

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

1. THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS)
No. 3 BILL, 1968.
2. THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS)
No. 4 BILL, 1968.

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha.

(1)

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha I am directed to enclose herewith the Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1968, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd August, 1968.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

(2)

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Appropriation (Railways) No. 4 Bill, 1968, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd August, 1968.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

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

MOTION RE SITUATION ARISING FROM THE ENTRY BY ARMED FORCES OF THE SOVIET UNION AND FOUR OF ITS WARSAW PACT ALLIES INTO CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN RELATION THERETO

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dahyabhai Patel to move the following motion :

"That the situation arising from the entry by the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and four of its Warsaw Pact allies into Czechoslovakia and the Prime Minister's statement made in the Rajya Sabha in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, before the hon. Member starts, may I enquire from you whether the debate will be confined to the 14 Members who have

given notice? In this motion all the Members are interested. Therefore, there should be an opportunity for every Member who wants to speak and it should not be confined only to the 14 Members. Therefore, the time allotted should be more than what you have allotted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The debate will go on from 12.00 to 1.00 P.M. now and then from 2.00 P.M. to 6.00 P.M.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Mr. Chairman, Sir, you have been kind enough to read the motion. So, I will not read it again. But I would crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House and seek your permission to allow me to make a slight modification because this motion only says that you take into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendments are there.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am not satisfied with them. So, I would crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House to suggest an amendment. In fact, my colleague, Prof. Ruthnaswamy . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the end of your speech you can move the amendment.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: At the end? Thank you. Sir, the strong feeling . . .

(Shri A.P. Chatterjee approached the Chairman.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given a ruling that nobody should come to me when I am getting on with the House.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir the strong feeling prevailing in the country and in this House of Parliament was displayed by the fact that, in spite of the confusion prevailing in the House, when the Prime Minister had made the statement here and when I requested the Members to stand up to mourn the death of democracy, everybody on this side stood up that day. Everybody . . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : Not everybody.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I know that you are not going to stand up. But most of the Opposition Members did stand up. What has happened in Czechoslovakia is not in violation not only of the Charter of the United Nations but also of the

Warsaw Pact itself to which all the Soviet countries subscribe. I will take the time of the House in reading all that. It has been read in the other house. The fact is that not only every human being but every animal wants freedom. If you get hold of a bird and put it in a cage, the moment there is a chance to escape the bird escapes. That is the feeling not only of human beings but of nations also. There are nations behind the iron curtain which want to get rid of that yoke. They want reforms. They want to build their destiny according to their own likes, and they are willing to abide by their Treaty obligations with their neighbours situated geographically as they are and, therefore they entered into what is known as the Warsaw Pact. Under that Pact also each of the nation is free to carry on its own affairs as it likes and none of the contracting parties should interfere into the affairs of another nation.

Sir, we have our dear ties with the nation of Czechoslovakia, ties not only of trade and commerce but even before we were free we supported Czechoslovakia in its fight for freedom. I will not recount the events of history. But one cannot omit to mention the brave stand that Dr. Benes took when Hitler tried to overpower the country. Again, the same thing was repeated, I think, in 1948 and, again, perhaps in 1963 under the Soviet regime. Yet the people of Czechoslovakia have stood up against this. And what did they want to do recently? They wanted to introduce certain reforms, a liberal attitude to the people expressing themselves in the Press. Perhaps they did not subscribe to the Soviet theory of giving harsh sentences on authors for writing plays. For example, we heard about two years ago how certain Soviet authors, who produced literature, very good literature, simply because the theme was freedom the bosses of the Kremlin disapproved of this and harsh sentences were given to them, and they have been put behind the bars. This is what the world does not like, every human being does not like and, naturally, therefore, the people are shocked. We have won our freedom from foreign domination, and we feel sympathy for the people who have suffered, not once, twice or three times under similar domination and yet determinedly stood up. It was heartening to hear.

Sir, it was heartening to hear how the people of Czechoslovakia sacrificed themselves peacefully before the invading tanks

of the Soviet Army. That is perhaps a lesson in non-violence. We do not know all the details. We do not know all the facts. But we understand that the leaders have been arrested. Some say they have been taken to Moscow though it is denied by Moscow. What is the fate of the President?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) :
The latest is that they have been killed.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :
I would like the hon'ble Prime Minister to inform the House if they have any information about the Party Secretary, Mr. Dubcek. What has happened to his Cabinet Colleagues? Where are his Cabinet colleagues?

Now, Sir, an attempt is made to set up a puppet Government. That has been the Soviet pattern everywhere. I hope there was an attempt to set up a Quisling Government and, therefore, the name 'Quisling' has become a word in the English language which signifies a puppet regime. I think it was in Norway that this puppet Government was set up. The conscience of the world is shocked by these events, particularly of the people of this country because we wanted to be friendly with Russia. Some of us, of course, were doubtful of this move but, by and large, people in this country were led to believe that the Soviet people had given up the ways of violence, that they would like the world and its peoples to behave in a civilised manner, that they would abide by the United Nations Charter and not use force against each other. The facts have unfortunately belied themselves. Was it that the men in the Kremlin were deeply worried at what was happening in Czechoslovakia? Did they feel that this urge for freedom in the people of Czechoslovakia would spread into the Soviet Union also and their despotic rule would come to an end? Was it that they realised that human beings, apart from plants and animals, grow only in freedom and dignity, that without freedom and dignity there is stagnation? No growth is possible without freedom. In spite of what we have been told by their friends here, what is the progress that these countries behind the iron curtain have made all these years? But even the socialist countries of Europe have practically, one and all, condemned this aggression. I could not understand the attitude of the Prime Minister. Why was she halting and flatering in her condemnation of the Soviet action? It is one thing to state in a straightforward manner that

[Shri Lokanath Misra]

we deplore the facts and we condemn it, and another thing to say in substitute words that we are sorry that this has happened, that it hurts us and what not.

I was able to follow some of the speeches in the other House and I am glad many of the Congress Members stood up and said what they wanted to, but when it came to the Resolution itself I was disappointed. I am glad there were some people, some Members of Parliament from the other side also who took courage and boldly condemned the Soviet action because there could be no other word for it. It is perfidy not only in their own continent of Europe but in the whole world to say that they stand for peace and preach peace, and then take measures : send in an army, and send in tanks.

Sir, only after eight days' meeting, five or six of these countries, Russian representatives, Czechoslovak representatives, Rumanian representatives, Poland and other countries, met to discuss their internal matters. And what did they decide?

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh) :
Not Rumania.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :
Armies that had been amassed on the borders were requested to be withdrawn. A show of withdrawal was made, we are told. Perhaps they all withdrew. What happened in eight days after that that the Soviet armies and tanks marched into Czechoslovakia? Was there any provocation? Did the little peace-loving Czechoslovakia offer any provocation? They have never done so. They are like us in many respects and they suffer like us also in many respects. Therefore, we have reason to have very great fellow feeling for them and to take up their cause.

Sir, the Prime Minister in her statement in the other House referred to her father, how he used to take up the causes of so many countries who were fighting for freedom. That is why he has gone down in history as a great man. The events of history changed soon after we got our freedom. A cloud descended on this country. The cloud of Krishna Menon descended on this country and we have our edition of the "Pravda" also. We started shutting an eye to the truth. The first act of mistake was to acquiesce in the raid and aggression on Tibet. For that action this country will always have to rue that day.

And I remember the last public speech that my father made in this city of Delhi on the Swami Vivekananda Anniversary day warning the people of this country and the Government that letting down Tibet would have very serious consequences. Have we not witnessed? We allowed them to take over Tibet and allowed their hunger, their greed to grow higher and more and more. At that time perhaps both the communist countries were together. Today we see the funny spectacle of the Chinese communists condemning the Russian action. Perhaps it is like the kettle calling the pot black. When two thieves fall out, do we take sides? It is not our business to take sides when these thieves fall out. Our action, our course should be the right course that was taught to us by the Father of our Nation. We have to support the oppressed everywhere if their cause is just; if their cause is not just, it is a different matter. And, therefore, I would like to know from the Prime Minister, what is going to be the attitude of the Government of India in the United Nations? I would like all the Members of this House to indicate to the Prime Minister that we would like our representative at the United Nations to support the resolution that has been moved in the United Nations. I think I have got something like the text of the resolution. I am sure the Prime Minister is also apprised of it. In the Security Council a resolution has been moved :

"The Security Council,

"Recalling that the United Nations is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members,

"Gravely concerned that, as announced by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, troops of the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact have entered their country without the knowledge and against the wishes of the Czechoslovakian Government,

"Considering that the action taken by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other members of the Warsaw Pact in invading the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is a violation of the United Nations Charter and, in particular, of the principle that all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State,

"Gravely concerned also by risks of violence and reprisals as well as by threats to individual liberty and human rights which cannot fail to result from imposed military occupation,

"Considering that the people of the Sovereign State of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have the right in accordance with the Charter freely to exercise their own self-determination and to arrange their own affairs without external intervention,

"1. Affirms that the sovereign, political independence and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic must be fully respected,

"2. Condemns the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other members of the Warsaw Pact in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and calls upon them to take no action of violence or reprisal that could result in further suffering or loss of life, forthwith to withdraw their forces, and to cease all other forms of intervention in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs,

"3. Calls upon member States of the United Nations to exercise their diplomatic influence upon the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the other countries concerned with a view to bringing about prompt implementation of this resolution,

"4. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit this resolution to the countries concerned, to keep the situation under constant review".

The Secretary General has also condemned the Soviet aggression.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is not the first time in history that the Soviets have committed aggression. There are some people who are inclined to shut their eyes to facts. There are some people who do not recognise that it is the habit of certain people to mislead the world, to give a different meaning to language, as language used by the communists acquires a different meaning every time when they call it a democratic republic. We know what it means. When they mean that is the people's wish, we know what it means. In defence, the "Pravada" and perhaps the

Indian edition of the "Pravada" as it was called in the other House, says that the Czechoslovakian people invited the Soviet armies. Is there anyone who will believe this?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : What is the Indian edition of Pravada?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : "Patriot", if you do not know. I will just come to it presently. But we have had several situations in this country when it, has been difficult to keep law and order as for instance, in Naxalbari. Would you like two or three people to say, we invite the invading army to come. This is what they say. They have got their own words. "This is a reactionary Government", they will say all sorts of things of that kind and invite the foreigner to come in, invite the Russians to come in. That would be the example that we will be setting if our representative at the United Nations does not take a firm stand and support this resolution. We have a habit of preaching so many things to the world. In season and out of season, we say, stop the bombing of North Vietnam. We ignore the fact that Ho Chi Minh and his representative very recently in Pakistan said, "Kashmir is an internal part of Pakistan". I do not know what type of friend they are. They say one thing to us and another thing to another person and of course, Russia has already done the somersault in the matter of arms.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Nominated) : But does it mean that we should not condemn the incessant bombing of Vietnam by America when children are being massacred and daily bombing is more than that of the last war put together?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Mr. Alva, I would like you to read the history of the Soviet Union—how they came to power, how many people did they put to death? How many children were starved? How many people died in front of the grain godowns because grain would not be released to them by the Soviet Union? Did you condemn it? I would like to know that before you talk of bombing. Sir, I am a man of peace. I do not like bombing. But I would like evil to be resisted every time. Mahatma Gandhi taught us to resist evil, if possible non-violently. Violently if we could not do it non-violently. To do this requires great

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

courage. To resist such force non-violently certainly requires great endurance and human courage and we must salute the brave young men in Prague who have sacrificed their lives in this manner non-violently before the Soviet tanks. I would like our Prime Minister, therefore, to instruct our representative at the United Nations to support the resolution that I just read before you. I do not know what the Government wants to do. We have before us the history of note one, but several betrayals under Krishna Menon's regime. Even though he is not there, his shadow a long shadow, continues after him and his influence is seen in many high quarters. Therefore, . . .

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated) : May I ask a question ? Has there ever been a Krishna Menon's regime in this country ? Was he ever the Prime Minister of India ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : He was more than the Prime Minister when he was the Defence Minister. If you know history, if you have been in Delhi—if you don't open your eyes to the facts, what can I do ? Ask your friends; ask your friends of the Congress Party and they will tell you why he had to go. It is only when the Congress Party took up courage and told the Prime Minister Mr. Nehru "Either Mr. Krishna Menon goes or you both go" that Mr. Krishna Menon went. (Interruption). I would honour those Members of the Congress Party who have got the old fire still. I see some of them still opposite me. I see also among them some who are back there, many of them are there because it is more profitable to be in the Congress. The Congress has power and there are many people who have joined the Congress because of that power and not because of the ideal that is before them.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Sir, I think those words should not go into the record . . .

(Interruption).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Every thing should go on record.

DR. ANUP SINGH : I think it is a very serious matter

(Interruption).

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sit down ; order, order.

DR. ANUP SINGH : I am not going to sit down at your bidding.

(Interruption).

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Sir, I am ready to prove every word of what I have said; I will produce the proof for it in your Chamber. (Interruption). I have not used any unparliamentary expression.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. Anup Singh, you can have your say later on.

(Interruption).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is a familiar obsession; it has been on record.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन् श्री अनूप सिंह क्यों खड़े हो जाते हैं ? बौद्धिक परतंत्रता की बेड़ी में श्री अनूप सिंह अपने को जकड़े रखना चाहते हैं । जहाँ श्री नेहरू का नाम आया इनकी छाती फटने लगी ।

(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Patel, you go ahead. (Interruption) Please, sit down, Rajnarain.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : We know it is true.

DR. ANUP SINGH : You were not in the meeting . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN : I know.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Rajnarain, please sit down.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Sir, I was seeking your permission to add to the resolution, "Having considered the Prime Minister's statement in the Rajya Sabha. . ."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order. He cannot give it. Somebody else can give it.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am suggesting this for the acceptance of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You finish your speech. I shall put the Motion and then you can put your amendment.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : All right, Sir. Since the Motion before the House is only for consideration and does not indicate any positive action . . .

श्री पीताम्बर दास (उत्तर प्रदेश) : इसमें एक प्रोसीजर की डिफिकल्टी आ जायगी । जो आदमी प्रस्ताव रखता है उसे क्या यह अधिकार भी है कि वह उसमें अमेंडमेंट दे दे ?

श्री राजनारायण : बराबर ।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : केवल चेयरमैन की परमीशन से कर सकता है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have given permission and it can be done.

AN. HON. MEMBER : What happens to the other amendments?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The others also will come.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : We want to have a say on the matter before you allow it...

MR. CHAIRMAN : The other amendments will come.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : They become out of place.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is the Motion ? First of all, the Motion should be moved.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : Sir, when he moves the amendment, we should be given an opportunity to have our say and after hearing us, if you so feel, you can either allow or disallow...

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am allowing him. (Interruption). Mr. Patel will first finish his speech. Then I shall put the Motion. Then the other Members will move their amendments. Then he will come in.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I may not be able to speak again at that time. I was just trying to be helpful to the House to save time...

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Sir, there will be another difficulty of procedure. After you have put the Motion, you can allow Mr. Patel to move his amendment. But he can move it only after all other amendments have been moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All right, that shall be done.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Sir, I bow to your ruling. This Motion itself is a Motion for taking the statement of the Prime Minister into consideration. And what we should do after the consideration is not mentioned there. The main, operative part of the Motion is not there and, therefore, I was seeking to suggest that we should request the Prime Minister,

urge the Prime Minister, to instruct our Representative at the United Nations to support the Resolution that is before the Security Council and which I have just read before you; it may not be word for word the same, but it conveys the sense of it. I have very serious reasons for moving it because not once or twice our Representative at the United Nations, whether under instructions from her or otherwise, has not acted according to what the people wanted, but according to his own sense and, therefore, the image of India in the world suffered. I do not want this to happen this time. Thank you.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Sir, I move:

1. "That at the end of the motion the following be added namely :

'and having considered the same, this House deeply deplores the aggression against Czechoslovakia committed by the Soviet Union and some other Warsaw Pact countries'."

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) : Sir, I move :

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

'and having considered the same this House strongly condemns the armed entry of the troops of Soviet Russia and its Warsaw Pact Allies into Czechoslovakia as a wanton act of aggression against a peaceful neighbour and calls upon all peace-loving nations of the world to lend full support to the people of Czechoslovakia and their leader Dubcek in their movement to assert their national independence and right to determine their way of life freely'."

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sir I move :

3. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should take all effective steps to secure withdrawal of invading Russian forces from Czechoslovakia and restore the Government of People's choice there'."

SHRI A. P. JAIN : Sir, I move :

4. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

'and having considered the same this House recommends that the

[Shri A. P. Jain]

Government should take effective steps through talks with the U.S.S.R. and the U.N.O. and otherwise to secure the withdrawal of the Russian forces from Czechoslovakia so that the people of Czechoslovakia may live a life according to their choice’.”

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I move :

5. “That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely :

‘and having considered the same, this House approves of the statement of the Prime Minister’.”

DR. ANUP SINGH : Sir, I move

6. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

“and having considered the same this House is of the opinion that the, armed forces of the U.S.S.R. and four of its Warsaw Pact allies should withdraw from the Czechoslovakia soil immediately’.”

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Sir, I beg to move :

7. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

‘and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the armed forces of Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland and East Germany have launched a naked imperialistic attack on Czechoslovakia under the leadership of the Russian forces and have encroached upon the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Czechoslovakia, and under these circumstances, this House strongly condemns the attack of Soviet imperialism’.”

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa) : Sir, I move :

8. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

‘and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the U.S. S.R. has committed clear violation of the United Nations Charter’.”

SHRI B. N. MANDAL (Bihar) : Sir, I move :

9. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

‘and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the action of the Soviet Union and four of its Warsaw Pact allies should be condemned and the Government of India should apprise those countries of this opinion of the House and ask the invading nations to withdraw their forces immediately from Czechoslovakia’.”

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sir, I move :

10. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

‘and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that there has been a clear violation of the U.N. Charter by the U.S.S.R. and some of the Warsaw Pact Powers’.”

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Patel, you move your amendment.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Sir, I move . . .

SHRI A. P. JAIN : On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : This amendment has not been circulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It has not been circulated ; it will be circulated after he moves it.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : Sir, my point of order is that the hon. Member has moved the motion. He has not given notice of his amendment to the motion according to the rules. Therefore he can move the amendment to the motion only with the permission of the Chair. He had ample opportunity to give notice of this amendment. But he has not given notice of this amendment and if I understand him correctly from what he has said in the speech, his amendment would upset many of our amendments. If we had had the amendment before us, we could have changed or amended our amendments in the light of his amendment. Therefore Sir, I submit that he has not made out any case for moving an amendment to this motion and I request that you may not give him permission.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have given him permission.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL) : On

a point of order, Sir. I would like to draw your attention to rule 160(2) of the Rules of Procedure, Sir. It says :

"If notice of such amendment has not been given one day before the day on which the resolution is moved, any member may object to the moving of the amendment, and such objection shall prevail, unless the Chairman allows the amendment to be moved".

Therefore, Sir, the proviso in this case is meant only for exceptional, extraordinary circumstances.

श्री राजनारायण : गुजराल साहब, क्यों समय नष्ट कर रहे हैं ? चेंबरमैन ने परमिट कर दिया है ।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : एक मिनट, मुझे खत्म करने दो ।

Sir, the position that I am trying to submit before you is this, that unless the circumstances should be exceptional and extraordinary. Here you have allowed him to move the motion; it is a joint motion, sponsored by eight or nine other Members. Now, the hon. Member has not given any reasons whatsoever as to why he wants to amend the motion. Therefore, Sir though in your wisdom you may permit him to move it, it is the spirit of this rule that should prevail ordinarily. No extraordinary circumstances are there.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am giving him permission under extraordinary circumstances.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The point of order is disposed of already . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, kindly listen to me and then say whether you have disposed of it or not. First of all, I must point out that in regard to a consideration motion of this kind, the usual convention is that the mover of the consideration motion does not move "having considered the same . . ." also somebody else does it. You can waive that convention here, but then it will be done for the first time. Then the second point is when you call somebody to move a motion, it is only a right and privilege of every Member to raise a point of order and bring to your notice the question as to the admissibility or otherwise of a motion as

to whether the motion¹ is in order or not. We Members here are faced with a situation where a motion is moved, the text of which we do not know; whether it conforms to the rules, we do not know; whether it is a negative motion, we do not know; whether it is a parallel motion, we do not know; whether it falls in line with the rules of the consideration motion of the kind that you have admitted, we do not know.

Therefore I say you can even keep it pending but do not ask the Members to accept a motion . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have permitted the amendment being moved. It will be circulated the moment it is ready.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Chairman, this is wrong, I submit to you. Any Member has a right to raise an objection to any resolution, or motion from the point of view of its admissibility or otherwise.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Mr. Chairman, I sought your permission to amend the motion because without the operative part of it, it would not have meaning.

(Interruptions.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have given permission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What have you done? I think confusion is worse confounded.

(Interruptions.)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा भूपेश गुप्ता जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि यह कृपा कर के बैठ जायें। इनका प्वाइंट सुन लिया गया। अब आगे चलें।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Mr. Chairman, I move :

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

'and having considered the same . . .'

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : On a point of order, Sir. The rights of the hon. mover of the motion are determined by rule 159(1) which says :

"A Member in whose name a resolution stands on the List of Business shall, except when he wishes to withdraw it, when called on, move the resolution, in which case he shall commence his speech . . ."

The hon. Member has no right whatsoever to go beyond this rule 159(1).

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I thought the hon. Minister in charge of Parliamentary Affairs was more conversant with the Rules of the House. What he refers to is in regard to Resolutions.

(Interruptions.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall not allow any more discussion on this.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Sir, I move :

11. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

'and having considered the same, this House urges the Government to instruct India's representative in the U.N. Security Council to support and vote for condemnation of the aggression and breach of the U. N. Charter'."

