

[श्री श्याम लाल यादव]

अधिक जानवर लूट कर चले गये पुलिस की मौजूदगी में। ऐसी एक बड़ी दुर्घटना हुई और यह दुर्घटना इसलिये बड़ी शर्मनाक है कि पुलिस की मौजूदगी में हुई। वहाँ पर आज तक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई न किमी के विरुद्ध कोई एक्शन लिया गया और न आज तक वहाँ मुसलमान लौट कर अपने घरों पर जा सके। मैं वहाँ गया हूँ, मैंने सारी हालत देखी है। वहाँ आज भी घर खाली पड़े हैं। सरकार के लिये यह बहुत शर्मनाक स्थिति है। इस मामले में ग्रेसमेन्ट किया जाता है कि 50 लाख रुपये की सम्पत्ति का नुकसान हुआ है या लूटी गई है। किसी आदमी को तो नहीं मारा गया लेकिन लूटने की नीयत से पुलिस की माजिश से और उसकी मौजूदगी में यह मारी लूटपाट हुई है। ऐसी घटना देश में नहीं हुई कि आम्ड गाँव मौजूद हो और पाँच हजार आदमियों द्वारा सारा गांव लूट लिया जाय और कोई कार्यवाही न हो। जिलाधिकारी वहाँ उस वक्त गये नहीं। मैं उनसे मिलने गया तो वह मुझसे मिले नहीं और इतनी बदतमीजी से व्यवहार किया कि जिमकी कल्पना नहीं की जा सकती। वह खुद मौके पर छः दिन के बाद जाते हैं।

(Time bell rings)

संसदीय कार्य विभाग तथा नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय में राज्यमंत्री (श्री ओम मेहता) : यह स्टेट का मामला है।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : यह आजमगढ़ जिला का मामला है। उस दिन आजमगढ़ जिले में दो मंत्री उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के मौजूद थे, दावते उड़ाई जा रही थी, सारे अधिकारी वहाँ थे, वहाँ जिला अधिकारी था, और पाँच दिन के बाद मौके पर गया, पाँच दिन तक आग जलती रही उसे बुझाने का कोई प्रयास नहीं किया गया।

श्री उपसभापति : आपने कह लिया जो कुछ कहना था।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : मान्यवर, इतनी चीज मैं मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सारे मामले की जाँच पुलिस से हटाकर भारत सरकार अपने हाथ में ले और इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार बयान दे ताकि स्थिति का स्पष्टीकरण हो सके और अल्पसंख्यकों के दिल में कोई सद्भावना पदा हो सके और पन्द्रह दिन के बाद भी अपने घरों पर लौट सकें। सारी उनकी खेती बर्बाद हो रही है। कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हो रही है। उनको पूरा मुआविजा दिया जाये। और मेरी मांग है कि जिला मैजिस्ट्रेट और एम० पी० को तुरन्त मुअत्तल करना चाहिये। अगर नहीं करेंगे तो एक गलत परम्परा बनेगी और कहीं अल्पसंख्यकों की सुरक्षा नहीं हो सकती और कोई व्यवस्था नहीं हो सकती।

श्री उपसभापति : आप कह चुके। यह स्टेट का मामला है।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : यह भी है कि सरकार जो जांच करवाती है वह भी सामने नहीं आती है, वाराणसी, फिरोजाबाद में पुलिस ज्यादातियों की बाबत की यहाँ के ज्वाइंट सेक्रेटरी ने जांच की लेकिन रिपोर्ट आज तक नहीं मिली कि क्या उसका नतीजा है। यही कार्यवाही यहाँ पर नहीं हो।

MOtion RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—Contd.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am sorry I have begin my speech with a protest and complaint against the manner in which the Minister has inauguated this debate. He had given notice of a motion that the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration. When a Member or a Minister makes a motion it is the convention in all parliamentary assemblies that he should make a speech in favour of that motion.

Instead of that he throws the burden of the debate on the private Members of parlia-

ment. Especially as this motion refers to the policy of the Government of India in regard to the international situation, the Minister's procedure is queer. Does he expect private Members of Parliament to enunciate the policy of the Government? It is his business, as the Minister, to commend the policy of the Government and, in not doing so, he is not fair to himself or to the Ministry or to the Government. If he had made a speech, he would have had the advantage of first service of the ball. He would have had the privilege of two speeches, one while introducing the debate and the other in concluding the debate. I hope the precedent set by the Minister will not be followed by Ministers on future occasions.

Now, with regard to the international situation great developments have taken place within the past year or two. Instead of two great super-powers facing each other, we have now three powers facing one another, a triangle of super-powers, the United States of America, Russia and China. The confrontation of these three powers shows that it is not any longer the conflict between communism and anti-communism. It is rather a conflict between one nation and another, between one nationalism and another, the nationalism of China against the nationalism of Russia. So, it seems to me that recent developments have taken us back to the old power conflict between the great powers, each great power trying to extend its influence, its impact upon the rest of the world. That is one important development that we have to take into consideration, viz, the new war between nations, the new war between the nationalism of the world. The old power game has come back in a new form. The nuclear balance, of course, keeps the peace as between the three powers. There is no longer the danger of a great war between the great powers. It is rather the little wars on the periphery that we have to contend with. One satisfactory feature of recent developments is that there has been a *detente* and an approach at understanding between the great powers, the United States and China, in the first place, and then the United States and Moscow in the second place. They have come to an understanding with one another. They have come to formal treaties of under-

standing, no doubt, at the lower level of trade, but this lead to a greater understanding in regard to political differences. Then, we have the phenomenon that we are confronted with on the Indian Ocean, the entry of great powers into the Indian Ocean. Now, it is rather childish and futile for us to protest against the entry of powers into any ocean. The Ocean is free. The high seas are free to all the powers. And who came first into the Indian ocean? After the withdrawal of the British power from the East, it is Russia that has first come into the Indian Ocean with its fleet, no doubt to extend its international influence.

Then the other development that has taken place very recently is the normalisation of the relations between China and Japan. These two great antagonist powers of the 19th and 20th centuries, have approached each other with a view to mutual understanding and cooperation. The result of that, of course, is the neglect of small States like Taiwan and others.

The war between the US and South Vietnam, and North Vietnam is still going on, the war that was initiated by Hanoi, by North Vietnam, with its invasion of South Vietnam, repeating its old game, its old tactics of bringing about the unity Vietnam by military force rather than by peaceful understanding.

Then we have another phenomenon in recent times, a very disturbing phenomenon, and this is the appearance of the letter bombs as a means of bringing about international decisions. The letter bomb has come to India also. Letter bombs have been despatched from India. It has already been acknowledged that India has nothing to do with manufacture and production of these letter bombs. How do these letter bombs come into India? They must have come from outside. How are they allowed to come from outside? Were they smuggled by some illicit means, and how were they allowed to be smuggled into India? What were our Customs organisations doing? India has acquired a bad name as a result of this. Indian mails have been held up in England in order to investigate how many of them carry these letter bombs. Now, in regard to these developments in the international field, what is India's attitude? Here we have

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

three big powers. A good step has been taken by India in concluding the Indo-Soviet Treaty. That should have been followed by other treaties with other powers, a treaty with the United States on the same lines, bringing about mutual understanding and cooperation in the field of trade, in the field of even military help. So, if an approach were made to wards the US and towards China in order to bring about these treaties of mutual help and cooperation, we would have the position of a certain treaty balance, peace being ensured by a balance of treaties. We do not have the power, we have not the military strength to bring about a military balance. But we have this power of bringing about treaties of alliance with the great powers so that the treaty of India with Russia can be balanced by the treaty of India with China and the US. Of course, approaches have to be made. Why does not India make the first approach towards China? When the President of the US, the most powerful military state in the world stooped to conquer and went China and has brought about this treaty with China, why should not India make this approach? Why can India not stoop in order to conquer? Why can they not make this little approach? They have no Ambassadorship in Peking and they have no Chinese Ambassadorship in India. Why can not the Ambassadorship be revived? If not a political treaty, a commercial treaty might be entered into between China and India as the first step.

In regard to the Indian Ocean we can do nothing about except strengthening our Naval defences. That is all we can do to meet this challenge of the great powers in the Indian Ocean. Let us strengthen our Navy in order to face these big powers. Strengthen our coastal defences. Make it possible for us to have a fleet of small attacking ship, motor boats, torpedo boats, petrol boats equipped with torpedoes or missiles. Let us have one Flotilla of ships stationed in Vizag, another on the Western coast and a third in the Andamans and Nicobars so that least our coasts might be protected.

In regard to Vietnam we must take up a more impartial attitude, a more independent attitude than we have done.

We have recognised Hanoi diplomatically. Why should we not go to the same extent in regard to Saigon? If we want to preserve our influence as an international power we must assume an attitude of impartiality and independence. Why should we not be impartial as between Israel and the Arab States? Why should we not extend our hand of friendship towards Israel and enter into diplomatic relations with it? Before independence we went all out in defence of small nations like Israel, one of the smallest nations in the world and it has proved its right to exist by the great things it has done. Therefore, why should we now adopt this partial attitude in regard to our relations with Israel?

Coming nearer home, we have the problem of Pakistan. After the recent war we tried to make peace in the shape of Simla Agreement on 2. 7. 72. Apart from the clauses that dealt with statements of friendship and of peaceful relations or of not resorting to war to solve our difficulties with Pakistan, there was the delicate and the technical question of delimiting the frontiers, the line of control, as it was put. Now that this dispute has been going on for weeks together the military officials have not been able to come to any settlement. This definition and demarcation of the line of control seems to me a very technical matter. I wonder if the representatives of the Defence Forces were consulted at the stage of the Simla agreement in regard to this clause of the Simla Agreement. It seems to me that in such matters the advice of the Army Chief of Staff would have been useful in order to define precisely the technical lines. The relations between the defence policy and the foreign policy are close and I think in future at least the Defence Forces should be consulted whenever technical matters in regard to the delimitation of frontiers or the delimitation of the line of control is discussed.

In conclusion there are certain things that have to be done. First is that in regard to foreign policy there is such question as a total policy. It is not one policy that is wanted in the External Affairs Ministry but policies because we are living from day to day, from hour to hour almost.

Therefore, there cannot be any formulation of a general policy in regard to intern-

ational relations. So the establishment of a Foreign Policy Planning Department seems to me entirely out of place. Foreign policy cannot be planned to cover any period of time, not even five years, not even one year, at the rate at which international relations develop. It was said that Napoleon came to grief because he let loose his imagination upon the formulation of his foreign policy; his imagination led him too far ahead. So I hope that the transfer of the arch-priest of the Foreign Policy planning Department in the External Affairs Ministry will mean the end of this Department.

What is to be India's role in international affairs? Our geographical position India almost stretching its hands towards the east and the west—seems to suggest that it should be the role of a leader in the promotion of peaceful international relations. Militarily also, according to the authoritative report of the *Loudon Times*, it is so far the greatest military power in South Asia. It could become the leader of South and South-East Asia. China, with her normalisation of relations with Japan, seems to aim at being the leader of Asia. Now if that comes to pass, it would be the fault of India for not making use of its opportunities. But if it is to play the part of the leader, it must be absolutely impartial and independent in the formulation of its foreign policy. It must not sympathise with one power against another. It must hold the scales even between all the powers that are contending with each other in South Asia and South-East Asia. If it is necessary, therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that the External Affairs Ministry should pay attention to all these questions because foreign policy or the stand taken in our foreign policy by the Government of India, by the Ministry of External Affairs, may threaten the very existence of India as a free and independent power. It must exercise impartiality and independence, and keep its hands from attachment to any power, however friendly or however sympathetic it may be. It was a saying of President Kennedy that failure in the domestic policy may defeat us but failure in international policy, in foreign policy, may kill us."

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in

the course of their speeches, the hon. Members of the Opposition have tried to make much of the fact, as they say, that the world situation has very much changed since Nehru launched the policy of non-alignment. One gentleman said that it is a new era of bilateralism. Another hon. Member made out the point that new power centres are coming up and that there are now as many as five power centres, and he wanted India to become the sixth power in the world. Then there is another approach which pleads that India should keep the scales even, as the hon. Member Ruthnaswamy, said just now.

I would submit that these premises which they take resort to as foundations for our foreign policy are very much off the mark. The basic factors which lead to the formulation of our foreign policy today remain the same as they were when Nehru launched his policy of non-alignment, and even earlier, when the Congress was fighting for independence and was having an absolutely clear international policy. The fact of the matter is that today the main contradiction in the world remains as before, between the forces of imperialism, forces of domination, and these other forces in the world which stand for freedom, which, having attained freedom, want to consolidate their independence by independent economic development.

No doubt the old colonialism has vanished. In 1919 over 1200 millions out of a world population of 1800 million people, that is, nearly 70 per cent, lived in enslaved colonies, semi-colonies and dominions. Today direct colonial rule has disappeared from most of the countries of Asia and Africa. Only some 30 million people live in colonies in southern Africa, in Angola, in Mozambique and in the Portuguese Colony of Guinea Bissau. They are the only countries which remain under colonial domination. They amount to considerably less than 1 per cent of mankind.

No doubt, after their liberation countries like India have been giving their utmost attention to the dire problems of poverty of their people, of building up their ravaged economies, ravaged by centuries of foreign rule and colonial exploitation. But even

[Shri Harsh Deo Malvia]

to day our conditions are very Poor. These new countries remain basically and predominantly agricultural economies. Exports of agricultural products and raw materials are subjected to all kinds of vagaries by such organisations as the European Economic Community. Per capita industrial production is US\$ 1.25 in under-developed countries, and US\$ 420 in the capitalist States. The world steel production in 1970, according to the figures given by the European Economic Community, was 560 million tons and out of this the share of the third world countries was negligible though more than 30 per cent of the processed consumer goods in the western capitalist countries depends on wealth produced in the third world countries, especially in regard to minerals. We produced 40 per cent of iron ore, 70 per cent of bauxite, 50 per cent of copper and 70 per cent of oil. At the same time the share of the Afro-Asian and other third world countries in the processing industries of the world is bare 6.5 per cent.

As a result, it is essential for us today that we have to industrialise our countries. We can solve our problems of poverty etc. only through developing our industries. But here our industrialisation is opposed by the developed countries. They want us to remain as hewers of wood and drawers of water. The conditions of the third world will be noted by the fact that in Tanzania as much as 90 per cent of the population lives on agriculture; about 85 per cent of Burma's 30 million people live in rural areas; and despite a marked trend towards urbanisation in India, 75 per cent of the 570 million people live in villages. As compared to this in Britain, for example, only 4 per cent of the population lives in the countryside. According to the US economists, William and Kaldor, on an average 12000 people die of starvation in our part of the world. As I was saying, the only possible way in which we can advance is through our industrialisation. Because our industrialisation policy is opposed by them, these countries of the West want us to remain economically backward. They want us to continue as raw material appendages for their industries and as markets for dumping their industrial products. Therefore the basic conflict remains between the newly free countries like India, like Egypt, like Burma, like

Ceylon and the liberated countries of Africa, and the imperialist countries.

Therefore, naturally when we formulate our foreign policy, this fact should be kept in mind. Our foreign policy had always an angle. I will quote from Jawaharlal Nehru. He once said :

"We have to achieve freedom and defend it. We have to meet aggression and to resist it and the forces employed should be adequate to the purpose. But even when preparing to resist aggression, the ultimate objective the objective of peace and reconciliation must never be lost sight of, and heart and mind must be attuned to this supreme aim and not swayed or clouded by hatred or fear. This is the basis and the goal of our foreign policy. We are neither blind to reality nor do we propose to acquiesce in any challenge to man's freedom, from whatever quarter it may come. Where freedom, is menaced, or justice threatened, or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral. What we plead for and endeavour to practise in our own unimportant way is a binding faith in peace and of unfailing endeavour of thought and action to ensure it."

This naturally must lead our friends to believe that our foreign policy is not a policy of keeping the scales even. We cannot be on the side of the United States, when it is bombing the people of Vietnam. We cannot support Israel because Israel is an imperialist tool in the Middle East and it is aggressing against the Arab countries. . .

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh) :
But we shall support USSR when it invades Czechoslovakia.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : May I submit that it is quite consistent with our foreign policy to have signed a treaty of friendship with the Soviet Union because Soviet Union through the 25 years which have elapsed since the Second World War and through over 50 years of its existence in this world has consistently been a friend of all the oppressed peoples. The Soviet Union has come to the aid of Vietnam; the Soviet Union has helped the Arab people to defend their freedom, the Soviet Union has helped India when it was menaced

during the Kashmir trouble and when it was threatened during the war at the time of Bangla Desh struggle for independence. Naturally, if we are today friendly with the Soviet Union, it is not because, as is being thought by some people with diseased minds that we are going to the Communist camp. This is utter nonsense. The fact is that we are friends of the Soviet Union which is an anti-imperialist power.

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : सावन में जो अन्धे होते हैं, वे ऐसे ही होते हैं । :

The new method which is being adopted by the Western imperialist countries to dominate us goes by the name of neo colonialism. In the economic field, it seeks to keep the Afro-Asian nations as economic appendages of the capitalist States. Neo colonialism is the modern Imperialist policy towards the newly free countries and the objective of this policy is the same old objective, namely, economic exploitation. This is today the main confrontation. This is the confrontation ultimately and the final result of this confrontation will decide the future shape of the world. And very rightly, Sir, under the able leadership of our respected Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, India has been following this policy.

Sir, there have been grumblings in this House and outside also about our having recognised North Vietnam. They ask why we have recognised North Vietnam and why we have recognised the German Democratic Republic. These are Sir, let them understand, mere culminations of certain policies which we have from the beginning pursued. We have always upheld in Vietnam the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own destiny, to secure their own freedom and to decide their fate uninterfered by any imperialist country.

Sir, we are faced with the problem of development and in this connection, very rightly our foreign policy has clearly aligned itself with the policies of the vast nations of Africa and Asia. Sir at the Lusaka Summit Conference in September, 1970, our Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, received the greatest ovation and let our friends know that if the policy we had pursued had been what they say should be

the policy, this would not have been our fate. At that Conference, our Prime Minister, Shrimati Gandhi, received the biggest ovation and she said in the course of her speech :

"The big powers have never accepted the validity of non-alignment. Neither colonialism nor racialism have vanished. The old comes in the new guise."

"Powerful vested interests, domestic and foreign, are combining to erect new structures of neo-colonialism and a realistic appraisal of our natural resources, our capacities and our competence reveals the possibility for us to work together to reduce our dependence upon those who do not respect our sovereignty."

"Neo-colonialism has no sympathy with our objective of self-reliance. It seeks to perpetuate our position of disadvantage. International markets are manipulated in such a way that primary producing countries have a permanent handicap. Levers of technology are also operated against us through unequal collaboration and royalty agreements."

Furthermore, Sir, at the same Conference, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our Prime Minister, said :

"We are painfully aware of the pitfalls of aid in which the bulk of credits are tied to projects from the donor countries and also of the fact that a big portion of new credits goes to the repayment of old loans."

