Mahavir somehow could not have the courage to face the general trend of the debate in this House. He was absent from the House throughout yesterday and in the course of his opening speech to-day, he said that he had taken great pains to study at great length the speech made by the leader of the Communist Party, Shri Sardesai. He also said that he had read

the speeches of a large number of my own colleagues from this party. But the normal courtesy and practice in debates is that a person who wants to make a major speech which he thought, according to his judgment, was very profound, he should first be soaked by the process of the impact of the speeches of those people who are speaking against the ideas that he is going to propound. The only irresistible conclusion is that unable to face the thrust of the debate, unable to face the flood of support for the policy that we are pursuing, he thought it fit to read it in cold print or pretend to read it, or may be he glanced through the newspapers, and then he comes here for the first time after lunch-time to-day and reels off a written text. This is not in tune with the general manner in which debates on such serious matters should be handled. So far as Shri Pande is concerned, it is very interesting that he also is not present. He has great regard for me. I am sure he would have been present here to hear me, but probably he did not have the heart to hear his own colleague, Shri Nawal Kishore. I think that he, in his own inimitable way, being a senior public man, has answered many of the doubt that Shri Pande sought to stir up.

**SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA** (Bihar): You have managed to divide them.

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT** (Haryana): They are divided among themselves.

**SHRI NAWAL KISHORE**: Mr. Krishan Kant should not talk about division. He is the symbol of division in the ruling Congress Party.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH**: You should not take him so seriously in this matter. So, when I say that it is difficult for me to handle a debate of this

nature, I think you will appreciate why I find myself in this predicament. The main critics are absent and I do not know how I should answer them or how seriously I should take their criticism or some of the points that they tried to build up. Anyhow, I would like to take this opportunity of placing on record some of my views on some important aspects that are before the country because the debate here has a much bigger audience in our own country and, I would like to add, in the world as a whole. Therefore, I would like to place on record certain aspects about points which have been raised. I will try to be very brief because I do not want to make a very comprehensive speech covering every point. I would start with the last point raised by Shri Nawai Kishore. This was also referred to by Dr Bhai Mahavir. And that is about Prime Minister Bhutto's speeches and his general attitude. I would like to say very briefly the following which is partly factual, because you might recall that I had informed either this House or the other House that we had already taken this matter up—I think I mentioned it here during the Question Hour—with the Government of Pakistan. The House is aware of the reported statements of the Prime Minister of Pakistan during his tour of Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir in early November which were contrary to the aims and objectives of the Simla Agreement, in particular, the provisions regarding non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

On 9th November we had sent an *aide memoire* to the Pakistan Government drawing pointed attention to these statements. We had said that in our view such statements by the highest authority in Pakistan could only cause apprehension among the people and the Government of India regarding Pakistan's in-

tention about the implementation of the Simla Agreement. Later on 21st November I sent a personal message to Mr. Aziz Ahmed, Pakistan's Minister of State for Defence and Foreign Affairs wherein I drew his attention to the speeches of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, particularly the speech at Mirpur on 9th November, which had tended to create the impression that he had endorsed the slogans from a section of the crowd which was advocating "Guerilla Warfare to liberate Kashmir". I asked Mr. Aziz Ahmed to clarify the Pakistan Government's position on this subject so that we would understand where we stood in terms of the Simla Agreement. Mr. Aziz Ahmed has sent me a reply. In his reply which was received towards the end of the last month—his reply is dated November 29—Mr. Aziz Ahmed has tried to explain that Prime Minister Bhutto's speeches, read as a whole, could not justify the kind of impression we had formed. Regarding Mr. Bhutto's remarks at Mirpur he clarified that the Prime Minister was actually trying to pacify a section of the crowd which was shouting these slogans and was creating a disturbance. He has further said that this is Mr. Bhutto's style of dealing with hecklers. He has further stated that on the other hand Mr. Bhutto has been repeatedly advocating during this tour that war would not resolve the Kashmir issue and that three wars fought during the last twenty-six years had left this issue unresolved. These are the words Mr. Aziz Ahmed has used while making a summary of the general trend of Mr. Bhutto's speeches. According to Mr. Aziz Ahmed, Pakistan Government remains committed to promoting friendship and harmonious relations with India and to implementing the Simla Agreement in letter and spirit. My only comment is that the fact that they are trying to be defensive