The questions were proposed.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar) : Mr. Chairman, we have assembled here today not to write an epitaph on Czechoslovakia for the spirit of freedom of man is indestructible. We have assembled here really to write an epitaph on the great professions of those five powers who are dancing the naked dance of death on the prostrate body of a small and helpless nation. Mr. Chairman, we are told that these five Armies have moved at the invitation of Czechoslovak people. The tiger would as well proclaim that the lamb by its bleatings had been inviting the tiger to go and devour the lamb. Mr. Chairman, it is not for the first time in our life time that we see that this small and industrious nation is being violated. Remember those days when an arrogant dictator sent his Army across the borders that divided his country from this small country. Czechoslovakia lay prostrate for some years. But then history records

that nemesis overtook that great dictator, history records that he had to commit suicide in the underground bunkers that he had built for himself. Mr. Chairman, we are told that the Armies of the Warsaw Pact countries led by one of the Super Powers, the USSR, have moved in at the invitation of Czechoslovak people. Now who are those people who have invited them? They are nameless and faceless. The USSR has not yet proclaimed who are the people who sent an invitation to their Armies to march into Czechoslovakia. Mr. Chairman, it has been made clear by those who hold the reins of legal power in Czechoslovakia that they marched without any information to the legally-constituted authorities both of the State and of the Communist Party. This has been made clear by the Czechoslovak Ambassadors in various capitals. I would like to have information on this point, whether the Czechoslovak Ambassador in Delhi has not informed our Government that this is not incursion by invitation but naked and brutal aggression against the wishes of the people. Mr. Chairman I know of no perfidy greater than this in the whole gamut of history. When Hitler sent his Armies in Czechoslovakia, it was a known enemy, it was a known adversary who sent his Armies to this helpless country. When Japan perfidiously attacked Pearl Harbour while negotiating in Washington, it was known to the whole world that Japan and the United States had been at loggerheads for the control of the Pacific for the previous 20 years. But here was a people, a small people, tied by a solemn pact, a pact which laid down obligations on its signatories to protect the independence of each other. Now on the one hand negotiations go on at Bratislava, communiques are signed and sentiments of friendship are expressed, on the other hand the five hands which were clasping in embrace the body of Czechoslovakia carried daggers, each one of them, in their other hands and with those daggers they stabbed a friendly unsuspecting people with whom they were bound by a solemn pact to protect their independence, their sovereignty and their integrity against all aggression. Therefore I say that it is an incident of an unprecedented character. Mr. Chairman ..

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sinha, you can continue your speech at 2 P.M.

The House then stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

The house reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : There has been a serious development today. In spite of the assurance given to both the Houses of Parliament by the Prime Minister that India would be second to none in sponsoring or in supporting any Resolution in favour of the Czechoslovakian people, the Government of India, we are told, have instructed our representative in U.N. to abstain from voting. Further I would like to add that if that is how the Prime Minister treats the Parliament, I think it is high time that the Prime Minister should be taken to task for this and as a mark of protest we shall not allow the proceedings of the House to continue until the Prime Minister comes and clarifies the position.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Lokanath Misra has raised a very serious point. This matter is being debated in this hon. House and if I remember correctly, only yesterday the hon. Prime Minister assured this Parliament and the nation that we shall stand firm in condemning aggression—or whatever words she might have used—and we shall see that effectively we support the cause of Czechoslovakia in safeguarding their liberty, their honour and their dignity. If what Mr. Lokanath Misra says is correct that our representative in the Security Council has abstained, it is something very serious and this whole debate will be meaningless unless and until this point is clarified. It will be just crying in the wilderness and the whole proceedings of this House will be meaningless if the Government had directed its representative to remain neutral there in the Security Council and we go on making speeches here.

The other news that has come is that the Czechoslovakian leader Dubcek has been murdered. If it is so if this is a confirmed news, I do not know if in this state of affairs the Government of India has chosen to remain neutral, nothing can be a greater effrontery to international behaviour and I seek that these two points should be clarified before the debate proceeds further.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, ज्यों ही हमें खबर लगी त्यों ही मैं आपके सचिव के पास एक प्रस्ताव लेकर आया जिसमें हमने

चेयरमैन से रिक्वेस्ट किया कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर को बुलाया जाय क्योंकि हमारी भारत की सरकार ने संक्योरिटी कौन्सिल में मतदान में भाग लेने में अलग रहने की हिदायत की, ऐसी खबर है। संसद् अभी इस पर विचार कर रहा है, संसद् में प्रस्ताव चल रहा है, पता नहीं संसद् क्या फैसला ले, फिर भी इतनी निर्लज्ज, इतनी बुज्जदिल, इतनी कायर, इतनी अशक्त यह भारत की सरकार है कि उसने ऐसे प्रश्न पर, जहाँ पर मानवता क़त्ल हो रही है, जहाँ पर आज़ादी क़त्ल हो रही है, जहाँ का नेता क़त्ल किया जा रहा है रूसी सेनाओं के जरिये, उस समय भी भारत के प्रतिनिधि ने इतनी बुज्जदिली, इतनी कायरता दिखायी और मतदान में भाग नहीं लिया। इससे बढ़कर पार्लियामेंट का अपमान और कोई हो नहीं सकता, इसने बढ़कर भारत की जनता का अपमान नहीं हो सकता। इसलिये मैंने आपसे निवेदन किया कि मदन की कार्यवाही हर्गिज हर्गिज नहीं चल सकती है, या तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर यहाँ आकर बतलाएँ कि क्या उन्होंने अपने प्रतिनिधि को हिदायत की कि भारत वोटिंग में भाग न ले और एब्सटेन करे।

इसी के साथ आप इस बात को देखें। यहाँ पर कहा जा सकता है यह खबर अभी आई, यकायक आई। इस खबर को आए ही गए आध घंटा, पौन घंटा और प्राइम मिनिस्टर को सूचना भी हो गई। अभी प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं आई। यह एक मामूली चीज़ नहीं है इसलिये आपसे हमारी प्रार्थना है आप हमारी भावनाओं को देश की भावनाओं को समझे। किसी मुल्क की आज़ादी इस आसानी से क़त्ल नहीं की जा सकती ज़िम तरह से रूसी साम्राज्यवाद का प्रतीक होकर बलगेरिया, हंगरी, पूर्वी जर्मनी, पोलैन्ड की सेना लेकर चेकॉस्लोवाकिया में गया है। इनलिये हम उसकी निन्दा करते हैं और भारत के प्रतिनिधि ने जो एब्सटेन किया है उसकी घोर भर्त्सना करते हैं, घोर निन्दा करते हैं; उसने भारतीय पौरुष को, भारतीय सम्मान को कलंकित किया है इसलिये प्राइम मिनिस्टर

[श्री राजनारायण]

को यह सदन निंदा करे कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने अपने प्रतिनिधि को क्यों आदेश दिया कि वह मतदान में भाग लेने से अलग रहे।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि जब चेकोस्लोवाकिया का प्रश्न सदन के दोनों सदनों में विचार हो रहा था तो भारत के प्रधान मंत्री महोदया की तरफ से इस बात का आश्वासन दिया गया कि वहां के लोगों के ऊपर जो अत्याचार किये जा रहे हैं, रूस की सेनाएं बलात् वहां पर अधिकार कर रही हैं, वहां के राजनैतिक नेताओं की हत्या करने का भी समाचार अब मिला है, तो उस सब में भारत अपनी प्रतिक्रियाएं, अपना विरोध, उन मारी बातों की भर्त्सना करने में किसी से पीछे नहीं रहेगा। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा जब प्रधान मंत्री ने यह आश्वासन दिया तो क्या वावजूद उस आश्वासन के हमारे प्रतिनिधि को क्या यह इन्स्ट्रक्शन भेजे गए कि वह यूनाइटेड नेशन्स सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल में उस प्रस्ताव के समय तटस्थ रहे या तटस्थ रहने के संबंध में पहले सूचना भेज दी गई थी और क्या आश्वासन देने के बाद प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने अपने प्रतिनिधि को फिर से इन्स्ट्रक्शन इस सदन की भावना, इस देश की जनभावना को ध्यान में रख कर नहीं दिये। अगर हम इस जन-घृणित कार्य को स्वीकार करते हैं, रूस ने जो कुछ किया बलात् चेकोस्लोवाकिया पर अधिकार करने के लिये अपनी सेनाएं भेज कर, और रूस के इस कदम में हम साथ दें तो यह कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं कि हम रूस के 'सेटलाइट' बन गए हैं। क्यों रूप जो कुछ भी करता है उसको किसी भी कारण से हमारे लिये मानना अनिवार्य हो गया है ?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Madam, we were shocked to hear that the Indian Government has instructed its representative to abstain from voting with regard to this important resolution that is being discussed in the Security Council. Yesterday only the Prime Minister made a statement in this House that we will take all steps to see that the United Nations

Charter is implemented and any violation of the U. N. Charter with regard to Czechoslovakia will be protested against and we will support the cause of Czechoslovakia in the Security Council. Now, contrary to the statement that was made to Parliament the Prime Minister and the Government of India appear to have advised the Indian representative to abstain from voting in the Security Council with regard to this very important question. Whereas Czechoslovakia is overrun by Soviet forces and other Warsaw Pact countries, India appears to have been overrun by Soviet Russia. It looks as though this Government has displayed cowardice and it looks as though this Government has become a satellite of Soviet Russia. Now that India's honour is at stake, this Government has no right to continue to exist in this country. It should be thrown and the Prime Minister should quit office.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Madam Deputy Chairman, a new element has been introduced in this tragic episode of Czechoslovakia. We were under the impression that we are discussing it here and that House has passed a Motion which takes the whole thing into consideration. And when we are considering this thing some instructions have been sent to our representative to abstain from voting. I say abstention is much worse than voting against. Either we vote for it or we vote against it. Abstention..... (Interruptions) In whose company we are? Out of thirteen Members in the Security Council only two on one side, eight Members on one side, and Pakistan, India and Algeria have only to get the distinction of abstaining on such a perfidy, or on such a tragic incident in the world. We think the Prime Minister should enlighten this House. Otherwise there is no point in having the debate. Let us wind up the debate here and now if there is no satisfactory answer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think it should be discussed in the course of the debate. I can understand this side but now I find that Mr. C. D. Pande is taking particular interest in this matter. Now the Prime Minister made a statement in the other House yesterday and certain motions were also rejected. Therefore, I do not know what exactly the position of the other House is. But it does appear that contrary viewpoints or radically divergent viewpoints were expressed in Lok Sabha, which did not find acceptance with the House. Whether it is right or not, that is not the point.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : But the Prime Minister made a statement here and it is there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am coming to that.

Therefore, there is nothing on record as far as the other House is concerned to sustain the proposition the hon. Members are making here.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : No, let the Congress Party withdraw its whip and then you will know the other House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not concerned . . .

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : On a point of order, Madam Deputy Chairman. While the contention was put forward on the floor of the House by some hon. Members that Parliament has not finally taken a decision, they meant to say that Rajya Sabha was still in possession of the discussion of the matter and therefore Parliament has not finally taken a decision in the matter. It is not for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, when it suits him and when he acts here as the representative of Soviet Russia, to say that the other House has thrown it out. How can he bring in the other House in this House when we are in possession of the Motion regarding Czechoslovakia and say that since the other House has rejected the Motions, now the Prime Minister can send the direction to our representative to abstain from voting? He cannot bring in that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let me complete the sentence. You know very well . . .

(*Interruptions*)

श्री राजनारायण : प्राइम मिनिस्टर का रिटेन स्टेटमेंट है, जिस रिटेन स्टेटमेंट में प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा है कि चेकोस्लोवाकिया को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। यह सत्य है या सत्य नहीं है ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You know very well that I am not a man who gets easily brow-beaten. Therefore I say... (*Interruptions*.) He is quite relevant, Mr. Rajnarain. I never said that because the other House has disposed of it, the

matter is not relevant here. In fact, I began by saying that you discuss it here, no doubt in the course of the debate. (*Interruptions*.) Let me finish. Otherwise I shall also start interrupting you. I know, sometimes so many of you have one view point and I happen to have a different view point. (*Interruptions*.) You know very well Bhupesh Gupta is not made of that stuff, one who easily gets cowed down here. I am not made of that stuff, you know very well. (*Interruptions*) I did not disturb you. Kindly listen to what I say; you will hear my viewpoint better. Now on this matter you are quite right when you said that this should be discussed. You are quite right also when you asked the Government position to be stated in the debate. Now, as matters stand at present, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel's Motion has become infructuous. Now with regard to the statement, if we discuss the statement, then we have to consider the statement made in this House by the Prime Minister, and in the other House, and the text of the Security Council Resolution which had been read out by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. If the text of the Security Council Resolution corresponds with the statement made in this House and the other House, you will be perfectly entitled to call the Prime Minister to question on the other hand, if the text does not tally with the statement made in this House, and in the other House, then you will have to argue (*Interruptions*) in a different way. Therefore, let it be the subject matter of the debate.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : The question is not about the text; the Government of India's instructions to abstain from voting, that is the point.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : The Prime Minister should withdraw the instructions that she has given to our representative.

(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If all of you stand up, whom am I to call? Now I think we must go on with the debate.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : You do not want to consider other points of view.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : I have been standing, Madam Deputy Chairman.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I shall come to you after Mr. Bhargava has spoken.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, the point at issue is very clear. If the Government of India has given instructions to its representative in the U.N. to abstain from the voting on the Resolution about Czechoslovakia, no purpose will be served by our going on with the debate.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Who are you ?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Please hear me. If the news is wrong and no instructions have been given by the Government of India to its representative, then we can certainly continue with the debate, and that can only be clarified if the Prime Minister takes the House into confidence and tells it whether the instructions have been issued or have not been issued.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Arjun Arora. I cannot call everybody. I cannot call the whole House.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : With your permission, Madam, I want to ask the Prime Minister whether instructions to abstain from the voting were given because the Government hope that by abstaining in the voting the Government will be in a better moral position . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It seems a contrary view cannot be expressed.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I want to know from the Prime Minister whether these instructions were given because Government hope that by abstaining the Government will be in a better moral position to secure withdrawal of . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If this is the way, Madam, I join my voice with him. Just because this is what the Communists say, it should not be allowed ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Madam, these people talk too much of democracy but they are not democrats enough to allow me to complete one sentence.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Every Member has the right to express his opinion.

श्री राजनारायण : आप कहना क्या चाहते हैं ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I must have my say; otherwise I must consider Mr. Rajnarain a Fascist and not a democrat.

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं नहीं, बोलिये, आप, मगर निर्नज्जता की सीमा पार न करें ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Thank you for the permission, Mr. Rajnarain.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : On a point of order. The point is this. We are not yet possessed of the facts, whether any instructions have been issued and if so what instructions have been issued.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : This is not a point of order.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : You are nobody to say that. You sit down.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Madam, I am not yielding.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Arora, please sit down.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : Madam, any useful debate can take place only when we know the facts. All this talk has been going on on the basis if it is so, then it is like that; if it is not then it is so. So I would request you to request the Prime Minister to enlighten the House and when we are in possession of the facts we can discuss and express our views.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Madam, you have correctly held that it was no point of order.

The Government in its statement day before yesterday said that the troops which have occupied Czechoslovakia must be withdrawn. That alone is the commitment of the Government. This House or the other place has not yet....

(Interruptions)

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : No, no. There was commitment to sovereignty, commitment to freedom.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : There is no freedom as far as Mr. Godey Murahari is concerned.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : The commitment of the Prime Minister was not only to the withdrawal of troops from there but the commitment was to freedom, sovereignty and liberty of the Czechoslovak people. That is the commitment which she has made.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : All that will be restored. The commitment that Government have made to this House and the other place is that it will secure the withdrawal of foreign troops from Czechoslovakia and I want the Prime Minister to say whether abstention is a means to secure that and as long as it is a means to secure that the Government has not violated any undertaking given to this House or to the country.

(Interruptions)

DR. ANUP SINGH : Madam, may I say....

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : On a point of order, I would like to know what this discussion is about.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : The Prime Minister should be asked to make a statement.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Let the Prime Minister make a statement and then we will discuss it.

श्री राजनारायण : मेडम, इन को बैठाइये न ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Since so many in the Opposition have been given opportunity to express their opinion I must give opportunity to some on this side also to express their views.

श्री राजनारायण : प्राइम मिनिस्टर बैठी हैं ।
उन से आप कहिये न कि बतलायें ।

DR. ANUP SINGH : I think every Member has the right to express his views and if you try to shout him down nobody is going to gain anything. I would just like to make one remark about what the hon. Mr. Bhargava has said. He has said that if the Government of India has given certain instructions to our representative to abstain then there is no point in our discussing the matter. I cannot see the logic or appreciate the inference...

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You cannot see the obvious.

DR. ANUP SINGH : Please listen. I do not want to repeat that I never intervene when anyone else speaks and I expect the same reciprocal treatment. I do not know whether the Government has or has not issued any instructions. That is the point. This motion has been discussed in the other House and it is entertained here. The tragic problem of Czechoslovakia is not going to vanish by today's voting. Unfortunately it is likely to continue. Therefore I do not see there is any merit in the suggestion that we should stop the discussion. We can continue the discussion and...

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no; we can't.

(Interruptions)

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मुझे भी मौका मिलेगा!

उपसभापति : नहीं जी, किमी को नहीं ।
Would the Prime Minister like to say something?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Just as you wish, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If you want to say something at this stage you may because the Opposition wants to know.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Otherwise we are not going to allow the debate.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Madam Deputy Chairman, hon. Members are rightly exercised over what has happened in the United Nations. They are seeking to prove that I have gone back on what I stated in this House or the other House. I would beg to submit that this is not so. Of all the comments made the world over ours was the very first which pointed to certain principles involved in the tragedy which has taken place. We mentioned these principles in very clear terms in the first day's statement and equally clearly in yesterday's statement in the other House; most of those principles have been included in the Resolution which came up before the United Nations. Hon. Members will remember that in my speech I made one point clear: what is our objective? Is our objective to gain some kind of propaganda point? Is it just to condemn or use words like

that or is it to state our positive support for the people of Czechoslovakia? And we pointed out in what manner—in fact I can read out what I said ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : You tell whether these instructions were issued or not.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : This only goes to prove that you have instructed your representative to abstain. It is very clear; you have not said a word about it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You must have patience. She has not finished yet. Please sit down.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Why all this rigmarole about commitment and positive support? What is positive?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please listen in patience because when you speak you also have long introductory remarks.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : So this is all introductory?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please listen; let her finish her statement. How can we go on if you go on interrupting like this?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Even when voting takes place there, Madam, there are often long explanations and clarifications over every point. Therefore, it is very necessary that I should go into these points. If hon. Members do not wish me to speak I shall not do so but if I am speaking on a serious question, I expect to be heard in all seriousness.

श्री राजनारायण : बोलिये, लेकिन जरा जल्दी अपने प्वाइंट पर आ जाइये ।

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : She has a long explanation to give. Evidently what she has done is wrong.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The hon. Shri Dahyabhai Patel read out some of the paragraphs from the Resolution. Now, the first is :

“Recalling that the United Nations is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members....”

Now, we fully support this. The second is :

“Considering that the action taken by the Government of the USSR and other members of the Warsaw Pact in invading the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is violation of the United Nations Charter, and in particular, of the principle that all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat and from the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State....”

This also we fully support and I have mentioned it in my statement yesterday.

Now the next para :

“Gravely concerned that, as announced by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, troops of the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact have entered their country without the knowledge and against the wishes of the Czechoslovakian Government;”

This also we support. Then, the next :

“Affirms that the people of the Sovereign State of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have the right in accordance with the Charter freely to exercise their own self-determination and to arrange their own affairs without external intervention;”

This also we fully support and, again I had mentioned it in my statement. Now :

“Affirms that the sovereign, political independence and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic must be fully respected.”

This also we support.

Now, in the third paragraph there is this sentence :

“Condemns the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic and other members of the Warsaw Pact in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and calls upon them forthwith to withdraw their forces, and to cease all other forms of intervention in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs.”

Now, Madam, with regard to this paragraph, we said that the word “condemns” should be changed, but we support the rest of the paragraph that calls upon them forthwith to withdraw, because we felt that it does not serve any useful purpose. It does not strengthen the rest of the case and it may make any attempt...

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI) : To heal.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It is not really the word.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Did you think of congratulating them?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Certainly not, but leaving that out, by replacing it with a word such as "deplores" would have served the purpose.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : What would you call this particular action ?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : You can laud the action of the Soviet Union in entering Czechoslovakia.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : As I was trying to say earlier, we have, on many previous occasions, said very strongly about various matters. We have spoken about them also in strong and unequivocal terms, yet we have not used the word "condemn", except, I think, on the question of South Africa and that also I do not know whether it was used.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : On the West Asia crisis you had condemned Israel.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Only in the case of Israel, the word "condemnation" was used in a certain context though not in the original resolution asking for withdrawal (Interruptions). Any way, our point was that we have to think very carefully at this moment. When we were meeting the leaders of the Opposition, one of them, not a member of either of the Communist Parties, had drawn our attention to one fact while we should take a strong stand on the principles involved, we should think very carefully of the words we use in condemnation or disapproval or whatever be the word, because India has followed a particular policy. I do not want to make my speech now, but I think it is necessary to remember that we should not take any stand which would make it more difficult for us to help the Czechoslovak people.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA (Bihar) : In what way are you helping Czechoslovakia ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : To say how we have helped other people would mean going into the history of the last twenty years. We have got ourselves involved in various things. We have helped to settle problems. That is not a matter of conjecture. That is a matter of fact.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : If you have courage, say the right thing.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I do not think this has anything to do with courage. If it was a question of courage, with all this shouting perhaps it would be much easier for me to say 'Yes'. It is not so. I do not believe this to be right and, therefore, I am not prepared to agree.