Posing the question as to whether "the developing countries should wait in the hope that some day a change of heart would take place among the developed countries", Mrs. Gandhi said that "we should not expect miracles of magnanimity."

Therefore, Sir, the basic essence of our foreign policy, whether viewed from the point of view of maintenance of our sovereignty, or from the point of view upholding our sovereignty which was also one of the objectives of our fight for freedom, or from the point of view of raising the living standards of millions of our people, remains the same. Our

[श्री एस० डी० मिश्र]

criterion remains the same and it is this criterion, which we have followed so far, has come in for criticism from some elements, either here or abroad, elements who do not see eye to eye with the anti-imperialistic character of our foreign policy and who ask that we keep the balance between the various powers. They want us to be just, without realizing what real justice is. Sir, I have little time at my disposal.

I would now like to say something about Pakistan. People have been critical about our Simla talks. May I submit—perhaps it will have a better appeal to their minds—that it was Mr. Winston Churchill, for whom I think they have some respect, who said once, "Talk-talk is better than war-war". And what we are doing with Pakistani is 'talk-talk'. Our friends have tried to make much out of the visit of Nixon to Peking. It is good as far as it goes, and we welcome this . . .

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Moscow also.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Our Government has welcomed this. But let them remember—and I specially ask Dr. Bhai Mahavir to remember—that through the last 14-15 years the Chinese Ambassadors and the American Ambassadors have been meeting in Warsaw, and the talks never stopped. They might have stopped for a period of year or a year and a half when there were certain tensions arising. But, by and large, the talks had been going on, and there is no harm in talks.

But, Sir, we must also be aware of another reality, and that is the reality of the Pakistan military junta. . . [Time Bell rings]

Sir, I will finish very soon. This military junta, which is ruling Pakistan, was propped up by the British rulers when the entire national movement was fighting imperialism. The British tried to prop up vested interests in the land to fight the national movement. They succeeded nowhere. The landlords had no influence anywhere except in Punjab. In Punjab the landlords were propped up to resist national movement. It is the same class of landlords who

were antinational, who were anti-Gandhi, who were anti-Congress, who fought against the independence movement, it is that very class which entered into the bureaucracy. This old reactionary, feudal, bureaucratic junta, continues to rule Pakistan, in spite of what Bhutto might say. And, therefore, while we are talking, I am sure, we should at the same time continue to strengthen ourselves. There are the latest reports from Pakistan about the built-up of arms. There have been reports in the papers saying that their army strength has gone up to more than 500,000. These are the things which are going on . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Wind up . . .

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : In conclusion, Sir,—I have very little time . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is no time. You will have to wind up.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Just two minutes. In conclusion, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of our hon. Foreign Minister to the question of Indian Ocean. It is true, as Shri Ruthnaswamy has pointed out, that the Indian Ocean is an open zone. Any ship can come and nobody can stop it. That's true. But also, Indian Ocean is a zone with which India is very much connected. Indian Ocean which a zone in is all the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean are interested, and it is the unanimous will of all the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean that Indian ocean should remain a zone of peace, a nuclear-free zone. In this respect, our Government has been constantly moving in the matter. I would suggest that our foreign Minister may take the initiative to call a meeting of all the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean to discuss the question of peace. If officially they cannot do it, there are non-official organizations which are interested in this respect, and non-official organizations should be encouraged . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up. I have given you enough warning . . .

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Lastly, I would like to pay a tribute to our Foreign Minister who has played his part well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Abu.

SHRI ABRAHAM ABU (Nominated) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, reference has been made in this House to the old saying that there are no permanent friends, but only permanent interests. There is a certain amount of truth in it, of course. But I think it is also rather a cynical statement. I think it is a somewhat inaccurate statement, too because the interests of a country are seldom permanent. They change with generation. They change as the values of a nation change. It is equally true to say that there are no permanent enemies, so that the aim of our foreign policy ought to be to make friends with those who have been our enemies.

But what is absolutely incontrovertible and which even Dr Bhai Mahavir will agree with me, is that we have permanent neighbours. To my mind, the truly permanent interest of a country is its permanent neighbours, and I think that our permanent neighbours ought to be the central idea of any foreign policy. Today when we look around the world and study the new alignments, we find that ideological rivalries are becoming a thing of the past. I think this is not a bad development. Today the great task that the world is facing is the problem of poverty and the problem of developing the cultures of different people. In this context, ideological competition has become irrelevant I am, therefore, putting forward the thesis that only a new feeling of regionalism—I mean a continental regionalism—can promote our interests in the short term and in the long term.

Because of our recent history, we are today an Asian people with our heads turned towards the West. It is time that we turn our heads properly to the East. Our foreign policy ought not to be based on our recent history, but on our history of the last 2000 years and on Asia's history of the last 2000 years. We have got to rediscover our own past as well as the past of our neighbours. Asia has produced the great religions of the world. Asia has some of the most

developed and refined cultures. These religions and these cultures have a basic unity which should lead us to an era of cultural, political and economical co-operation.

If this basic idea of Asian unity and Asian co-operation is accepted, then we have to think in terms of how best to promote this idea. As things stand today, our relations with our immediate neighbours and with the other Asian nations are at best lukewarm and half-hearted. There has been some talk, in recent years, about Asian unity but I do not think we have done anything so far that can be called bold or imaginative in this direction. Hon. Members who have visited South East Asia will, no doubt, have noticed how miserably poor is the effort we are making to bring India and the great countries of that region together. Most of our embassies in this part are still 'B' and 'C' class embassies, poorly staffed and poorly-financed. Two years ago when I was in Cambodia, I noticed that our diplomatic staff there consisted of just two people, the Ambassador and the First Secretary. The First Secretary was Political Secretary, Cultural Secretary and Press Attache, all rolled into one. If you talk to young people in Vietnam or Cambodia or Thailand or Malaysia, you realise how little they know about India, how little interest they have in our country and whatever little they know is biased and prejudiced, often based on their experience with petty businessmen or with the coolies they have seen on the streets. We have neglected these countries far too long. Even today, just count the number of cultural delegation and other delegations that go to London, Paris or Berlin every year and compare them with the number of delegations that go to Cambodia, Indonesia or Malaysia. You will find that we take much less interest in these Asian neighbouring countries than we do in European countries. So, I say that we have got to rethink the entire situation. We, in this country, have to develop much more interest in the Asian countries and then only we can expect the other Asian countries to take interest in us. There are many things we can do. We can, for instance, encourage more of our students to go to South-East Asian and East Asian countries and we should have more of their students

[Shri Abraham Abu.]

coming here. We should vastly expand our publicity efforts in these regions. We should organise cultural programmes on a big scale.

Sir, many of the old alliances have disappeared. The Commonwealth is on the decline. I believe that Asia as a Continent tied together by centuries of history has a great future if we build up close cooperation between the different countries of the region.

What we should attempt is an Asian Common Market, an economic and cultural common market of Asia. I believe that if we work towards this end then we may find that the present differences with our neighbours are really not fundamental but superficial and temporary. Ultimately we shall achieve a democratic, secular, independent and also prosperous Asia, an Asia free from poverty and conflict, an Asia free from the interference of imperialist powers. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : I do not think the hon. Minister has made a note of what he has said; he has voiced the sentiments of the people as a whole.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has taken note of everybody's opinion.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. I rise to express a certain disquiet I feel about the trends which our foreign policy is assuming again of late. To me it appears that after the Indo-Pak war and the emergence of Bangla Desh a certain complacency and self-satisfaction seems to have set—in a certain taking of things for granted—and though it might well be that we are going to this conference or that or expressing ourselves in international affairs in one forum or another, we seem to be really not assessing events properly or taking adequate steps in time. Events seem to overtake us and then we rush hither and thither and try to do something. Uganda is only a small instance in point. We were taken by surprise by the events there. We had not assessed how things were going on there not only from the point of view

of what the Ugandan Government itself was doing but also from the point of view of what the imperialist powers who are still intriguing quite a lot in the continent of Africa and what they were doing so that today what we are able to do in respect of Uganda and the situation which has arisen there affecting our country is very much in the nature of only salvage operations, minimising the damage as much as possible now.

Our Government claims that our foreign policy is non-aligned. I want to question this on the basis of certain facts relating to the position of our own Government. It appears to me rather a case of our country dependent now on the capitalist powers, now on the socialist powers and indulging in a sort of play-between from time to time with dependence on imperialist powers still dominating many aspects of our foreign policy.

As many friends have already pointed out, it is a fast changing international situation in which we are living today; we cannot take things for granted. Friends become enemies and enemies are becoming friends and many new alignments are taking place. We have to keep a close watch over the day-to-day events, how they are happening. We do have to react quickly to those events. We have to see that we do take an independent policy of our own, dictated purely by our own national interest.

The United States is no longer such a super capitalist power as it appeared to be some years ago. We saw the dollar in the doledrums only last year. Now the United States is itself being seriously challenged in the world market by the rise of West Germany and Japan. Today it is not having things its own way. The European Common Market in which the Western European capitalist powers have banded themselves together, is an institution which they have organised to meet the challenge of America and this has added to the crisis of the United States imperialism. Therefore, we must see and assess from time to time, what is happening, the strength of each country, the problems it is facing, whether it is still retaining its old strength, etc. Today not only in the United States—of course in the United

States—but also in Britain, Italy, France, and far off places from Europe like Japan, another capitalist country, there are strikes galore, mounting unemployment, economic difficulties and interneene rivalries as among themselves.

Therefore, it is all the more necessary when our Government decides its foreign policy and the measures in pursuance of such a policy, that it does not have to kow-tow to this particular power or that power or be dependent on any of these imperialist powers, whatever might have been the position years and years ago. Today we are a big country with a huge reserve of big manpower, with unlimited natural resources and we have a Government which really can take independent decisions provided—and only provided—it does not depend on foreign imperialist powers, as unfortunately my complaint is it is still doing so today. If you take Africa, for instance, in this changing world, within the last two decades 41 countries have become independent and, as has been pointed out by my another friend, it is only about say 10 per cent perhaps of Africa's population which is still in colonial bondage and is not yet free. The imperialists who grabbed Africa and cut it out into slices, shared it out among themselves between 1870 and round about the beginning of this century, had to face rising national liberation struggles and had eventually to concede freedom to many of these African countries. Yet they continue their economic hold and their economic exploitation there. There is rivalry among the imperialist powers. But this process is also rousing resentment and resistance of the local people leading to nationalisation of foreign resources and so on. Africa is in ferment.

1 P. M.

The liberation struggles have succeeded in many countries. Imperialism is really not able to dictate terms to what was once called Black Africa or the Dark Continent any longer. We are far far away from the days when the imperialists could dictate terms to the African people. Even if you just pass on for one minute to the South American continent there again you will find that it was the preserve of America. We are all familiar with the Munroe Doctrine of more than a century ago by which the American imperialists reserved to them-

selves the right to exploit South America without any European rival imperialist Governments coming and penetrating South American market. In South America 220 big monopoly combines of America control 90 per cent of the investment in South America today. I am talking of Latin America but it is in those countries that the flag of revolt has been unfurled against this imperialist oppression. A country like Peru, for instance, has nationalised the International Petroleum Company; a country like Chile, for instance, has nationalised big concerns like the Anakonda Copper Mines and many other concerns. Today the American merchants feel that except for Brazil and Mexico in no other country of the South American continent is there any possibility of their dominating and trying to earn super profits as they used to do exclusively as their sole monopoly.

Sir, can I continue after lunch ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How much more time will you take ?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : I would like to take another 15 minutes or so.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can continue and finish now. We can sit for another ten minutes.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : What is the harm if we adjourn now and he continues after lunch ?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : That is what I thought.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) : If he wants to conclude after lunch, we can adjourn now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right. The House stands adjourned till 2.00.

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

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Venkataraman to continue.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, a reference to the fast changing world situation will not be complete with our a reference also to the socialist half of the world. I was still now speaking only about the capitalist countries. There, of course, you do not come across reports about the unemployment problem or economic crises, as is known in the capitalist countries, but then the biggest thing there is the division in the socialist camp also the inimical position of the Soviet Union and the peoples' Republic of China towards each other.

That is one of the important things in the world situation; also it has its reflection on the world situation and it should come within our purview also whenever we take decisions about our own matters. My request is that with this as a background, in this background, the problems of the international issues must also be seen and then we will see how inadequate our own decisions have been or our performance has been in the light of such a fast-changing world, where old values are no longer there, where even the new values are changing very rapidly, where the alignments are changing rapidly. With this orientation of a changing world, how far are we sticking to our policy which we claim to be neutral, non alignment, and so on. I will take one point and illustrate my position. I will take our own experience. Have we learnt those lessons ? Are we consistent with what we profess to be our foreign policy when it comes to a question of practical steps ? I will take the question of Vietnam.

Vietnam is the place where not only current history but also the future of the world is being decisively made. That war has been going on for some years now. A small country, a little country—North and South Vietnam together, with hardly 3 crores of people—was attacked by American imperialists with all the devilish inventions of science in the service of the war. And it looks as though they are trying to see the end of that conflict at least now. But nobody is sure at least until that peace treaty is signed.

Now, I want to illustrate our own professions and practice with reference to the issue of this war. In 1954, an agreement was arrived at after the French imperialists were sent out of Vietnam that the future of Vietnam should be determined in the way which the 1954 Agreement laid down. India took a very big part in bringing about that Agreement and rightly India was made Chairman of the International Control Commission for the implementation of the 1954 Agreement. Then it was decided that the country would be one eventually. But for the time being, there were to be two administrations in the North Vietnam and South Vietnam. Secondly, after one year, elections would have to be held to unify the entire country. Thirdly, it was said and laid down that no arms should be brought into the country and no conflict should be engendered. But then, within one year, it was America that broke this Agreement, came into Vietnam, got control of South Vietnam Government and started its aggression. The people of South Vietnam resented this and they had to take to arms to fight the South Vietnamese Government and the American imperialism at its back. My point is this : At that time, was it not our moral responsibility as Chairman of the International Control Commission to bring this unwanted aggression of the US to the notice of the public to mobilise even our own people against American aggression. When a democratic peaceful procedure had been laid for the unification of the Vietnamese people how is it that it is being upset by American action ? But then we did not do it. My point is that we did not do it because we looked to the American imperialism for loans, for aid, for the progress of our Plans, we did not want to offend them, and we kept mum.

Unfortunately, that cruel war went on. More bombs were showered in this Vietnam war than in all the theatres of the war in the second World War. But the people in an unprecedented way which history has never seen till now heroically fought it back. Then bit by bit the People's Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, which was set up against the Americans and the Saigon Government, came into possession of larger and extensive territories. The Americans went on bombing. They bombed North Vietnam also. Till then

what was our position? My point is how our professions and practice are contradictory. We merely said, "Withdraw foreign troops from Vietnam". We would not say "Withdraw American troops from Vietnam". In those days we did not even condemn bombing to start with in the early stages nor did we stop having talks with the Saigon Government backed by American imperialism. We were actually selling tanks and war material to them. Finally, a stage came after some years when the Bangla Desh issue came up in our own country. The Indo-Pak war came. Then we could see the naked face of American imperialism for our ownself. Our eyes were opened. And it was at that time that we decided to call Madam Binh, Foreign Minister of the People's Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, to tour India. Later on the way in which the United States in the Indo-Pak war called our country the aggressor, the way in which they helped Pakistan with arms and ammunition, the way in which they brought the Seventh Fleet into the Bay of Bengal, woke us up and we found that American imperialism really is the enemy of democratic urge, of freedom, of the urges of a freedom, and that it is after that that we started criticising American actions. Then we suddenly discovered that the American funds and the American aid are always for some political pressures on countries. Then we talked of self-reliance. Then we talked of aid without strings. And we also said that the seven-point peace proposal put forward by the People's Revolutionary Government of Vietnam must be taken up. Now I ask in all seriousness: Are we sliding back now? Are the lessons of the Bangla Desh war period forgotten? Are the statements during the Indo-Pak war period merely paper statements? Have we forgotten the experience of those days? Why are we even now hesitating to ask the United States to sign the treaty of peace without stalling the issues? It is not a question of thinking why we should interfere in somebody else's affairs? We have seen face to face what pressure American imperialism can bring. Should not a demand be made that the United States should right now sign the treaty somehow? Saying it is for the sake of peace President Nixon went to China when the elections were to be held in America. Sir, it is one of the tragedies

of the current history that the U.S.S.R., the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are at logger-heads.

Instead of a united socialist camp finishing off imperialism, a divided socialist camp is sought to be utilised by the imperialists. And the tragedy was that the Nixon-Peking joint communique or the Nixon-Soviet Union joint communique did not condemn the bombing in Vietnam. They would not even postpone the visit of Nixon. They received Nixon when he was continuing the attack in Vietnam, when America was still continuing the war in the most hideous way, with laser rays and what not, against the unfortunate people of North Vietnam. And the two socialist giants could not come together. No doubt, they helped enormously the North Vietnamese people with arms and ammunition. But they could have done more. They could have jointly and effectively intervened; then the Americans could not have continued the war. And South-East Asia would not be the cockpit of fighting which it is now. Therefore, I say that effective action should have been taken by them. Anyway that is not a matter I am bothered about, so far as our policy is concerned, on which alone I will now make a few points and conclude.

My point is, we are not acting against aggression and for freedom, consistent with what we say. We should tell the American Government that they should sign the treaty. Of course, it is said that the details are being worked out. Now they say that Kissinger has gone back and the talks have been adjourned till the 4th of December. But what prevents us from stating our viewpoint fairly, openly and in a forthright way? It is not a question of interference in any particular country's affairs. It is a question of war and peace. We are for peace; we are not for war. We are a non-aligned country. We want peace to prevail in every part of the globe. Therefore, we should not try to take shelter behind any plea and say that it is not a matter which concerns us to express our point of view in a forthright way. So, that makes me very apprehensive that we are sliding back from a policy which became more and more anti U.S. imperialist at the time of Bangla Desh to one which is again going back to the old days of dependence

[Shri Mr. Venkataraman]

on American imperialism. Now my view was confirmed when I say some recent statements of our Finance Minister, Mr. Chavan when he was in Washington. This is what he is reported to have said, addressing the National Press Club and earlier at a dinner given by our Indian Ambassador there, Mr. L.K. Jha :

He (our Finance Minister) "feels quite convinced that there is a certain abiding warmth in the relations between the two pre-eminent democracies of the east and the west." (the pre-eminent democracies being ourselves and America.)

"We cannot be prisoners of the past. We must look ahead." . . . "Ind'a was not reluctant to sign a treaty of friendship with the U.S. similar to the one signed with Russia."

Now my point is, even at the time we signed the treaty with the Soviet Union, it was said that we will sign a similar treaty with any other country. But what is the context now? The context now is, when you have had the 7th Fleet here, when you have had the Bangla Desh experience, when you have had America aiding Pakistan against us, when you have openly come out with several statements about the dangers of taking American aid, when eminent leaders of the Government go about the country and criticise the United States of America, pointedly talking about the CIA and its nefarious activities, here is our esteemed Finance Minister pleading for propitiating America during his recent visit there.