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

on this and are trying again to come back to the Simla Agreement is a factor in the situation which we should not ignore. While we have taken note of this clarification, we cannot but express our unhappiness that the Prime Minister of Pakistan should have thought it fit to make remarks in his speeches which violated the provisions of the Simla Agreement regarding non-interference in each others international affairs. We will, therefore, earnestly hope that Pakistan Government will fulfil the assurance contained in Mr. Aziz Ahmed's letter of 29th November. It is necessary for us not to forget the objective. The objective is clear. We have to stabilise peace. In our relations with Pakistan we have to reverse the trends of confrontation and we are dead-earnest to establish good neighbourly relations. And if there are any deviations from the side of Pakistan, it should be our duty to point out those deviations and try to bring them back on to the rails so that they continue to be firm on the Simla Agreement. It is not a very pleasant task. But while dealing with a history of the type that we have had with Pakistan, the main objective has to be kept in view and it is with that objective that we continue to make our efforts.

I would also like to take this opportunity to bring the figures up-to-date with regard to repatriation of the three categories of persons about which I made a reference in my opening remark. I have got now figures which are fairly recent. I have got figures upto 2nd December, 1973. The figures available with us till 2nd December, 1973 are quite impressive and they show that the persons repatriated were as follows :—

Prisoners of war and civilian internees in India . . . . . 30,190

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Even today I heard on the radio that 900 have gone.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Pakistanies from Bangladesh—22,593.

Bangladesh nationals from Pakistan—52,821.

The number is well over a lakh and this trend is continuing. My senior brother Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha has pointed out that even this morning it was on the radio that more prisoners of war have gone. It is true that during these three or four days further repatriation has taken place. But I am giving you authentic figures which show that one lakh persons have already been repatriated.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): What is the total number remaining still to be repatriated?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: As the House is aware, we are dealing with three categories of persons—prisoners of war and civil internees in India; Bangladesh nationals in Pakistan and Pakistani nationals in Bangladesh. The outstanding number is still substantial. It will take some months more before we complete this first phase...

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MEYMON: What about Indian prisoners of war in Pakistan?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Indian prisoners in Pakistani custody at the time of ceasefire had been repatriated long ago. We had exchanged Pakistani prisoners that came into our custody from Western side with the Indian POW's that were in their custody. It is quite obvious that there were no Indian prisoners of war on the Eastern side,



श्री ओउम् प्रकाश त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) . पाकिस्तानी प्रिजनर्स पर जो हमारा रुपया खर्च हुआ है उसके बारे में क्या हुआ है ।

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him complete his speech

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH A part of the money according to international convention is recoverable and we have reserved our right to claim the expenditure which is recoverable according to international law

The other important point that cropped up during the debate quite naturally was the recent visit to India of His Excellency Brezhnev and also to some extent reference was made to the visit of Dr Husak. I would like to say that some of the criticism—although it was very, very mild—that was voiced was not—it appears—based on a correct appraisal of the contents of the various documents that were signed at the end of these visits. I have laid copies on the Table of the House. But apparently, the critics had other preoccupations and they did not have time to study these documents carefully. Therefore, with your permission, I would like to take this opportunity to pinpoint the salient features of the documents that we signed with the USSR leader. I would divide it into two parts. Political and Economic

In the political field, the important agreements that have been arrived at may be summarised as follows

(1) The Soviet Union has paid tributes to India's policy of non-alignment and her valuable contribution to the struggle for peace and against colonialism, neo-colonialism and facism.