(Interruptions)

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : If you had courage, you would have said that.

(Interruptions) all

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : May I add one or two words? When we got the news that this resolution was being put to vote almost immediately, we naturally wanted to have time to consider the matter fully before giving our advice. I believe that Algeria also asked for time to consult its Government and get its Government's view. There is another point. Quite often when these resolutions come up for voting, they are voted upon para by para. Now that we have made our stand very clear, we could have voted for all the other paragraphs. Unfortunately para by para voting was not allowed and our slight amendment or change of one word was also not allowed and when a little time was asked for to consult the Government, that was also not given.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No more.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Is it a departure from the usual practice?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : No. I do not have the full report, but we had told our representative that he should make our view very clear on all these points, that we strongly supported the Charter rights of Czechoslovakia, that we

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

supported the point about withdrawal of the forces and of Czechoslovakia being enabled to form its own Government or its own system and to deal with its internal affairs as it thought best without any interference from outside. As I said, we have not yet got a full report of what happened there . . .

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : If he has acted against your order, then recall that man.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I did not suggest that—our instructions were that he should clarify our views on all these points, but our instructions were not to accept the word “condemns” . . .

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, इस तरह से नहीं चल सकता है। सदन की कुछ मर्यादा होनी चाहिये। प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन की मर्यादा को भंग किया है, राष्ट्र की मर्यादा को भंग किया है।

(Hon. Members stood up)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No more. (Interruptions). I allowed you to put questions earlier and you have got the Prime Minister's reply. When I am on my feet please sit down.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : If the Prime Minister has so instructed her representative at the UN, it is a damn shame for the country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am on my feet. You had raised certain points. You have brought to the notice of the House certain information which was received in the lunch hour or before that. You have put these questions to the Prime Minister. She has taken pains at length to explain it and she has explained exactly how the voting has been done and what the Government's intentions were. Now, we have finished that. Let the debate go on. Mr. B. K. P. Sinha.

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : As a protest against the betrayal of this House we walk out. (Interruptions). It is an utter betrayal of this country. We have been kept in the dark. All those points of order were raised when I was trying to move my amendments. Therefore, in protest we walked out.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : महोदया, मेरा निवेदन है कि पैराग्राफ बाई पैराग्राफ अगर इसपर वोटिंग हुई होती तो हमारा यह कहना कि हमने केवल कडेमनेशन का विरोध किया है इसमें कोई अर्थ होता, लेकिन हम मजबूर किये गये पूरे प्रस्ताव पर एक साथ विचार करने के लिये, ऐसी परिस्थिति में बजाय इसके कि हम सारे प्रस्ताव से ऐक्स्टन कर के अपनी स्थिति को और बिगाड़ते यह अच्छा होता कि अगर सारा प्रस्ताव जो वोटिंग के लिये रखा गया था हम उसका समर्थन करके अपना स्पष्टीकरण कडेमनेशन के बारे में देते। इसलिये यह जो सरकार का रवैया रहा है इस सरकार के रवैया के विरोध में हम दुख के साथ सदन का बहिष्कार करते हैं।

(At this stage some hon. Members left the House)

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : मैं यह साफ करना चाहूंगा कि जो कुछ हमने पहले कहा वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर के कहने के पहले कहा, लेकिन प्राइम मिनिस्टर को सुनने के बाद यह साफ हो गया है . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Nothing. should be taken on record.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : It is a betrayal of the cause of humanity. It is no use our participating. As a mark of protest we are walking out.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान, भारत की सरकार ने भारत की स्वतंत्रता को बेचने की साजिश की है। जब राज्य सभा में यह विषय चल रहा था उस समय इस सरकार ने अपने प्रतिनिधि को एक्स्टेन होने की हिदायत दी है। इससे बढ़ कर घृणित, गन्दा और जनतंत्र और जम्हूरियत को कल करने वाला कोई काम नहीं हो सकता। जब चेकोस्लावाकिया की आजादी खतरे में पड़ी हो और विदेशी सेना ने रूसी नेतृत्व में वहाँ जाकर कब्जा कर लिया हो तब भारत की सरकार में इतनी भी हिम्मत न हो। इतनी बेहया और बेशर्म यह सरकार है कि वह कॅडेमनेशन शब्द को बदलवाना चाहती थी। क्या हम में इतनी हिम्मत नहीं कि हम किसी के गलत काम को कॅडेम कर सकें, किसी के गलत काम की

भर्त्सना कर सकें, किसी के गलत काम की निन्दा कर सकें ! यह प्रधान मंत्री बेशर्म है, यह राष्ट्र की इज्जत को बेचन वाली है और यह कायर है और इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष की जनता इस कांग्रेसी सरकार को उखाड़ कर फेंके जिस प्रधान मंत्री ने देश के साथ धोखा दिया हो मुल्क के साथ गद्दारी की हो उसको प्रधान मंत्री के पद पर रहने का कोई हक नहीं है। इसलिये मामला साफ हो गया है कि आज सदन की कार्यवाही स्थगित हो, सदन की कार्यवाही स्थगित।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sinha.

श्री आबिद अली (महाराष्ट्र) : भूपेश गुप्त को ले जाओ अपने साथ, वे तुम्हारे दोस्त हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : असल में अगर अपनी...

(Interruption)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do not want any dialogue to be carried on. Let us go on with the debate. Mr. Sinha.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : How can I speak . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We do not support the resolution sponsored by the U.S.A. . . .

श्री राजनारायण : अगर किसी में अपना कुछ हो तो बात है। कन्डेम किया है इटली की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने, कन्डेम किया है ब्रिटेन की पार्टी ने, कन्डेम किया है फ्रांस की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने क्या कहा है, चीन ने भी कहा 'शेमलेस टु दि एक्सट्रीम' और उसने यह भी कहा कि नाजी अटेक जो चेकोस्लोवाकिया में आ उसकी याद दिलाता है रूस का यह हमला। चीन ने हिम्मत के साथ अपनी राय का इजहार किया है। हमारी एक ही पार्टी है जो साम्राज्यवाद रूसी हो या अमरीकी सबको एक साथ कन्डेम करती है। हम अमरीका की दलाली नहीं करते, रूस की दलाली नहीं करते।

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA : On a point of order. As the hon. Member has spoken without your permission, this should not go on record.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Such words 'रूस की दलाली' should not go on record.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sinha.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं अपने लिये भी कह रहा हूँ। न मैं अमेरिका का दलाल हूँ, न रूस का दलाल हूँ, मैं अपने लिये कह रहा हूँ। जब रूस ने हमला किया तो रूस की भर्त्सना की और जब अमरीका ने हमला किया तो अमरीका की भर्त्सना की, बराबर की और बराबर करते हैं। हमने शुरू में कहा जब रूस की हथियारों की मदद आई पाकिस्तान को कि रूस, ब्रिटेन और अमरीका तीनों की कूटनीति से हिन्दुस्तान का बंट-वारा भारत और पाक के बीच हुआ। तिब्बत के बारे में . . .

(Interruption)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down, Mr. Rajnarain. Mr. Sinha, you go on.

श्री राजनारायण : हम जाते हैं।

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Madam Deputy Chairman, the threads of my thought got jumbled up when I had to terminate after four minutes. They get more jumbled up now. . . (Interruption)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : These gentlemen here are talking . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What is going on there ? Please go to the lobby if you want a conference.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : This noise has jumbled my thought further. It will take some time before I collect the thread. But before I resume my speech I would like the hon. Prime Minister to enlighten us whether opportunity was taken by our representative in the Security Council to explain his abstention. Did his explanation say that while India agreed to the other paragraphs and agreed in substance to the objectionable paragraph India disagreed to that particular word 'condemnation', and since the whole resolution was voted upon, therefore he abstained? Because if he had given this explanation, the whole colour would change.

Coming to my speech, Madam Deputy Chairman, I have said that this perfidy is unprecedented in history. This aggression

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha]

violates all canons of decent human behaviour because an unsuspecting friend, a small and industrious people have been attacked. Madam, it violates the law of nations because the law of nations contemplates that every State, small or big, has a right to its own independent existence, has a right to develop in its own way. Last but most important, this aggression violates the Charter of the United Nations, for the United Nations Charter makes no distinction between a small State and a big State. It contemplates that instead of the law of the jungle that prevailed in the 19th century the law of order will prevail in the international sphere. The United Nations Charter contemplates that the sovereignty and integrity of the various States, big and small, shall be respected. The Charter contemplates that each nation will have the opportunity to develop in its own way. By this act of aggression the Charter has been violated, it has received a violent shock. What is the defence of those who have invaded Czechoslovakia? They say that they have invaded in virtue of some contractual obligation. The contractual obligation was to protect the integrity and independence of the Warsaw Pact countries. Under the contractual obligation it was not open to other members of the Warsaw Pact to violate the sovereignty and integrity of another country, a signatory to the same pact.

It is also being said that by this action European peace and security are being guaranteed and being protected. We remember that this sort of argument was advanced by the Nazis when they started their process of expansion in the 1930's. Madam, if this action has done anything, it has given a rude jerk to the process of *detente* which was noticeable in the affairs of Europe during the last five years.

After this action, Europe shall not be the same again. After this action, it will not be possible for Soviet Russia to maintain the unity of the Communist movement in the world. Madam, a suspicion has arisen among the nations of Europe. Disarmament has become difficult now. The process of *detente* has received a rude shock. And it is not possible now to hope that the affair of the Middle East or Vietnam could be solved with that expedition with which they would otherwise have been solved. Therefore, it is futile to talk of peace. The Chinese, a wayward nation in the international community, have rightly come out

with the word that the logic of Soviet Russia and the Warsaw Pact countries that they have gone in to safeguard socialism reminds the world of the logic of piratical imperialism. I cannot use more forceful words. And these are the words of a great Communist power.

Madam, we are assured that the January reforms shall be respected. It is a queer logic that they want to respect the January reforms but at the same time they put in prison those who were the originators of those reforms.

SHRI ABID ALI : That is the Communist way.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : It is like some bandit taking away the bridegroom and telling the whole congregation assemble for the marriage, "Go on with your marriage ceremony". Those who are responsible for these January reforms are taken away spirited away. One does not know where they are, one does not know the fate of Mr. Dubcek, the Reformist leader. But it is proclaimed that the invading powers have no intention of doing away with the January reforms. And now, this is being done under the banner of Lenin, all this is being done under the plea that they are protecting socialism and Communism. I do not think their could be a greater irony. Lenin was a great leader and a great human being. Lenin respected the sovereignty of nations. I have seen a plaque that has been put up at one of the doors of a room in a building in Leningrad by the Finnish people. Twenty years after Lenin died, the grateful Finnish people put up a plaque to commemorate the event, the day when Lenin gave freedom to the Finnish people. The Finnish people had not adopted a socialist society, they adopted for an order which the Communists call a free enterprise order, a capitalistic order. But Lenin, the man who founded Communism, the founder of the socialist system in the world, told the Finnish people, "If you do not want to live with us, if you want to have your own destiny, you are free to have your own independent way." After a little military intervention in Poland, it was Lenin who directed Trotsky to sign the Treaty of Brest letovska and gave the Polish people freedom to develop in their own way. It was Lenin who inscribed into the Soviet Constitution—and he meant it—that the constituent units of Soviet Russia should be free to lead an independent life if they so desired. Tragedy of tragedies, these invading armies are exploiting the name of that great man, Lenin. I am sure Lenin

must be feeling restless in the mausoleum that they have built for him.

They talk of Communism. I regard Communism as a great liberatirian, equalitarian and humanitarian philosophy. But that this the Communism of those who were responsible for giving the conception of Communism to this world. But after Soviet Russia established the Soviet power, particularly after the death of Lenin, the Communism of Marx and Engels ceased to be the philosophy of Communism. The Russian vested interests were being projected as the philosophy of Communism. The Third International which was founded by Karl Marx to spread the gospel of Communism became an organ of the Russian Foreign Ministry. And therefore, for the last 30 years or 40 years or so, we have been witnessing not the expansion of Communism but a perverted form of Communism which puts on the garb of Communism but which really serves the interests of those States which proclaim to be socialist or Soviet States. It is time that the independent Communist parties of other countries where socialism or Communism is not obtaining or prevailing knew of this deformity to which Communism has been subjected. It is time that they decided to get away from these moorings. Unless they do that, no nation would have an independent, free and prosperous existence.

DR. ANUP SINGH : Madam, there is nobody from the Treasury Benches.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhagat is there.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Now, coming to the statement made by the Prime Minister. If this statement is treated in isolation, if this incident is treated in isolation, I would be the first man to give a pat to this Government for this wise and restrained step. But the whole thing has to be looked at in the light of the past. Whenever something occurred in any part of the world, even before the people affected directly by those incidents came out with their denunciation, we were forthright in denunciation. We developed a habit, a habit to which the people got used. Now, whenever incidents of this kind happen, people expect the Government to come out with a strong denunciation. We developed a peculiar pro-

pensity to pass judgement on all the issues that arose in the world, near or remote, and I am sure, if there was a war between the Mars and the Moon, before the presidents of the Mars and the Moon could have spoken, if they have one, our leaders would have come out with the approval of one side and the condemnation of the other side.

In this background, it is difficult for me to accept that this statement serves the purpose of the situation. But as I have already said, I am one of those who have been always telling our leaders: Please mind your own business; you are not the knight paladins who must go on defending all lost causes in any and every corner of the world. You must keep silent because a nation whose most conspicuous possessions are a few begging bowls cannot be independent and is not independent whatever the delusions of grandeur from which that nation and its leaders suffer. Therefore, in such a situation of weakness, prudence demands that we keep quiet on such issues. But then . . .

(Time bell rings)

SHRI A. P. JAIN : There is plenty of time and very few speakers now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No very few, they will be coming back.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : . . . those words were not heeded. And when we spoke those words, we were branded as right conservatives leaning towards the Anglo-Americans and what not. And today when the boot is on the other leg, the people are throwing those statements of our leaders in their faces, and they have no reply to give. It is really sophistry to say that it would be wrong to condemn this or that, to use this word or that. Did we not outdo Nasser in condemning the British and the French when the Suez was invaded? We outdid the Arabs in condemning Israel in the last war. Times without number we have been coming out with denunciatory statements where others are concerned. What is it that prevents this Government and its leadership today from coming out with a forthright denunciation. I however sympathise with them. For the last ten years they have been following wrong policies. And because of the wrong policies they have no friends except Soviet Russia today.

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha]

They have broken all their bridges except the bridge that unites them with the Soviet Union. Even that bridge is creaking today. Therefore, I say again that I sympathise with the pathetic helplessness of the leaders of our Government because if they alienate Soviet Russia, there is nobody else on whom they can rely. It is time, therefore, that our Government applied its mind to the question of evolving a new foreign policy which would suit modern conditions better.

Madam, the great reality today is that the world has been divided by the great powers. (*Time Bell rings.*) I will be very brief, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : One or two minutes more.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : There are not many speakers. Let him continue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are so many others.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : I am winding up. The world has been divided into spheres of influence, and Eastern Europe falls under the sphere of influence of the Russians. Whatever sensation the Western powers may create in the United Nations and the Security Council, it is clear that they have to accept the reality that Eastern Europe is under the sphere of influence of Soviet Russia. Similarly, the socialist countries have reconciled themselves to the fact that certain other areas fall under the sphere of influence of the Anglo-American bloc. I would like to know in which sphere of influence are we placed. Are the nations of the world waiting for the development of China as a great nation and a great power and thereafter we fall under the sphere of influence of China? Is it not a possibility that we should visualise even now and try to take time by the forelock? These are grave issues that we are faced with. I hope that the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India will apply their mind to this aspect of the problem.

Madam, we are sorry for Czechoslovakia. But let us not be oblivious of the fact

that the weak and small in this world have no place, no safety. I hope the External Affairs Ministry will bear this in mind and try to bring a fresh breath of air in the conduct of our diplomacy. But that can be done, not by fossilised brains who had been long sitting under the dome of the External Affairs Ministry. A great and powerful personality had long impressed them with his views which were useful till 1958; but which ceased to be viable and vital after 1958. Now they cannot think of a change in the foreign policy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You must wind up.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Therefore, an element of flexibility, an element of resilience, an element of freshness has to be provided by the political leaders who preside over the destinies of the External Affairs Ministry. I hope they will keep this in mind.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa) : Madam Deputy Chairman, if I may be permitted to use the Prime Minister's phrase in her statement that "it is with a heavy heart and with a profound sense of concern that I have to report to this House certain events which are currently taking place in Czechoslovakia", I am sorry not only for that country's present and future but also at the turn of events in which my country is now drifting.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I am reminded of a childhood experience which I might speak out here today because that holds good at the way we react to international events. People of my age group know that in the primary schools, in the second and third standards, in the curriculum there was something like 'Manas Anka' which means that the teacher puts an arithmetical problem which you are to answer, not using the slate and the pencil but in your mind, then write down the answer on the slate and put the slate down. We were kiddies. Seven or eight children were standing together. The question was put : if two mangoes are bought for five annas how much ten mangoes would cost? And, Madam Deputy Chairman, everything faded out from my view, because I was very poor in mathematics, except the teacher's cane, slender and sure, and if I may add, peacefully

aggressive like our Home Minister. However, the boy standing by my side noted the answer and put down the slate. When the slate was examined he had written "Rs. 1/4". That is how our Government reacts to international events. We always feel that we are the only people in the world to be the guardians of humanity talk something and judge our friends whom we should not judge, as they say in the military phraseology "until the heat of the hooves of the horses is cooled down".

Madam Deputy Chairman, it seems to me that this affair is not so easy. Mostly it relates to the politics of Europe and the maintenance of balance of power in that continent. I am sorry I do not have much time to develop my theory here, but Madam I can point out that Czechoslovakia as it is geographically situated, until some change-over comes in Europe, is bound to be a victim for maintaining political balance in that part of the world, called Europe. But I would like to point out that we are countries living in our own orbits. We have our own impulses and our own velocity. But we co-exist as the planets co-exist in the Universe. We co-exist also in the U. N. The socialist countries, either individually or collectively put together, live in a different orbit. When we try to build our relationship with them, we should also know how to behave towards them. Madam Deputy Chairman, please allow me to quote a line from the "Events in Czechoslovakia" from TASS. It is a very pointing sentence. It says :—

"The threat to the socialist system in Czechoslovakia constitutes at the same time a threat to the minstays of European peace."

Madam, in continuation of that I may read a portion from the British Information Services pamphlet which I got this morning. It is clearly stated therein that they were in the know of what was going to happen in Czechoslovakia and they were also prepared for it.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Who was prepared ?

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA : I mean to say others are also prepared. To a question how unsurprised had he

been by events, the reply of the Foreign Minister, Mr. Stewart was :

"We have known, of course, that Soviet and allied Soviet forces were so positioned that they could with ease take Czechoslovakia over. The possibility of this therefore we have been aware of. Naturally, one had hoped after the meeting of Bratislava that the danger was receding, but I do not think any of us felt it had vanished because of Bratislava".

Madam, the whole pamphlet deals with the situation between the East and the West. But we are so much worried about the human aspect of it that we are talking in way as if we alone are the guardians of humanity in any part of the world.