Now, I do not take it as Mr. Chavan's responsibility alone or Mr. Jha's responsibility alone. It is Government of India's policy. In fact, Mr. Chavan actually quoting our Prime Minister... "India is grateful for the assistance from the United States in many areas of our development" "We have always recognised the pre-eminent role which the United States has played in the past in helping India's development." These things come now. No wonder that Mr. Chavan in that visit did not condemn the bombing of Vietnam. On the other hand, during his visit, at a time when war was still continuing and bombing was going on, he went out of his way and said that they are

planning to end the war by negotiations. This certificate was unnecessary for the American imperialism. What I am saying, there is a Tamil proverb which means "the tiger cannot become a vegetarian. Even if it is hungry, it does not become a vegetarian." In much the same way imperialism does not change. The leopard does not change its spots. Therefore, we have to be very careful, very vigilant, our Ministers have to be very, very vigilant, about their pronouncements. They have to be watching their steps very carefully when they commit our country to positions which apparently come into violent conflict with pronouncements officially made on the floor of Parliament itself. Therefore, I would say, every word of what Mr. Chavan said must have had Government of India's clearance and it was not his own individual statement or anything like that. Therefore, I am apprehensive whether our foreign policy is quietly and slowly sliding back. For instance, take the recent invitation to the British capital, American capital or Japanese capital or the West German capital to come and set up industries here promising them cheap labour, promising them permission for unlimited exports of goods that they manufacture here. Of course, it has not yet started because in England there is a hue and cry that these industries should not go because there will be unemployment and so many people will be thrown out of their jobs there. These are straws in the wind. These things seem to indicate a sliding back, a throw back, in our foreign policy, however much, ignoring the complicated world situation, ignoring that we are formally committed to a policy of non-alignment. I say the world consists of the capitalist world and the socialist world and there is no middle world. At least the middle world to which we claim to belong, must be firmly anti-imperialist. We have got an old anti-imperialist tradition. Let us be true to our tradition. Let us be firm. Our image suffers in the eyes of many countries of the third world because they feel that we are not sufficiently anti-imperialist. That is why I say that the cornerstone of our foreign policy must firmly be anti-imperialist. We must have an independent policy. There is no question of our being soft to imperialists of any brand whatsoever. I want only to add now about the CIA. I am mentioning

about it only as a passing thought. There is so much talk about the CIA. This is no new discovery so far as my party is concerned. We have been warning the Government about the nefarious activities of the CIA for years now. Why does not the Government take steps instead of merely talking about it ? Why should the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Peace Corps and things like that go on being permitted ? Are they or are they not injuring our country ? I want to refer to this question because there again it is a question of not non-alignment, but of being soft, now leaning on one side, the capitalist side, then leaning on the other side, the socialist side, and then try somehow to balance. Eventually we wobble and the result is that our policy is not firm and our policy is not anti-imperialist and ultimately our country comes to grief, and our national interests are affected. Therefore. I would appeal to the Foreign Minister to state categorically that our policy is one which is consistently anti-imperialist and we are not going to depend on imperialism. The recent events have raised apprehension in the minds of people that the Government of India, while talking of non-alignment, is really going towards collaboration with the imperialists. At any rate they are listening to the voice of the big business and acting according to their advice. This is against national interests.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Prof Ruthnaswamy in the forenoon said that there should not be a general foreign policy of a country and that every issue must be tackled on the basis of different policies. He talked of series of policies to tackle different problems that confront us. I do not understand really what he meant. In driving a car one has to take care of the steering, the brake, the gear, the clutch and the accelerator. If five persons are allowed to operate these five parts, I do not know where the car will go. Therefore, I insist that there must be a basic policy of a country and that necessarily has to be flexible and capable of being applied in different ways in different situations and circumstances. But there is no doubt that the country must have a basic policy.

Prof. Ruthnaswamy talked of balance

of treaties and so, on. Most probably he wanted that the Government of India's policy should do one of neutralism. I would like to make it very clear that non-alignment, as I understand it, is not neutralism. Whenever there is an event or a situation in any part of the world, it is not that we adopt a neutral attitude and say that we have nothing to say about that. We certainly have an attitude and we have something to say. If there is bombing in Vietnam, we condemn that. If there is aggression somewhere, we certainly condemn it. If people somewhere are fighting for their freedom, we certainly support that struggle. In all situations we do not adopt a neutral attitude. Non-alignment is not a policy of neutralism as Prof Ruthnaswamy would like us to believe.

Yesterday in the debate, the whole policy of non-alignment was attacked. It was said that non-alignment was born in a certain context. When we were between two power camps and did not want to align with any particular camp, the policy of non-alignment was accepted. True. Then they said that the situation has since changed and the pattern of power structure has changed and therefore according to them—particularly Dr. Bhai Mahavir and my esteemed friend Nana Saheb Goray—non-alignment has no relevance today. These hon. friends have forgotten that along with the development of the situation in the world and along with the changing pattern of the world structure, non-alignment also has developed and has progressed. Non-alignment is not a negative policy just as non-violence enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi is also not a negative policy. It has a positive aspect and it is a dynamic concept which means that we must march forward. Policy of non-alignment is a policy of anti-imperialism; policy of non-alignment is a policy of anti-colonialism; policy of non-alignment is a policy of peace and co-existence. It is a policy of respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

It is a policy of non-interference in others affairs; It is a policy of equality amongst nations, big or small, in the world; and it is a policy of co-operation in place of confrontation. These are the positive

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

aspects of the policy of non-alignment and these ideas have developed during the last 25 years or so. I am sorry, Sir that my friend, Dr. Bhai Mahavir and my esteemed friend, Shri Goray, did not take any note of these things and it is in this context only that we have to see what we have done and what the situation today is in the world.

Sir, my friend from the CPM made a long speech and the substance of his speech was that India had not taken an anti-imperialist stand consistently. Sir, I was amazed to listen to it, to listen to a speech of this kind from a very old and experienced honourable Member of this House. In fact, it was India which first took up the stand against imperialism in the world and India was the standard torch-bearer in this respect, India was the forerunner and India was the leader in the anti-imperialist struggles in the anti-imperialist campaigns, in the world, and others followed us as a matter of course, as a matter of historical course.

Can you give one instance during the last 25 years when India has not taken a stand against colonialist rule and imperialist domination? Give us one instance. Have we not taken an anti-imperialist stand so far? Have we not condemned the bombing in Vietnam? Have we not condemned colonialism? Sir, he quoted from Mr. Chavan's speech. You cannot judge the policy of the Government by quoting from the speech of a Minister made somewhere, by quoting from some speech here and some elsewhere. If Mr. Chavan in that particular context did not have to say anything about Vietnam, may I remind my honourable friend from the CPM that in the joint communiques of America and Russia and America and China there was no word of condemnation of the bombing in Vietnam? Why blame us alone? All the time we cannot go about shouting the same slogan. We have condemned it; we have supported the cause of the Vietnamese people; we stand by them; we honour them and we admire them for their courage and bravery in their fight against the biggest imperialist nation in the world.

Sir, the world has changed. Yes, it has changed. Ever since Moscow signed a treaty with Germany, the changing pattern has started. Then came the talk of a European security system; then, Sir, there was the Sino-US *rapprochement*; and, Sir, there was US-Russia *rapprochement*. All these developments are very significant and are very important and they have certainly brought changes in the world's power structure today. There is a move for detente and so on. What do these developments indicate? Sir, yesterday, our friends suggested that in view of these changes and in the context of the new situation in the world today, we have to change our policy of non-alignment. But, Sir, may I very humbly ask them what these changes indicate? What do we see now? Non-alignment asked for, was projected for, was propagated for, co-operation in place of confrontation. If the USA and the Soviet Russia go in for co-operation in place of confrontation and if the USA goes in for co-operation in place of confrontation with China, is it not an achievement of the policy of non-alignment? If it is not, what is it then? Only because they have done this and they have not declared their policy to be a policy of non alignment does it make any difference? This is what we have been shouting for and this is what India and the other countries in the non-aligned camp have been fighting for and this is the result of it. And, Sir, today it has been proved that international issues, that world problems, cannot be solved by a policy of confrontation, but must be solved by a policy of co-operation and this is the achievement of the policy of non-alignment.

So, Sir, I submit that all these developments that have taken place in the world today have amply vindicated the basic principles of non-alignment and some of these principles have even been incorporated in the joint communiques issued from Moscow and Peking.

Sir, what is this *detente* between the US and China? Dr. Bhai Mahavir, the great intellectual as he is, gave us a learned lecture yesterday and he had only one thing to say.

He said that this *rapprochement* between America and China is because of China

having acquired atomic and nuclear power. A fantastic argument ! Didn't Russia have nuclear power long ago ? Was there any *detente* between Russia and USA during the last 25 years, in spite of Russia having atomic power and nuclear power ? China's possession of nuclear power is not the motivation behind this rapprochement between America and China.

I think there are five factors behind this development.

Dollar crisis and America's search for new markets is the first factor. Second factor is that China is in need of scientific and technological assistance from USA. It can't help it. China has to take scientific and technological assistance from USA. That is in China's interest and the first factor is in America's interest. Then, the third factor is Russia-China rivalry. In the context of Russia-China rivalry, Russia wants the friendship of America and China also wants the friendship of America. And America wants to exploit them both; America wants to exploit the situation. The fourth factor is that America has lost the battle in Vietnam. What is to be done to counter-balance this discomfiture ? They have to do something. And that's why all these moves for rapprochement between America and China, and Russia and America. The fifth cause that was, and which is not there today, the Presidential election in America. Since Nixon failed miserably in Vietnam, since the prospect before him in Vietnam was very gloomy, he wanted to tell his people : My friends, although we are losing, we are making new inroads into Peking and Moscow. These are the five basic causes for this move for *detente* between America and China and between America and Russia—not the nuclear power theory.

Dr. Bhai Mahavir has said that our policy was wrong, and he has advised us to re-model our policy on the basis of one principle : Increase the national strength. Nanasahab Goray has said that there are five powers today in the world and that India has the potentiality to become the 6th power. In other words, he also wanted that the only policy we should follow is the policy of develop our own strength.

Sir, firstly, I must make it clear that I am not in favour of India going nuclear. There are various reasons why I am opposed to India going nuclear. The most important reason is financial. We are not in a position to spend billions to produce a nuclear bomb when millions are hungry and suffering. Secondly, India never had the objective to become a super power—the centre of power. Never. Neither, in the days of Pt. Nehru, nor these days. We are large in size, big in size. Even then India will treat everybody on an equal footing. And we want to be treated on an equal footing by others.

What is the meaning of building national strength ? Dr. Bhai Mahavir and Nanasahab Goray said yesterday; "Build Strength."

We have to achieve economic prosperity. But to build economic prosperity, you must have peace. Economic prosperity cannot be achieved with a policy of confrontation. To build economic prosperity you must have a policy of non-alignment and a policy of peace. And that is precisely what non-alignment means. And, therefore, even in the context of today, non-alignment is a valid policy. That is the correct policy—a policy of peace, friendship and cooperation—that we are pursuing. If a policy helps developing ourselves—not only ourselves, but other countries also by following that policy—that is the only way in which this world can make progress.

Sir, Dr. Bhai Mahavir said that our chief objective should be not peace, but national interest. Where is the contradiction ? Attainment of peace or maintenance of peace and serving the national interest of this country, in my opinion, are synonymous and identical. One is tied with the other. Peace is required for economic prosperity. Therefore, there is no contradiction between the two.

Sir, they have criticised non-alignment. May I ask them as to what is the alternative ? If not non-alignment, then alignment with whom ? With whom should we align ? That is the basic question. Why criticise non-alignment ? If you criticise non-alignment, you must be able to say : align with so and so. You talk of a policy of neutral

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

lism and all that. My contention is that it is not non-alignment, but it is the policy of alignment that has failed. Why is it that the American camp is broken into parts today ? Is not the Soviet camp broken up into parts, just as my friend from CPM said that the socialist camp is divided ? The capitalists' game of defeating the policy of non-alignment has failed. Both the camps have cracked and the policy of non-alignment alone is making progress. Otherwise, more than 80 countries today would not have adopted the policy of non-alignment. Every new country that is coming up, every new country that is becoming independent and attaining freedom is adhering to non-alignment. If this policy does not serve the cause of the developing countries and backward countries and if this policy is so bad, then why should every new country that is coming up and attaining freedom should accept this policy of non-alignment ?

Therefore, in the present context, most important and vital task for the non aligned countries is to build up closer cooperation between the smaller nations for economic and social development, for freedom from colonial stranglehold and for mutual settlement of problems through a policy of bilateralism.

Sir, I would like to sound a note of warning. Although the power camps have cracked and the whole picture is changing, the concept of sphere of influence in international affairs still remains a very dangerous factor in the world politics today. We must guard ourselves against that. We have taken several steps against that. But the most important step is the Simla Agreement. What is the Simla Agreement ? We never said that the Simla Agreement had solved all the problems between India and Pakistan. We said that it was a step in a right direction. It has called for a policy of cooperation and bilateral settlement of problems instead of confrontation. That is what the Simla Agreement said. Now Dr. Bhai Mahavir, in his long speech. I think he spent three-fourths of his time talking about the Simla Agreement. What is wrong with the Simla Agreement ? He said that Bhutto had said this and Bhutto had said that. Our Commanders met 9 times or 10 times and still there is no

solution. May I ask him one simple question ? Since the Simla Agreement was signed on the 2nd of July 1972, since that date are we going in a progressive direction or a regressive direction ?

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Rajasthan) : Where are we going ?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Please don't interrupt me. You had enough time.

माथुर साहब, आप समझते तो बहुत कम हैं, समझने की कोशिश कीजिए ।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : ठीक है आप बताइये ।

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : In which direction are we going ? Has Pakistan repudiated the Simla Agreement ? Has it been declared as completely void ? Has anything like that happened after the Simla Agreement was signed ? Has there not been exchange of civilian and military prisoners ? Has there not been sufficient progress made even on the question of delineation of the line of control ? May be we have not made progress over one and three-quarters of square miles, but have we not made progress ? My question is, after we signed this Agreement have we made progress or not ? Of is there any reason for us to say, well, this has failed; we renounce it and go back to a policy of confrontation ? Has Mr. Bhutto said that ? Has any Pakistani leader said that ? This is the question to be answered. We have made progress. Progress is slow; progress is slower than what we expected. But that does not mean that we are going backwards. We are going forwards. However slow the progress may be, there is no doubt in anybody's mind that we are going forward towards our objective of making the Simla Agreement a complete success.

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : कोलू का ब्रेक दिन भर चलने के बाद भी वहीं का वहीं रहना है ।

श्री उपसभापति : समय बहुत कम है उनको बोलने दीजिए ।

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Goray Saheb said yesterday that we must have a final and positive policy towards Pakistan. In all humility I submit to my senior colleague that there is no finality in international affairs. So far as the positive side of it is concerned, I think after signing the Simla Agreement we have adopted a positive policy towards Pakistan.

Dr. Alva said a very interesting thing in his speech, that we won the war last year by the grace of God. Maybe, I do not know; I also do not know whether God exists or does not exist; whether He was gracious or ungracious I do not know. But to deny the achievement of others, to refuse to give credit to others and give all the credit to God for winning the war sounded something very strange, very much comical I should say. In my opinion, Sir, we won the war because of the complete unity that was shown by the people of this country. We won the war because of the high standard of skill and efficiency and bravery shown by our armed forces. We won the war because we fought for a cause, a right and just cause. We won the war, above all, because of the superb and dynamic leadership provided by the Prime Minister which has been acclaimed by the whole world; nobody can deny it. Why are you so shy in giving credit to whom it rightly belongs? The whole world has acknowledged the superb and dynamic leadership she provided in the whole operation last year. Everybody here was nervous and trembling when the refugees were coming when the atrocities were going on in East Pakistan. Everybody was trembling here, but the Government stood firm on its ground, pursued its policy and plan steadily with confidence and faith and ultimately the war was won in a matter of fourteen days. (*Time bell rings*) I have come here to close, Sir.

Dr. Bhai Mahavir has also said that our Ministers including the Prime Minister went round the whole world the result was that in the General Assembly of the United Nations 104 votes went against us. Sir, Dr. Bhai Mahavir has forgotten what happened immediately after that. It is true that in the General Assembly 104 votes went against us. But what happened in the Security Council meeting itself when the honourable Sardar Swaran Singh was present? What

happened there? Most probably he does not remember or he has forgotten conveniently. A snap vote means nothing. Please remember, America, the most powerful nation in the world also lost in the United Nations on the issue of admission of China, America also lost. Does it mean that America lost all its influence and strength?

This is all a very cheap and childish argument that one can give. Look at the result of these efforts made by our Government or the Ministers in going round the world last year. Today, the result is that 95 nations in the world have recognised Bangla Desh. Why do you forget this? 104 votes against us on one particular occasion, on a snap vote—was that very permanent, was that very important, very significant? What is permanent, what is significant is, today 95 nations have recognised Bangla Desh and only yesterday a Resolution was passed unanimously in the United Nations Assembly supporting the cause of admission of Bangla Desh into the United Nations. How are these things happening? These things have not just dropped from heavens. These are the result, the outcome of the efforts made by the Government during last year and all these months during this year. Sir, I had a personal experience. I was there. I had some practical experience about what our Government did at the United Nations last year. I was there for three months. We had to struggle and fight. What efforts we had to make, the whole delegation of the Government had to make, I have some experience about that, you have no such experience.

The last point is about the Indo-Russian Treaty. Our friends have questioned: Why treaty with Russia alone, why not with other countries? I say, who prevents it. Have we said 'no' to anybody else? Have we not signed a treaty with a democratic country also? Is Bangla Desh not a democratic country? Most probably, Dr. Alva and others want that we should go with a begging bowl for signing a treaty with the United States of America. My only reply is, I will advise Dr. Alva to speak to Mr. Nixon, his friend, and not to us. We are prepared to offer a hand of friendship to everybody, whoever takes it. We are friends, but we must not forget what role America played in the last year and even now. We

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

have to take into account all those facts before we say all these things.

I would end by saying that Indo-Soviet Treaty is a pillar of strength for us in the foreign affairs. It is very significant not only for our mutual benefit. It is not India alone who wants friendship of Russia, but Russia also needs friendship of India—please note it—because of geo-political factors. These geo-political factors have brought us together.

Russia stood by us at the time of Kashmir issue, at the time of Goa, Bangla Desh, every time for the last 25 years. It is the only major power that has sincerely and honestly stood by us and, therefore, we value that friendship very much. That does not mean we shall not go for friendship with others; we shall certainly go, we will always try, we are trying that. We will also see that nobody, no other country tries to belittle the importance and significance of the Indo-Soviet Treaty so far as our own national interest is concerned.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, In order to make appropriate suggestions for the conduct of our foreign policy let us first look at the scenario of international politics. Today what are the dominant factors that would determine the trend and tenor of world events in the immediate future and would also call for suitable responses from our side in terms of foreign policy positions? For the purpose of discussion in this House I would identify six significant occurrences, that loom large on the horizon of international politics.