(2) India has welcomed the *detente* between the USSR and the USA, supporting the Soviet efforts in that direction and hoping that this relaxation will further spread to the other parts of the world and bring an end to the

nuclear arms race which is a threat to mankind. The House will recall that this is consistent with our well-known position and this answers the alleged inconsistency as pointed out by Dr Mahavir

(3) Both sides welcome the process of growing *detente* in Europe and the strengthening of peace in that continent

(4) Both sides favour the strict and full implementation of the Vietnam Agreement of 27th January, 1973, the Agreement that brought about peace in that region and the Laotian Agreement of August 1973, a brief mention of which was made by me in my opening remarks, as well as hope for a just settlement in Cambodia in accordance with the national interests of the people of Cambodia

(5) On the sub-continent, the Soviet Union reiterated their support for India's well-known policy and initiatives in normalising the situation. Both sides also support the admission of Bangladesh into the UN and recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan

(6) On West Asia, both sides agree that durable peace in the region is possible only through the strict implementation of the Resolution of the Security Council which will constitute the most reliable guarantee for the security and respect for the rights of all countries—"all" is underlined

(7) The USSR has expressed her readiness to find a fair solution to the question of making the Indian Ocean a "Zone of Peace"

(8) Both in the Joint Declaration and in the 15-Year Economic Agreement, the principles of respect for

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

sovereignty, territorial integrity, non interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, governing the relations between the two countries have been reiterated. Of course, the support for the liberation struggles, for ending colonialism, for ending racism, for ending *apartheid* has been reiterated.

I have tried to highlight the important political content of this Declaration and I am sure that even the worst critics will agree, those critics who, I should say, are allergic to the USSR will agree, that all these are very sound principles consistent with our long-standing attitude.

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT** At this stage, before you refer to the economic aspect of the agreement, I would like you to clarify one thing with regard to an allegation made in the "London Economist" of 14th November wherein the correspondent says that Mr Brezhnev's plan is going to gain something in return for the economic help Mrs Gandhi is getting which will be to Russia's interest, that is, in Russia getting some Indian port facilities which their fleet can use. Then, Sir, he goes on to say that this week the Indian Government confirmed that a formal Soviet request for port facilities in India has been put on the summit agenda and this the Government would certainly consider and so on.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH** I would like to say that we should not attach any importance to the speculative items that appear not only in "The London Economist", but also in several other American and West European newspapers and journals. This is the usual kite-flying and there is absolutely no substance. There is absolutely no

substance in these suggestions and the documents that we have signed fully demonstrate that any suggestion to the contrary was spread in order to create some sort of misunderstanding between the two friendly countries. We should be cautious about these things. We know our interests and we will reject firmly any attempt to create any differences or misunderstanding. Everybody knows that there is no military content in our friendship with the USSR. They have never asked and we have never given any facilities in the form of base, naval or otherwise, and all speculation to that effect is totally unfounded and I would reject it with the greatest emphasis at my command. (cheers)

Now, Mr Deputy Chairman, I come to the economic content of the agreements that have been signed. These also I will try to summarise in a very brief manner, pointing out various fields in which this economic and trade cooperation has been agreed upon.

Under the 15-year Economic & Trade Cooperation Agreement, Indo-USSR cooperation and collaboration in the following fields will grow

- 1 In production capacity for iron & steel
- 2 Our capacity to produce non-ferrous metals.
- 3 Prospecting production and refining of oil, natural gas, coal and other essential materials
- 4 Power engineering, petro-chemical industries and shipping
- 5 Agriculture and training of personal

Capacities of existing plants in India, where we have received Soviet assistance, will be expanded and the Soviet Union will also assist in the setting up of new plants.

Production capacities in the Bhilai and Bokaro Steel Plants will expand to 7 and 10 million tonnes per annum, respectively. The Mathura oil refinery will have an annual capacity of 6 million tonnes. Copper mining blocks at Malanjkhand will be developed. The Calcutta underground railway project will receive Soviet assistance.