There, Madam, I want to make out one more point. I do not like my country to be drawn into the whirlpool of Western politics. For the maintenance of balance of power they are having their own ways, and when we are going to have connections with other countries with whom we are to be friendly, we should not try to judge them like others who are unfriendly to them. Madam, I would like to point out one thing. To curb the belligerency of the Pakistanis when we opened the western sector, these British people and the Americans also shouted that we had done something very unsacred. Where was the UN Charter then? They are using the UN Charter as it suits them. Many people here in this House also use it as it suits them. My only contention is this that we should not remain friendless in the world and we should not try to judge every friend, whomsoever we have—not measuring them with our own yardstick. As I told you, Madam, these are two different orbits. We say we are in the free world. We are democracies. But I do not think that American democracy can be compared with that of India's or the British democracy can be compared with that of India's. In America monopolism is there. That has given some stability to that country and they are used to it. But here monopoly is stifling our life and is stunting our economic and national growth. In the parliamentary democracies, Madam, I have read about the developments in the last world war, there were Members of Parliament who went to the front and fought. There was one young conservative member who gave his life when they were retreating

[Shri Brahmananda Panda]

from Dunkirk and he remained a national hero. Here what do we do? We go out of the Parliament House, meet some demonstration in the morning, get ourselves arrested and imprisoned till 4.30 or till the rising of the court. And if the House sits a little late we come back here and shout that there have been police excesses and the Home Minister comes with a statement deliberately minimising the excesses of the police. This is a farce. We should prove ourselves that we are a mature people, that we have taken to democracy seriously and it concerns the lives of our people, and not the play we enact here. Madam, one more point I would like to make out ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Not quite relevant, I suppose.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA : Madam, one thing I want to say, whether it may or may not be relevant. But I believe that the fundamental business of a Government is to maintain law and order at home and advance its interests abroad. To any incident that happens in the world or to any event, our reaction should be keeping in view our dominant purpose, our goals and how we should advance our interests abroad. And a Government alone—not the Members either on that side or this side of the Houses—a Government alone can cope with the realities of a situation. If a Government is unrealistic, if a Government is indolent, that has no right to rule a country. The Britishers in the Victorian period—many people—believed that a country can be ruled by talking. The days have changed. In the changed circumstances, keeping the dominant purpose in view, they have changed. Therefore, they are dynamically changed. They grow according to circumstances. But here, madam, we still believe that we can rule a country by talking. I feel pained many a time to see what is happening in our country. I think that the Prime Minister should not have been in a hurry to come with a statement and judge a friend who is until now friendly to us in international affairs and in international commitments to judge them harshly until the things cleared. The Prime Minister of England, Mr. Wilson, says that they are in contact with their friends. I want to ask my Prime Minister, who are the friends we have consulted? Who are those friends who advised us to make that statement

so soon? If I understand the Prime Minister's conscience it is pressure, nothing but party pressure, that has put her in such a position as to come with that statement so hurriedly and so hastily. Therefore, although I think that many things in the statement should not have been there, still once it is given and it cannot be denied—I do not think any of these amendments that have been put forward can be accepted. —I support the statement and I wish, those who love India and also wish India to be friendly to those countries who want to usher in an era of socialism, will be solidly behind the Prime Minister, whatever the forces, whatever reactionary forces may be there who trouble her or try to put her into difficulties.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to speak today with a deep sense of sorrow and shame. It is because of two reasons. I was born in the Gandhi-Nehru era of our motherland with glorious traditions, of high ideals of compassion, tolerance, peace and love and also I adhere to the socialist principles enunciated by great thinkers like Karl Marx, Lenin and Rosa Luxembourg. When I speak today I am reminded of those great people who have given an impetus to me to come to politics and to do social service. Madam Deputy Chairman, I emphasise this point for the benefit of those friends who call themselves socialists and Marxists and who profess themselves to be progressive. If you go into the motive force behind the Marxist ideology, Marx himself said that the greatest problem of human life is the dignity of mankind. If you come to Lenin, Madam Deputy Chairman, I shall try to refresh the memory of those progressive Members of this House that after the Russian Revolution when the news was given to Lenin that small children of the Czar had been killed by somebody, tears rolled down the eyes of the great revolutionary, Lenin. Not only this, Madam Deputy Chairman, I am reminded of that historic letter written by that revolutionary Rosa Luxembourg to her friend. She said that when she read the news of the deforestation in Austria, her mind went to the chirping birds in the trees. What would happen to those small birds? This was the ideal, this was the feeling of the people who enunciated the great principle of socialism. If you come to our own country, Madam Deputy Chairman, this

Government which claims to be the heir, which claims to get the heritage of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru... it has become more shameful for me to see this kind of attitude of this Government. Mahatma Gandhi long back gave us a slogan, a sermon, that you should have the courage to stand against all tyranny, against all oppression, even if you are a lonely man. The very principle of Satyagraha was based on this basic understanding that even a single individual should challenge the tyranny in any part of the world. Not only did he profess it; but when he was a lonely man in the dark forests of Africa, he went round and suffered all humiliation, all suffering in order to evolve this principle. I am surprised at the ignorance of the people who are running the External Affairs Ministry today, because I have been hearing for the last few days that it will be wrong to pass any condemnatory resolution because it will not be in keeping with the traditions of this great Parliament. It has been told time and again that it has not been customary in this House to pass such a resolution. With your permission, Madam Deputy Chairman, because time is very short, I shall give only some salient points.

It was the 28th March, 1960. Some resolution was moved in the two Houses of the Parliament. It was moved by no less a person than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The resolution pertained to firing in Langa township in South Africa and the resolution deplored the activities and of the action of the Government there. What Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru observed at that time in the Parliament, I quote :

"It is not the custom of this House normally to consider such matters which

are supposed to be in the internal jurisdiction of another country; nor indeed would we like other countries to consider matters in the internal jurisdiction of this country. That is the normal practice, and it is the right practice. However, sometimes things happen and occurrences take place which are not normal at all, but are exceedingly abnormal and then it becomes rather difficult if some convention comes in the way of the expression of a feeling which is deep-seated and powerful. After all this House is and ought to be in some measure a mirror of our people's feelings."

This is what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of the foreign policy of this country, said. It was an internal matter of South Africa, but Pandit Nehru said that if some such incidents take place and if sentiments are very powerful, then it becomes a duty of this House, of this country, that we should express the indignation, anguish and anger of the country through this Parliament. I do not know whether persons sitting in the External Affairs Ministry, whether they are officers or political leaders, have ever cared to understand the sentiments expressed by our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I see some pseudo-progressives who always talk of Nehru's policies and who always support every thing which the Government brings forward on the ground that otherwise it will be a departure from the policy of Pandit Nehru. And what, in their opinion, is the policy of Pandit Nehru? The policy, according to them is non-alignment. Nothing can be more stupid than to repeat this word of non-alignment again and again as the fundamental of our foreign policy. Pandit Nehru never thought that non-alignment was the funda-

mental of our foreign policy. It is a technique, it is a strategy. The fundamentals of our foreign policy were expounded in the five great principles, the Panch Sheel. Pandit Nehru—I do not want to quote again because I do not have time—in a joint communique with the Czechoslovak Prime Minister here in Delhi said that these five principles of Panch Sheel, are the cardinal principles which should guide our international policy. May I ask this Government, in all humility, through you, Madam Deputy Chairman, on both these points, whether an abnormal situation has arisen or not? Do they think that sweeping over a whole nation is a normal thing in international behaviour? Do they think that the marching of the five Warsaw Pact countries' troops into the territory of Czechoslovakia is a matter which should be taken lightly, is in accordance with the principles of Panchsheel and or is a matter on which sentiments should be very sober and polite? It is said "We will lose our manoeuvrability." What manoeuvrability have you got? You have no manoeuvrability when your interests were involved. In spite of all your friendship, only a month back, you were pathetic figures saying that it is the business of the Soviet Union to sell arms to Pakistan. You could not safeguard your own interests by your power of manoeuvrability. It is only naive to say that manoeuvrability will be used in favour of another country by their good wishes and good offices. Nothing can be more wrong, nothing can be more irrelevant in the present context.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I emphasise this point again and again that wherever any policy or any stand of the Government is attacked, it is thought that it is something reactionary. It is thought that it is a departure from the cardinal principles enunciated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Madam Deputy Chairman, if this Government is hesitant or vacillating in condemning the aggression in Czechoslovakia, they are guilty of departing from the principle, enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi or even by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the Foreign Minister of this country because I have quoted from this book—"India's Foreign Policy," published by this Government itself—where Pandit Nehru has said that if an abnormal situation arises the indignation and anger of this country should be

expressed through this House. The Government is guilty of dereliction of duty in not giving an opportunity to this House and to the Parliament to express the indignation, anger and anguish of the people of this great country.

Madam, I would like to mention another point in connection with what is being said by my friends who are supposed to be progressive and socialist. For them perhaps Lenin was never born. I hear every time in their polemics the theory of the right of self-determination. Where is that theory of the right of self-determination? I do not think even the greatest exponent of Marxism or Leninism will say or assert that what is being done by the troops of the Warsaw Pact countries in Czechoslovakia is anywhere way consistent with the theory of the right of self-determination to nations expounded by the great socialist thinker, Lenin. I am surprised, Madam Deputy Chairman, that irrelevant points are raised in this discussion. I do not know how America comes into it, how other things come into it. I am one of those who have condemned the Americans for their action in Vietnam. I am one of those who have condemned their action in Guatemala or Cuba. I am one of those who feel that aggression or intervention in any part of the world by any power is deplorable, condemnable and reprehensible. But can any one say that if tanks and machine-guns of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact allies enter that country, they would only shower flowers and not killing bullets? It will be a most condemnable and unfortunate and tragic event of socialist history if the socialists throughout the world take this attitude. Madam Deputy Chairman, I shall quote now what one of the great socialists, who is a partner in this attack on Czechoslovakia, says. He says:

"An alliance in politics is always based on mutual interest. Where is there is no mutual interest, the alliance must cease to exist. Without the alliance with the Soviet Union, Poland would not be able to stand up to German imperialism. She would not be able to exist as an independent State."

This is what Mr. Gomulka said. The worry of Mr. Gomulka is that the sovereignty and integrity of Poland should be maintained. If the Czech leader, Mr. Dubcek asserts the same right ...

SHRI C. D. PANDE : He has been killed.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Madam Deputy Chairman, if what my friend, Mr. Pande, says is true, that his voice has been silenced for ever, then that will be the greatest tragedy in history and it will be a greatest shame for this country and Parliament that even then, Government is considering and pondering over whether we should condemn this act of aggression or not.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : It will only disapprove.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Madam, I am reminded of another occasion when the Nazis were in occupation of Czechoslovakia. After the Nazi occupation was over, a very monumental book was published and it was read throughout the world. I hope all hon. Members know about this book. It is "Notes from the Gallows" by Julius Fuchik. He was a war prisoner of the Nazis in Czechoslovakia. He was done to death and many years after his death, some portions of his diary were published in the form of this book. I will quote a few sentences in order to bring home the solemnity of this occasion and the gravity of the situation to the deaf and dumb people who are at the head of our Foreign Ministry. I quote, Madam, he says :

"The bare wall before their staring eyes became a screen on which they projected more scenes than have ever been filmed, as they waited to be called to another hearing, to torture, to death. The film of one's whole life or of some minor moment of life, a film of one's mother, wife or children, of one's broken home or ruined life. Films of courageous comrades—or of betrayal. The film of the man to whom I gave that anti-Nazi leaflet, of blood which is flowing again, of a firm grip of the hand which held me loyal. Films full of horror or of brave decision, of hate or love, fear and hope. Our backs turned to life, each of us died here daily before his own eyes. But not all were reborn.

I have seen the film of my life a hundred times, thousands of details. Now I shall attempt to set it down. If the hangman's noose strangles before I finish, millions remain to write its happy ending."

This was the sentiment expressed from the gallows by Julius Fuchik. I warn Madam Deputy Chairman, all those defenders of the Soviet Union that this great martyr Fuchik's voice is still ringing in their ears. Can you put your hand on your heart and ask how many thousand mothers and sisters in the streets of Prague are today weeping and crying because of the torture and tyranny of the Soviet Union and their allies? If on this occasion our country and our nation is not going to condemn this action, what more occasion will arise in the history of mankind when this great country of Mahatma Gandhi, of Buddha and Asoka, of Panchsheel and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, will rise in revolt against this tyranny, this torture of humanity, by these people?

1960.

In the end, Madam, I quote one slogan which was raised only a few months back in the streets of Poland. Some students and some labourers there also rose in revolt and they quoted a couplet from a poet of Poland. I quote :

"They will make me free—where the news came from I do not know ;

But I know what freedom means if granted by Moscow.

Scum, they will just take fetters off my hands and feet,

But shackle the soul"

This was written by Mickiewicz, a great Polish poet. On this what did Mr. Gomułka say? He said :

"From the epoch in which he wrote we are separated not only by almost one hundred and fifty years but also by the Great October Revolution".

I ask you, Madam Deputy Chairman, and through you this House, the Prime Minister and the Minister of State sitting here whether the apprehension of this great Polish poet is not true even today. The voice which was raised by all socialists, which was raised by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi is now going to be extinguished, demolished and shattered; it is a shame; it is a matter of anguish. Being an Indian citizen, being born in the country of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, I have no other feeling but the feeling of anguish and shame at the behaviour of the present Government. Thank you. [23/8/68]

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Madam Deputy Chairman, we are at the new watershed of history. You will remember when the Russian Revolution took place, all the people all over the world hailed it. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Lala Lajpatrai and Mahatma Gandhi hailed it. We thought something new was coming and there was some hope for the downtrodden people and for the oppressed people who were suffering under the colonial rule. The great poet Iqbal at that time said :

आफ़नाबे ताजा पैदा वतने गीती से हुआ,
आसमां डुबे हुए तारों का मातम कब तलक ।

"From the bosom of this earth a new sun has been born; let us not mourn the fallen stars."

I am astonished at what we see happening in Czechoslovakia after the socialist revolution which gave us hope, sustenance and strength to fight the colonial powers. What do we see in Czechoslovakia? I am reminded of what that great poet Faiz Ahmed Faiz of Pakistan said. He said :

यह दाग दाग उजाला,
यह शबगुज़ीदा सहर,
वो इन्तज़ार था जिसका,
यह वह सहर तो नहीं ।

"That is a dark-spotted dawn and the night engulfing the morn,

That was not the morning for which we struggled and yearned."

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN (Gujarat) : Is this by a poet of a politician?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : By a poet, I am sorry Mr. Momin has forgotten those days of national struggle when we used to walk with poems to rouse our people and when Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru were leading us. I am sorry today Mr. Momin has forgotten all that. He ought to know that poems are part of life and you cannot divorce them like that.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : So this is life.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Your life is somewhere else, Mr. Arora, not here.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Madam,

if he says that my wife is somewhere else, he is correct. My life is very much in this House.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Madam, I would like to salute those heroes and those martyrs who were laying themselves before the tanks of Russia, who were facing the bullets of the Russian troops. I bow my head to them because they are lighting and kindling a new fire of freedom which will certainly win in the end. These people who put their bare bodies against the most powerful weapons, who refuse to be provoked when provocation is natural, who react to the use of a massive force by disciplined civil disobedience, such people cannot be kept long in subjugation, because freedom's battle once begun, though baffled, often is ever won. I may remind Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that George Bernard Shaw was invited to Russia after the Russian Revolution. After meeting Lenin and everybody in Snanghai he came and there some press people asked him what was the fate of communism. These were the words of George Bernard Shaw :

"In my considered judgment, communism has a great future provided all the living communists are terminal ted."

Probably our friends of the Communist Party in Russia are trying to follow what Mr. Bernard Shaw said. I hope this does not become true because Karl Marx and the movement of communism gave us hope and we thought it will create a new world.

Coming to the present situation, there are two vital issues at stake which need to be considered. One is the violation of the U. N. Charter or the Warsaw Pact. I do not want to deal with that because it has been treated by my elder friend, Mr. Sinha.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You belong to the House of Elders.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : The Warsaw Pact was a pack among these countries so that they could protect themselves from foreign aggression but what can a small country like Czechoslovakia do when the same Powers who constituted the Warsaw Pact entered their country and occupied it? This is a violation not only of the U. N. Charter but of the Warsaw

Pact to which Czechoslovakia is a signatory. One of the arguments which is being given by the Russians is that the people of Czechoslovakia have invited them. Here is an appeal by a group of members in the name of the Central Party of Czechoslovakia or the Government and the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia, which has been circulated by the News and Views of the Soviet Union. It is a long thing but after reading that I find that there are no names there. Who drafted it, who sent them nobody knows. It may have been drafted in the Soviet Union or at some other place but if it was genuine it should have been signed by some. It is not signed by anybody and it is not given here. It may be that some of the trainees of Czechoslovakia who are getting training in Russia may have been asked to write the letter in "PRAVDA" that the Russians should go and help them. It may have so happened. There is no evidence to show that the Czechoslovakian people and the Government as well as the parties of the National Assembly ever invited the Warsaw Pact Powers or Russia to come and help them because they did not need it. They did not fear any danger from the Western Powers. There is no danger from the West because in the whole appeal there is no mention as such to the Western Powers threatening Czechoslovakia. On the other hand you will remember that when Novotny was there and when Major General... who was a protege of Novotny did try to bring out a coup against the liberal forces and it failed, where did Novotny fade away? He is in America. Novotny who was a friend of Russia has gone to America. It means that the enemies of the present liberation movement were not getting sustenance from anywhere else than from America. That is why they have gone to America and the views of Dubcek were the views of the people of Czechoslovakia. That is why you see that in the last 2 years how Dubcek and others came to power. It was not like any other Socialist or Communist Party but what happened was that there was a great discussion in the Party and in the Czechoslovakian towns about how the Novotny regime was working and after great discussion by judges and by everybody, they came to the conclusion that that regime should go and some other liberal regime should come. That is why Dubcek came to power. It was not in a light-hearted manner or in a conspiratorial manner that Dubcek came to power. We know that this is a historical development in Czechos-

lovakia, because Czechoslovakia is one of those countries which is a little more industrialised and has a better industrial and agricultural base and that is why they have better democratic traditions. That is why there is a movement for liberalisation which is stronger than in any other East European country. It was not a forced view. It was the view of the people and the High Court Judges said that they were going to investigate into the miscarriage of justices there. So the whole thing that was done was with the help and strength of the people and it was not a forced thing.

I am sorry when I look at the world reaction to-day I find that when the Warsaw Powers and Russia marched into Czechoslovakia, who were the first to criticise the Russians? It was not the Western Powers or the U.S.A. or Britain. It was the Communist Parties of Western Europe who came out first to criticise what Russia and the Warsaw Pact countries have done. Rumania has criticised, the Italian Communist Party has criticised, the British and the French Communist Parties have criticised. This is what the Rumanian Communist Party leader said :

"If one considers that there is a counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia one may say the same thing tomorrow about Rumania".

This is what the Rumanian Communist Party Chief said :

"The occupation of Czechoslovakia was a grave mistake and a serious danger to peace in Europe and socialism in the world."

It is not that only 2 or 3 countries are perturbed about this. There are many others also. Here is what the Czechoslovak President SVOBODA said in a broadcast last night that the action of the Warsaw Pact countries was illegal. He declared that there is no way back from the liberal programme the country had embarked upon. The Swedish Communist Party says :

"The attempt to impose by force a policy different from that which has the obvious support of the Czechoslovak people is a crime against the principles of Socialism."

This is what the representative of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Muzik, said in the

[Shri Krishan Kant]

Security Council. He compared the situation to that in 1938, when the Munich Agreement was concluded by the then British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, and Hitler.

"Now as then, the question of the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia is at stake" Mr. Muzik declared.

Mr. Muzik's appearance before the Council took many by surprise for earlier in the day one report circulating in the UN had said he was not in sympathy with the liberal elements led by Party Secretary Alexander Dubcek. Mr. Muzik read out a series of communications from Mr. Hajek, one of which specifically repudiated a Russian statement that the intervention by Warsaw Pact forces was at the Czechoslovak Government's request a contention repeated in the Council only a little while earlier by the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister.

These are the documents which will show whether Czechoslovakia wanted them or not. I am sorry that the Asian Communist Parties did not come forward and have not given a clear declaration of their views till now.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh) : China gave.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : China came out to-day. The West European countries came out before. I wanted to know from the Indian Communist Party their views.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : China is not a mystic in Asia.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Does China represent the views of Mr. Gupta? I want to know whether the Chinese Communist Party and the Government of China represent the views of the Indian Communist Party?

DR. Z. A. AHMAD : I can understand the Swatantra or the Jan Sangh Members saying that but I cannot understand a progressive person like him saying that when there are no differences between us. He is unnecessarily bringing in the Communist Party and says so many Communist Parties have come out.

(Interruptions)

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : When your turn comes, you can speak.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD : Why do you bring in unnecessarily all these things?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Who came out first?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You read our party's 'New Age' I believe.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : You were not supporting Czechoslovakia at the time when we were supporting it. When we were supporting comrade Dubcek you were denouncing that gentleman.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I know all that. What about the reaction of the Communist Party?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Now Mr. Krishan Kant should be satisfied because the communist leaders who had not participated at all had to speak on the floor of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Your time is over.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I am concluding. I am very glad if they are really criticising today the Russian Communist Party, and Russia and the Warsaw Pact countries moving into Czechoslovakia.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : They do.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, Mr. Krishan Kant, your time is over. May I call the next speaker?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : In the end I would like to say that I am sure the Government of India will certainly move in such directions that the forces which have deliberately gone there without the invitation of the people there will go back and the Czechs will get their individual liberty, collective liberty, sovereignty and integrity of the country. Until then all the peace-loving and freedom loving people's sympathies and their help will go out to them. Thank you.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Madam Deputy Chairman, I remind myself as well as the hon. Members of this House of a momentous meeting that was held in 1960 of almost all the communist parties of the world, and in that meeting of the communist parties a memorandum was issued also, a resolution so to say, and that resolution was signed by the representatives of almost all the communist parties of the world and that resolution made a very important point and that point is this that as revolution cannot be exported, similarly counter-revolution also cannot be allowed to be exported. In other words, Madam Deputy Chairman, it is true that

a socialist country will not try to export revolution to a country where the people are not yet ripe for revolution, where the objective conditions are not mature enough to bring about a revolution, but it is also true that if counter revolution is sought to be exported to a particular country, then it becomes the sacred duty of the socialist countries to stop that export of counter revolution.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra) : If the people are ripe, then the counter-revolution can be exported, you mean.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Madam Deputy Chairman, I am submitting this that if there is a counter-revolutionary conspiracy, if there is a counter-revolutionary danger in a socialist country, then it is the duty of the brother socialist countries certainly to come forward and to see that this counter-revolutionary coup does not get under way. There have been admirable instances of how counter-revolution was stopped by the brotherly help of the socialist countries. Not very long ago, in 1956, when we found that in Hungary counter-revolutionary gangs of traitors to the socialist cause were raising their ugly head and trying to throttle the democracy and progress of that country, then all the communist parties including the communist party of the People's Republic of China came forward and said that immediately steps ought to be taken in order that the counter-revolution in Hungary may not get under way. And the Soviet army marched into Hungary in order to see that the counter revolutionary coup did not succeed. (*Interruptions*) And at that time, Madam Deputy Chairman, I am quite sure and certain that at that time Mr. Nehru, who was then the Prime Minister of India, kept silent over the matter and did not come forward in the manner in which his proteges are coming forward in full-throated denunciation; he did not come forward at that time to utter any word of denunciation against the Soviet interference in Hungary. Why? The reason was simple. Mr. Nehru in those days knew very well how history was shaping itself. After all, he had a sense of history, of course not that sense of history which would always be approved of but certainly, with that reservation I say that he had a sense of history, with reservation I say. But anyway, his sense of history did not betray him at that time. (*Interruptions*) And according to that sense of history he saw that, well, the attack of Britain and France on the