First is the re-election of President Nixon for the second and final term and the impending withdrawal of U. S. forces from Vietnam, and the possible emergence of a new nexus of relationship between the U. S. and the countries of South East Asia, particularly Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand.

Second is the continuance of the policy of *detente* that informs the relationship between the super-powers, the big powers and the regional powers in different parts of the world. The increasing rapprochement bet-

ween Washington and Moscow, between Washington and Peking, between Peking and Tokyo, between Bonn and Berlin, and between Phnom Penh and Pyongyong is evidence of this happy international development.

Third is the emergence of an active and homogeneous European community that is striving to build a new continental identity for the first time, cutting across the old fragmented nation--States of Europe--nation-states which had a long history of animosity and mutual conflict, which had made Europe an area of conflict for the last two hundred years. But today thanks to new developments an inter-dependant continental production, distribution and exchange system is about to usher in a new European civilisation based on Pan European unity and economic solidarity, thus marking a decisive shift in the history of modern world. As an extension and concomitant of this development I would particularly like to mention the happy and far reaching process of reconciliation between the two Germanys which on the one side is able to establish bridges between the East and the West and on the other hand will lead to the growth of a partnership in the heart of Europe which will make Europe a centre of world economic, commercial, diplomatic and political activity.

Fourth is the rise of democratic Japan with its newly-established friendship with China and the Soviet Union, revealing a tremendous potentiality for autonomous action. This is a factor of far-reaching consequence to East, South and South East Asia.

Fifth is the unhealthy development in certain parts of Africa, particularly in Uganda, in which the mass expulsion of Asians is almost a policy of racialism with a vengeance which reveals very negative aspects that might erode the very heart of the structure of what is called Afro-Asian solidarity. This is an alarming occurrence and one only wishes that it is halted soon and that it is not allowed to spread to other countries of Africa.

The sixth significant development is the emergence of our own country, India, as the dominant power in South Asia both in political and—without being chauvinistic I

may add—in military sense as a consequence of the recent Indo-Pakistani war resulting in the dismemberment of Pakistan and the establishment of a friendly and peaceful People's Republic of Bangladesh. But this is so above all because we have revealed, as I had occasion to mention in this House earlier, the majesty of the democratic system which has been able to bear external shocks and to mediate internal developments through a process of consensus-building coupled with democratic action.

In the context of this scenario what are we doing to work out strategies and alternative postures of foreign policy? Our stand on Vietnam has been positive and scrupulous but I am afraid it has not been adequate. It has not helped us to play the role which India as the dominant power in South Asia is expected to play. For many years we have not played the same Asian role as Jawaharlal Nehru had 3 P.M. played in the fifties of this Century.

It is true that we have sponsored the cause of Vietnam always, but India certainly has not emerged as an Asian power capable of making proposals and constructive alternatives for the solution of the problems of the miserable people of Vietnam. I would particularly like, now that an impending withdrawal of the United States forces is on the cards, that we have to work out a strategy for our role in Vietnam, as a good neighbour and also as a power which is not interested either in nuclear armaments or conventional armaments, but as a power which is interested in the promotion of the ideal of democratic polity the world over. On Vietnam, let us not accuse the Government alone. What have the Opposition parties themselves done? As a matter of fact, what has public opinion in India done? I must say, as a citizen of the democratic Republic of India, I feel somewhat ashamed occasionally in the international conferences when we observe that the accredited representatives of Vietnam feel that India has played it safe, that we have had a low profile on Vietnam. I should think that a national consensus has to be built-up not only on problems like that of Vietnam but also on other problems of Asia which impinge heavily not only on the conduct of the foreign policy of India, but also on the very survival of this country as a new

model of democratic growth. In the vacuum which will be created by the withdrawal of America from Vietnam—if not wholly at least partially—it is necessary that some possible role should be played by India. Without spelling out what that role ought to be, I would only draw the attention of the Minister of External Affairs and others concerned to the fact that they have to sit down and work out strategies and postures for suitable responses.

Our policy of non-alignment has certainly played its creative role in the promotion of *detente* in the world, and in increasing the area of peace. It would be idle to say now that the policy of non-alignment has not succeeded. After all, policies succeed within the framework within which they are conceived and are operationalized. To be sure, non-alignment has been the single biggest factor for mobilising opinion against the division of the world into warring blocs. It has been a policy which was able to overlook the needless bifurcation of the globe and assert the autonomy and the right of smaller countries to have transactions with both the blocs.

Our European policy has not been as integrated and positive as it ought to be. I am afraid it has been more in the nature of an *ad hoc*, piecemeal response to specific items. I would draw the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to the fact that we have now to work out a systematic policy for Europe as an integral part of world peace. Partly because of our Commonwealth links, partly because of the unhealthy obsession with British foreign policy and partly because we have always considered Britain to be the heart of Europe, we have not developed an adequate European posture and policy. The time has come for us to re-think more actively as to what should be our relationship with the new united Europe which is emerging both as an economic entity and as a political entity. With the two Germanys, as I have said earlier, it is a fact that our relations have been cordial. We have played a very healthy role in building bridges between East and West Germanys. I hope our relationship will be further strengthened, now that rapprochement between the two Germanys would restore a prominent place to this heartland of Europe.

Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

The recognition of the fact that Japan is a key factor in Asian politics and economy has to be carefully worked out. I have an impression that we have, in a way, overlooked Japan sometimes for sentimental reasons and sometimes because of the past role of Japan and also because for long we have thought in terms of building bridges only with China.

Sir, I would now draw your attention to the sixth factor which I have mentioned, namely, the emergence of India as a dominant regional power.

I would first like to suggest that at this stage of socio-economic development through which we are passing, there is an imperative need for the building-up of national consensus on foreign policy, which was not only built but was indeed operationalised in the first decade of our independence. It calls for a bipartisan commitment to a national foreign policy. If my friends in the Opposition allow me to say so, there is a need indeed, for building up a national consensus on other aspects of national policy as well. Too much of party consideration and partisan politics in the country—which is otherwise poor—has led to a miserable chaos in the country, for which the Government must take its share, but I am afraid the Opposition parties should also take their adequate share.

Secondly I would suggest that discussion round the question as to whether our foreign policy is fully and authentically non-aligned or not is both sterile and irrelevant. At least one aspect seems to be true that we are not pursuing a policy of alignment in the sense of pre-empting our right of looking at each event autonomously in terms of our own national interests. True, we have entered into Treaties of Friendship, Peace and Co-operation with some countries including the Soviet Union, and it is also true that by entering into treaties we have taken upon ourselves certain obligations. But it is not true that by these treaties we have entered into some surreptitious forms of alignment. It is not true that the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation with the Soviet Union, even if it is for a period of twenty years, is taking India away from its declared goals and ideals or from

the frame work of non-alignment. It is qualitatively different from alignment. Time has come for us to think of another problem. If non-alignment does not adequately reflect what we are doing, then probably we will have to coin another term to reflect our policy. The real issue is this: whether we are pursuing a policy based on independent judgment and action in consonance with our interests and the interests of enlightened world opinion or not? If we are doing so, then I am reminded of the famous lines of Pope—

“For forms of government let fools contest, whatever is best administered is best.”

Whether it is non-alignment, quasi-alignment or total alignment, the fact is that the policy being pursued at the moment is by and large, a viable national policy.

Sir, at this point I must submit for the consideration of the Hon'ble Members that in contemporary situation of international politics, three dimensions of the foreign policy have to be examined: firstly, the dimension of bilateral or mutual relations between India and each specific country, secondly, the multi lateral or regional relations and thirdly, the dimension of international in the sense of being more than multilateral or global relations.

Sir, my own impression is that if one does analyse India's relations with each of the sovereign entities in the world on the balance our bilateral relations have been more than satisfactory. I may also add that our international relations have also been quite satisfactory because if we analyse our relations in the international conferences, in the international agencies of the United Nations, and in United Nations itself, we find that more often than not, Indian position is supported by many nations. What is missing, however, is that we have not been able to work out an equally successful pattern of relations at the multi-lateral or regional level. This is due to many reason. Firstly, India has not been able to work out as to how it should involve other neighbouring countries in terms of India's regional interests. Secondly, India's regional interests in the past have often been subordinated, for instance, to

the ideological considerations of one bloc or the economic consideration of another bloc. I would submit that this aspect should be carefully examined. As an instance I may mention that my own analysis of India's relations with the Arab world is that our bilateral relations with the 18 Arab countries have been on the balance good because I have put in category A seven of the 18 nations in category B seven of the 18 nations and in category C only four. But at the multilateral *i.e.* regional level, our relations with the Arab world have not been quite adequate, because in category A I will put only Egypt—even that I submit, is doubtful. But again at the international level, I have put 11 out of 18 in category A, 1 in category B and only 6 in category C.

Sir, The role which the Third world has to play, in which India has a pre-eminent position, is the role of the removal of poverty the world over, role of industrialisation of economy, role of the modernisation of the polity and, I would particularly like to emphasise, the role of secularisation of politics of which India is an outstanding model. I would say that 'diffusing' of the ignition point of international politics is also one of the cardinal purposes which must inform our foreign policy.

Lastly, something about the Simla Agreement. It is true that we have adhered to the Simla Agreement both in letter and in spirit. But it is equally true that Pakistan has not stuck to the letter and particularly the spirit of the Simla Agreement. It is a fact that Pakistan has been dragging its feet. It is a fact, if I may be permitted to say so without offending the protocol or the niceties of this House, that the President of Pakistan has been indulging in double talk. He speaks in one way to certain editors of our papers and he speaks in another way to his Pakistani audiences. His public postures are far from adequate. This is an unhappy situation. I may mention that this whole controversy about one square mile or two square miles reveals a policy which only reflects a sense of hatred and fear of India. I am not certain whether the Thaku Chak area falls within the Jammu and Kashmir cease-fire line or in the international

border. But I will say even if it falls within the Jammu and Kashmir cease-fire line, I do not understand why Pakistan cannot concede that for the larger interest of the withdrawal of Indian forces from its territory and the eventual settlement of other disputes. I am convinced that the Simla spirit has to be maintained because it is in the interest of both India and Pakistan. But I am not certain whether the ruling elite of Pakistan is equally conscious of this.

Sir, I may sound somewhat sentimental—and it is a very personal note—when I say that I have not been happy that the Chief of Army of a victorious army was sent to Lahore to negotiate a concession with (I would not like to say) the notorious, General Tikka Khan when we knew fully well that even prior to the departure of General Manekshaw there was no possibility of any rapprochement. I would have rather preferred, not very happily so, that this General Tikka Khan should have come to India and talked to our Chief of the Army. I am mentioning this because some image has to be maintained of our army. Whether victorious or not, our Chief of Army ought not to go to a country which unleashed naked aggression, which had upset the entire economic and cultural structure of the sub-continent. I would also say let it not be thought by the common man, and let not our army rank and file feel that the Army Chief of a patriotic and a victorious Army has been put in a certain inferior position.

Finally, I would like to say that the policy Planning Division of the Ministry of External Affairs needs to be operationalised. We just cannot go on from event to event and respond in an *ad hoc* manner with the best of the wisdom available, and depending largely on such a skilful foreign Minister as we have. We must have alternative strategies worked out and alternative postures examined linking Foreign Policy with problems of defence, trade and scientific interchange. I think unless the Policy Planning Division is made to work out the many problems of Foreign Policy in conjunction with such of the expertise which is available in this country, we will never be able to have an integrated and systematic framework of our foreign policy, to pursue the available options.

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

In the end, Sir, I would like to mention that our Foreign Secretary, Mr. T. N. Kaul, is about to retire. I am sure the House will join me in saying that the admirable way in which Mr. T.N. Kaul had worked for the promotion of national interest and the conduct of our foreign policy generally calls for a word of deep appreciation from this House.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : रिटायर तो होने दीजिए। राज्य सभा में आ जायेंगे।

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN : Sir, we have been always attacking bureaucrats in season and out of season. But sometimes we must realise that some efficient bureaucrats have political vision which ought to be the envy of active politicians. Thank you.

श्रीमती सीता देवी (पंजाब) : माननीय उप सभापति जी, यहां पर इस विषय पर बहुत से भाषण हुए हैं इसलिए मेरे मन में भी विचार आया कि एक-दो आवश्यक बातें हाऊस के सामने रखी जायें। सदियों तक हिन्दुस्तान गुलाम रहा, अमरीका और ब्रिटेन ने हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी मण्डी बनाये रखा। यहां पर उन्होंने हमें सिर्फ पराधीन ही नहीं कर दिया बल्कि बिल्कुल कंगाल कर दिया। बड़े युद्ध के बाद बड़ी जद्दोजिहद के बाद जब हम आजाद हुए, तो हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने एक फैसला किया कि यह जो हमें आजादी मिली है उसके बाद हमें आर्थिक आजादी भी लेनी है। इसलिए उन्होंने यह फैसला किया कि एक तटस्थता की नीति की अपनाएँगे, किमी भी गुट में नहीं रहेंगे। जब उन्होंने यह फैसला किया, इस फैसले के बाद नकशा बदला, सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान का नहीं बल्कि दुनिया के दूसरे देशों का भी। जहां पर युद्ध होता था, लड़ाई होती थी, सब देश हिन्दुस्तान की ओर देखते थे और वह इसलिए कि हिन्दुस्तान शांति का पैगाम देने वाला है, सुलह का पैगाम देने वाला है। लोग पंडित जी को शांति का देवता समझते थे। तब से लेकर अब तक भारत की वही नीति चली आ रही है।

सबसे पहले मैं, हमारे जो विदेश मंत्री है, उन्होंने यह जो इतना बड़ा नाजुक सा विषय है, उसके सन् 1971 से लेकर अब तक जो युद्ध हुआ जिस तरह से उन्होंने स्थिति को सम्भाला है और जिस बहादुरी से, सावधानी से चतुराई से उन्होंने दूसरे देशों में भी हमारा नाम ऊंचा किया है, उसके लिए उनको मुबारकबाद देना चाहती हूं। कठ जो सीचें हुईं उनमें यह कहा गया, शिमला समझौते की बात को लेकर, कि अब वह खत्म हो गया है, मुर्दा लाश है, उसके बाद भी कांग्रेस वाले यूँ ही तारीफ करते हैं। मैं समझती हूं वें शिमला समझौते की भावना नहीं समझते। अगर शिमला समझौते की भावना को समझते तो ऐसा नहीं कहते हिन्दुस्तान हमेशा ही अपने देश भी शांति रखना चाहता है, पड़ोसी के साथ भी प्यार से रहना चाहता है और पड़ोसी के दुख को बांट कर उस को सुखी भी करना चाहता है, जैसा कि उसने अभी बंगलादेश के वक्ता अपना जवाब दिया। उस वक्त भी हमारे अगोजिशन के भाई कहते थे—जरा वे उस वक्त के अखबारों को निकालें और पढ़ें—कि क्या सरकार की नीति है, काह को उन लाखों शरणार्थियों को बुला लिया, काहे को उनको रोटी खिलाने के लिए भगड़ा किया, इस किस्म की स्पीचें देते थे कि यह गलत पालिसी है, क्या बंगला देश की जखूरत थी, क्यों उन लोगों को यहां आने देते हैं, अगर वे मरते थे पाकिस्तान की गोलियों से तो मरते देते, बेइज्जत होते तो होने देते। तो उस वक्त भी ये हमारी पालिसी को रगड़ते थकते नहीं थे। आपको याद होगा—उस वक्त मैं हाऊस की मेम्बर नहीं थी—इसी पार्लियामेंट के बाहर हमारे विपक्षी भाइयों ने सत्याग्रह किया था इस बात के लिए कि बंगला देश को जल्दी मान्यता दो, जल्दी मान्यता दो। क्योंकि उनका काम ही यही है। कइयों की पालिसी कन्स्ट्रिक्टिव्ह होती है, कइयों कि डिस्ट्रिक्टिव्ह होती है उनके पालिसी डिस्ट्रिक्टिव्ह है, और वे वह काम करना चाहते हैं जिसमें चीप पापुलेरिटी

हामिल हो और कभी कभी वह अखबारों में लिखा जाए, देश की बात बने या न बने, और कोड भी मौका आए गवर्नमेंट को रगड़ दें, खवा-हमखवाह ही उनको रगड़ दें।

हमारी जितनी यहां स्पीचें हुई हैं सभी में अमरीका, रूस, चीन और ब्रिटेन आदि बड़ी बड़ी शक्तियों का जिक्र करते हैं। मैं अपने विदेश मंत्री जी से कहना चाहती हूं चाहे वे शक्तियां जिम डंग से भी मोचनी हों, पर हमें जो हमारे पड़ोसी देश हैं उनके साथ अच्छे संबंध बनाने चाहिए।

नेपाल के लोग जो हैं या अफगानिस्तान के लोग जो हैं उनके साथ हम ज्यादा सम्बन्ध बनाएं। वहां के पोलिटिशियन, वहां के जर्नलिस्ट, वहां के लोग हमारे देश में आए तो हमारे आपस में दोस्ती के सम्बन्ध, प्रेम के संबंध ज्यादा बढ़ेंगे। अपने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे जिनसे अच्छे सम्बन्ध बनेंगे उतने ही हम भी मजबूत होंगे और वे भी मजबूत होंगे।

शिमला समझौते में सबसे बड़ा फायदा क्या हुआ है? ये तो कहते हैं कि कुछ नहीं हुआ। यह ठीक है कि वहां के भुट्टो साहब कई बार ऐसी स्पीचें करते हैं, लोगों की एक जबान होती है, उनकी 10 जबान हैं, एक जबान से एक बात कहते हैं, दूसरी से दूसरी कहते हैं, पर शिमला समझौते के बाद वहां की जो जनता है उसके रवैये में फर्क हुआ है या नहीं, यह आप देखें। वहां की जनता अब ऐसा मोचने लगी है कि हमें भारत के साथ प्रेम से रहना है। वे भी मुख चाहते हैं, शांति चाहते हैं, वे सोचने लगे हैं कि इस युद्ध के अन्दर उनका बहुत विनाश हुआ है और इसलिए उन्हें अपने देश में शान्ति से रहना चाहिए और भारत के साथ, पड़ोसी मुल्क के साथ शांति से रहना चाहिए। तो क्या यह शिमला समझौते से फायदा नहीं हुआ? मैं समझती हूँ कि यह इतना बड़ा लाभ हुआ है जो लड़ाई से नहीं हो सकता। ये चीजें लड़ाई से हल नहीं हो सकतीं, समझौते से हो सकती हैं।