In very specific terms, Soviet Union has reiterated its commitment to assist us in our achievements of economic self-reliance, particularly in the key industrial sectors. We are also to receive fresh credits from Soviet Union. The existing credit relations between the two countries are in the process of being improved and streamlined.

As a result of the recent talks India and USSR have undertaken to increase their bilateral trade turnover between now and 1980 from 50% to 100%. The trade turn-over during 1973 has been of the order of over Rs 400 crores. It is obvious that the two countries will have to create additional production capacities for meeting the requirements of each other, over a long-term period.

The Agreement on Cooperation between our Planning Commission and the Soviet Planning Commission will assist us in assessing long-term requirements of the Soviet economy in order to increase our export capacities in the required sectors. It will also help us to determine the long-term capacities of Soviet economy in fields and areas of special interest to us, like newsprint, special steel, fertilizers, non-ferrous metals, etc.

Now, I have given this details, because it appears that most of these have not been carefully studied even by very careful Members, particularly those who wanted to criticize these documents.

I was amazed when certain observations were made, quoting copiously from the Parliamentary Committee of Public Undertaking's Reports. It is amazing that use has been made of this exercise, with which many of us are familiar, which is undertaken in order to highlight the shortcomings of State undertakings. Any selective quoting or criticism of the shortcomings in one type of project certainly is not the whole picture.

I do not want to compare the progress of plants. Unfortunately, in many spheres, particularly in Steel, we faced several difficulties. I was myself in charge of Steel for 5 years and it was during my stewardship that the three major plants in the public sector were constructed—Bhilai steel plant with USSR's help, then the Rourkela steel plant with help from the Federal Republic of Germany and Durgapur steel plant with the help of the British.

Now, it is not for me to enter into a full-dress debate about the progress of these steel plants or to compare these three names, Bhilai Steel Plant, Durgapur Steel Plant and the Rourkela Steel Plant. Look at their performance. Look at the total production over a certain period and the ratio of the actual production to capacity and this arithmetic will convince even the hardest critic as to which of the three plants has the best performance. This is a complete answer. I do not want to compare because at one stage when I was the Steel Minister, somebody asked me "Which of the three plants do you think is the best?" My reply was, "They are like children to me and I have equal love for all the three and I want all the three to prosper". But the later figures will indicate what

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

the actual arithmetic is. By any comparison, the Bhilai Steel Plant certainly gave the best performance of the three steel plants. We want that the other two steel plants—Rourkela and Durgapur—should also give us good performance. But it so happened that Bhilai did outshine the others in performance and in actual production and even in the economic turnover. Is it a matter of mere coincidence that out of all these public undertakings, Dr. Bhai Mahavir thought fit only to refer to those projects which have been established with U.S.S.R. collaboration? Is this the way to treat this hon. House in order to create an impression as if anything that goes up as a result of collaboration with the U.S.S.R. is necessarily something which is defective? I would say that this is a completely wrong way of dealing with such a serious matter. I do not mind if he criticises us inside the country. He is perfectly at liberty to do so. Once when I asked him as to why he was always negative, he said, "We are in the opposition and we do not want you to remain there." If this is the attitude, I do not mind. But I would humbly appeal to him and my other colleagues in the Opposition that we should adopt a different attitude when we are discussing international affairs because here it is not only the party that might be ruling suffers, but the country suffers and, therefore, while dealing with international affairs, whether they are political or economic, I would appeal to the hon. Members to follow the example of other responsible leaders of other parties. Even the leader of the Jan Sangh group has not thought it fit to remain present here although he said he would come.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE: He said he would come.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: My point is that the Pandes and Dr. Bhai Mahavirs should also learn some lesson at any rate from other senior colleagues even in opposition because in such matters our love for the country and our patriotism should be the guiding factor and not a desire merely to raise a debate. Drain-inspecting is familiar. This is part and parcel of parliamentary life to drain-inspect. But it injures the national interest and I have no hesitation in saying that this type of selective and disconnected quotations from public documents does definitely distort our image in the international sphere. Therefore, I would very strongly urge that this temptation should be resisted and we should not indulge in this type of criticism.