Egypt certainly was an imperialist aggression and therefore had to be condemned. He did not come forward at that time to condemn the interference of the Soviet Union and her allies in the internal affairs of Hungary, as was alleged by the protagonists of certain imperialist interests. Madam Deputy Chairman, what I am submitting before you is this that reality is a very hard task-master and everything has to be judged in the test and crucible of reality. Everyone was out to condemn. At that time Stalin was at the head of affairs in the Soviet Union, the great Stalin, and everyone knows that at the time when the noose, the deadly noose, was being prepared for the neck of the Soviet Union by the Fascists and their accomplices just in the months before the Second World War, then the Soviet Communist Party, at the head of which was the great Stalin, did not hesitate to push forward, to grind down to the ground the Mannerheim Line of Finland because the Soviet Union at that time knew that the Mannerheim Line of Finland was the hot bed of aggression and an aggression spot from which attacks could be mounted on the socialist fatherland of the world. And that was necessary. It is not correct to say that at no moment in the period of history a socialist country can march its army into another Socialist country—yes, subject to this of course, subject to this and provided that in that socialist country the ugly head of conspiracy is rearing its head. Madam Deputy Chairman, one must remember that today the world is in a very bad way. You know that in 1954 the Geneva pact over Vietnam was concluded and the United States Ambassador solemnly said that he was not going to do anything against the Geneva pact. Yet we find that a person called Ngo Dinh Diem raised his head and the Diem brothers tried to sabotage the Geneva Pact there and you know what happened thereafter. Since 1956 a grave and very pernicious civil war has taken hold of Vietnam. At that time it could have been said that the Diem brothers were the voice of the people of South Vietnam but if we could look at it dialectically we could have seen even at that time that the Diem brothers were the concentrated centre of conspiracy, hostile action and counter revolutionary action in Vietnam. It cannot therefore be said at a particular moment when a particular centre is gathering strength—it may well look very innocent and harmless at that particular moment but one cannot say—what will gather round that centre; it cannot also be said

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

for certain that that particular centre might not lead to a bloody civil war or a counter-revolution against revolution as has been unleashed in South Vietnam. Therefore it is necessary to nip the entire counter-revolution in the bud. The whole thing therefore has to be seen realistically which in the Marxist language we call dialectically because you must know what is coming into being. What is not the most important thing but what is coming into being is the most important thing and if we see in the panorama of passing events that what is apparent is not the real thing but what is hidden behind the apparent thing is the real thing that is coming into being, well then, that thing has to be resisted or supported as suits the interests of revolution. If it appears to the Communist Party of a particular country that a particular phenomenon is coming into the surface, that a particular tendency is coming into the surface—that tendency may be hidden and it may not be seen; it may be hidden by many kinds of camouflage—and if that tendency is analysed and found to be an evil tendency that evil tendency has to be smothered and has to be destroyed even at the risk of being called, well, all kinds of names by persons who are not dialectically minded. Madam Deputy Chairman, therefore it would not be quite correct to say—I am raising a question of principle and I am saying this—that at no moment in history can a socialist country march its armoured columns into another socialist country. It can do so if it is found that in that socialist country a hydra-headed monster is just nursing itself and is growing into a big powerful serpent which may destroy in its death coil the entire socialism of that particular country.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Who decides that? Who gives the decision?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Therefore Madam Deputy Chairman, it would not do to plaster with condemnation all acts of a socialist country, and in this case, whatever acts may have been done by the Soviet Union in regard to this particular country, Czechoslovakia but, Madam Deputy Chairman, I must also say this, that the Soviet Union is finding itself in a position which is not very comfortable, certainly not comfortable internationally though from the point of Marxist principles, from the point of view of Communists principles, other things

might be said. Why is it actually finding itself in such a soup as this? It is because the Soviet Union has so far followed a policy which policy in a way has encouraged such types of liberalism, liberalism which has been tabooed by Marxists as a theory of ultimate capitulation to imperialism. For example, one fine morning we woke up and found that the Soviet Union is saying that there is nothing like the dictatorship of the proletariat. They began to say that the Communist Party is not a party of the proletariat but a party of the whole people; they began to say that the age of the dictatorship of the proletariat has gone and now it is the dictatorship of the entire people.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : What is there in China now?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Those revisionist theories of the Soviet Union have led the Soviet Union to this impasse. It is these revisionist policies that have encouraged this particular reformistic, neo-revisionistic and pro-capitalistic tendencies in different parts of the world. We are quite sure that as far as the present situation is concerned the Soviet Union will now see that these mistakes which she had committed earlier now require to be rectified immediately. After all, socialism has not yet triumphed in the entire world and if socialism has not triumphed in the entire world, if it is still facing encirclement, then it won't do to say that because the enemies of socialism have been uprooted in a particular country and have been destroyed therefore you should not have the dictatorship of the proletariat. Can it be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is only for crushing internal resistance? If there is external resistance, if there is conspiracy every moment, every hour of a socialist country's life, conspiracy on the part of capitalist and imperialist countries to strangle socialism, to destroy socialism then there must be dictatorship of the proletariat. It won't do to say that dictatorship of the proletariat is a concept that has outlived its existence. Even now it is interesting to see, even after all these experiences of the Soviet Union, in their statement they have referred to the leading role of the Communist Party; they are even now shy of using the expression 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. They do not say that the leadership must be the leadership of the working class and that the leadership of the proletariat will lead the country to socialism and ultimately to communism. These are the things which have led the

Communist Party of the Soviet Union along a revisionist path and this revisionist path has ultimately carried them and landed them in this sorry soup in which they are now finding themselves. Madam Deputy Chairman, though the entire State policy as well as the Party policy of the Soviet Union has gone down the slope or incline of revisionism so far, we have to judge the present situation in its proper perspective and aspect. And what is the present situation? The present situation is this. It is true that this policy of revisionism of the Soviet Union has given rise to the present problems in the socialist world; but it is also true—and it must be properly stressed and emphasized—that though its revisionism has brought the Soviet Union to this particular impasse this should not compel her to look on when a socialist country in its neighbourhood is rocked by a conspiracy supported by pro-capitalist or pro-imperialist conspirators and is being led towards the restoration of capitalism. If that situation becomes apparent to the Soviet Union, then in spite of all the errors of revisionism and all that, if the Soviet Union now at least wants to correct itself and see that socialism in Czechoslovakia is not jeopardised then we cannot but approve of its action. Our Party's attitude is quite clear. We are not wedded either to the Soviet Union or to the People's Republic of China. We are following an independent policy based on genuine Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, our outlook and our attitude to these things is necessarily more objective, we claim, than the attitude and outlook of persons whose vision and whose views are coloured by certain friendship and certain ties with certain countries. Because we are independent that way, we can look at things properly in their face and objectively. And objectively looking, we can say this that as far as the present action of the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia is concerned that was a necessity and that necessity has to be approved . . .

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : How do you say that?

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is his opinion. Let him express his opinion.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : What I am submitting is this. This particular imbroglio in Czechoslovakia is a thing which could have led to a situation similar to Hungary, the situation which developed in Hungary in 1956. It was because

the Soviet Union was late in interfering in spite of the earnest request of the the Communist Party of the People's Republic of China at that time when the Hungarian counter-revolution first reared its head. Then, the Communist Party of the People's Republic of China began to say that the time had come to save the revolution and to resist the counter-revolution. But there was delay in the Soviet Union marching its army and, therefore, we found in Hungary traitors active. When the counter-revolution and the leadership of Imre Nage reared its head, the finest sons of the working-class were murdered by the Soviet Union. In that situation a wild terror took hold of the entire country of Hungary. This particular counter-revolutionary coup or putsch could have happened in Czechoslovakia. Therefore, it was necessary to stop it in the very beginning and the Soviet Union, in my opinion, has done the correct thing . . .

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE : What were the circumstances?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : . . . in order to prevent that putsch, and therefore there was the marching of the Soviet troops into Czechoslovakia.

One word more and I have finished. (Interruption). It is not correct to say that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is completely imprisoned or it is finding itself in a position which is painful or unpleasant for itself. As far as the facts are concerned, all the facts are not with us. Until those facts are with us, unless those facts come to use, it is not possible for us and none of us should make any comment on the situation prevailing inside Czechoslovakia to that extent. Therefore in the context of the situation prevailing in Czechoslovakia and prevailing in the entire world, the action of the Soviet Union has to be judged.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Madam Deputy Chairman . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Madam, I am one of the persons who have given notice of this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You will all get a chance, all those who have given notice.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : It is not a question of getting a chance. There must be some prescribed procedure.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am calling every one, ten minutes each.

SHRI TARKESHWAR PANDE : (Uttar Pradesh) : What about us?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Everyone will get a chance.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Because I sit quietly, the whole order is just disturbed. My name is in the Order Paper.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is left to the Chair when to call and whom to call.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Then, I have my right to protest and I do protest.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Madam, John Stuart Mill said : "Of all great things much remains to be said." I am sure after this debate is over, much will remain to be said about the events in Czechoslovakia. It is remarkable that the Czech representative in the Security Council as well as the Soviet representative in the Security Council used language entirely different from what has been used by many leaders of the Opposition and my friends like Mr. Chandra Shekhar in this House today. In the Security Council both the Czech representative and the Soviet representative used very mild restrained and temperate language. That was not without meaning. Its meaning is that both the spokesmen of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union did not get extremely excited about these events.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE : Czechoslovakia filed a complaint before the Security Council.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : That is why the discussion came about. This much elementary politics he must know. Both the representatives of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union used restrained language in the Security Council because they are hopeful of an early settlement through negotiations and the withdrawal of troops from the soil of Czechoslovakia. Mr. Jacob Malik was the Soviet spokesman. Those of us who have been following the proceedings of the Security Council during the last twenty years very well know that Mr. Jacob Malik is next to none in the use of vituperative language, but he was restrained.

So was the spokesman of the Czech Government, their Charge-d'Affaires there. Let us all, let all the friends of freedom and sovereignty of Czechoslovakia make a note of this fact. It is remarkable that Mr. Malik himself said that he hoped for an early withdrawal of troops. It is also remarkable that, according to press reports, what are usually described as the UN circles hope that the withdrawal of troops from Czechoslovakia is a matter of weeks, if not days. So let us not get unnecessarily excited.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Withdrawal after the establishment of a puppet government. That is the point.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Well, which Government is a puppet government and which is a people's government is something which always remains debatable. (Interruptions). It cannot be certainly decided by inconsequential Members of Parliament like Mr. Dharia.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : We can see even here who are the puppets.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I know whose puppet Mr. Dharia is and everyone knows whose puppet Mr. Dharia remains. So, do not provoke me too much. In the circumstances I feel that the statement that the Prime Minister made was worthy of the great traditions of this country and it is also worthy of a country which—thanks to the policies with which many Congressmen also do not agree—has acquired some respect in the councils of the nations.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : And also 30,000 square miles.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : We will send Mr. B. K. P. Sinha to reclaim some of that. What is that statement? That statement correctly says that we have always been deeply committed to the cause of freedom everywhere. Secondly, it says that the principle of non-interference by one country in the internal affairs of another constitutes the very basis of peaceful co-existence, and, thirdly, it says and says correctly that India has always raised her voice whenever these principles have been violated. Of course the temper and the tone of the voice is determined by the Government and not by excited people. The statement conveys to the people of Czechoslovakia the profound concern at the turn which events have taken, and I am sure in expressing concern this country is united. But it is remarkable that this statement describes

the situation in Czechoslovakia as something which has arisen because of "problems and differences between Czechoslovakia and its allies". We cannot ignore the Warsaw Pact. We cannot ignore that these countries and Czechoslovakia are committed for common defence. We also cannot ignore the fact that during the Second World War it was through Czechoslovakia that the Nazi troops marched into Eastern Europe. We cannot ignore the fact that counter-revolution is still a force while imperialism is not altogether dead.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE : This is nothing sort of imperialism.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Let us also remember that India was against the Warsaw Pact.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Now you have become the great champion of the Warsaw Pact.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I know and everyone knows that many of the people who are today concerned about events in Central Europe are the people who condemned Czechoslovak Communists, Novotny and Dubcek alike. It is anti-Sovietism which has found a handle for many people.

Then I come back in spite of these interruptions to the statement made by the Prime Minister, which we are considering. The last paragraph of it says three important things. One is that the forces which have entered Czechoslovakia will be withdrawn at the earliest possible moment. Secondly, it expresses the hope that the Czech people will be able to determine their future according to their own wishes and interests. Thirdly, it says that whatever mutual problems there may be between Czechoslovakia and its allies will be settled peacefully. In correct, temperate and restrained language this statement expresses the wish of the Indian people when it calls for withdrawal at the earliest possible moment of foreign troops from Czechoslovakia, and it stands for the right of the Czech people to determine their future according to their own wishes and interests and not according to the wishes of anybody else. Fourthly, it realises that Czechoslovakia and its allies must settle their problems through negotiations.

Madam, there have been certain utterances like murder of democracy, murder

of sovereignty, in this House and elsewhere in the country. I am sure the people who were angry because they thought it was murder of democracy do not argue that Czechoslovakia had all of a sudden become a bourgeois democracy. It was a socialist democracy and the unfortunate events in Central Europe have occurred because the whole socialist camp, to be more explicit, the world Communist camp is in disarray, and there is something in what Mr. Chatterjee said that certain policies have brought about a situation in which the socialist camp is in disarray, and military intervention is certainly not the method to correct that. It is very remarkable that the concern expressed by our Prime Minister is also the concern of the Communist Party of India, the Communist Party of France, the Communist Party of Italy. This is bound to have a great effect on the thinking of Soviet leaders, and I am sure the fact that the representative of India in the Security Council abstained from voting with the American bloc—it was not merely a question of voting with this resolution or that resolution; those who know the working of the Security Council will remember that in the Security Council, in the United Nations General Assembly and in every Committee of the United Nations there is a solid American bloc, and voting for that resolution would have meant voting with the American bloc and voting with the American bloc on an issue concerning the socialist camp is not the best way of correcting a blatant mistake which has been made.

Madam, it is very remarkable that when the American representative, Mr. George Ball, made certain references to events in Czechoslovakia and went out of his way to support the Czech people, the spokesman of Czechoslovakia in the Security Council contradicted him. There were two instances mentioned by Mr. George Ball in condemnation of the Soviet Union. They were the events of February 1948 and the death of Mr. Masaryk, the suicide of Mr. Masaryk. On both these points the spokesman of Czechoslovakia contradicted and condemned the utterances of the spokesman of the U. S. A. In this country people who have always been anti-socialist, people who have always been anti-Soviet, people who have condemned Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland alike have all of a sudden become champions of Czechoslovakia, (*Interruption*) I am sure the leaders of Czechoslovak Government, the Czech party and t

[Shri Arjun Arora]

Czech people will not agree with the utterances of the Swatantra and Jan Sangh spokesmen in the Parliament of India. If, as in the United Nations Security Council, a representative of the Czechoslovakian Government were here he would have contradicted most of these utterances, just as he contradicted the utterance of Mr. George Ball in the Security Council, and would have said, "Oh God, save us from our friends".

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Novotny was the leader.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Novotny is no more the leader. I am referring to what happened yesterday. (*Interruptions*) Mr. C. D. Pande does not appear to read daily newspapers. He is relying upon monthly magazines because I am speaking of what happened in the Security Council yesterday and it is reported in the Indian Press. He will, of course, read it next month.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Do you refer to those leaders who have been spirited away to unknown destinations ...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I am sure, in spite of what Mr. B. K. P. Sinha says, there will be a peaceful settlement ...

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : With puppets.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : ... of the dispute between the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries and Czechoslovakia which is also a socialist country.

Before I sit down, I must say that I condemn the presence of foreign troops everywhere. But I find ... (*Interruptions*) Everywhere includes Czechoslovakia and Mr. Khobaragade's own home. You try to understand a little. I have said and I repeat that I am against the presence of Foreign troops everywhere. I am against the presence of foreign troops in Vietnam. I am against the presence of American troops in Europe. I am also against the presence of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia. All foreign troops must be withdrawn. (*Interruptions*) But some of my friends who agree with the principle of withdrawal of foreign troops will stop where the Soviet troops are concerned in the world today, the American troops are stationed in 70 foreign countries. They must all be withdrawn. If they are withdrawn, the world will be safe for democracy and a peaceful co-existence.

With these words, I support every word of the statement that the Prime Minister made on the 21st and I submit that that is the correct way of intervening in international conflicts.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Madam Deputy Chairman, I have been participating in this debate with a heavy heart and even though our friends have been describing us as agitated Members, I would like to say that it is not out of an agitated mind that I speak. But at the same time I must say that if one does not get agitated over the injustice and the atrocities that are being committed, then he is not worth living, and from that context I am agitated, I am proud that I am agitated.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : You are a human being.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Before I begin, I would like to tell you that the patriotic people of Czechoslovakia put their lives before the tanks of the Soviet Union and others who wanted to crush Czechoslovakia, and even today they have been resisting very bravely. We know that before these heavy, mighty Warsaw Pact countries it will not be possible for those people there to sustain their struggle. But in days to come, I have no doubt whatsoever that truth will prevail and the sovereignty and independence of Czechoslovakia will come into existence.

AN HON. MEMBER : You may not be there.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : For some latest news I was referring to this bulletin which was sent forth by the Indo-Soviet Relations Department wherein they have said—

"Moscow, August 21 : Tass is authorised to state that party and Government leaders of the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic have asked the Soviet Union and other allied States to render fraternal Czechoslovakian people urgent assistance including assistance with armed forces...." and all that.

Now, the Tass has done that, it has the authority to state to the party and Government leaders of Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic. Those who are now championing that cause, may I know from them who are these leaders and what is that

party and the Government leaders? We all know that the President, the Presidium of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, the National Assembly, their four Ministers who were in Czechoslovakia and their representatives in the United Nations all have condemned this naked aggression. It is not that they invited them but they have condemned this naked aggression. And we know that only a week prior these leaders, Mr. Kosygin and others had their talks with Mr. Dubcek and others, and they resolved for an amicable settlement. Even if we refer to the speech made by our comrade, Mr. Yogindra Sharma, what do we find? He has said—

“Our Party’s position in regard to developments in Czechoslovakia are quite well known. When the reforms were undertaken by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia under the leadership of Dubcek, our Party came out in full-throated and open support to the measures for strengthening and developing socialist democracy. We acclaimed it has a positive development. We stand by the position we took earlier and we do feel that such reforms are necessary to strengthen and develop socialist democracy and indeed the socialist system as a whole in Czechoslovakia.”

Now, the very same Mr. Dubcek becomes a reactionary, he becomes a puppet and a tool in the hands of the imperialist powers. May I know ...

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : We have not said reactionary.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Even the stand of the comrade from the Communist Party’s stand in this is that Mr. Dubcek was a person who stood for Czechoslovakia, who was a patriot and that he was not a stooge.

And when we look at the revolution that took place in that country—and I am referring to Communist Affairs which is a monthly magazine—therein they have stated...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Who is the publisher?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I will give it to you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He is quoting from a magazine which I get free, every month from the U.S. Information Service.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do not quote it.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : It says—

“Mr. Kliment can boldly declare. . .”

And he states—

“I believe in free elections; a functioning parliament with an opposition; the rehabilitation of public opinion; active neutrality; federalization; socialism of our own type, tailored to our own needs and resources and determine by our own choice.”

And Mr. Dubcek said—

“We must declare war on every form of arrogance... and foil any attempt to secure the Party’s influence in society by methods which that society would reject as power-based and authoritarian.”

I am only referring to the speeches made by the leaders. If they are not correct, they will correct me. From where I get this is immaterial. Whether the speeches are correct, that is more material.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE : Where did he get them from ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : And, Madam, from this point of view if anybody says that it is because of the external, imperialistic force that the Soviet Union had to march their armies into Czechoslovakia to uphold the socialist system, I am here to say that ultimately it is for that country to decide what should be the future of that country. It is not the monopoly of Russia and Warsaw Pact countries to see what should happen in other countries. That way tomorrow they will march into India to uphold their socialism here.

Madam, we have been looking at Russia not only with hope but we were looking at it from several points of view. We felt that they would give a lead to the whole world. But I must say today by this action they have given a setback, a blow to the socialist movement of the whole world. Madam, today they have upset the whole balance.

Madam, we were under the impression that this movement of democratic forces was also taking roots in the socialist Russia.

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

We are of the opinion that democracy and socialism cannot be separated. If we look at America we look at them for certain democratic traditions that they created in their country. Of course, we looked at them from that point of view and we appreciated that even while we formulated our own Constitution. But whenever they committed bombing on Vietnam, we were here to condemn their action. We are not working here like puppets. We have our own judgments and independent views. I must say, Madam, that while we were having our struggle for independence our views on foreign policy remained all the while independent even though we were a dependent country. But after our independence, for several reasons, our policy is being reconditioned. So far we are not self-reliant.

AN HON. MEMBER : How?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : It is being reconditioned. Even the Prime Minister in her statement has said all these things cautiously. I do not know the reason. I appreciate that we are passing through such a critical period when we want to have all countries as friends and, therefore, naturally we have to be cautious in using words. I do not blame the hon'ble Prime Minister. But why are we so much cautious? Why can we not express ourselves freely? Obviously the reason is that even our independence today is conditioned because we are not a self-reliant country today.

And, Madam Deputy Chairman, what is our foreign policy? Is it not a reflection of our internal strength? So long as we are not powerful enough, so long as we are not in a position to stand on our own legs, so long as we are not self-reliant, it will not be possible for us to reflect our foreign policy in a correct form. Therefore, instead of blaming the hon'ble Prime Minister for using this word or that word, I feel . . . (*Interruption by Shri Arjun Arora*) I will come to you, Mr. Arjun Arora, for lessons when you are Minister of External Affairs. He will then be our guide.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : By the time he is the Prime Minister you will be the President of India.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : What about Mr. Bhupesh Gupta?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I may be the Chairman of the Khadi Board.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Thereby my friend has suggested that he has no chance whatsoever. So, Madam, my submission today is what are these developments that are taking place in the whole world. We are just referring to our own functioning in the United Nations. I do not know why we abstained from voting. The hon'ble Prime Minister has clarified the position. But I have yet failed to realise why our representative at the United Nations could not say that he stood by the Resolution so far as the whole of the United Nations Resolution is concerned though he did not agree with this word "condemn". He could have said that he was not voting for the word "condemn" and that he stood for the whole of the Resolution. Skies would not have fallen if we had said that and it would have been possible for us to maintain our dignity at the same time clarifying our position.