अभी यहां पर और बहुत सी बातें कही गईं, जनरल मानिकशा को क्यों भेजा यह भी गलत हुआ। मैं कहती हूँ कि इस किसम की बातें नहीं करनी चाहिए। हम सद्भावना लाना चाहते हैं। भुट्टो साहब भी आखिर शिमला आए थे, वहां के लोग कह सकते थे कि भुट्टो क्यों गए, उनकी बेइज्जती हो गई। हमें यह समझना चाहिए कि सद्भावना से ही सब काम होते हैं।

अमरीका के मुनालिक एक सामने मेंबर बोल रहे थे। मुझे आश्चर्य हो रहा था कि अमरीका की बात बहुत करते चले जा रहे हैं और हिन्दुस्तान की पोलिसी को लताड़ते चले जा रहे हैं। उन्होंने एक दफा चीन का नाम नहीं लिया, चीन की पोलिसी का नाम नहीं लिया, जितना दोष दिया वह हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को दिया।

बहुत जिक्र हुआ इजराइल का। कहा गया कि हिन्दुस्तान इजराइल को मान्यता नहीं देता, हिन्दुस्तान इजराइल से समझौता नहीं करता। मुझे बड़ी हैरानी होती है अगर मैं किसी हिन्दुस्तानी के मुँह में यह सुनती हूँ कि इजराइल को हम मान्यता नहीं देते। कौन सा इजराइल? वही इजराइल जो अमरीका का पिटू है, जो अमरीका के इशारे पर चलता है। कौन सा अमरीका? वही अमरीका जिससे बंगला देश में जब खून की नदियां बह रही थीं, बहीनों को वेइज्जत किया जा रहा था वबरता का नंगा नाच हो रहा था जिसे अमरीका ने उस वक्त पाकिस्तान की मदद की, उसकी पीठ ठोकने के लिए सातवां बेड़ा लेकर आया उस अमरीका का पिटू इजराइल है। आज उसको मान्यता देने की बातें जब वे लोग करते हैं जो देश भक्ति का बड़ा दम भरते हैं तब मुझे बड़ी हैरानी होती है।

बहुत जिक्र हुआ अरब देशों का। उनके मुतालिक एक बात मैं कहना चाहती हूँ। ठीक है, अरब देशों से काफी देर से हमारे सम्बन्ध

[श्रीमती सीता देवी]

चले आ रहे है। कई दफा वोट नहीं करते, कई दफा वे हमारे साथ वोट करते हैं परन्तु उसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम तरह से भावावेश में बह कर हम उनसे लड़ाई-भगड़ा कर लें। अरब देश हमारे पड़ोसी हैं, करोड़ों रुपए का व्यापार हमारा अरब देशों के साथ होता है। हमारे 17-18 लाख आदमी अरब देशों में बसते हैं। तो यह कैसे हो सकता है। इस किस्स के भावावेश में बह कर हम अरब देशों के साथ झगड़ा नहीं कर सकते।

अभी मेरे सामने एक मेम्बर ने कहा, मुझे बड़ी हैरानी हुई कि कितनी गलतबयानी करते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि हम अमरीका से पैसा लेने के लिए या उनसे कुछ ज्यादा प्राप्त करने के लिए अमरीका को कुछ नहीं कहते।

वह भूल गये इस बात को कि हमारी माननीया प्रधान मंत्री ने एक दफा नहीं, दस दफा जगह जगह पर दोहराया है कि हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े होंगे और हम अमरीका या ब्रिटेन किसी का भी मुंह नहीं देखेंगे। उन्होंने जगह जगह यह कहा है कि हम आर्थिक रूप से भी अपने पैरों पर खड़े होंगे और इसके लिए उन्होंने देग का आवाहन किया है और आप ने देखा है कि इस लड़ाई के बाद हमारे देश का नक्शा ही बदल गया है। ठीक है आप अपोजीशन में हैं और मैं इस बात को मानती हूँ कि अपोजीशन को अपोजीशन ही करना चाहिए, पर अपोजीशन करें किसी प्वाइन्ट पर, केवल इस लिए अपोजीशन न करें कि चूँकि हम अपोजीशन में हैं इस लिए अपोजीशन कर रहे हैं और उसके लिए आप गलतबयानी करें कि हम अमरीका के आगे हाथ फँलते हैं या अमरीका को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। यह कितनी गलत बात है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने तो अमरीका ही नहीं, और देशों के लिए भी कह दिया कि हम किसी के आगे हाथ पमारने को तैयार नहीं है। हम आर्थिक क्षेत्र में अपने पैरों पर खड़े होंगे, हम भूखे रहेंगे,

या जैसे भी रहेंगे लेकिन हम अपने भरोसे रहेंगे। मेरे पास ज्यादा समय नहीं है, लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि इन चन्द सालों में हमारे देश ने कितनी तरक्की की है। हमारे यहाँ आज जेट विमान बनते हैं और दूसरी बड़ी से बड़ी चीजें बनती हैं। जो आज बजाय इस के कि हम गर्व अनुभव करें, हमारा पार्लियामेंट का प्रत्येक मेम्बर गर्व से कहे कि हमारा देश बड़ी तरक्की कर गया है हमारी पालिसी अच्छी है, हमारी तटस्थता की नीति अच्छी है और उसके लिए सारे देश हमारी तरफ देख रहे हैं, हम इस तरह की बातें करते हैं। हमारा देश ईस्ट जर्मनी को मान्यता देने में भी आगे रहा है। तो मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमारी जो तटस्थता की पालिसी है, जो पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने बनायी थी और जिसको आज श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी अच्छी तरह से चला रही हैं और अपने देश को आगे ले जा रही हैं उसी के कारण अभी जो लड़ाई हुई है उसमें आप देखें कि हमारे देश का सिर कितना ऊँचा हुआ है। आज सारे देश, अमरीका और ब्रिटेन भी चीन का गुणगान करते नहीं थकते, लेकिन क्या आज हमारी शक्ति उससे कम है। मैं समझती हूँ कि आज दुनिया के देशों में हमारी शक्ति और मान उससे कहीं ज्यादा है और इस लिए मैं अपनी इस पालिसी के लिए श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी और अपने विदेश मंत्री जी को मुबारकबाद देती हूँ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are glad we are having an opportunity to discuss, after a long time, the international situation. I think we should all feel happy that at the close of the year 1972, we can look forward to 1973 with greater confidence and hope from the point of view of strengthening the cause of world peace and advancing the cause of struggle for national liberation, democracy and social progress. Unless this is understood, the new developments that have taken place over the years, especially in the recent period, in the international situation will not be comprehended. After all, these positive developments are

the result of the combined effort of all peace-loving forces, whether they be the community of the socialist countries, the international working class movement, national liberation forces or the newly freed countries like ours or the general world peace movement. These forces have been working together all these years in order to bring about a change in the international climate and to create conditions in which the nations can live in peaceful co-existence among themselves in spite of different social systems and in which threats of thermo nuclear wars can be averted and normalisation of relations between nations can take place. These are accepted objectives and we have made significant strides in that direction. It is nobody's claim that we have reached the goal or even very near it. But the fact remains that the forces that stand on our path are today weaker than before and the forces that make headway are forging ahead in the interests of humanity and are stronger today.

Therefore, Sir, the outstanding fact of the international situation today, if we take stock of the situation during the year that we shall be soon ending, that will pass by soon, is that the balance of forces in the world have changed in favour of the forces of peace and freedom against the forces of imperialism and war.

Well, Sir, our friends from the Jana Sangh will naturally not understand it, because they have been weakened in the process. But we are not discussing the delirium of the Jana Sangh which is in a quandary. Nor our friend, Shri Goray, the intellectual, will understand it, because he suffers from an age-long malady of social democracy of his type. That is more tragic than annoying or distressing that way.

Sir, therefore, I would say that on the whole we can claim that we have advanced and that should give us some confidence and I am very happy to say that in the context of developments today our country has played an important and significant role. Therefore, I disagree with my friend, Shri M.R. Venkataraman, when he drew up a rather negativist and defeatist picture. May I ask him whether India is less anti-imperialistic today than, say, five years ago? Has our stand been weekend comparatively *vis-*

a-vis imperialism now than it was ten years ago? Are we in the same position with regard to the United States of America or the American imperialism today as we were, say, six or seven years ago? I think the facts will never suggest this kind of sweeping; incorrect, one-sided and, if I may say so, with all respect, subjective conclusions,

Sir, I think that those who are on the left should recognise these facts because they show the strength of the left. After all, it is these what we have been fighting for; it is these what we have been preaching; and it is these what we have been telling the whole country. Today, if more Congressmen and others share our views and we share their views and take a common stand against the American imperialism, whether it is with regard to the issue of Vietnam or some other issue, that is a matter for rejoicing and that should give us confidence rather than cause any heart burning or evoke misconceived criticism. One should not suffer from conceptual misconception in matters of this kind.

Sir, now let me start with our sub-continent. So far I made only some general observations.

It is true that we are deadlocked over the Simla agreement. It is most unfortunate that an area of 1.5 sq. miles should have caused the deadlock and we do not know how to solve it. Sir, this is most unfortunate, I can say. But that should not lead us to the conclusion as it has led the Jana Sangh, that the Simla agreement is dead, because, Sir, they wanted the Simla agreement to be dead right at the moment it was born and they wanted to throttle the child when it was born and they wanted to commit infanticide of the Simla agreement. Having failed to do so, now they say that the Simla agreement is dead. That is not so.

Sir, when we signed the Simla agreement did we think that it would be a smooth-sailing affair? Agreements are entered into by two countries and the two countries do not function in the air. We have our internal political factors in our country and they have their internal political factors and these internal factors play an important part. Assuming for a moment that in our

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

country the Jana Sangh is so powerful, as the jingoistic and communal and anarchic elements, and the Jamait-e-Islam and others are powerful in Pakistan, would we have such an easy passage with the Simla agreement? I ask, Sir. The Jana Sangh would not even concede that we will have to face difficulties. Some times even the Ministers face difficulties in the face of criticism coming from the Jana Sangh. Pakistan, unfortunately, is not to be blamed, because they are not happily placed as we are. Our democratic and secular forces are much more decisive, they are far stronger and today, we are in a better position to stand up with this agreement and seek its implementation and their internal forces are comparatively weaker and, therefore, they are not able to do as much as we are able to do, on the other side of the border.

That you must remember. Bhutto is unpredictable, as you yourself say. Bhutto himself says, "I am a product of contradictory situation". In Pakistan's situation, there are lots of contradictions. On the one hand, the forces which would like the Simla Agreement to succeed are there. There are forces there, well entrenched in the political and economic life of that country, and also in the administration and armed forces, which have never taken, it seems, kindly to the Simla Agreement. They would like it to be retarded, obstructed and subverted. This is the position. Therefore, you must take this into account. Our behaviour and our stand in this matter should be such as to treat the other forces, particularly the forces in Pakistan, in order to counter the influence of the negative forces in their country. Unfortunately, Jan Sangh's criticism against the Simla Agreement and their approach to the whole problem of Indo-Pak relations provide an ammunition for those very forces in Pakistan which would like to see the Simla Agreement dead. There is bilaterism between them—between the extreme right reactionary forces in this country of the Jan Sangh type and the Jamait-e-Islami. As I have said, both of them want that the Simla Agreement should be dead and buried once and for all. Both of them want these two countries to live in constant fear of each other. They have their vested interests. Therefore, Sir, let not the Simla Agreement be upset by

temporary difficulties. These difficulties, we know, can be overcome.

What is the alternative to the Simla Agreement? The alternative to it is not that we send Mr. Vajpayee with sword in hand and Dr. Bhai Mahavir as a General or Commander across the border. If they like it, let them say so. They will not say so. Simla Agreement is the breath of our life in this country. We have always sought friendly relations with Pakistan under different conditions, under different military rulers and under various pressures, and so on, who did not take to that path. Today life has taught them certain lessons. Life has taught us also certain lessons. Let them learn their lesson. Extend your helping hand to them. I am sure, Sir, events in this sub-continent are shaping themselves in the direction of Simla Agreement. This is a historical process which is going on. It is not a dying process. Dying process is one which Yahya Khan started and Ayub Khan and others aided. Well, that is dying. The other thing is growing. Let us march on with life rather than look back and harp on the path, and capitalize on what is dead and is bound to be dead in course of time. Sir, we are not the undertakers of the Simla Agreement. We are the upholders of the Simla Agreement. Let them be the undertakers of the Simla Agreement if they like. And, therefore, Sir, I say that efforts should be made in that direction. We know that our Government will do so.

Sir, here I should like to say only one thing. Government should not be stiff in this matter. If in certain cases, what they call political discussions are helpful, don't avoid political discussions. Don't stand on ceremony. I cannot agree with Mr. Rasheeduddin Khan who said, "Why did you send your Commander-in-Chief there? Why didn't you call their man here?" Now these are very common-place gestures. Or, rather this kind of thing does not work. Anyhow, what we are the whole country knows; the whole world knows. By sending our Chief of the Army Staff, I do not think we have lowered the honour and prestige of our country. We have indeed added to the prestige of our country. Generosity is our approach when generosity is called for. Flexibility is our approach when it is needed.

Therefore, let us not grudge over this matter. It does not matter who comes where. The point is we must meet somewhere, either here or there or in some other planet. The time has come when both countries must realise that they have got to live together. And for that they must have a dialogue, discussion, not only at military level, but also at political level, whether official level or ministerial level. By and large, I congratulate the approach of our Government. But sometimes I find some of their statements—maybe, under pressure of the Jan Sangh and others—tend to be a little stern and rigid. That should be avoided. That is about the Simla Agreement.

Now with regard to the sub-continent and other developments. Take the case of Bangla Desh. Why this picture of defeatism is drawn, I do not understand. Bangla Desh has emerged as a secular, friendly, republic, committed to the policy of peace. They have adopted a Constitution in which this commitment is written down : They shall fight imperialism for the cause of peace. They shall fight colonialism and neo-colonialism. This is a thing which even we have not said in our Constitution in such clear terms. The adoption of the Constitution of Bangla Desh is an important event, symbolic of the new trends in this sub-continent. And we see Bangla Desh President amongst ourselves today, amongst our people. Bangla Desh is seeking friendship with us. Today it has been recognised, within a year of its existence by 90 countries out of 131 countries of the world. Is it a small thing ? Now, this thing should be noted by our friends. Why do they shut their eyes when history passes before them ? Why do they shut their eyes to such a historical development which brings majesty to the future of the sub-continent with 7½ crores of people being accepted in the comity of nations despite opposition, open opposition, by China and Pakistan, and of course, secretly also by a few others ? This is not a small development. I am glad that Bangla Desh President is amidst us in our country today. He comes here not merely as a President. He comes here as a fellow fighter against imperialism, as a fellow fighter for the cause of liberation, as a fellow fighter who is trying to determine the future of the sub-

continent by a common sacrifice, a common fight, a common struggle. That is how we receive him, we receive our brothers there. In him, in the reception that we extend to him, we are receiving the whole people of Bangla Desh as our friends, as our brothers, as our own people. That will inspire us. His speech will inspire us. I am sure some Jan Sangh friends must have also listened to the speech. Therefore, let there not be any needless defeatism. Yes, with Pakistan something is bad. Some of the statements of President Bhutto I do not like. But the fact remains that Pakistan has withdrawn from the SEATO also. Take note of this fact. The fact remains that Bhutto himself is very apologetic about his continuance in the CENTO and he will soon withdraw from the CENTO. The fact remains also that Bhutto is now preparing the ground for recognition of Bangla Desh although he still says the Muslim League is opposed to it. These are facts. These may have contradictory features. But things are moving. That you must take note of. So I think there is nothing to be despondent about as far as our sub-continent is concerned. We can look forward to better days in the coming years from the point of view of establishing durable peace in our sub-continent, and, I would say, good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan. The struggle is a sacred one. The struggle has been posed before us by life itself. It must be continued. The forces are much more in favour of the success of the struggle rather than those who are trying to spite it and create difficulties in our way. As far as Bangla Desh is concerned, one thing I should like to say. Our Government should release all civilians of Pakistan where Bangla Desh is not involved. Even in regard to Bangla Desh, in regard to civilians who are in your hands or in the joint custody, I would suggest that you should discuss with the Government of Bangla Desh so that we close the chapter straightway. Release civilians, not only women and children; all civilians who are there except those who were held for spying and all that. It is a good step you have taken of releasing prisoners of war taken into custody on the Western front.

But carry it forward. Let not there be a single civilian Pakistani in our hands—

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

male or female, young or aged. Let them all be released. If some technical difficulty arises with regard to their custody as far as Bangla Desh is concerned, that can be taken up with them—I am not discussing the other subject. I hope Pakistan would soon recognise Bangla Desh which will facilitate the solution of the other problem, namely, the problem of prisoners of war. That is a tripartite problem; it cannot be solved by us. It can be solved by Pakistan, —which must recognise Bangla Desh—Bangla Desh and India together. Unfortunately the stand taken by Pakistan is coming in the way of an early solution to this vexed problem the solution for which everybody wants.

Coming to Indo-China, in Indo-China things are developing favourably. Our friends may not like it; they never liked it. How would they be happy today when the Vietnamese liberation struggle is on the threshold of final and decisive victory? How can I expect it when for the last twenty years they have been working for the fall of the Vietnamese liberation struggle. There is an agreement which was arrived at last October between USA and the DRV of Vietnam which is a significant and momentous step. It is unfortunate that this agreement was not signed as scheduled on the 31st of October, and American backed out of signing of the agreement for reasons well explained by them and which are not at all acceptable to anybody. I wish our Government at that time had come out with a statement calling upon the United States to sign that agreement. Our Government did a very good thing when it supported the seven-point peace plan of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Vietnam. I am not questioning the *bona fides* of the Government in this matter. Government's stand has been very clear on the side of the Vietnamese liberation but since it had been so it is all the more necessary that an attempt to build pressure and contribute to the building up of pressure by making a statement, by coming out with a public declaration that the United States should honour its own agreement by signing it on the scheduled date—on the 31st of October—instead of making it again a subject-matter of debate after Kissinger had gone to Saigon

or elsewhere, should have been made. That is the point of my complaint. I say, it was not very graceful on the part of the Government to remain quiet on that occasion. Now what we are afraid is this : Here, the the latest issue of the *Time* magazine—of 27th November—says:—

“Saigon, meanwhile, continued its frantic preparations to deal with the uncertain dynamics of peace. By weeks and the massive, eleventh-hour infusion of now U. S. military hardware—59 tanks, 100 personnel carriers, 32 heavy-transport-planes, 210 fighter-bombers and 280 helicopters—was virtually complete. On the political front, the Thieu regime has added tens of thousands of known or suspected Communists and Communist sympathizers to South Viet Nam's prison population in the past few weeks.”

The two points that I want to make in this connection are : That this situation is being exploited by Thieu for the repression of suspected persons and politicals in his own country. There are 30,000 political prisoners inside the prisons in Thieu's hands. The report is that they may be slaughtered and mass murders may take place because they expect that peace might come near. This is one side of it. I do not know how this thing can be stopped. Surely, this thing can only be stopped by the implementation of the agreement and the signing of the agreement, to begin with. Another aspect of it is, before the agreement is signed and peace comes to Indo-China, America is developing, under one pretext or another, that area as a base of American weapons and so on so that they can utilise these weapons against us, against the Indo-Chinese, against the entire region.