Sir, these are very basic matters and at this stage I would like to touch upon one point which was raised by the distinguished Member of the Swatantra Party, Prof. Ruthnaswamy. What he said was that the primary attention was to basic industries and the effects of this help were not available to the general people, to the average run of the people, to the agriculturists and the rural population. I would humbly request him to ponder over this thing. What are the requirements of an agriculturist today? I myself am an agriculturist. I do not know whether Prof. Ruthnaswamy was also a peasant or not. I was born in a small village; I was brought up in a peasant family. And I can tell you the basic requirements of a peasant today, whether he is in Punjab or Haryana or Andhra Pradesh or Maharashtra or Tamil Nadu. His requirement is to modernise agriculture. His basic requirement is that he should get more fertilizer, he should have the benefit of the latest agricultural research, he should have the benefit of

pesticides, he should have the mechanical means like tractors, and he should have lift pumps. Can we produce all these basic materials unless we have got steel, unless we have got fertilizers, unless we have got electricity to run the pumps? So, in a sense the economy is so complicated or so interdependent that any basic advance in the rural sector or in the consumer sector is not possible today unless we give attention to the basic requirements.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY** (Tamil Nadu): What about the cottage and rural industries?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH**: Even in cottage industries, what do we require? We require machine tools, we require small machines, we require electric power, and we require metals—ferrous and non-ferrous. And the list that I read out shows that attention is going to be given to the production of these, even to expand production of these things. I would like to say that this conflict between the consumer industry and the heavy industry is a slogan about which we should be very, very careful in a developing society. The highly industrialised countries will always continue to din in our ears that we should sleep over the basic industry and we should concentrate on consumer industries. The inexorable lesson of history is that we cannot have worthwhile consumer industries unless we give attention to the basic industries. In fact, one flows from the other. Now I am not adumbrating the general economic policy. But these are the features which should be quite clear to every hon. Member of this House. They are quite clear to me because I have had the good fortune under the control of this House to

handle several economic Ministries. So, for this reason, it is very necessary to give attention to these basic industries—metals, machines, power, fertilizers and chemical industries. Without these, any talk of worth-while consumer industry is certainly not feasible. And we should also remember that ours is not a country with small population. We have the responsibility to serve more than 550 million people. Can we serve them with their normal requirements of steel? An agriculturist does require a piece of steel in every plough that he uses. He does require steel when he installs his electric pump. He does require electric power to energize that pump. He does require oil if the electricity is not there to run the pump. So, these are the things about which we are seeking collaboration.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI**: The hon. Minister has put the case very well and very convincingly. But there is one clarification which I would like to have from him. In all these industries and other matters, the Russian experts are invited and they will come. Have you made sure that the financial or other control of these industries would not be interfered with by the Russians?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH**: This is a very valid point. And I would like to say, based on my own experience, that we not only make ample provision for this but we are also very, very jealous to safeguard our right to control the finances and the management. I would like to cite only one example. When I was the Steel Minister, for the Bhilai Plant, a very distinguished steel engineer of very outstanding stature was deputed by the Soviet Union to head the Soviet Team. He is so well-known and so outstanding in his own country that today he is the Vice-Prime-

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

Minister in the USSR—Mr. Dimshitz In his very first meeting with me, he asked me as to what the organisation was going to be. I told him that I would benefit by his advice and would do whatever he suggested. It is very interesting, he said that he did not want to be involved in any administrative or financial matters which were entirely our own concern. He said that his function was to give us good adequate technical advice which would enable us to complete the construction. He stated that so far as administrative, financial and other matters were concerned we must have a top man who is an Indian and who would be answerable to us. He did not want to be involved in this. I have quoted only one example. In every case we are careful to ensure this aspect.