Madam, we refuse to learn lessons from our history and from what our great leader, Tilak, stood for. He said that even if the skies fall he would stand on the fallen sky to see that the prestige and dignity of the human individual and the country is maintained. These are our traditions.

I was listening to the Prime Minister very calmly and patiently. I was trying to understand whether our representative was right. It was possible for our representative to express our views so far as the word "condemn" in the context of voting for the Resolution goes. If we voted for the Resolution would it mean that we immediately go to the Americans? I do not stand for this theory. We have our own independent policy, let us make it very clear.

Our Prime Minister has made it clear that we shall stand by the United Nations Charter. Only yesterday she said in the other House, which she repeated here also, that the Government of India shall stand by the United Nations Charter, that it shall not only uphold it in the days to come but she will see to it that the integrity and sovereignty of Czechoslovakia is maintained at any cost. If that is so we could have told the Soviet Russia likewise. I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister to use all her good offices to see that these forces of occupation from Czechoslovakia are immediately withdrawn. These countries have no business whatsoever to interfere

in the internal affairs of other countries. It is from this point of view, and with due regard for the Government, I must say that a firm policy shall have to be adopted. Are we going to be influenced by this bloc or that bloc? We should not bother about them. What do we stand for? From that point of view on the one hand this country shall have to prepare itself and on the other it shall really have to stand on its own feet.

Recently, we have seen how the architects, of the Tashkent Agreement have made the Czechoslovak citizens their slaves. We never expected from those architects of the Tashkent Agreement that they would go to that extent. We looked at Russia from altogether a different point of view. We looked at Russia that it will give leadership to the whole world. But they have thrown all the ideologies of which we were proud to the winds ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : ... we do feel that if in a democratic country these progressive ideals are not brought into being then democracy cannot be sustained from this angle ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I feel that the time has come when this country should have a firm policy. Pandit Nehru never circumscribed the policy of this country. He was very clear in his view. He has given the thought to this country that this country should stand on its own merit according to its own functions, and not at the instance of anybody else.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA (Maharashtra) : Madam Deputy Chairman, it is with a very heavy heart that I am rising to participate in this debate. Madam, I have always been an admirer of Russia and I have always supported our friendship with that great country. I received a jolt when Russia agreed to give arms to Pakistan. I thought it was a little cynical on the part of the U.S.S.R. after all her protestations to have indulged in that action. But speaking in this House in the debate I counselled patience and I said that we should not say anything which would come in the way of our traditional policy, namely, our friendship with the U.S.S.R. But what is the situation today?

Some thing has happened which I can only describe as outrageous in international history. In fact, aggression has been committed against a friendly, innocent country. Now what has happened to all those brave words we used to hear from the U.S.S.R.? There is not one single communique which the U.S.S.R. has signed along with us or with other countries in which these magic words did not occur, peaceful co-existence, non-interference in the affairs of other countries. What has now happened to those brave words? Is Russia peacefully co-existing with Czechoslovakia? Is she not interfering in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia? Madam, I can only describe this as a gross violation of the United Nations Charter, a naked aggression and an act of international banditry which we must condemn unequivocally and as strongly as possible.

I do not always agree with my learned friend, Mr. Dharia, but on this occasion I am in entire agreement with him. This is the occasion when India should speak with a loud voice. This is the occasion that India should make it clear where it stands. I would like to know from the Prime Minister, why is it we did not support the resolution which the Western Powers have submitted to the Security Council? This is not a case of West against East. This is not a case of white against black. This is not a case of white against brown. It is a case of right against wrong. Is there any doubt in our minds as to where the right or where the wrong is? Never was there a clearer case than this one for our saying that the USSR is entirely in the wrong and she should be condemned. Why do we shirk taking strong action? We somehow or other think that we should always watch the reactions of other countries, what will Pakistan say, what will Russia say, what will this or that country say... Do these countries ever ask themselves, what India will say? Our foreign policy seems to be based on the reactions of other countries, not on our own strength, not on our own people.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I would remind Mr. Chagla—he was not here—our Prime Minister is the second Prime Minister in the world next to the Australian Prime Minister, to make a statement both in this House and in the other House. She did not look to any other Prime Minister's reaction or statement or any other Government's statement.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I am afraid I have not made myself very clear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Chagla, you spoke in the United Nations many a time as the head of the Indian Delegation. Never did you use the word "international banditry" against the United States of America?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Well, when the occasion comes I will use it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Never you did.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, is the last person in this House to stand up and say anything against the USSR. The French Communist Party, the Italian Communist Party, the British Communist Party have condemned the action. What is the Indian Communist Party doing?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Chagla, I had given my chance to you. I showed that courtesy to you. I want to ask you, when you spoke in the United Nations, why did you not condemn the American aggression in Vietnam as international banditry? Why did you not insist on strong language being used in the resolution in the United Nations. You made long speeches there. You wanted to win the favour of the United States of America. You should explain all these things.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : When Mr. Chagla went there, he was not the Foreign Minister. He went there to represent India on the Kashmir issue. The Vietnam issue was not there before the United Nations. You cannot expect him to explain that. It is not appropriate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will produce Mr. Chagla's speeches tomorrow.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : May I make a confession ? I have never been a *persona grata* of the United States nor am I a *persona grata* of the United Kingdom. If I have been a *persona grata* at all, it has been with the USSR. Therefore, I said, "It is with a heavy heart that I am participating in this debate". If I felt deeply moved that a country which waved the flag of peace, international understanding, should today have violated every principle, every ideal, violated the Charter,

had committed aggression against a friendly country, it is because I have been a friend of the USSR, it is because I have friendship that I am using the strong language and I think we must use that strong language. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, lectured to us here on freedom, on rights of citizens and the Constitution. Now when such an act was committed by the USSR, why does he not get up ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He had not yet spoken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have given my chance to you. Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not need to be incited to lack courage...

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD * * *

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Madam, on a point of order, on a point of order...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : ... (Interruptions.)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise on a point of order...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It will be expunged.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Dr. Ahmad made a very derogatory remark against Mr. Chagla. It should be expunged immediately.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, I have said it.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : I did not make a derogatory remark. It was a political remark. It was not a derogatory remark. It was a political remark.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

(Interruptions)

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : He changes his views ... (Interruptions.) Mr. Chandra Shekhar, let me say, let me say...

(Interruptions)

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

All right, you are a great independent. I know what you are. The point is, I used it in a political sense; but if it pains some of our friends, I have no hesitation to withdraw it. I myself say that. If it pains you I withdraw it. But I meant it in a political sense, not a personal sense.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please take your seat.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I do not want my friend to withdraw it. I do not expect anything better from him . . .

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: It is not gentlemanlike . . . (*Interruptions*) . . . Then I don't withdraw . . .

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I know what I am. You look after yourself. This is a part of communist ideology, part of communist dialectics . . . (*Interruptions*) . . . Now, Madam, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta talked about Vietnam. You read my statements in Parliament, when I was in office or outside. I have condemned unequivocally the American action in Vietnam. But here what is happening? Here is a country which we thought was progressing from Stalinism, had entered into a sort of detente with the United States, which was fighting for disarmament, which was fighting for international peace. One fine morning, one hears on the radio—it is very difficult to get anything from news papers now-a-days, one hears from the radio—that Czechoslovakia has been invaded. What is the excuse given? They were invited by Czechoslovakia, by unnamed people. Nobody has been named. The Communist Party in Czechoslovakia has officially stated that nobody issued any invitation to the USSR and my friends here do not feel on what has happened. I am using strong language and I wish I could use stronger language. This is an occasion, Madam, when, as I said, we should speak loudly, we should speak unequivocally. We made a grave error in the case of Hungary, and I must warn the Prime Minister, we are still paying the price. When I was in the United States, the question was often asked: "How can a country like yours, with your ideologies of peace, your belief in Gandhiji's philosophy, how can a country like yours support the rape of Hungary?" and I had no answer. I did not have and I do not have an answer. Let not the world condemn

us again that when Czechoslovakia was similarly treated we kept silent and did not speak. Madam, India has great traditions of fighting against tyranny, injustice, cruelty. This is an occasion when we must keep up that tradition. What has been Russia's attitude about Israel's war against Egypt? Similar to our own. First vacate the aggression, withdraw the troops before anything further can be done. This is exactly the resolution proposed by the seven Western nations. "You withdraw your troops which are there without the consent of the country which you have entered, and then anything further can be done." Now, Madam, I do not want to take long . . .

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA: But America has not to this day advised Israel to withdraw from the U. A. R. . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: We did it (*Interruption.*)

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Madam, Russia has put the hands of the clock back by I do not know how many years. The whole framework which was being slowly and gradually built up has been shattered. Our belief in international peace, belief in non-aggression, belief in peaceful co-existence, belief in not interfering with other countries' internal affairs, all seem to have disappeared, and to-day we find ourselves back in the Stalinist regime. I do not know how long it will take before confidence is restored in the ideals which are enshrined in the Charter.

Now, Madam, I would like to say one thing more. We must seriously assess and make an appraisal of our foreign policy. We must not put all our eggs in one basket. The basket has become very shaky. It is not the basket we expected. It is not the basket which gave us consolation and friendship and understanding. Therefore, we should really consider whether this charge in the world situation that has come about should not make us also re-think our foreign policy.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: In what manner and in what direction?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I say in the proper way. There is one thing more that I would like to say before I sit down,

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

and that is to offer my sincere congratulations to Mr. Asoka Mehta for resigning his seat in the Cabinet. I am happy to learn that even to-day there are some people left in this country who can resign from high places on a question of principle. Whether one agrees with him or not, he has resigned on a question of principle and I think we should all salute that attitude which is in conformity with the highest standards of public life.

Madam, this has been a sad debate. If I have used strong expressions, I have been moved into expressing myself in that way, because when I heard of this aggression, I could not almost believe my ears. I thought there was some mistake. And so soon after what was supposed to be a settlement between Czechoslovakia and Russia and some of the Warsaw Pact countries like a bolt from the blue came this news that Czechoslovakia had been invaded.

My final appeal to the Prime Minister is, we are a member of the Security Council. India still counts for a great deal in the councils of the world. Let us not forfeit the confidence and the regard which right-thinking nations have in us. Let us speak our mind. After all, what is the meaning of non-alignment to which we adhere? Non-alignment does not mean that we support a country right or wrong because that country is a friend of ours. Non-alignment means the right to decide a question on merits, to condemn a wrong deed and to support a right action. And I submit, Madam, this is a case, where we should condemn what the U.S. S. R. has done which, I am sure, all right minded people will agree in condemning. The Prime Minister officially make take up a particular attitude. But I assure her that the whole public opinion in India is aghast at what the U.S.S.R. has done; and after all, Government must to a large extent and in a large measure respond to public opinion in this country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Congress Party list is very long and I will not be able to call all of them. There are four Members in whose names amendments stand—Shri C. D. Pande, Shri A. P. Jain, Shri M. P. Shukla and Dr. Anup Singh. They will speak very briefly. Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : What about me ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Surely in a debate like this every one cannot be accommodated.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : You can extend the time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We cannot take so much time.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : We ask for it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is all right. But we cannot accommodate everybody though some more time may be given. A party cannot give 27 names and expect everybody to be called. Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Those who have given the motion are called: that has been the practice of this House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If I call everybody, it will take another six hours or eight hours. Yes, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : We can sit up to 8 O'Clock.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am not willing to extend the time by so much. The Prime Minister will be called at 6 P.M. Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam Deputy Chairman, I have been called to speak immediately after Mr. Chagla. I was a little surprised at the kind of language in which he indulged. Generally he is not accustomed to use such language as "international banditry" and so on. Yet he pretended to be a friend of the Soviet Union. You will remember that when he spoke at the United Nations on the Kashmir issue, his speech was applauded by some Members on that side on the Swatantra benches, in contrast to what Mr. Krishna Menon used to say, on the ground that Mr. Chagla spoke in a very sober, moderate language. To-day perhaps to acquire applause from the same quarter he has spoken in a different language, and his vocabulary now includes, out of office in a situation like this, such words as "outrage" and "international banditry." We have a great regard for Chagla, the Chief Justice Chagla, the Chairman of the Mundhra tribunal. But we had difficulty always in understanding him either as Foreign Minister or as one who speaks on the language issue. It is not accidental that Mr. Chagla should have

concluded his speech by congratulating Mr. Asoka Mehta for his resignation. I should have thought that he would also remind himself and the person he admires now that there was an occasion also before to resign when the Americans wanted devaluation to be accepted by our country. But that is all a different matter. Yet, Mr. Chagla is a learned man.

Madam Deputy Chairman, hon. Members would naturally expect us to tell the House as to how we, of the Communist Party of India, look at the developments, what is our stand-point and how we would like the problems to be solved. It is a very legitimate query from hon. Members when it comes to something which concerns very intimately the socialist community, the Communist movement and generally the larger issues of world struggle against imperialism, peaceful co-existence, etc.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

I fully understand them and, therefore, I shall proceed, step by step, to tell the House as to where we stand in regard to this matter. I regret that Mr. Chagla, in whose favour I yielded my chance, did not wait for me to speak on this subject. Having got the priority given him by me, he turned the gun against me. Perhaps that is the order of the day.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Czechoslovak development, especially the situation arising out of the entry of the military units of the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact, has caused anxiety and concern in our country and in many parts of the world. We have also been concerned about it, not today but for some time. Today we are undoubtedly gravely concerned that the Soviet Army units as well as the units of certain Warsaw Pact countries have crossed into Czechoslovak territory. But one has to consider these things very carefully. These developments are undoubtedly very serious developments which concern not only the Czechoslovak people and their future but they also touch on international relations and the world community, if I may say so, as a whole. Therefore naturally such a matter should be discussed and debated but there should be an attempt to understand the background in which these things have taken place and we should

analyse them in such a manner as would improve the situation. Our approach is along that line.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, many have been showing concern. Among those expression concern you do not find identical motivations or even identical approaches. For example when we were discussing Czechoslovakia, we saw hon. Members from this side left the House. Before they left the House they demanded the resignation of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, personally, I believe, not the Government. Therefore you will see that internal politics had been imported in it. The more they speak, the more their posture becomes clear. Are they showing concern about the Czechoslovak people, the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia, whom Mr. Dhayabhai Patel all these years had been denouncing and decrying as a satellite of the USSR, a country not to be looked at, a country not to be visited and—was visiting Tiwan and South Korea all right? Well, today Mr. Dahyabhai Patel's heart is bleeding for the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia. Mr. Masani who wanted the Americans not only to continue the bombing of North Vietnam but to send American troops right into Hanoi has become the champion of liberty and human freedom. These are interesting and somewhat amusing . . .

SHRI M. N. KAUL : On a point of order, I submit that the Members of the other House who have participated in the debate should not be brought into this controversy. It is a settled parliamentary practice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The hon. Member did not say that when Mr. Yogendra Sharma is mentioned. Anyway, this is a very interesting thing. Therefore their concern has to be taken with a grain of salt. Well, every time a development like this takes place, they always attack the foreign policy of the Government, certain individuals in the Government, with a view to creating an atmosphere where certain forces clearly inimical to socialism, hostile to the socialist countries, are helped. That thing has been happening. Therefore I have nothing to do with the concern shown by the Swatantra Party or the Jan Sangh or the like. If they are for the independence of Czechoslovakia which must be cherished and respected we are equally interested in defending

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

socialism in Czechoslovakia. Also we cannot think of Czechoslovakia except as an independent Socialist Republic and I say that Czechoslovakia shall remain a Socialist Republic and shall never be handed over to the West. There shall never be restoration of capitalism in that country and in that matter I have confidence in the Czechoslovak working people more than in anybody else. Well, that is our approach. But certainly when other Members on that side and some on this side show concern, whose *bona fides* about peaceful co-existence and non-alignment, is not doubted I am prepared to respect their concern even if they use some harsh words against me but I am not prepared to tolerate this exhibition of concern coming from the enemies of Communism, the enemies of Socialism and the enemies of the working class, counter-revolutionary and retrograde forces. Let that be clear. Therefore I think the hon. Members should show a little understanding of the situation. You may or may not agree with what I say but I think we can share our thoughts for a better understanding of the situation. I was rather surprised when it was said that something was not done in the United Nations by the Government of India and the entire Opposition minus some of us walked out and there was a furore. I have been in this House for 16 years and on many occasions I had spoken to Jawaharlal Nehru as to why strong words were not used in the case of Guatemala, in the case of other countries where imperialist aggression took place. But he used to advise me in favour of mild words, mild expressions. Now there have been many Resolutions in the United Nations supported by India or sponsored by India and very often in the case of clear-cut imperialist aggression our criticism had always been that Jawaharlal Nehru did not use very strong expressions, he used mild words. I did not then see my friends here getting up and trooping out of the House. Well, go through the records of the United Nations; they are in the Library. You will find the position is clear. What they had not done in the past they do today. It is quite different, and it is done immediately, without waiting for the speeches to complete; the demand for resignation is immediately put forward. Do you think that by the resignation of the Congress Government here you will get the Soviet tanks return from Prague to Moscow? If you think so, say so. If for example Mr. Asoka Mehta becomes the

Prime Minister of the country with the blessings of Shri Dahyabhai Patel, that will happen then say so. I can understand that. Czechoslovakia for them is a pretext, is a camouflage for political manoeuvres and moves in this country. Well, I dissociate myself with it but I share the concern of many hon. Members opposite and I have no hesitation in saying that.

After all what is our stand? Our stand is quite clear that the troops of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries should leave Czechoslovakia as soon as possible. That is our stand. I do not know what the other people are saying. But this is our Party's stand, I am categorically stating it. Our stand is that normal conditions in Czechoslovakia should be restored. Our stand is that Socialism should be made safe. These are our standpoints. Therefore I have no hesitation in saying that there are points of agreement with many of you. I believe the Prime Minister herself has said that the Soviet troops and the troops of the Warsaw Pact countries should leave Czechoslovakia as early as possible. I entirely agree with that view. Therefore my disagreement is not on that score at all. I hope I have made my position clear. We have been watching with anxiety and concern the developments over the past few months in Czechoslovakia. The hon. Member was referring to the Communist Party's attitude. May I tell him that when the reforms started, our Communist Party was among the first to acclaim the reforms to strengthen and develop the socialist democracy under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia headed by Dubcek. I am not saying it to-day for argument's sake. I have brought here—the Members may kindly note—because they are interested in our views, even those who abuse us, more so perhaps. Here, in the New Age, the Central organ of the Communist Party of India, of 2nd June, we wrote :

“Czechoslovakia is no doubt passing through an important historical process and, happily the process is led by its Communist Party itself. The errors, shortcomings and deformities in the Czechoslovak society especially in the sphere of economy, political system and the Party have been frankly nailed down and are now being eliminated. This is being done

not to weaken socialism but to ensure that socialism strides forward, unhindered by obsolete ideas and methods or by conservatism. A new line of action, as expounded in the Party's Action Programme, has been found necessary in meeting the demands of the new situation which has arisen in the wake of the realisation of the socialist revolution in the country. That Czechoslovakia 'is an active part of the revolutionary process in the world' has been firmly reiterated."

Then we said :

"We do not have detailed information about everything that is happening in Czechoslovakia to-day. However, judged by what is already available here, it would appear that on the whole the current developments leading to the enrichment and expansion of socialist democracy deserve to be welcomed. The new leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist Party can count on our support and sympathy in the difficult and complicated tasks it has undertaken."

Again we added :

"One cannot, however, be unmindful of the machinations of the anti-socialist forces both within the country and from outside or of the pressures of certain alien trends including the revisionist variety. These clearly aim at undermining socialism and unity of the socialist countries."

This is what we said.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Your advice has been disregarded and you have been absolutely thrown overboard by them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We stand by that position. We did say then when the reforms were started to strengthen socialist democracy that it was a positive development. I reiterate at this moment in this House on behalf of our Party that we consider it to be so. Let me tell you how the Central Committee of the Czechoslovakia's Communist Party headed by Dubcek viewed our stand. Our New Age correspondent, Masood Ali Khan, met Cestmir Cisar, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on July 2nd and the interview was published in the July 14 issue of the New Age and it said :

"Before answering the questions the CPCZ leader first expressed appreciation of the New Age editorial (June 2) on Czechoslovakia for its understanding, sympathy and support."

That is how the Czechoslovakian leadership reacted to our standpoint. Therefore there should not be any doubt about it.

Now certain other developments had taken place. First of all, as I know, certain reactionary forces within Czechoslovakia encouraged and aided by West Germany wanted to take advantage of the process of reform in order to push their ends and restore capitalism in Czechoslovakia and take Czechoslovakia to the West. After the war many people did not leave Czechoslovakia and many capitalists and other elements remained there. The Czechoslovakian revolution did not come in the same way as the Russian October Revolution. It came in a particular manner. These elements took advantage of the situation in order to press certain things and create a situation where it would be easy for the reactionary and anti-socialist elements to take over. That was their plan. Obviously this could not be supported and Dubcek himself admitted that such forces were there and they were dealing with those forces. Hon. Members should know this. An appeal called "Two Thousand Words" was issued by these elements in Czechoslovakia which was virtually a call of revolt against the socialist system. All kinds of complications were being created. Hon. Members should know this when they abuse us. These people were putting up posters with such a slogan : "The last but one Communist should kill the last Communist". This is how it was being done. The slogan was given that the Communist Party should be dissolved. The slogan was given that the Communist Party should not be allowed to function anywhere. These were not helpful things and certainly they had counter-revolutionary inspiration from the West. Therefore you must take that into account. Even in the declaration issued after the Bratislava Agreement to which Dubcek was a signatory it was said :

"Support to and consolidation and safeguarding of these gains achieved through heroic efforts and selfless labour of every people is a common internationalist duty of all socialist countries. Such is the unanimous

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

opinion of all participants in the conference who expressed their unbending determination to develop and defend the socialist gains in their countries, to work for new achievements in socialist construction."