Therefore there is a rush of weapons on the part of Americans to that country. The figures have been given. They may be an under-estimation but certainly they are not an over-estimation by the American magazine, *Times*, which nobody can question, it is not a Communist magazine either. Therefore, we should be very careful. I think, Government should come out with regard to this matter. Let the negotiations go on, if there are any, but the Government of India should exert its influence,

moral pressure as well as Political pressure in the international opinion along with others to compel the Americans' Nixon, to sign the agreement or arrive at an agreement. Well, Sir, the agreement should be signed I should like to point out that this impressed even President Nixon who in his message of 20th October to Premier Pham Van Dong, of North Democratic Republic of Vietnam, appreciated their goodwill and expressed the view that the agreement could be considered complete. Only then they agreed to sign it. On October 22, President Nixon sent a message in which he expressed satisfaction and the agreement, now with his approval, was complete, awaiting signatures. This was given out by American sources. Sir, at that time, Mr. Kissinger himself revealed to the press and that has been published in New York Times, International Herald and Tribune :

"The Agreement we signed last night represents a breakthrough in relations. If we implement the Agreement with sincerity and goodwill, we can give to our people peace with honour and progress which we have not found so long."

I am sorry, Sir, this is not in this connection, it is in another connection. Mr. Kissinger said :

"As Radio Hanoi correctly stated today, on October 8 the North Vietnamese for the first time made a proposal which enabled us to accelerate the negotiations."

He paid a tribute to North Vietnamese people. Therefore, I think, Government can certainly do something with regard to this matter and we should be helpful to find a solution of this problem. (*Time Bell rings*). Sir, I am finishing very quickly,

With regard to West Asia, Sir, the situation there is a bit tense. Americans are helping Israel. Israel is attacking Syria and its aggressive tactics are going on. But then the Arab nationalism is gaining strength. Not only the Palestinian Liberation Forces are fighting, the entire Arab people who stand against Imperialism, stand for national liberation, are maintaining their unity. Recently, there was an

attempt in the Egyptian Republic of Arab to create dissensions among them and bring about some kind of leverage or faction of friendly relations between the Soviet Union on the one hand and the Arab Republic of Egypt on the other. Sir, the Arab people seemed to have solved that problem in a way it should have been solved and now this friendship has been well set. It has been made abundantly clear by President Sadat himself again and again, in his broadcasts and other statements that Arab-Soviet friendship is of paramount importance from the point of view of safeguarding independence in that region and fighting imperialism. Therefore, I think we should fully support the Arab cause and come out against the Americans and Israel.

My friend still wants Israel to be recognised. What for, for doing more blatant attacks on the Arabs? And they are attacking and carrying on their aggression and more arms are being supplied to them.

I should like the Government to adopt a more active policy with regard to freedom fighting in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau and other places. We should think in terms of giving them material assistance including arms. We should hold discussions with other countries in the neighbourhood who are helping them so that we can help them more and participate in the glorious liberation struggle of these people against Portuguese and other colonialists and racists, the struggle that is going on unabated in full fury despite violence and terror of all kinds perpetrated by imperialists, colonialists and racists. Coming to Europe I can say that we should be happy, Europe is the place where two world wars started. Today it is not the climate of cold war that dominates Europe, it is the climate of detente of that dominates Europe. Currently preparatory talks are going on at Helsinki for holding a conference for European security and co-operation. Today more and more western powers are veering round to the necessity of European security and co-operation and for that purpose a conference is going to be held next year in Europe. Now the big powers are also falling in line with this kind of thinking. We are glad to know that Pompidou the French President in a statement has said that this

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

bloc versus bloc approach is no good but we should all work together so that the barriers artificially created in the wake of the war disappear and we live in peace and mutual co-operation despite differences in our social systems in order that we can exploit the technological and scientific revolution for the well-being of our people and at the same time we guarantee peace and security to Europe. The concluding of treaties by West Germany with the Soviet Union and Poland is a significant development which has contributed to this detente. Not only that today we find that the two German States, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany have also signed a treaty between themselves. We are glad that both would soon be admitted into the United Nations. In this connection we are very happy that the Government of India has at long last given full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic whereby they have strengthened not only our friendly relations with a friendly country but also contributed to the cause of European detente and to the cause of European security and peace, indeed to world peace, and enhanced the stature and prestige of our country in the whole world. Therefore Europe today is not the Europe of Dulles. Various other things are happening there. The Moscow meeting between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Brezhnev was of very great importance, the value of which is realised today. And this is not accidental.

Guided by the Peace plan of the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union had taken a number of initiatives to bring about normalisation of relations among the nations, particularly with the United States of America and other great powers and if success had been achieved in that direction it redounds to the credit of the peace-loving forces and of course to the Soviet people and the statesmanship of the Soviet people. It is sign of strength. Some people want to belittle it. Mr. Nixon and others who are the authors of the policy of cold war who wanted to contain global communism, who wanted to divide Europe into two, who never accepted the Oder Heisse border, who wanted the fruits of the world war II to be forcefully kept, who wanted to keep secret bases in West Germany armed with nuclear weapons, these are the people to day who

are going to Moscow in order to sign treaties for peaceful co-existence. This certainly shows the strength of the forces of peace and not the weakness of the forces of peace. Sir, we should welcome such things.

Coming to Latin America, I should only like to say, why are you not having good relations with Cuba? They have their Ambassador here but we have only one officer there. We do not have our Ambassador in Cuba. Why should it be so? In Havana we should have our Ambassador and we should develop trade, economic and cultural relations with Cuba, that island of socialism in American hemisphere. They are now standing up against their threat within 90 miles of American guns believing in and upholding the same principles of peace for which we stand in this country. Is it not our duty to extend our hand of co-operation and friendship with that friendly nation and exchange ambassadors with them? Why are we not having our Ambassador there. We should increase the staff and develop economic and cultural relations with Cuba. I do not know why we are not doing that. The Government should take steps in that direction.

4 P.M. In Chile things are moving fast.

Now, again our friends are upset. In Chile the progressive forces, socialists and others are fighting the Americans. They are rebuilding their country against neo-colonialism, rebuilding their economy giving rise to the workers and peasants asking for radical agrarian reforms and pursuing a policy of peace, pursuing a policy of friendship with non-aligned nations like ours and with socialist countries. Therefore, I think we should forge a policy of active co-operation ..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : ...with the socialist forces in Latin America.

Now, finally, before I sit down I should like to say, strengthen our relationship. It is already strengthened and the Government deserves to be congratulated on it. But still I would say that with the socialist countries, there is great scope for further strengthening of relations. The Indo-Soviet treaty has been a historical event. What will the prophets of doom say now? More than a year has passed since that historic

treaty was signed. What has happened since then ? Well, we have become stronger. They have become stronger and what is more the cause of peace and independence has become stranger. The imperialist enemies have become weaker as a result of it. Our political and economic co-operation is bound to grow not only with the Soviet Union, but also with other socialist countries. Therefore, it is necessary for us to strengthen our relations further and steps are being taken. I think the strengthening will be maintained. There is a tendency, in some quarters, not to develop economic co-operation with the socialist countries and there are elements in the Government and outside the Government which create obstacles in the development of economic co-operation. They should not be encouraged.

Finally, one thing has a little annoyed us and I must say it. Mr. Nixon has sent a message to the Prime Minister on her birthday, and nobody says a bad thing in a birthday message. Now, immediately the External Affairs Ministry releases the message to the press. I have not done it. You have not done it. Have you done it ? No. In that they have briefed the press. There they say that some positive elements are noted in the message. They call it a welcome sign. They call it significant. All over India these things appear. It is quite clear that there has been a briefing of the press. Not only that. The briefing also refers to an article which Prime Minister Indira Gandhi had written to "New York" a foreign affair quarterly in which something has been said about future relations with America. Now, what is the policy of the Americans in this matter ? If the message has come to you, release it to the press. Now, do you think that it is as simple as all that, that we have to read Mr. Nixon's policy towards India from a birthday message to Shrimati Indira Gandhi ? Policies are not made and unmade in birthday messages, or condolence messages. Let us be clear about it. Therefore, let us not be taken in by Mr. Nixon's message. Now, we have difficulty with regard to food. Already there is a talk about American food imports, if not PL-480. Mr. Billy Graham is there in this country, the great evangelical priest, a friend of Mr. Nixon, to repair the relations between our two countries. At the same time they are

sending arms to Pakistan through CENTO. CENTO does not send American arms without America's nodding approval. Everybody knows it. This kind of thing will not do. The American policy has undergone no change. My friends should not think very much about the American elections. As far as Mr. Nixon is concerned, Mr. Nixon remains Mr. Nixon, but I would never say that the American people have voted for the Right. They may have voted for Mr. Nixon, but they do not want the war in Vietnam to continue. They want *detente* in Europe. They want improvement in the relationship between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. (*Time Bell rings*). They want some change in the basic policies of the United States of America. Therefore, I would not like to blame the American people. Nor would I confuse Mr. Nixon's election with the mood of the American people. Mr. Nixon may be there in the White House to continue his policy.

The world has changed. The American people have changed and they are changing and the mood of the American people is not to encourage such a policy. Unfortunately, there was no alternative for them, in a bipartisan system in America. Therefore, voting is not a right expression. Therefore do not judge by these things. All that I say is, today if we want to improve our relations with the United States, we must strengthen our fight against the American imperialism, against non-colonialism, should strengthen our case against imperialism. The unity which we have built up against imperialism in this country over the last few years, particularly last year and this year, must not be allowed to be dissipated or weakened; it should be carried forward. Then alone will America understand.

Sir, we must not yield to any pressure on account of our economic difficulties. Now they are showing generosity towards us. Everybody knows that they are going to take advantage of our food difficulty and other difficulties in order to pressurise us, in order to soften India's attitude. People are sick of war. The success of our foreign policy lies in peace and friendship with the people who stand for independence, peace, freedom all over the world. We are

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

on the high road to new successes, and we look forward to the new year that is coming with confidence and hope. We shall be fulfilling our duty of strengthening our positive role, overcoming our weak points and deficiencies and at the same time strengthening our solidarity against the imperialist bases at the home front as well as in the international arena. Today we have many more friends than ever before in the world both at home and outside. The socialist world is marching forward with great success than it was ever before and the non-aligned countries are more confident in their struggle. So are the other people, fighting for national liberation and peace everywhere. We must fight for it with greater confidence and trust, and I think we can make the year 1973, a year of mighty, historic success for the cause of peace, national liberation, social progress, democracy and for the welfare of the mankind.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mathur, please finish in five minutes.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : मैं केवल एक ही विषय पर बोलना चाहूंगा। वह तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में हैं। पिछले दिनों नेपाल के प्रधान मंत्री श्री कीर्ति निधि विष्ट चीन गए थे। उनके स्वागत में जो भाषण हुआ उसमें चीन के प्रधान मंत्री ने उनको यह कहा कि आपको जो एक्स-टर्नल थ्रूट है उसके सम्बन्ध में हम आपकी मदद करना चाहते हैं। श्री विष्ट ने अच्छा काम किया जो उसके सम्बन्ध में कोई जिज्ञा नहीं किया कि हमारे यहाँ को एक्सटर्नल थ्रूट है। उसी तरह से बंगलादेश के साथ हमारे जो संबंध है उससे रुष्ट होकर चीन ने बंगला देश के प्रश्न को लेकर सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल में वीटो का प्रयोग किया है। चीन की हमारे पड़ोसी मित्र देश के साथ इस प्रकार की दुष्टतापूर्ण नीति है। लेकिन जहाँ तक चीन का और हमारा सम्बन्ध है जहाँ तक तिब्बत का सवाल है, हमारी सरकार ने प्रारम्भ में उसके सम्बन्ध में जो रुख लिया था, उसके बावजूद उसने तिब्बत को स्वाधीन राष्ट्र नहीं माना, और तिब्बत में जिस प्रकार के

हमारे अधिकार थे उन अधिकारों का संरक्षण भी हमारी सरकार ने नहीं किया और हमारी गलतियों के कारण तिब्बत चीन के जंगल में फँस गया। आज एक मौका है, अगर हम दक्षिण वियतनाम को जो जनवादी सरकार है, जिसको आजाद सरकार कहते हैं, वहाँ पर कोई व्यवहारिक सरकार नहीं लेकिन फिर भी दक्षिण वियतनाम की सरकार को हम इस प्रकार की मान्यता दे सकते हैं, वैसे ही हम तिब्बत को दे सकते हैं। तिब्बत के लोग जब हिन्दुस्तान में आ सकते हैं और हमने दलाई लामा को भी जब वे हिन्दुस्तान आए, शरण दिया और यह काम जो हमारी सरकार ने किया उसकी सराहना की है, लेकिन शरण देना ही पर्याप्त नहीं है और आज चीन के जिस प्रकार के इरादे हैं और तिब्बत का जिस प्रकार से दुनियाँ के नक्शे में स्थान है और चीन के साथ हमारा जिस प्रकार का सम्बन्ध है, उसको देखते हुये मैं कहना चाहूंगा, सरकार को पहल करनी चाहिये और तिब्बत का जो स्थान है वह उसे मिलना चाहिए। तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में जो हमने गल्ती की, भूल की, उसको हम सुधारें और दलाई लामा की सरकार को हम तिब्बत की सरकार के रूप में मान्यता दें। दलाई लामा की सरकार और तिब्बत के प्रश्न को हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठाएँ दुनियाँ के दूसरे देश इस मामले में हमारी मदद करना चाहते हैं, मगर पहल हिन्दुस्तान को करनी पड़ेगी। अगर हिन्दुस्तान तिब्बत के मामले में पहल करे और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठाए और दलाई लामा की अपनी सरकार गठित करने में और उसको मान्यता दिलाने में मदद दें तो मैं समझता हूँ, इसमें हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति की बड़ी सफलता होगी।

श्री सूरज प्रसाद (बिहार) : अब इस बात को अमरीका भी नहीं मानेगा।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : अमरीका से रूस का सम्बन्ध हो गया, हमारा सम्बन्ध नहीं। उसी

तब से, पाकिस्तान के बारे में हमारी सरकार केवल इतना ही नहीं कहती रही कि हमें भुट्टो साहब के हाथ मजबूत करने हैं जिससे भुट्टो साहब को किसी प्रकार की दिक्कत न हो। पाकिस्तान में भी कुछ इस प्रकार के स्थान हैं, जैसे पख्तूनिस्तान के बारे में माँग है, जहाँ के लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई में साथ दिया, कंधे से कंधा मिला कर साथ दिया, लेकिन आज वहाँ पाकिस्तान की सरकार द्वारा जिस प्रकार का दमन किया जा रहा है उसको देखते हुए हमारी सरकार को चाहिए कि पख्तूनिस्तान के निर्माण की जो लोग माँग करते हैं, उसके लिए भी हमारी सरकार उन्हें और उनके आंदोलन में सब प्रकार का सहयोग और समर्थन दे, उसी में हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की सफलता है।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ किसी भी देश की विदेश नीति चाहे वह सही हो या गलत हो अगर उसके पीछे उस देश की ताकत है तब तो नीति सफल मानी जाती है और अगर उस देश के पास ताकत नहीं है तो उसकी सही नीतियाँ भी असफल होती हैं। Diplomacy succeeds when backed by force. चीन के मुकाबले जब हमारा देश हारा था तो नेपाल, बर्मा और लंका भी हमारी ओर नहीं ताकते थे और हम जीत गए तो सारे देश हमारी ओर ताक रहे हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमको अपनी विदेश नीति को सफल बनाने के लिए अपने देश की फौजी ताकत को बढ़ाना चाहिए। रूस और अमरीका की सारी नीतियाँ सफल होती हैं क्योंकि उनके पास फौजी ताकत है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें रूस की दोस्ती की इज्जत करनी चाहिए और ताईद करनी चाहिए। यह वह रूस है जिसने गोआ के मामले में हमारी मदद की है, जिसने काश्मीर के मामले में हमारा साथ दिया, जिसने बंगला देश के मामले में हमारा साथ दिया, जब

अमरीका का सातवाँ बेटा बंगाल की खाड़ी में बढ़ रहा था, जिस समय अमरीका और चीन के इन्टर-वेन्शन का डर था उस समय जिस रूस ने हमारा साथ दिया था उस रूस के खिलाफ क्यों हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के लोग कहते हैं कि रूस से दोस्ती क्यों करते हो, अमरीका से दोस्ती करो यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से कहूँगा कि जो लोग अमरीका से दोस्ती की बात करते हैं उनको वहाँ भेज दें (Interruption) आप उस अमरीका से दोस्ती करना चाहते हैं जिसने सातवाँ बेटा भेजा, जिस समय बंगला देश में जुल्म हो रहे थे, करोड़ों लोग तबाह किए जा रहे थे, लाखों महिलाओं के साथ पशुता का व्यवहार हो रहा था वह अमरीका उस समय भी पाकिस्तान की हिमायत कर रहा था और अपने हथियारों से, अपनी ताकत से पाकिस्तान की मदद की थी। उस अमरीका से दोस्ती की बात करने से ज्यादा बेवफाई क्या हो सकती है। दुनिया में आपको किसी न किसी मजबूत का हाथ पकड़ कर रहना है जब तक आप कमजोर हैं। जब तक आप मजबूत नहीं हो जाते तब तक आपको किसी मजबूत के साथ रहना है। अगर आप रूस के साथ दोस्ती के खिलाफ बोलते हैं तो आप अपने मुल्क के खिलाफ बोलते हैं।

हमारे कुछ दोस्तों ने तर्क दिया कि इजराइल को मान्यता मत दो, वह अमरीका का दोस्त है, वह अमरीका का दलाल है। अगर आप इजराइल को अमरीका का दलाल कहेंगे तो नार्थ कोरिया, नार्थ वियतनाम और स्वयं पाकिस्तान को क्या कहेंगे। अगर आप उनको मान्यता देते हैं तो इजराइल को देने से कैसे रोक सकते हैं। आप कहते हैं अरब कन्ट्रीज की बात। किस समय अरब कन्ट्रीज ने आपका साथ दिया? जिस समय पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया क्या अरब कन्ट्रीज ने आपका साथ दिया? जिस समय पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया क्या अरब कन्ट्रीज ने आपका साथ दिया? जिस समय मुसलमान महिलाओं के साथ बंगला देश में बर्बरता हो रही थी उस समय भी अमरीका के दबाव के कारण

[श्री नानेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

अरब कन्ट्रीज ने बंगला देश का साथ नहीं दिया इस लिए आप रबात में अपनी फजीहत कराने के बाद अरब कन्ट्रीज के तुष्टीकरण की नीति के कारण इजराइल को दूर न रखें।

“तुष्टीकरण की नीति आप की बहुत सफल नहीं हुई है और कही पर भी यह सफल नहीं हुई है। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर जरा भी ईमानदारी सरकार में हो और अपने देश के हित को ही वह आना क्राइटेरियन बनाती हो और आप किन्हीं दूसरे पहलुओं से न सोचते हों तो आपको इजराइल को जरूर मान्यता देनी चाहिए। घन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, the Foreign Minister.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, before the hon. Minister speaks, I would like him to kindly surrender the floor to me for one minute. I do not want to make any comments about our foreign policy. It is only a clarification that I wish to seek from the Minister. Sir, the other day we were very much upset when Mr. Surendra Pal Singh, in reply to a question with regard to our Commissioner resident at Hong Kong, said that our Commissioner was ejected out of his house and that he had to hire another residence at Rs. 13,040 per month and had to spend about Rs. 40,000 on furniture, etc. That day it gave us an impression that our relationship with Hong Kong was not very cordial. But luckily a report in the *Indian Express*, dated the 24th September, said that in an interview with their press representative, Shri B. K. Tiwari, our Commissioner remarked :

“It was not an eviction. If one likes to leave, then one leaves.”