Well, we may have many shortcomings. But, I have a great pride or faith in the capacity of our technocrats, engineers, scientists, metallurgists, electrical engineers, who handle even the most complicated of these projects. It is mainly on account of the devoted and very able help that we get by our own engineers that we have been able to establish so many industries.

Sir, I would like to end this by giving you briefly some points from the agreements signed between India and Czechoslovakia, because that was also a matter which was of considerable importance. The economic collaboration agreement concluded during Dr. Husak's visit will have the following direct results to assist India in attaining self-reliance in our economic development. Our trade turn-over which stands at Rs. 80 crores this year is likely to increase to Rs. 150 crores in 1974. The latest Czech credit to us of Rs. 80 crores has been given, as the House knows,

on terms which are more favourable than those of the previous Czechoslovak credits. Czechoslovakia has undertaken to strengthen our industrial base, especially in the field of power generation, electrification of Railways, fertilizer production and engineering. We have been able to discuss with the Czechoslovak leaders the possibility of their supplying us certain specific items of special interest to us currently. These include, as in the case of the Soviet Union, items like newsprint, special alloys and steel, fertilizers, special pipes meant for drilling, etc.

Sir, before I pass on to the next subject, I would like to say that this criticism that because it is a balanced trade and a barter trade and so there is some catch in it, requires some clarification. Otherwise, it will cause confusion in the country. Now, it is an amazing argument. The obvious stage in the development of our economy is such that we can no longer be content only by the export of so-called traditional items like tea, jute or textiles or iron-ore or manganese. We have to move from this traditional ambit of our exports to the exports of engineering goods, to those goods that are produced as a result of our new industry. We are prepared in India to enter into such arrangements with any country, whether it is the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Britain, France or the United States of America, in fact with any country which is prepared to open up its economy to our industrial goods, whether they are components or whether they are finished industrial goods. Now, how can you force any country, whether it is the Soviet Union or Britain or France to accept any components from us unless they fit into their own machines. So, it is quite obvious that if we are desirous of expanding the base and

ambit of our exports—we want that this should be spread into industrial goods—we must know the requirements of other countries in order to be able to sell those goods. And it is here that with the agreement the two sides will remain in touch with each situation the planning field and in other fields. To know it precisely, it is the field in which we can step up our production which will be acceptable to both. This is a quite straight-forward thing. Nothing secret about it and it is rather surprising that anything fishy should be read into it.

Then the usual warning of prophets of doom and despair, what will happen if the things go wrong? I am proceeding on the basis that we will see that the things do not go wrong. It is one of our jobs to see that we proceed correctly. Of course, may be that things can go wrong and they are able to build up arguments and then say we have told you what will happen. No country can form its opinion on the basis of 'things will go wrong'. It is the function of the Government and the administration to keep their eyes open and see that things do not go wrong and, therefore, to base a policy on such fear and on such suspicion is totally wrong and without any justification whatsoever.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I know that I must finish within the next few minutes. Therefore, I quickly say a few words more about our neighbours. I did touch upon this matter in my opening remarks as to the policy we have been pursuing over the years, a consistent policy of befriending our neighbours and I can claim that we have succeeded reasonably well in our efforts in this direction. Look at our present relations with Bangladesh—political and economic. Look at the relations between India and Burma. We are quietly discussing rather the sensitive matters like demarcation of