If you read the Bratislava Agreement you will find that they also took into account certain dangerous elements that existed there. Therefore the situation is complicated that way. Hon. Members should not miss this. I am referring to this because others here who have become suddenly the champions of Communism ignore them. At least once in my life I have found Mr. Patel championing the Czechoslovak Communists. I am waiting for the day when he shall champion our cause here but perhaps by that time something else will have happened, and we may not need it. It is quite clear as far as that part is concerned. What happened after that? After the Bratislava Agreement which was signed by six Warsaw Pact Powers including Czechoslovakia, it was expected that a solution to the problem, internally within Czechoslovakia, and as between the members of these Warsaw Pact Powers, would be found in a normal, peaceful manner through discussions, negotiations and talks. Unfortunately this has not happened. You can understand that we can only be sorry. It is very tragic that this has not happened. Therefore, when the armed units have gone there, certainly we want to make it clear that the armed forces should come out—whichever units have gone there from the other countries but at the same time we make it abundantly clear that while we stand for inviolability of independence and sovereignty, we also equally firmly stand for socialism. Let my friend Mr. Patel define his attitude towards socialism. But he does not say so because his expectations are not the same as that of many Members opposite. He thought: 'Here is some troubled water, let me jump into it and fish in the troubled water'. He wants to succeed in snatching Czechoslovakia away and deliver it to West Germany, restore capitalism in Czechoslovakia; otherwise, Mr. Vice-Chairman, would you believe Mr. M. L. Sondhi, the Jan Sangh Young Turk, flaunting the action programme of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in the Lok Sabha as if it is the "Organiser"? You would not believe it. It was such a drama. We are seeing it. Yet the Action

Programme is a document which we support, which we have published in our papers, which certainly spells out a good proposal for strengthening and expansion of socialist democracies in all walks of life. This should be made clear. I do not wish to take much time in this connection. Before I sit down I would like to say one or two words about the approach. What is expected of us as Indians? In short, what is expected of the Government of India to do in this situation since we are discussing it in Parliament? If you think denunciation is the duty for the Government of India to do, I would ask hon. Members to think calmly whether that would help a solution of the problem. Those who feel that socialism must live in Czechoslovakia, that independence and sovereignty must remain, certainly they would like the Government of India or for that matter any man of goodwill, or any organisation endowed with goodwill, to function in the given situation in such a manner that they are in a position to exert influence, influence on all including the Soviet Union, including Soviet leaders and leaders of the Warsaw Pact powers. They, after all, are still our friends. We have not disowned their friendship; neither they have disowned our friendship. A problem has arisen, a difference has arisen between two sets of people, the party running the Government of India on this side on the one hand and the friends of India on the other over a particular matter. Are we to go into hysteria over it to make denunciation and so on? That, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel can do. That, the Jana Sangh can do.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time to wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Certain other people can do. But certainly the Government is not to be expected to behave in this manner, and I still feel that India can exert certain moral influence in favour of independence and of socialism both. Those who are prepared to exert influence in favour of independence and socialism, certainly through mutual discussion they can find a common voice. They can work out a common approach and that would be really helping Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak people are not looking to Shrimati Indira Gandhi or to you so that you can denounce everybody. They are looking forward to you so that the beneficial and healing influence of India with its policy of peaceful

co-existence, with its policy of non-alignment, which has used certain moderation in times of extreme difficulty, is made to be felt everywhere. That is the Czechoslovak approach. It is surprising to see some of our friends using stronger language than we hear in Czechoslovakia itself from those who have divergent points of view in Czechoslovakia *vis-a-vis* the Soviet Union and others. The Soviet leaders are very careful in selecting their language because they too look to a solution within the framework of socialism and independence. I think, therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, before I sit down that India should, and the Government of India in particular should, if at all interested in helping, exert its influence and maintain a position of objectivity, calmness and statesmanship, and that attitude cannot be adopted if the Government of India under the pressure of these benches yield to them. This is all that I would like to say in this connection. Again, before I sit down, I would like the hon. Members to realise that our position is the one that we have stated, and that is the position of the Communist Party of India. We shall be the happiest people to see Soviet troops and other troops of the Warsaw members out of Czechoslovakia. We shall be happy to see the communist party of Czechoslovakia and the working people of Czechoslovakia strengthening their socialism. We shall be happy to see that in Czechoslovak Socialist Republic independence and free life under socialism become inviolable in every way. To that end all men or goodwill should work and exert their influence and bring their wisdom and collective thought to bear upon the situation. This is all my appeal. I think many of the people may not like it but I hope the Government of India and others there would at least consider it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Now I shall call those hon. Members who have given notice of amendments and I would request them to be very brief in their remarks.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for revealing the situation as it prevails in the Communist Party of India as in other communist parties of the world. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta made a case that his party was creating an atmosphere throughout the world, particularly in Czechoslovakia, and they were welcoming that development. He has quoted

the articles that he has written in his paper the 'New Age'. I am sorry to see that the entire friendship, the entire following, the entire devotion of the Communist Party of India, the devotion of the communist parties of Italy and of France have been disregarded by Russia. Now, in fact, he should be as much disappointed and anguished as we are on this side. I am very glad that you were nourishing the dream that we nourished that the dehumanising cult of communism should go and that Czechoslovakia was the crucial spot where the new experiment was taking place. We were thinking that that harshness of communism will disappear and the world would be a happier one to live in. Now that thing has gone, that dream has been shattered.

Now let us see what are the affairs in Czechoslovakia. I have analysed it and I feel that the Russian people are exploiting international communist sentiments for their national ends. If I compare, there is no difference between the aggression committed in Czechoslovakia and the aggression committed by Catherine the Great and Ivan the Terrible on Poland, and we people throughout the world should realise that Russia or China or America, they are all basing their policies on national interests. It is only the duped countries in the world that are following a different path on account of certain ideology. I am really constrained to say how, on this, when you see this thing clearly, when you, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, see that your efforts for the last three months have been shattered to pieces, you still think that there is any hope from Russia. He said: If we condemn them, will their tanks withdraw from Czechoslovakia? I say; if Mrs. Indira Gandhi says, "We do not denounce you. We do not condemn you. We simply cajole you to do something". . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You want her to do.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : If she simply cajoles Mr. Kosygin, will that do? That is not the question. The Russian people are very hardheaded. Do not think that they are going to abandon their plans because the Communist Party of India does not like it or because the Communist Party of Italy does not like it. They have got a national interest and they think that as long as any action serves that national purpose, that is good enough for them. As long as they are rooted in that purpose, no amount of cajoling, no amount of

[Shri C. D. Pande]

begging, no amount of softening your attitude will influence them. Now you must see how things happened. In 1948, when Stalin was ruling in Russia, Marshal Tito did the same thing as Dubcek was doing today. The whole world had learnt about it. I know how Jawaharlal Nehru reacted, and Mrs. Gandhi must be knowing it more than I.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of information. I was always under the impression that he knew Nehru better than she.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : I know that and she knows that. Mr. Nehru wanted that some softening should be there in the Bloc. And when Marshal Tito left the Bloc, he was still a communist, not that he gave up socialism. He was an admired leader of the world. And do you know what Nehru said ? I happened to share that talk. He said in reference to Marshal Tito : He is the man. He is the man who is going to soften the harshness of communism. Now that very step was taken by Mr. Dubcek and you see the result of it now, the action taken on it now by outside powers by their interference in their internal affairs. We admired then the courage of that great man Marshal Tito, and at that time the tyrant Stalin ruling Russia did not do what Kosygin and others have done in Czechoslovakia today. The Czechoslovak people were not wanting to go out of the Bloc, as did Marshal Tito. They were remaining communists. Your sympathies were with them. You were so hopeful of peace reigning in Czechoslovakia. Now, if they are being sequestered, if they are murdered, if they are thrown away from here and there, then are you happy? Is it your scheme ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will not be happy even if you are not there.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Let me be murdered. (*Interruptions.*) Here it is a question where, for the first time, the imperialist powers are closing their eyes to what happens in Czechoslovakia. I am anguished. I am very angry with the United States of America that they are not taking a plain clear view of the thing, a forthright view of the thing. I think this is a menace and I am not satisfied with the United States because they are not showing that fervour for freedom as they have shown. It may be right or wrong but in this case which deserves the greatest sympathy of the

world they have lagged behind. Therefore I have come to the conclusion that hereafter we should deflate the giants wherever they are. There are three giants in the world and as long as these three giants remain, no small power is safe in the world. One is Soviet Russia, the other is the United States and the third is China. Our policy should not be just non-alignment and approval of whatever they do. We should say, if they do something right, it is all right but if they are aggressors we should go against them.

Now there is this question about this single word. Everybody says it is naked aggression. Many of the countries have said that this is a horrible thing. This sudden attack has hurt many hearts in the world. If somebody has committed aggression, and naked aggression at that, what should be the word to describe it, disapprove, express concern, feel sorry or condemn ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For your information, the Security Council Resolution— I am not giving any opinion— does not contain that word 'naked aggression'.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : If it is not naked aggression what else is it ? It is naked aggression. You may or may not agree but it is aggression of the worst type. We have never seen an aggression of this type. I think even Hitler's aggression cannot be compared to this because Hitler at least had some excuse in that some people of his were in the Sudetenland and he had that as a pretext.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : You are mistaken. Hitler's men killed even the cats in the famous freedom village of Liddice near Prague when Hitler's oppressive Governor Heydrich was assassinated. I have been there

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Here in this case the Soviet Union was the protecting power: it was supposed to protect the rights of the socialist countries and these countries are in a way satellites of that great power and they are depending on the Soviet Union for the progress of their countries. This is a case of the mother stabbing her innocent child. There is no crime greater than this crime committed by the Soviet Union and the world must learn a lesson. All these isms, all these dogmas and all these questions right and left, they are only to beguile the people and the world.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have never known a mother killing her child but I have known the father-in-law nursing his son-in-law.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: If it is not a mother killing her child, you can say a brother killing a brother, an elder brother killing his younger brother. Whatever it is, what is the comparison between mighty Russia and this small country, Czechoslovakia? It was this small country, Czechoslovakia, that is crushed and crushed at what time? It is crushed at a time when they were negotiating, when an agreement was signed.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: They were duped.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: All of a sudden you just jump on it and sequester the people and shoot the people? Guns are still booming in that unfortunate land and with all this we are not prepared to say that we condemn this aggression. Even if you are milder, even if you tone down your anger—the anger is there all right—do you think you will be in a better position to achieve, your objective? Your objective, namely the withdrawal of the Russian forces will not be achieved in any case but one thing will be achieved and that is, the world will know that India is not cowed down by the fear of Russia. We will have a status then, we want that India should have an image. I know our protest or condemnation will have no value whatsoever because we have no power but at the same time if we fail to condemn this now our reputation as a great moral power will go down and go down badly in history and we will never be able to restore that reputation. Therefore I think....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That will do. Mr. Jain.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I begin by offering my profound admiration to the people of Czechoslovakia who are today facing the Russian tanks and bullets to save their freedom. They have stood bravely oppressions and invasions in the past and I trust they will again come out triumphant after this trial. I also offer my admiration to the brave Dubcek, who started the process of liberalisation in his country and is being oppressed because he started this process of liberalisation. Even as the Security Council is in session

7-202 S 162

the Czechoslovak people are trying to solve the problem in a peaceful manner. They are of course agitated; and suffer from sense of oppression but have not taken up any attitude which would further aggravate the situation and I hope that a solution to this difficult problem which is bothering the whole world will be found and found soon in a manner which will save the honour and dignity of the great people of Czechoslovakia.

Since the second World War people all over the world have been trying to build a new social order in which nations, big and small, nations weak and strong, could live in peace and amity where their sovereignty may be respected, where their integrity may be respected and where they may be allowed to live a life of their own but this event has given a rude shock to the efforts of the people to build a new social order. I am not going into the details of the USSR being the original signatory to the U. N. Charter and a contracting party to the Warsaw Pact both of which assured the sovereignty and integrity of nations and their right to determine their internal affairs in the manner they liked. I would refer to a recent event and refer to the latest statement of the Communist and Workers Parties of the Socialist Countries. The statement was issued on the 3rd of this month and it said:

"The participants in the Conference (i.e., the USSR, the four Warsaw Pact allies and Czechoslovakia) express their firm resolve to do everything in their power for deepening all round cooperation in their countries on the basis of principles of equality...."

Please remember these words 'principle of equality'.

respect for sovereignty and national independence, territorial integrity, fraternal mutual assistance and solidarity."

That was the consensus arrived at on the 3rd at Bratislava. And it was applauded in an editorial of the Pravda of the 5th August as a great achievement to consolidate the socialist forces and to recognise the principle of independence, sovereignty, integrity and the right of the people to live in the manner they liked. But what happened after that? A period of pause

[Shti A. P. Jain]

intervened and we know nothing of what happened between the 5th August and the 20th August. All of a sudden on the morning of the 21st we hear that the Russian armed forces and the tanks of the four Warsaw Pact allies, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and East Germany, had entered Czechoslovakia and occupied all the big cities including Prague. There was shooting in the streets and both the Secretary of the Communist Party and the President and other Czech leaders were put under arrest. Their houses were surrounded by the Russian tanks. And now we get the explanation from the Tass. And what do they say ?

"The Tass is authorised to state that Party and Government leaders of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have asked the Soviet Union and allied States to render fraternal Czechoslovak people urgent assistance including assistance to the armed forces."

Now, as has been repeatedly asked more than once here, who are these Party leaders and who are the Government leaders? We have it on good authority that none of the Government leaders or the important Party leaders had invited the Soviets. In fact, most of them are under arrest; and may be some of them have been killed. Others have been put under restraint. If this is not aggression, wanton and unjustified, what else could it be? Now, so far as we are concerned, the Prime Minister has made a statement. I am not going to quarrel about the words. The intention is that we want the Russian troops to vacate Czechoslovakia not as soon as possible, but immediately, because they have no right to remain there. Further, the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia must be recognised. It must become a fact. The Czech people must have the right to live the life they want to live. The matter is before the Security Council and the Prime Minister this morning made it clear that there was no disagreement between India and the seven powers which moved the resolution in the Security Council, on the text of the resolution excepting one word and that is 'condemnation'.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : It is a war of words.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : It is a war of words. It is not a war of substance. I simply cannot understand why our representative

in the UN could not negotiate with other powers. If he had properly negotiated I am sure that the seven powers which moved the resolution, would have agreed to substitute the word "deplore for condemnation" in order to gain the support of India. It is surprising that we should abstain from voting for the sake of one word. We should have negotiated. There is a lot of opportunity for manoeuvring in international forums. I am afraid the matter was not handled properly. Now, before the world there is one question. Is it the law of the jungle that should prevail ? Is it the law of might that will hold ground ? And not the rule of justice, the right of the small nations to live and exist, their right to live a life of their own ? This is the crisis of conscience. It is a matter of some satisfaction to us that the world has risen with one voice. Even the differences between communists and non-communists have faded on this issue. The two leading communist parties of Europe, France and Italy, and of England, have all condemned the entry of Russian troops into Czechoslovakia. Tito has condemned it. Rumania has condemned it. So, it is not a question of communist or non-communist, but it is a question which touches the people's conscience. On this there is a much greater degree of agreement than on any other issue. I know that we cannot compel Russia, but Russia should take cognisance of the outraged feelings and sentiments of humanity, withdraw its troops and restore the sovereignty and integrity of Czechoslovakia.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल : महोदय, पिछले दो दिनों से इस संसद् में हम बड़े दुख के साथ 21 अगस्त की उस घटना पर विचार कर रहे हैं जब कि इस जगत के एक महान राष्ट्र रूस ने अपने सहयोगी चार राष्ट्रों के साथ अपने एक मित्र राष्ट्र पर, जो निर्दोष था, जिसका कोई अपराध नहीं था उस पर इस बहाने में कि उसके कुछ अज्ञात आदमियों ने उनको दावत दी कि अपने टैंकों और अपनी फौजों को ले कर के उसे कुचल दें, उस पर हमला किया। यह स्पष्ट रूप से एक छोटे देश की ही नहीं अपितु सम्पूर्ण मानवता की, स्वाधीनता पर आक्रमण है और सही तौर पर सारे जगत को और सारे जगत

की मानवता की चेतना को इस पर महान क्षोभ और दुख हुआ है। यदि ऐसी घटना का सारे जगत की मानवता विरोध करे और उसके प्रति अपना क्रोध और क्षोभ व्यक्त करे तभी मैं समझता हूँ कि जगत के ये महान और शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र रूस और अमेरिका अपनी शक्ति का दुरुपयोग करने से रुक सकते हैं, अन्यथा मैं मानता हूँ कि इतने बड़े शक्तिशाली और महान, फौजी दृष्टि से शक्तिशाली, आणुविक शक्ति की दृष्टि से शक्तिशाली राष्ट्रों का मुकाबिला कोई और देश शक्ति से, शस्त्रास्त्र के बल से और फौजों से नहीं कर सकता, इनका मुकाबिला तो कर सकते हैं जगत की मानवता की चेतना को जाग्रत करने से, उसको उद्बुद्ध करने से और उसको उनके विरुद्ध प्रेरित करने से। हमारे देश की मानवता ने, हमारे देश की उद्बुद्ध चेतना ने, हमारे देश के सभी राजनैतिक वर्ग के लोगों ने अपने विचारों को, अपने शब्दों को, अपनी भावनाओं को, निर्भीकता के साथ इस सदन में और बाहर व्यक्त किया है और जगत की उस चेतना के साथ अपनी आवाज को मिलाया है और इसके लिये समझता हूँ कि यह हमारे लिये गर्व और गौरव की बात है।

महोदया, हमारे देश की सरकार का, हमारा, पिछले बीस वर्षों से एक स्टैंड रहा है, हमने सदैव जगत में शान्ति की, स्वाधीनता की रक्षा में, जगत में छोटे राष्ट्रों के कुचले जाने के विरुद्ध आवाज उठाने में, सही बात को सही और गलत बात को गलत कहने में जगत का नेतृत्व किया है और इसमें जगत का साथ दिया है। हम आज भी मानते हैं कि हमारी सरकार उसमें किसी से पीछे नहीं है। इस देश की सरकार के सामने तीन चार प्रकार के कर्तव्य हैं, इस समय ये विचार हैं, एक तो यह कि यह एक महान राष्ट्र है, स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र है, इसकी एक परराष्ट्र-नीति रही है और उसी पर कामिसटेटली हम चल रहे हैं, आज से नहीं गुरु में चल रहे हैं तो क्रोध के कारण, क्षोभ में, लोभ में अथवा भय से हम उसके विपरीत तो नहीं जा सकते हैं

और नहीं जाना चाहिये। मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है उसमें वह किसी प्रकार से भी अपने उस मार्ग से विचलित नहीं हुई हैं जो मार्ग कि बीस वर्षों से हमारे नेताओं ने प्रशस्त किया था। उसीपर दृढ़ता से अग्रसर हैं। दूसरी बात है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र के चार्टर की, वारसा पैक्ट की शर्तों की, जो व्यक्त रूप से अवहेलना हुई है उसकी हम निन्दा अपने वक्तव्य में कर रहे हैं या नहीं कर रहे हैं। निन्दा का शब्द न होते हुये भी हम कहते हैं कि हम हमेशा सभी देशों की स्वाधीनता और देश की स्वतंत्रता के हामी रहे हैं, हमने देशों की आन्तरिक स्वाधीनता की आवाज उठाई है, तो अवश्य ही हम निन्दा कर रहे हैं चाहे हम निन्दा का शब्द कहें या न कहें।

मैं यह मानता हूँ कि भारत का एक और कर्तव्य है। यह झगड़ा उसके मित्र राष्ट्रों में है, रूस, पोलैंड, हंगेरी, ईस्ट जर्मनी और बल्गेरिया से हमारी मित्रता है और चेकोस्लोवाकिया से भी हमारी मित्रता है और जब दो मित्र आपस में झगड़े तो तीसरे मित्र का यह कर्तव्य नहीं होता कि जब शान्ति स्थापित कराने को जाये तो अपराधी मुक्त को गाली देने लगे। अगर आज रूस को अपराधी कहे तो क्या होगा? सारा जगत मानता है, सारे जगत की चेतना मानती है, रूस के अन्दर भी इसकी भावना होगी, लेकिन अगर हम खड़े हो कर गाली देना शुरू कर दें तो रूस से वह कार्य नहीं करा सकते जो उससे करवाना चाहते हैं। क्या हम चाहते हैं! हम वही चाहते हैं जो चेकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता चाहती है। वह चाहती है कि रूस की फौजें वहां से हट जायें, वह चाहती है कि नार्मल कंडीशंस हो जायें, वहां की सरकार वहां की पार्टी स्वतंत्र रूप से अपना निर्णय करे और जो नेता कैद कर लिये गये हैं वह छोड़ दिये जायें। इन तीन बातों को हम भी चाहते हैं और इन तीनों बातों का समर्थन कर रहे हैं और संयुक्त राष्ट्र मंच में भी हमने यही प्रयत्न किया है। भारत सरकार अपनी सही नीति पर है और यदि

[श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल]