Well, I would like to have clarification about this unpleasant episode. I do not want to go into the merits of the high rent that we have to pay. What I am anxious about is to be assured that our relationship

with Hong Kong still continues to be cordial. That is all I have to say.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it has been an interesting and a useful debate. I have benefited greatly by the observation made by hon. members from this side and from the opposition benches. Several matters have been touched upon, clarifications have been given and also some criticism has been voiced. Some very constructive suggestions have also been made. As a matter of fact, in a debate of this type and in the atmosphere in which it has been conducted, much of my task has been made light by very effective replies given by hon. Members of this House to some points of criticism that were raised. And I am happy to note that these replies to the criticism were given not only by colleagues of our party but also by several Members who sit on Opposition benches. I would, in this background, resist the temptation of picking up points and then trying merely to give counter-arguments or give a defence against the criticism. That has been very effectively done by several hon. Members who have participated in the debate and I need not hammer this point too much. This does not mean that I have no observations to make. In fact, it is a very important occasion and I would like to utilise this opportunity of bringing the information of the hon. Members up-to-date on some points, and I would also venture to offer comments on some important matters that have been raised.

Taking the world as a whole, I broadly agree with the point mentioned by several hon. Members from the Opposition benches as also from the ruling party, that by and large the positive developments in the world today are significant.

These positive developments are not confined to any one particular region, but they encompass Europe, Asia and also Africa and Latin America. These new developments can broadly be described as developments in the direction of developing an atmosphere of a detente, of relaxation of tensions. I do not want to give an impression that all the difficult problems have been solved. That is not correct. But new attitudes have been brought about and a

certain atmosphere of friction, cold war, of confrontation, is slowly giving way to an atmosphere of relaxation of tensions and of trying to explore avenues where agreements may be arrived at, if not on very important and basic issues, at any rate, on some of the issues. And from that point of view I would say that this is a welcome development. I do not want to go into the details because they have been mentioned in the House and outside on more than one occasion. Taking Europe, for instance, the significant moves which brought the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union nearer to each other, which resulted in the signing of the Moscow Agreement between the FRG and the USSR, and the Warsaw Treaty between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany, acceptance by the Federal Republic of Germany of the existing frontiers in Europe, creating relaxation between the FRG and the German Democratic Republic which ultimately has resulted in the signing of treaties and agreements between the two German States, the FRG and the GDR, and this paves the way for admission of both the GDR and the FRG to the United Nations next year, these are very significant events and we have to take not of all these developments. Several honourable Members have drawn attention to a new Europe that is taking shape, Western Europe, the entry of the United Kingdom into the European Community, a big economic entity, somewhat inward looking at present. It is the hope and expectation of the developing countries that this bigger Europe Community, would view the problems of the developing world in a more imaginative manner than what was visible in the UNCTAD Conference at Santiago. Whether it will come about or not, only time can tell. But there is no doubt that the European Community, by its new economic process of integration, is a very big economic unit and can play a very significant role not only to the mutual interest and advantage of the European countries, but with imagination, with enlightened self-interest, and by consolidating the forces of peace, can take steps which might, to a certain extent, be in the direction of lessening the differences between the rich and the poor.

Take Asia where the situation is more disquieting, has been more disquieting as compared to Europe. And

there are several sensitive and difficult areas in Asia. But even in Asia, if we have a broad sweep of the situation, things are appearing to be moving in the right direction. The admission of the people's Republic of China into the United Nations may cause temporary irritation to some countries. This may create some temporary problems. But there is no denying the fact that the international situation, the situation in Asia, has significantly changed by seating the rightful Governments of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

In fact even those countries which do not like the Chinese attitude on concrete issues do feel—and this is commonly said in the United Nations Lobbies—that the People's Republic of China had been kept out of the United Nations far too long. It would have been better for the international community and better for China if the legitimate and rightful government of the People's Republic of China had been seated in the United Nations much earlier. The negative attitude of several countries started melting away last year and this has facilitated the seating of the Government of the People's Republic of China. This is a very significant event because the Chinese representatives can put across the Chinese viewpoint to the international community and they have also to listen to what others have to say about the Chinese policies and how they conduct themselves in the international sphere. Under the circumstances, it is all the more surprising that of all the countries China should be the one country which should exercise its veto to keep Bangla Desh out. Bangla Desh may not lose anything by remaining out of the United Nations. But the international community will definitely lose, if Bangla Desh is not admitted into the family of the United Nations and is not afforded an opportunity to play its rightful role in that organisation. It is no favour to Bangla Desh to admit it to the United Nations. As a free, independent and sovereign country, it is entitled to be in the United Nations and the United Nations and the international community will be the poorer if they keep Bangla Desh out. In this connection the remarkable sentiments expressed by the President of Bangla Desh yesterday when he addressed the Members of both Houses of Parliament are very significant. That shows the direction

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

in which the mind of the people of Bangla Desh is working.

Apart from the admission of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, President Nixon's visit to Peking also has altered the situation. We are in favour of relaxation of tension in all parts of the world. Any step taken in any part of the world which results in relaxation of tension is welcome to us. That is in line with our thinking and it is in line with our policy which we have steadfastly pursued all these years over since our Independence. The visit of President Nixon to Peking has to be evaluated in this context. But it has altered the geo-political situation of that part of Asia, particularly amongst the neighbouring countries of China. Several countries which had formulated and had pursued a policy dependent only on an attitude or atmosphere of confrontation between the People's Republic of China and the United States of America were temporarily swept off their feet. They did not know what to do. Slowly they are recovering and realising the realities of the situation or are reformulating their attitudes and readjusting themselves to the new realities that are taking shape in this context.

A reference has been made to the reconciliation that has been initiated between Japan and the People's Republic of China. This again is a welcome development and we welcome it. So long as all these developments move towards relaxation of tension and are not at the cost of third parties, we always welcome them and it is our hope that none of these moves will be at the cost of any third party. The parties concerned are at pains to tell the world that these moves are not at the cost of any third party. Let us hope so and we would like to believe that they are genuine when they say that.

Moving a little south of Japan, we see the new moves taken by the two Koreas, North Korea and South Korea. They have had bilateral talks and we see the efforts that are being made by both of them to bring about, what they describe as, a peaceful reunification of the two Koreas. Again

these are all positive steps and we should not ignore them.

Then, we come to Indo-China. The situation there, as you know, has been a matter of the gravest concern to the international community. We in India have always been deeply involved emotionally in what has been happening in Vietnam and the Prime Minister of India, myself and the other honourable Members of this House, have expressed their views in no unmistakable terms on several occasions and I do not want to go into these things and into the whole history. What is the present position in Indo-China? This is an important matter and I would like to say a few words.

The situation in Indo-China continues to be fluid and complex and has so far eluded a satisfactory solution. The month of October raised high hopes of a DRVN US accord. However, the hopes were soon belied by the Saigon Government raising difficulties with the result that the signing of the agreement which, according to the DRVN, was scheduled for 31st October, was postponed. It is a good augury, however, that the secret talks in Paris were resumed on the 20th November and although the first round of talks has proved inconclusive, the talks are again scheduled to be held on December 4. In the reported accord reached in October, it would appear that both sides had given some significant concessions. Credit should be given to the DRVN for its initiative to put forward on October 8 a draft agreement which formed the basis of subsequent negotiations and resulted in the finalisation of the agreement within a matter of about three days or so.

The question of Laos and Cambodia is intimately connected with the question of a peace settlement in Vietnam. The problem has, however, become more complicated by the conflicting interests of the great powers. In Laos, we are happy to see the resumption of talks in Vientiane between the Pathet Lao and the Laotian Government. Although the progress of these discussions has been slow, it underlines the desire of both the sides to come together and settle the problem bilaterally and peacefully. We hope that these talks are continued and that they become fruitful.

More complicated, however, is the problem of Cambodia. As far as Laos and Cambodia are concerned, an end to the Vietnam conflict would create conditions for a solution of the problem of these two countries.

The people of both these countries inherited a rich cultural heritage and are most peace loving by nature. India has always held them in high esteem and extends to them her fraternal support. India would like to see that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of these two States are safeguarded in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

Whereas I cannot say that the war in Vietnam is over—bombing still continues, I cannot say that the problem of Laos and Cambodia has been solved—it is still awaiting final settlement and final solution—I do venture to say that the trends are somewhat positive, and every effort should be made to ensure that this positive trend continues to yield concrete results.

In Asia, West Asia has also been another area to which several hon. Members have made a reference. Some oblique references have also been made and an opportunity was also seized to offer some criticism, though mild, about India's attitude to this problem. I would like to say quite clearly that in the Arab-Israel conflict, we have stood on the Arab side because we firmly believe, and we continue to believe, that justice is on the side of the Arabs. We have been totally opposed to the acquisition of territory by aggression. And so long as Israel continues to be in possession of territories, got hold of by Israel and occupied by Israel as a result of aggression, we will continue to support the Security Council Resolution that all those territories should be vacated, and that these should go under the control of the governments of the countries concerned, whether it is Egypt or Syria or Jordan. The Israeli aggressive war cannot be condoned. The continued defiance of the unanimous resolution of the Security Council is a matter of grave concern, and we continue to support the Arab cause because justice is on their side.

Some observations were made as to why we should continue to support them when

the Arab appreciation of the developing situation in Bangla Desh was not in accordance with the realities of the situation. I have no hesitation in expressing my disappointment that the attitude of several Arab countries in this respect was not based on realities. It was not a correct appreciation of the situation. I won't be surprised if they were moved by extraneous considerations. But that does not mean that we should alter our attitude on the Arab-Israel dispute when we see justice on the side of the Arabs. It will be very wrong for a country like India to change its stand which was taken after a great deal of consideration. It will be very unwise to change that stand merely because subsequently the attitude of certain countries was not to our liking. It will not be healthy thing and it will certainly not strengthen us, and it will be wrong on merits and it is also against our enlightened self-interest. We should view it in that context.

Some vague expressions have been used as to why we do not recognize Israel. I want to make it clear that we do recognize Israel as a State. There is no doubt about it.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : What about diplomatic relations ?

SARDAR SWARN SINGH : Israel has also got some sort of presence in our country. It is not that we treat them as untouchables. But we have to have normal diplomatic representation depending on our mutual interests. Even in the Arab world, there is no identity of views and it is wrong to equate all the Arab countries together. There are different shades of opinions even among the Arabs and I have no hesitation in saying that in several cases the real position of some of the Arab countries may not be the same which appears to be from their statements made from time to time. In international life, one should get reconciled to the realities of the situation. Sometimes the real positions are different from the outward opinions or statements that are made by certain countries.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : It seems to be so in your case also.

SARDAR SWARN SINGH : If you ask me any specific question, I will be able to tell you,

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I am asking with regard to Israel.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I have already made a statement with regard to Israel. We recognise Israel. Israel has got some sort of representation also in India. I am firmly of the opinion that at the present juncture no useful purpose will be served and no national interest will be served by upgrading the level of representation or having regular ambassadors in each other's countries.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : May I ask a question ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I cannot enter into a running debate. This is a game at which all of us can play.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : We can understand a little better

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : When you spoke, said a number of things. I had a strong temptation to ask questions. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Suppose we had relations with Israel, you would have been the ambassador there.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : That is reserved either for the ruling party or the loyal Opposition of the ruling party.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I do not think that a highly intellectual person like Dr. Bhai Mahavir can be wasted in an ambassadorial position in Israel.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : This is a compliment to me, Sir. But this is a left-handed compliment to the ambassadors appointed in different countries. That is not my question. I only mentioned that we had not even invited Israel to a commercial venture like Asia 72 Fair.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : It is a minor matter. Ask Mr. Yunus who was handling it. It is much too small a matter to be referred to in a serious debate like this.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : You are treating them as untouchables.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am enjoying. Twenty-five years ago, it was all America. Now it has become Israel.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : For you it is Russia and Russia alone all the time.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Even the confirmed critics of the Arab countries can see that two Arab countries have already recognised Bangla Desh. They are Iraq and South Yemen. There are other Arab countries whose attitude about the happenings in the Indian sub-continent is undergoing a very significant change. Is it in our national interest to facilitate that change or do you want to pin them down to a position which they took, based maybe on mistaken understanding of the situation or maybe due to some extraneous considerations ? Our national interest requires that we should permit these countries to move towards the realisation of the realities in the Indian sub-continent rather than pick up some earlier statement and say, "You said 18 months or 14 months ago a particular thing. Even if you say a different thing now, even then we are not going to be impressed. We will hold you guilty because you said certain things about 12 months ago." This is a normal way of functioning in the international sphere. We should do everything to convert others and bring them round to our viewpoint and not have this punitive attitude and try to clacken any institution or any persons who happen to be our critics. Otherwise, you will increase very much the number of these critics and you will not be doing the right thing in the interest of our country.

I mention these things in the context of Asia as developments which can be regarded as positive. I do not think however, that the present situation in West Asia is such which can be described as having moved towards a positive direction.

I am sorry, this is the present situation, and I must tell the House in all frankness the reality of the situation. But if we look to Asia as a whole, China-Japan relations, North Korea and South Korea, new trends in Indo-China and, finally, happenings in the Indian subcontinent, the total picture is one of distinct improvement in the situation judged from the international point of view.

and from the point of view of peace and of strengthening the forces of progress in Asia.

Take the Indian sub-continent. Prophets of gloom can always draw long faces, but what is happening today? Let us project ourselves to a position exactly a year ago and compare it with what the situation today is in the Indian sub-continent, and no other speech or no other statement is necessary. We are proud that yesterday we welcomed the President of Bangla Desh in the Central Hall of our Parliament when the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha and the Speaker of the Lok Sabha and all the distinguished Members of Parliament of both Houses, belonging to all parties, had the occasion to listen to not only a highly emotional but also a very constructive speech made by the President of Bangla Desh. We happen to be discussing the international situation when the President of Bangla Desh is touring our country, who was our distinguished guest during the last three days—and he has gone out and he is visiting several other States in our country. This is symbolic of a new atmosphere that is taking shape, that is developing in the Indian sub-continent, an atmosphere of friendship and good-neighbourly relations between what used to be at one time historically the eastern wing of Pakistan which is now independent, sovereign Bangla Desh and India. That is obviously a matter of immense gratification to us. It is a positive development in the international situation.

Bangla Desh is now recognised by about 95 countries of the world including four permanent members of the Security Council. When the question of Bangla Desh's admission to the United Nations came up before the Security Council, it is a matter of great satisfaction that out of the fifteen members of the Security Council there was only one negative vote; three countries who are traditionally friendly to Pakistan did not dare to oppose the admission of Bangla Desh in the Security Council; they just abstained. And there were eleven positive votes in favour of Bangla Desh's admission to the United Nations. Bangla Desh has already been admitted to a large number of specialised agencies of the United Nations family and the United Nations Organisation. Bangla Desh is already a member of the Commonwealth and is also a member of

the Colombo Plan countries. Bangla Desh has been admitted already by the Secretary-General of the United Nations with Observer's status in the United Nations. These are very positive developments and we can look forward to an era of greater co-operation and strengthening of friendly and close and good-neighbourly relations between Bangla Desh and India.

Already in several important spheres of economic corporation, technological cooperation significant agreements have been concluded between Bangla Desh and India. A treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation was concluded when our Prime Minister paid a visit to Dacca in March last. These are the developments in the Indian sub-continent.

Take our relations with Pakistan. I know, if we apply a critical eye, we can pick holes here and there. We can always make out a case even when there is no case but if we look at the present India-Pakistan relations, I think it is a matter which should afford some satisfaction to us. Let us not forget that the real problems that face the Indian sub-continent, the people of India, the people of Bangla Desh, the people of Pakistan, are the socio-economic problems to raise their living standards, to increase the economic and industrial strength of these countries so that the benefits may be available to the vast millions of people that inhabit this area. I would like to sound a note of warning here that it is becoming rather fashionable, I should say, using the expression not in the correct sense, *i. e.* talking of military strength and military might. Of course we have to be militarily strong because we have discovered that to maintain peace also it is necessary that a country like India should be militarily strong. But to say that everything depends on our military strength perhaps will not be a very correct appreciation of the situation. Talk on any matter, there is a tendency among certain quarters to say that nothing can happen if we are militarily strong; let us be militarily strong. Nothing can happen in the Indian Ocean, let us have more of naval strength. There is some disputes which delays settlement between the military representatives of India and Pakistan, again at once we come back that the only way to solve this problem is 'mili-

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

tary strength'. Military strength is very important. Strength of the country is important. Economic strength, unity amongst the people, progress in industry and agriculture all these are very important. But we must not miss the central theme and the central theme is that India should be the central country in South Asia which should be the torch-bearer for establishing durable peace in this region which, I am sure will result in the establishment of durable peace in a greater part of Asia. This is the vision which should never become dim. We will be committing all of mistakes if we miss this central objective that we should always pursue. It is true that peace is elusive, can be elusive, but it has to be pursued. It has to be searched for assiduously, carefully and in a determined manner, not that we should slide back again to some sort of Chauvinism or Jingoism if we feel that there is a little set-back. Our attitude should be to go ahead, to remove the difficulty that comes in the way of establishment of durable peace. Do not always think of using a sledge hammer even for killing a fly. That is a very dangerous attitude in private life, it is all the more dangerous in international relations.

We should understand these problems in the true perspective and not lose sight of the basic objective if we face any difficulties.