the boundary. The world does not know about it. We are bilaterally trying to resolve. There have been exchange of delegations between Burma and India to strengthen the economic content of our relationship. I myself led such a delegation some time back. There have been exchange of ministerial delegations in which there were several experts from Burma's side, who spent two weeks in our country. Take our relations with our northern neighbours, Bhutan and Nepal. We have got excellent relations, both in the economic and political fields. Take our relations with Sri Lanka. Notwithstanding the discordant voices that are raised from time to time, it is a fact that we have entered into an agreement which settles the future of a number of persons of Indian origin. Some will get Sri Lanka citizenship, others we have agreed to take back according to the agreed phased programme. These are the bilateral discussions. Take our relations with Afghanistan. We welcome that Afghanistan in their best judgment have decided now to function as the Republic of Afghanistan. We welcome these changes because it is their own concern. We have excellent relations with Afghanistan. One of their very senior leaders came to India. I myself paid a visit to Kabul only a couple of months back and I was greatly satisfied with the determination of the new Government of Afghanistan to strengthen their sovereignty, their independence and to improve the economic lot of the people in Afghanistan. There is such a complete understanding between us and Afghanistan on all matters.

I want that our relations with other neighbours should also be good and this is the policy we have been consistently pursuing. I have already touched upon

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

our relations and our efforts to normalise relations with Pakistan, with China. We have every time expressed our desire to improve relations. Well, we have not got 'Kissingers' in India and you will have to be content with what I am because I have to look after the relationship but I would like to assure you that this is a matter perhaps in which some reciprocity is necessary. Now about Mr. Kissinger's visit, he is a good friend of mine, I like some of his unorthodox methods but let us not forget—as I reminded Shri Goray because he raised this matter on an earlier occasion also—that it will be wrong to imagine that any great magic was done by Dr. Kissinger's hope from Pakistan to Peking when he undertook his first visit. That was preceded by long years of quiet diplomacy between the two countries. We are perhaps less quiet because we have got near normal relations because we have got embassies of both countries functioning in Peking and in Delhi. We have contracts in other capitals also. So we do not dramatise our relations with China. Only if both countries show reciprocity can relations improve and we shall not hesitate to take advantage of the possibility of improving relations but any over-anxiety or just repeating it *ad nauseum* I am sure will not advance the objective which might be before some of the hon. Members.

Having said this I would like to reiterate our clear policy on West Asia because that was again a matter which was touched upon in rather a circuitous manner by some of the critics. This is an area of conflict and we have taken a consistent stand. I want to make sure that the strength of our stand is not whittled down by these discordant voices and I would therefore like to

reiterate our clear position in this respect. As I have already said on two occasions, there are in the West Asia situation some hopeful trends. There is a cease fire; at the present moment it is there although at times it appears very precarious. On the wider issues of durable peace, negotiations have been taking place, in various capitals. There are some hints or suggestions that peace talks might commence shortly. Towards the end of November, there was an Arab Heads of States and Governments meeting in Algiers, with a view to co-ordinating Arab action towards the just settlement of the West Asia problem. We have been kept in close and constant touch with the situation and our Arab friends have been in constant consultation with us, both in the United Nations and elsewhere, in our capital and in the Arab capitals. We are glad that besides strong diplomatic support we were able to offer some material support to them, and we were able to send some supplies, medicines and doctors, etc. both to Egypt and to Syria.

The military might of Israel, and their temporary successes in 1948, 1956 and 1967 resulted in the long-term considerations of statesmanship being forgotten. We are sorry that after each conflict in the Middle East, in the ensuing negotiations, expediency and the desire to acquire more real estate over-shadowed the considerations of justice, equity, peace and stability. The result has been a continuing crisis and a continuing tragedy not only for West Asia but for the entire civilized world.

The arrogance of Israel and the support she has received from her mighty friends, the House is aware, had driven the Palestinians to measures of desperation. Mr. Abraham had rightly drawn attention to the miserable condition of



the Palestinians who have been expelled from their homeland in a manner unprecedented in history. Our views on this matter can leave no room for doubt. The rights of the Palestinians must be restored and their homeland assured to them. Our attitude towards this situation in this conflict is based on firm and unalterable principles. These are principles not only of equity and justice and steadfast friendship and solidarity but also principles of international law and behaviour. I can do no better than quote what the Prime Minister has said on this subject. I quote :

"Our sympathies for the Arabs are for two reasons. First, they are our centuries old friends and secondly their territories have been occupied following the Israeli aggression. We have certain principles and the whole world knows India has never compromised on principles. Our relations with the Arabs are centuries old and these ties are not frivolous bonds of friendship. They are old and solid. We have always stood for the vacation of territories occupied by aggression, irrespective of the countries involve."