It has now been accepted by the whole country except of course one political party whom we have not been able to convince—the people of India feel and I believe the people of Pakistan also have the same feeling—that the signing of the Simla Agreement is a distinct departure from the past. The past was one of confrontation, both military and political, one of friction and that atmosphere of confrontation should change into one of good neighbourly relations. The Prime Minister has made the position clear and I have also mentioned on more than one occasion that we do think that the Simla Agreement is a distinct step in the direction of altering that atmosphere, that attitude of confrontation into one of co-operation and of good neighbourly relations.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Tashkent was also one like that.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I do not see why Tashkent is decried. There was nothing wrong in the Tashkent Declaration. I have never said so, you can look through all my statements. I reiterate that Tashkent Declaration was a good agreement because in Tashkent the two sides had agreed to do away with the effects of war. They had also entered into several agreements to strengthen the relations between the two countries but after signing the Agreement the follow-up action on the side of Pakistan did not come up according to what was agreed to in the Tashkent Declaration. I would request hon. Members to view these solemn Agreements arrived at between two countries with a little more seriousness than I notice when in a very casual manner objections are just aired without understanding their implications. It will be a bad day for country if international agreements that any are entered into by accredited representatives—in this case and also in the case of the Tashkent Declaration they had been broadly approved by Parliament—are taken very casually as if one always tries to find an excuse for wriggling out of those agreements. It has never enhance the prestige and honour of any country if that country always thinks of excuses for getting out of agreements. There can be difficulties, there can be setbacks, there can be complications, there can be knots; these have to be got over. They should not become an excuse for scrapping the agreements or saying that they should be buried. The Simla Agreements is very much alive. We adhere to it and we will ensure that Pakistan also adheres to it. That should be the attitude and that is precisely the attitude that we have.

Now there are two matters of recent occurrence about which I would like to inform the House and bring there information up to date. One is about the last meeting of the Chief of the Army Staff. Hon. Members will recall my statement in the House on the 14th November where I stated that the senior Military Commanders of India and Pakistan, who were entrusted with the task of delineating the line of control on maps have so far held 9 rounds of discussions and an agreement had been reached on 19 maps delineating the entire length of the line of control

from the Chumb area on the international border to Partapur sector in the North. I also mention that the Senior Military Commanders were unable to reach a settlement on a controversy over a pocket approximately $1\frac{1}{2}$ square miles in area and it was being considered whether a meeting at another level should be held to resolve this question. In response message received from the Government of Pakistan suggesting a meeting at the level of the Chiefs of the Army Staff of the two sides India agreed to this and the meeting was held at Lahore on 28th November. They failed to resolve the controversy over this issue and as mentioned in the communique they decided to refer the matter back to the Governments as their interpretation of Para IV of the Simla Agreement was at variance.

5 P. M.

Hon. Members would recall that I had also stated in this House, during the same debate; that if no agreement was reached at the Chiefs of Staff level, the issue could be taken up at another level. While the Lahore meeting has failed to settle the question of this controversy, we have taken note of the Pakistan Government's view that this is a minor issue. This is what they have mentioned in various statements. Government will, therefore, consider the possibility of another meeting with Pakistan at the same or a different level. This is in conformity with the Government's stand of solving differences bilaterally and peacefully in accordance with the provisions of the Simla Agreement.

Another event of importance is the resolution about the admission of Bangladesh into the United Nations and I would like to bring on record the facts of this development. The General Assembly of the United Nations has unanimously adopted two resolutions on the question of Bangladesh. Both the resolution were adopted without a vote and the President of the Assembly read a statement proposing such unanimous adoption. The first resolution was a 22-member resolution initiated by Yugoslavia which, considering that Bangladesh is eligible for membership of the United Nations, "expressed the desire that Bangladesh will be admitted to the U. N.

at an early date." The second resolution, co-sponsored by nine delegations, was on the initiative of Argentina as compromise proposal in order to avoid acrimonious debate on the Yugoslav resolution, as well as to avoid far-reaching amendments by Pakistan and some other delegations. This resolution refers in its preambulatory paragraphs to the United Nations Charter and the Security Council resolution No. 307 of 21st December, 1971, as well as notes with satisfaction the steps taken so far to facilitate the restorations of conditions of normalcy in the Asian sub-continent, notably the Simla Agreement. It expresses "the hope that all parties will refrain from any act which could jeopardise prospects of a settlement" and the desire that the parties concerned will make all possible efforts in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect to reach a fair settlement of issues still pending" between them. The resolution also "calls for the return of prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Convention and the Security Council resolution." In his statement asking for the adoption of these resolutions, the President said that the consensus of the Assembly was in favour of the admission of Bangladesh and that the Assembly was also in favour of the implementation of the Security Council resolution. He added that the admission of Bangladesh should be viewed along with the overall solution of the existing political, legal and humanitarian problems and that it was essential to view the "simultaneous adoption of these two resolutions as constituting the inter-dependence between these viewpoints. A peaceful solution on the sub-continent should be promoted". This is from the statement of the president.

In explaining the Indian position on the two resolutions, our permanent representative, according to Government instructions, welcomed the President's reference to the desire of the parties concerned to make all possible efforts in co-operation and with mutual respect to reach a settlement on the issues that are still pending. He also welcomed the reference to the Simla Agreement in the second resolution. On the question of prisoners of war, our permanent representative referred to the discussions during the Simla summit and explained the point of view of India regarding their surrender to

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

the joint command and the need for the association of Bangladesh in the matter.

He also quoted paragraph 6 of the Simla Agreement which referred to further discussions between the representatives of the two sides for establishment of durable peace and normalisation of relations including repatriation of prisoners-of-war and civilian internees. He added that this solemn agreement was ratified by the Parliaments of the two countries.

I would like to recall to the hon. Members that the question of the settlement of the prisoners-of-war question has also been covered by the Simla Agreement and our complaint has been that Pakistan, by its continued non-recognition of Bangla Desh, is coming in the way of the implementation of that part of the Simla Agreement and is thwarting the discussion that should be held on a trilateral basis for the final settlement of the question of the prisoners-of-war. Similarly, at the Delhi meeting of the representatives of the two sides, the Indian side stated that Bangla Desh was a necessary party to the discussion of the repatriation of the prisoners-of-war and civilian internees and that its recognition by Pakistan would facilitate further progress. The Pakistani side noted the Indian view and stated that the question of recognition of Bangla Desh was under serious consideration. This was the Delhi Agreement. Our permanent representative further said that he failed to understand why Pakistan had not still taken any step towards mutual recognition of each other by Pakistan and Bangla Desh. He pointed out that the implication of non-recognition of Bangla Desh by Pakistan was tantamount to denying the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bangla Desh which was accepted by over 90 members of the United Nations. Finally, we pointed out in our statement that the reference to interdependence made by the President was seen by us as indicating that as long as Bangla Desh was kept out of the United Nations and as long as Pakistan refused to recognise Bangla Desh, the solution of the pending problems including the implementation of the Security Council's Resolution would be difficult, if not impossible.

This overwhelming and unanimous support to the basic approach that the countries

in the sub-continent should intensify their mutual efforts to come to a settlement of all the problems that still remain unsolved, is very significant, and I would like to commend this to the critics of the Simla Agreement. It is not only in the mutual interest of both India and Pakistan that the Simla Agreement should be implemented but it has also the unanimous support of the international community, and they are expecting that all the countries in this region should adhere to the principle of mutuality and should make every effort to settle all outstanding problems by mutual discussion and by mutual agreements. This is a significant development.

In this context, therefore, I would say the situation in the Indian sub continent also can be described as something which definitely has moved towards the relaxation of tensions. A new situation has developed the emergence of Bangla Desh and the signing of the Simla Agreement and the endorsement of the basic principles of the Simla Agreement by the international community is something which is very significant. There can be a strong temptation amongst the members of the international community to put their fingers in any dispute going on in any part of the world which, sometimes, may be with the best of intentions. But in this particular case, we have it in the forms this Resolution that primarily the countries in this region, India, Bangla Desh and Pakistan, should put their heads together and should try to resolve all their differences by mutual agreement. This is a vindication of the basic concepts of the Simla Agreement, and I fail to understand why some hon. Members continue to hammer this negative note and continue to criticise the Simla Agreement without understanding our interest in this respect and the interests of peace in the sub-continent, and also of strengthening of the forces of peace throughout Asia. This, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is the international situation that we face. In this context what should be our attitude?

Several hon. Members have said that we should reassess the situation. Of course, the Foreign Office would not be doing their duty if they do not reassess the

situation. It is one of their duties always to take all these aspects into consideration and to adopt attitudes and to make their contribution so that the process of strengthening of durable peace is further reinforced. This is the function of the Foreign Office and we will be badly failing in our duty if we were not to take a good note of what is happening in our neighbourhood, what is happening in other parts of the world, what is happening in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. We have to keep all that in view. Having kept all that in view I am firmly of the opinion that the policy that we have been pursuing, a policy of judging issues independently on their merits, a policy of adherence to peace, a policy of not being tied to one power bloc or the other, a policy of independent action and independent judgment on any issue of importance, is the correct policy.

Hon'ble Members have mentioned : Where is non-alignment when countries that were engaged in the game of cold war are themselves getting nearer to each other and are relaxing in a manner in which the original hard attitudes are disappearing. If anything, that is a vindication of the policy of non-alignment. If other countries who were formerly engaged in cold war and in confrontation are getting nearer, is that a reason that we should give up non-alignment and should get aligned ? And aligned to whom when, according to your assessment, they themselves are getting nearer to each other ? The validity of this argument is very difficult to understand. I do not think that those hon'ble Members who put forward that idea, although they are in a microscopic minority, ever gave thought to what they are saying. If the power blocks are crumbling, if the process of detente has been initiated, if the old adversaries are trying to get nearer to each other, is that the time to give up non-alignment and be aligned ? There is no answer to this second question. Therefore, the independent policy that we have pursued in the international world in looking after our own national interests is the correct policy.

Again, a yardstick was put across by several Members, not many, two or three from the Opposite side. They had a simple formula. Our self-interest is the

sole criterion and everything should be done to see that our self-interest is safeguarded. Of course, who can dispute that thing ? But even our enlightened self-interest, India's own interest cannot be divorced from the rest of the world. India stands to gain if the forces of peace in the world are stabilised and strengthened. India and the entire under-developed world stand to lose if peace is disturbed. If the world is engulfed by conflagration and the resources of the world and the thoughts of the world go towards war and conflict, India with the rest of the developing world, the non-aligned nations, suffer.

So, to imagine that India's interest lies not in consolidating the forces of peace is a very short-sighted approach and is not in our self-interest. Let us not forget that it is also in our self-interest that we should have some clear principles in front of us. Adherence to principles gives greater strength in the international community, and also internally, as compared to acquisition of some symbols of material strength, whether they are economic or even military. If we waver on principles, that weakens us more than the loss of a few tanks or a few aircraft. These can easily be secured in the world to-day. Luckily, on account of certain forward planning undertaken by us, we can easily strengthen our defence potential, by and large, by our own effort. The industrial base that we have developed with the help of friendly countries, particularly the socialist countries, is such to-day that it gives us confidence that, by and large, even in the military sense we can look after our requirements. It is not a small achievement. And having secured that, our pursuit to resolve our differences with Pakistan in a peaceful manner should continue. That is the best bet and I would say that any distraction from that path is not either in our self-interest or in the larger interest of peace.

There are two other matters, rather three, about which I must make a few observations before I finish. One is the Indian Ocean. Several hon. Members have made mention about this and I would like to say that we are pursuing a certain policy in this respect which is a correct policy, and which is the policy to which most of the littoral countries surrounding the Indian

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

Ocean are veering round. This policy is to keep the Indian Ocean area free from big power rivalry, free from foreign bases and free from nuclear weapons. Now, I do not know whether we will succeed at the first step. But this is the direction in which we must move. This was our effort in Lusaka. This was our effort during the last U. N. General Assembly session. This has been reiterated in the present General Assembly session. And, by and large, an atmosphere is building up where even the countries who have got big naval power will have to listen to the views of the littoral countries. It is a correct policy that we are pursuing . . .

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Do you propose to take the initiative to call a conference of the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : That is a suggestion which can be considered. As a matter of fact, the vast majority of them, excepting those who are members of Pacts, did attend the Lusaka Conference, and there were groups of the littoral countries . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Some day some alternative idea should come. You may not give it now. Ultimately we will have to evolve a system of Asian security in order to make this zone free from the threat of war.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I see the point that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has mentioned. I am at the present moment on a smaller issue, the Indian Ocean, which is important. In this connection, I would like to say that our friendly neighbour, Sri Lanka, is taking the initiative. It is good that they are taking the initiative. We are giving them all possible support to ensure that the Indian Ocean area emerges as an area of peace free from big power rivalry.

Two other matters have been raised and they are engaging the attention of the Government—our relations with China and our relations with the United States.

And I think that my intervention in this debate will not be complete unless I were to say something on these two important

issues. In this matter we should not be sentimental. We should see what our best interest is and we should pursue a policy which is in our interest, in the interest of peace and also in the interests of progress and development.

So far as America is concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that we have much in common with that great country and its people. We cherish common values of an abiding nature such as our belief in democracy and democratic way of life, individual liberty and human dignity. There is no basic conflict between the interests of India and the United States in this region or elsewhere. This does not, however, mean that we look at various problems in an identical manner. The view from New Delhi is bound to be somewhat different as compared to the view from Washington because of our geographical and historical position and our traditions and policies. It is necessary that both countries should understand and respect mutual differences of points of view within the broad framework of our common values and on the basis of mutual respect. There is no reason why our relations with the United States should not only be normalised, but also become friendly and cooperative. If countries like the United States and China which have different political, social and economic systems can normalise their relations, if countries like the United States and the Soviet Union, who are rivals in certain ways, can normalise their relations, there is no reason why our two countries which have much in common should not be able to normalise and strengthen our relations. There have been differences in the past few years, differences that were vital to our interests, which have given rise to some strains in our relations with America. However, these differences are of a temporary nature. If America is prepared to make a fresh start on the recognition of realities of the new situation in this area, I have no doubt that our relations can again become normal and friendly. The conflict in Vietnam which had given rise to some differences between our two countries is on the way to a peaceful solution. Once peace is restored in Vietnam, India, along with America and other countries, can cooperate in the important task of the reconstruction of this war-torn region and in the stabilisation of peace

therein. In the past the US military assistance to Pakistan has been one of the main reasons for the strained relations between India and America because it had not only encouraged the anti-Indian and militaristic policy of Pakistan, but also increased tension on this sub-continent. The attitude the United States in the struggle for freedom of Bangla Desh was another source of tension between two great countries. It is a matter of gratification that Bangla Desh has emerged as a sovereign, stable democratic and independent country. We are glad that the United States of America has recognised Bangla Desh and is cooperating in the task of reconstruction in Bangla Desh. We hope that in the light of past experience America will take no steps to upset the trends towards normalisation of relations on the sub-continent. We have every reason to believe that it will encourage and support the new policy of bilateralism enshrined in the Simla Agreement. Against this background I can assure this House that we shall do everything in our power to try to normalise and strengthen our relations with America on the basis of recognition of the new realities and on the basis of equality, reciprocity and mutual respect.

As for China, geography has placed us as neighbours of this great country. We cannot wish away China any more than China can wish away India. Border problems have existed between neighbouring countries throughout the ages. The countries concerned should settle such matters through peaceful negotiations and not by resort to force.

We see no reason why two great countries like India and China should not be able to do the same. It is our firm belief that India and China can and must normalise their relations on the basis of the five principles of peaceful co existence which our two countries were the first to subscribe to. We are glad that China has also given expression to this view. However, to translate this desire into concrete terms, it is necessary that positive steps must be taken by both sides for this purpose. We are willing and ready to hold bilateral discussions with China on the problems that bedevil our mutual relations. Some hon. Members have referred to the desirability of exchanging Ambassadors. Although mere excha-

nge of Ambassadors does not always lead to improvement or normalisation of relations, we are ready and willing to consider this matter also. We would be happy to normalise our economic, cultural and other relations with China if she is willing to do so. For normalisation of relations, it is necessary that there must be a desire on both sides. We hope and believe that the time is not far off when in the interests of the two countries and in the larger interests of peace and stability in Asia, India and China will be able to take positive steps towards normalisation of relations on the basis of mutual respect, equality and reciprocity.

We can assure China that we have no desire or intention to interfere in her internal affairs. We regard Tibet as part of China and any allegations that we are encouraging fissiparous tendencies in Tibet is totally unfounded and baseless. We hope that China will also respect our territorial integrity and sovereignty and not encourage any fissiparous elements in our country. Some people seem to think that our friendly relations with the USSR is an obstacle in the way of our normalising relations with China. This is not correct. Our friendship with any country is not based on enmity against any third country. Our hand of friendship is open for any country to grasp provided there are no conditions attached with regard to our relations with any other country. We want to be friendly with all countries and we will not accept any conditions from any third country with regard to our bilateral relations with any other country. We are glad that the spirit of bilateralism and detente is spreading to various parts of the world. There is no reason why India and China—two great countries of Asia—should not be able to solve their mutual problems bilaterally and peacefully in their mutual interests and in the larger interests of peace, stability and progress in Asia and the world. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : One suggestion. Since it was read out, it appears to be a policy statement. I wish it was read out at the beginning of the hon. Minister's speech so that we could have given our reaction to it. It is a written statement and obviously it has been prepared carefully.

But the portion relating to America is in direct contrast to what the Government has been saying. There is no reference in it to their aggressive designs, no reference to encouragement of certain forces and no reference to CIA activities. Do I understand that the application for PL 480 will be sent very soon . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Surendra Pal Singh will reply to Shri Tyagi's point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All those things should have been given there. For the last one year we have been told by the Government certain things about American . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. Yes, Shri Surendra Pal Singh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Here is a wishy-washy soft-spoken statement.

To cover up everything is bad. Therefore I referred to this. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let him answer Shri Tyagi's point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I request you not to water down our stand in regard to America. Have good relations with them on the basis of our anti-imperialist position, anti-colonialism, their aggressive designs against our country including intensification of the CIA activities about which our Prime Minister has said. Even about the CIA activities your Prime Minister has said : "How can we think of improving our relationship with the USA ?".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right, You have made your point.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Have I made my point ? Then, has he understood it, Sir ? . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He is quite intelligent to understand your point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Since you have said that I have made my point

and Sardar Swaran Singh is a very intelligent man and he surely is not lacking in intelligence, I presume he has understood it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, Mr. Surendra Pal Singh will reply to the point raised by Tyagiji.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : Sir with your permission I would like to clarify certain points which Mr. Tyagi raised about the house of our Commissioner in Hong Kong. I think, Sir Shri Lokanath Misra also raised this point. Now, Sir, the whole confusion appears to have cropped up over the word "eviction". May I, at the very outset, say that neither in my reply to an Unstarred Question in the Rajya Sabha nor to another question in the other House have I used the word "eviction" anywhere. The words used by me in the reply to the question—with your permission I would like to read out—are as follows:

"The old house was sold by its owner and that was the main reason why he had to leave the old house and move into a new one."

I have not used the word "eviction". It appears to be true from the Press reports that our Commissioner in Hong Kong has made the statement that he was not evicted. So, in fact, there is no contradiction between what he said and what I said. We maintain that he was not evicted, and he also maintains that he was not evicted. So, there is no contradiction in this. As for our relations with Hong Kong, they are very happy and cordial and this incident will not have any effect on our relations with Hong Kong. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirtytwo minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday the 1st December, 1972.