I would like to add one more thought. We are indeed anxious that peace and stability in West Asia are ensured. We are anxious that recourse to the conference table, rather than arbitrament of weapons, should succeed there. Our commitment to justice is there. Our support for the Arabs is well known. To Israel we must sound a note of caution. Israel should draw the lessons of history and should see the writing on the wall. Already in the last few weeks Israel has become more and more isolated in Asia and in Africa, also in Europe. Look at the joint statement issued by the Ministers of the European community. Look at the last statement issued by Japan. Look at the several

African countries which have broken off diplomatic relations with Israel. This process can go very much further and it will not be in the interests of Israel herself to force the non-aligned countries into taking further steps to ensure justice and peace for the entire region. We must and we shall do all we can to ensure that peace with honour is restored to the West Asian region.

Sir, now I will say a few words, before I close, about our relations with the United States of America. The House may recall that, a little over a year ago, on 30th November, 1972, I stated in the Rajya Sabha that we would do everything in our power to normalise and strengthen our relations with the United States on the basis of equality, reciprocity and mutual respect. I am glad to be able to say that in the post-1971 period both India and the United States have made conscious and deliberate efforts to ensure that our mutual relations improve. I was able in the month of October to have discussions with the new Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger in Washington. We have also noted that in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in September, 1973 Dr. Kissinger recognised India's role as of special importance in the developing world whose growth and stability is essential to peace and stability in South Asia. In this connection, it is pertinent to point out that negotiations on settlement of the question of PL-480 funds are making satisfactory progress and we hope that this question would soon be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of the two sides. Our assessment is that Indo-US relations have entered a phase where a constructive, co-operative and mature relationship can be built up between the two countries. On two recent occasions we have reiterated that durable peace in

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

this region continues to be the prime objective of our policy, not only in the sub-continent, not only with Pakistan, but peace generally in this region. We are gratified to note that our American friends have a better appreciation of this policy, including the fact that supply of arms to Pakistan, whether directly or indirectly, can be a major element impeding the process of normalisation. It is our earnest hope that, keeping in view the steady improvement in the situation in the sub-continent, the U.S. Government will take all steps to help the process and not take measures which adversely affect it.

Sir, I would now very briefly say something about Iran. I would like to give the information about our relationship with Iran. I am happy to be able to say that the Foreign Minister of Iran, Dr. Abbas Ali Khalatbary, will be with us next week. The House will recall that I had paid a visit to Iran in July. This should indicate how sustained and continuing the dialogue between Iran and India has all along been. Both Governments believe that there should be a close and continuing dialogue between us. The political, economic, cultural and other relations between India and Iran have been growing satisfactorily. We shall in the very near future be holding another meeting of the Joint Economic Commission in which economic and industrial collaboration will be reviewed and new projects discussed. We consider Iran a neighbour and heir to a common historical, linguistic and cultural heritage. At times some doubts have been expressed either on Iranian motivations towards us or our attitude

towards them. I am glad to be able to say that despite such insinuations both countries have not allowed their bilateral relations to be affected. Both Iran and India subscribe to the policy of creating a Zone of Peace in the Indian Ocean free from great Power presence and rivalries. In this context of peaceful co-operation, we, shall, on our side, do everything to strengthen our ties with Iran.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, within the short time at my disposal I have tried to touch upon some important aspects of our foreign policy and I have tried to meet some of the points that have been raised. I hope that the policy which we are pursuing will receive the support of the entire House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I shall now put the amendment of Mr. Mathur to vote. The question is :

"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 motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at eight minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 7th December, 1973.