हम शब्दों को विचारपूर्वक देखें और समझें तो यही पायेंगे। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के समक्ष अपने बीस वर्षों के स्टैंड के विचार से, संसार में उन आदर्शों की रक्षा करने के विचार से जिन शब्दों का प्रयोग करना एक गम्भीर, विचारवान और शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र की परराष्ट्र-नीति का नेतृत्व करने के ख्याल से उचित है उनका प्रयोग किया है। यदि हम ऐसा कुछ कहें जो कि इस सदन की महानता के विरुद्ध हो या यदि संसद में ऐसा प्रस्ताव लाते जिस प्रस्ताव के कारण हम उन उद्देश्यों को पूरा न कर सकें जिनको पूरा करना हमारा ध्येय है तो यह उचित नहीं। यदि आज हम यहां, जैसा कि हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने कहा, कठोर से कठोर निन्दा का प्रस्ताव पास कर दें तो वह ऐसी बात नहीं है जो कि रूस को अपने मार्ग से विचलित कर ले या यदि हम कठोर से कठोर प्रशंसा का प्रस्ताव भी कर दें तब भी हम खुशामद कर के उसको विचलित नहीं कर सकते। इसके वास्ते हमको उन शब्दों का प्रयोग करना होगा, उन तरीकों को अपनाना होगा, उन उपायों को करना होगा जो कि आज की परिस्थिति में उपयुक्त हों और हमको यह दिखाना होगा कि हम गम्भीरता से, जगत के इतिहास में एक दर्दनाक घटना के समय, कैसे विचार करते हैं। यह हमें देखना होगा। मुझे क्षोभ हुआ जब हमने देखा कि इस ओर से और उस ओर से शोर हुआ और उस शोर से यह सोचा कि हम जो बात कर रहे हैं वह ठीक है। इसमें कोई नदेह की बात नहीं कि जो घटना हुई है उस पर हर एक मानव को क्रोध है, क्षोभ है, दुःख है, तब प्रस्ताव और क्या करेंगे। एक महान राष्ट्र जिससे जगत आशा करता है कि वह जगत को शांति की ओर ले जायेंगे, जगत को और तरक्की की ओर ले जायेंगे, एक समाजवाद और शांति की दुहाई देता है, और दूसरा गणतंत्र और शांति की दुहाई देता है, व्यक्तिगत स्वतंत्रता की दुहाई देता है, यही राष्ट्र जब जगत में गलत रास्तों पर जायेंगे तो उन्हें हम शक्ति द्वारा रोक नहीं सकते, गाली दे कर नहीं रोक सकते और प्रशंसा कर के भी

नहीं रोक सकते, उनके कामों के विरुद्ध जगत में जनमत तैयार करके रोक सकते हैं और उस जनमत की तैयारी करने में हमारे देश की प्रधान मंत्री सारे जगत में दूसरे स्थान पर रही हैं। यह हमारे लिये गौरव की बात है और इसके लिये हम प्रधान मंत्री को बधाई देते हैं।

महोदया, परसों की शाम जब लोक सभा में प्रधान मंत्री वक्तव्य देने जा रही थीं मैं गैलरी में अपने मन में विचार कर रहा था कि कहीं प्रधान मंत्री का ऐसा वक्तव्य न हो जो हमारे लिये किसी प्रकार का गलत कदम हो लेकिन उस वक्तव्य के बाद मैं आश्चर्य हो गया। मैं किसी भी अपने साथी से उस कृत्य की निन्दा करने में, उसका बुरा कहने में, उसको गलत कहने में, उसके विरोध करने में, अगर कोई चीज मानव हित का सहारा करने में होती है, मैं उसको गलत कहने में किसी से पीछे नहीं हूँ परन्तु साथ ही मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हमारे देश की सरकार को, हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री को, कभी भी ऐसा शब्द प्रयोग नहीं करना चाहिये जो उस उद्देश्य के प्राप्त करने में, जो हमारे सामने है बाधक हो। अगर आज हम ऐसे शब्दों का उपयोग करें जिससे मित्र शत्रु हो जाय, शत्रु तो शत्रु ही रहेगा, तो बुद्धिमत्ता की बात नहीं है। हम किसी भी बात को पहले से एन्टीसिपेट कर यह कहना आरम्भ कर दें कि यह गलत है, वह बुरा है, तो हम वहां सुरक्षा परिषद में किस तरह जज होकर बैठेंगे। मैं इस बारे में क्षमा चाहूंगा श्री चागला जी से, वह बड़े न्यायाधीश रहे हैं, जब वह न्यायाधीश की जगह पर बैठेंगे और पहले ही किसी बात के सिलसिले में, इन्टरप्रिटेशन के सिलसिले में, घटना के सिलसिले में अपने विचार व्यक्त कर देंगे तो फिर न्याय कैसे होगा। मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है वह अपनी जगह पर्याप्त है, काफी है, उस उद्देश्य को पूरा करने के लिये जो हमारे सामने है। हम यहां पर जितने भी विचार व्यक्त करते हैं वह क्षोभ के कारण हैं, प्रधान मंत्री को भी बराबर क्षोभ है, लेकिन उन्होंने किसी भी सिद्धान्त के विपरीत बात नहीं कही है। रहा, सेक्योरिटी

कौंसिल में वोटिंग की बात, महोदया, जब मैंने समाचार सुना तो मुझे भी इस बात पर शोभ हो रहा था कि आखिर प्रधान मंत्री ने वचन दिये हैं चैक स्वाधीनता की रक्षा के लिये, वहां से फौजों को हटाने के लिये, वहां नार्मल कंडीशंस लाने के लिये, वहां चैक राष्ट्र के मौलिक अधिकारों की रक्षा के लिये, सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल में बातचीत करेंगे, यह क्या बात हो गई। मुझे फौरन ही संशय हुआ कि उस प्रस्ताव में कुछ बात ऐसी जरूर होगी जो हमारे मौलिक विचारों और सिद्धांत के विरुद्ध होगी। मैं नहीं मानता कि एक शब्द ही हमको रोक सकता था लेकिन एक शब्द का भी यदि इम्प्लीकेशन ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि जो हमको हमारे उद्देश्य से हमको दूर हटा रहा हो, जिसको हम पूरा करना चाहते हैं, जो हमारे बीच में गहरी खाई पैदा कर सकता है, तो हम अपने उद्देश्य को पूरा करने के लिये अपने को रोक सकते हैं। इस समय बहुत गंभीरता से, शांति से धारज से, इस दुःखद घटना की आंच से हम चैक देश को एक महान प्रलय की आग में फंशाने से बचाना चाहते हैं और उसकी ओर महान भारत देश अग्रसर हो सकता है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस राष्ट्र का आत्म बल, जनता का सबल, उनके साथ है, वह इसे इस तरह से उपयोग में लाए कि उस दुःखद घटना का अंत शांति में हो, चैक राष्ट्र की स्वाधीनता में हो तथा चैक राष्ट्र के अधिकारों की रक्षा में हो।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस वक्तव्य का समर्थन करता हूं।

DR. ANUP SINGH : Madam, we have been privileged to listen to some of the most eloquent, moving speeches inspired by conviction and a great deal of fervour. I personally share all the sentiments that have been expressed and I admire those people who have spoken out very boldly. I must submit, however, that if one were to listen to their speeches in isolation without any reference to the statement made by the Prime Minister, one would get the feeling that we have not done anything at all, that we have by implication at least condoned or approved of the action. I think that would be very misleading. The only quarrel is

about the use of strong language. One of the hon. Members has said that while speaking in this House on South African racial policy the great Prime Minister used much stronger words. I think he forgets, not deliberately but perhaps by accident, that on that issue of racial discrimination against the Asiatics, against the Indians, the entire country and every Member of Parliament irrespective of party affiliations were united. But what is the situation today? An hon. Member behind me said : what was the need and where was the necessity of the Prime Minister to rush with a statement; why did not she wait? On the other hand, there were Members who said that the statement had been very mild. Obviously we are not unanimous about the contents of the statement nor about the desirability of the statement. Under those circumstances the Government, a responsible Government, must try to reconcile the various points of view keeping in mind our traditions and heritage and keeping in mind also the present situation and the way in which we can offer any help.

Mr. Chatterjee speaking for the Left Communist Party. I think, has advocated one of the most dangerous doctrines when he said that if in order to save socialism, obviously of the type the Russians want or somebody else, anything is done, that must be condoned, to save the revolution of the socialist type. I think the reverse implication must also be accepted that if the capitalists decide that they must march into Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R. or other socialist countries, to save capitalism from dying, they will be equally justified. What are we discussing here? I think speaking for myself the Russians have committed a great blunder. They have damaged their own reputation more than they have damaged up till now the Czechoslovakians. We had come to believe, some of us, that since the acceptance of the doctrine of co-existence the tension in the world had been steadily reduced and the chances of the great giants coming together had improved. By this act I think the possibility of co-existence or its efficacy will not be accepted by the people so easily, simply because if it is not possible for the doctrine of co-existence to operate within one family, members of the Communist Party, it becomes far more difficult for that doctrine to operate among the capitalists and the Communists. I have no time to elaborate

[Dr. Anup Singh]

but I am simply saying that a great deal of damage has been done to the possibility of co-existence as a lever for peace. Secondly, I think their reputation in the Afro-Asian countries must have also suffered a great deal. They happen to be champions of anti-imperialism, anti-racialism, and all the rest, but the use of force particularly after subscribing to the Warsaw Pact which forbids intervention by any signatories in the internal affairs of other countries, by doing so, I think they have damaged their own cause.

Madam Deputy Chairman, some of the hon. Members in the opposition have thought it fit and necessary to walk out as a protest because the representative of the Government of India in the Security Council has not approved the resolution. I think this is setting a very bad example, as I said in my earlier intervention. The Prime Minister has explained the difficulty, the circumstances in which we did not find it possible to associate ourselves with the sponsors of the resolution. Somebody has suggested, I hope not in all seriousness, that we were afraid to go along with the Americans. If we were to look at the record, we would find that on hundreds of occasions we have been bracketed with the Americans, sometimes with the Soviet Union, particularly in the early days of the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council, with the result that alternately we got abuses from both sides. They called us pro-Communists, pro-Soviet Russia. Sometimes they called us the stooges of the Americans in the Russian Press. But ultimately they found that we made our own decisions, good or bad. And Panditji was the first man to proclaim on so many occasions that I do not feel that I am infallible. It is our judgment, for good or bad.

Finally, it is also asked : When has restraint paid any dividends ? Not in so many words but the implication was that if we denounced, if we used strong words, it would be far more effective. I think, if one were to look back at the history of the last twenty years since we became independent, our restraint has paid dividends in Korea, in Indo-China, in Indonesia, during the Suez crisis; on every occasion it paid dividends. And our country at every step we should be very proud of this fact—emerged with a stronger moral position in the arena of international affairs.

My young friend, Mr. Dharia, said that it appears today that our foreign policy is conditioned. I was really surprised to hear it from him. The foreign policy of any country, is it evolved, implemented in a vacuum ? Certainly, it is not a crime to admit that the foreign policy of every country including our own is conditioned. The foreign policy that Panditji advocated, of which he was the architect, he did not spin it out from a vacuum. It represented a trend of thought bequeathed to him and the Indian National Congress from decades before. It is conditioned. And what the Prime Minister has said with reference to this particular episode is certainly conditioned, and it should be conditioned.

Thank you.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I shall try to be brief even at the risk of my remarks becoming less effective, because we must soon close the discussion under the pressure of time.

I shall make it clear first that so far as I am concerned, while so many people in the country are surprised and some shocked, I am not surprised at the developments that have taken place. It may not be known, but I claim to be a good student of Communism and International Communism. I did all the study in jail, and I have very closely followed the developments in this sphere after I was free. Therefore, what has happened does not surprise me. Some things which were similar have happened before and similar things might also hereafter happen. The only thing which appeals to India is that a country which is small and weak has been overrun and the Soviet military is in occupation. It is another thing mutually to discuss personally or at conferences between the parties as to what took place, and as to what now is happening inside Czechoslovakia and what should be done. There are certain groups inside Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Communist Party leadership seems to be inclined towards one particular group. All the matters could have been discussed and settled. But taking the troops inside the country and with the help of the troops keeping the legally constituted leadership under some kind of siege or internment—and some of them seem to have disappeared in places not locatable—is a thing which is understandable so far as we are concerned. Hence

our desire to do something to help in changing the situation; hence the desire to express our views.

Now, I am one of those who feel that we have certainly to express our views. But I am not of the opinion that we can very much help. I do not agree with those friends who have said that Soviet Russia will lose its reputation and therefore we can ask it to do this or not to do this, or that world opinion is going to influence them. Soviet Russia is a very practical-minded country. And they know which way and in which direction their interests lie. I have no doubt that in the Security Council they will take up a stand which is entirely in accordance with their interests. We may try to influence them. I do not know how much influence really we will have with them, yet it is our duty to try.

But I strongly feel that too much has been said about one word 'condemnation'. I myself as an individual condemn what the Soviet Union and her allied socialist countries have done. And possibly also, as a Member of Parliament, I condemn it. But if in the next minute I am asked to assist in making a Government draft, I will advise them not to use the word 'condemn'. When the Government as such functions, it functions taking the totality of thing into consideration and it is the totality of circumstances which Government have taken into consideration in not agreeing to the word 'condemnation' with which I personally may agree but for our Government to use it is not desirable. I do not know whether the other bloc with which also we do not want to be allied has not been insistent about the use of the word 'condemnation' because it fits in with their policies. We do not want to get involved with one bloc or the other, just as we do not want to break finally with Soviet Russia. They have done something which we think is wrong. If it is our effort, I do not know how far it will be successful to see that the wrong is undone, then it is not wise to use this word. I do not want to develop this point here. Circumstanced as we are, I think it is a correct thing which Government have done, and I congratulate the Prime Minister on resisting the pressure which was exercised on her today in respect of the word 'condemnation'. Now, I suggest—I do not know how far it is possible—that there may be another word which may suit the Government of India better...

AN HON. MEMBER : Regrets.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM :
....and may also serve the purpose. Whether it is possible to move another amendment containing everything else—softening or reshaping this word—I do not know. I do not want India's position to be misunderstood. The world should know that by all the rest of the Resolution we stand. But if the procedure does not permit it, we are helpless. We must explain our position in a different way, on different occasions, wherever possible.

Another thing that I would like to say is that some friends have suggested that we should reconsider our foreign policy.

AN HON. MEMBER : Nothing doing.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM :
Our foreign policy does not depend upon our brain, it depends upon our muscle. The word 'muscle' I use metaphorically. It depends upon our strength. And we witnessed today unfortunately—unfortunately according to my view—too much of party complex in the attitude of some Members and the incident of walk-out which took place. There was too much of anti-other party feeling and a desire to create a certain situation which prejudiced that party in public opinion. I may be wrong, I may be doing injustice to them. But this is what I honestly feel. And I think these and similar internal things are reducing our strength and unless our country is strong, we cannot influence world affairs today. Our position was different ten years ago. Several things have happened in the internal situation and the external situation and there have been other factors which have today reduced the weight of India before the world. We are sorry for it. We should try to retrieve our position. This is the duty of all of us.

I do not wish to say anything further. But I think the stand taken by the Government is right. It is possible that Soviet Russia may take its own time to vacate Czechoslovakia. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said that he stands for their vacating. But it is a question of timing the vacating. They will vacate only when their purposes, certain purposes which they have in view with regard to the internal politics of Czechoslovakia have been achieved. And possibly

[Shri Jairamdas Daulatram]

they will stay on till the things they desire are properly stabilised. I do not know. These are the possibilities. But I think we have to continue to put all such pressure as we can to see that the interests of Czechoslovakia are safeguarded.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND
MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
(SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) :

Madam Deputy Chairman, I really do not have much to say as I have already clarified the position regarding our voting in the U.N. earlier in the day. During the last three days, in one form or another in this House and in the other House, and indeed all over country and in large parts of the world people have followed the tragic happenings in Czechoslovakia with profound concern and I think I used the word "anguish". The House has followed the reports which have come through the world Press and the Radio. There have been reports of violence of bloodshed of loss of precious lives and property. There have been reports and rumours about Czechoslovak leaders. All these reports have naturally heightened our concern. We have been in close, anxious and constant touch with our Embassies abroad and with the Ambassadors of other countries here. We have in particular kept contact with our Ambassador in Czechoslovakia and with the Charge-d'affaires of Czechoslovakia here in Delhi. Even today he continues to function on behalf of the legally constituted Government of Czechoslovakia. All the countries in the world today seem to have joined together in the expression of distress concern and anxiety. I think—and I have said this before—the developments of these three days seem to have set the clock back by fifteen years and dragged the world back to the old atmosphere of the cold war.

What has happened in Czechoslovakia has shocked us as much as it has shocked the world, not only because of the tragedy of Czechoslovakian situation itself but for what we think it may mean in terms of the world situation, what it may mean in terms of reversing what over the years we have worked for so sincerely and so firmly. We believe that every country has a full right to shape its own destiny. We are opposed to interference by one nation in another's affairs. These points, Madam, I have made in this House earlier.

When this motion was moved by the hon'ble Member, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, he spoke at some length on co-existence and made the point that perhaps we had now discovered the perfidy of the Soviet Union and this would open our eyes. It is surprising, Madam, that so many times we have explained what non-alignment means, and on what basis our friendships are formed, and yet we find the same arguments used again and again.

Madam, we are not friends with a country because we agree with its system of Government. We are not friends with countries because we approve of what they do. We say that we believe in co-existence because countries have to live together in this world until science advances so much that perhaps we can move a whole country to some other planet. Until then we have to live together in this world in peace. And that is why we evolved this policy that we must learn to live together. We must learn to find areas of agreement; we must learn to enlarge those areas. It is not as if we did not disapprove when disapproval was called for irrespective of whether friendship was at its highest or whether it was at its lowest, whether it was the Soviet Union or whether it was the United States that did it or some other country did so. As far as our policy is concerned we did draw attention to wrong acts when they took place friendship was beside the point. But it has at no time affected our friendship with a particular nation. Our friendship is based firstly on the principle that in this world we have to live together and, secondly, it has been based on what we consider, after very careful consideration, to be in the national interest. I do not think that we should at this moment be swept off our feet by emotion.

I have said in the other House and I would like to repeat here, that perhaps there is nobody in this House who has had such close contacts with Czechoslovakia for so many years as I have had personally, not as a member of the Government, but ever since a small Government, but ever since I was a small girl. I have known the people of the country fairly well and I have known large sections of the people in the Universities and in other spheres of activity. I do not often agree with the hon'ble Shri Bhupesh Gupta but today I must say that this new-found friendship

for Czechoslovakia amongst some of the parties which have earlier always spoken against our friendship with those countries, does seem to me to be a little astonishing. However, I welcome it. For that reason I do not want to say that it has no value, because today Czechoslovakia does need all the voices which can be raised in her support.

Madam, some things have been said about our voting. I should like to refer briefly to the Rules of Procedure.

Rule 32 says :—

“Principal motions and draft resolutions shall have precedence in the order of their submission.”

Therefore, even if we wanted to have an amendment or to have another motion, the substantive one would still have been voted upon first.

The rule goes on to say :—

“Parts of a motion or a draft resolution shall be voted on separately at the request of any representative, unless the original mover objects.”

Now, Madam, we did, as I have said earlier in this House, take up this point and we wanted to have the voting taken up paragraph by paragraph but we were not allowed to do so. Similarly, our representative asked for a little time so that we would have more opportunity of considering the matter and giving a full reply. But that also was not allowed. I took the matter to the Cabinet and whatever decision was taken was taken by the whole Cabinet.

As I have explained earlier, in this particular case we have supported practically the entire Resolution, all the clauses but one sub-part of a single paragraph, that is, one paragraph out of nine paragraphs including the Preamble. We wanted to record our vote on the Resolution accordingly. But, as I said, it was not possible to do so.

Much has been made as to why we did not add one word, “condemn”. Was that word so important? Now we did consider its importance in this context. By all that follows in the Resolution and all that I have said in my speech, it is obvious what our attitude is. Then, Madam, when we are blamed for being either weak or halting or afraid, I must say these are rather strange terms, because what is the courage needed in this?

Is it in support of the Czechoslovak people, or is it for something else? I said yesterday that it is easy enough to condemn, but what we have always felt on this issue, as in others, is that the point is not to condemn or not to condemn. What is more important and indeed, what is vital for Czechoslovakia is the withdrawal of all foreign troops, the restoration of the legitimate government to power and restoration of the sovereignty to the people of Czechoslovakia. We are all in favour of these objectives and we do not think that these objectives can be furthered by beginning with condemnation. This is the point. Hon'ble Shri Jairamdas Daulatram has supported us in this and this is our own view also.

The main objective which we have to pursue as a mature and responsible people, as a member of the Security Council, is to do everything possible to stop the process of the serious setback to the forces of peace in Europe and in the world generally, to try and reverse the trend which has struck such a sharp blow to the earlier welcome processes of peaceful co-existence. This will serve the long-term and lasting interest of Europe and the world and I believe it will also ensure the sovereignty and independence of Czechoslovakia. This is the only way in which an atmosphere can be created which is necessary for the full observance of the U.N. Charter and the observance of the Charter rights of all free nations. Therefore, we have expressed our sympathies with the people and leaders of Czechoslovakia and I am glad that many Members have referred to the valiant history of the Czechoslovak people and that they have referred also to the manner in which the Czechoslovak people are meeting this particular crisis. They are meeting it in the light of the guidance which we ourselves were given by our great leader Mahatma Gandhi. The Czechoslovak people have a long history of fighting for freedom and in this they command the admiration of the world. There has been some concern expressed for the safety of the Czechoslovak leaders. Madam, although some news has appeared, the Czechoslovak Embassy here does not say that it is authoritative. But I am sure the House will join me in expressing our concern and also our hope that they are safe and will soon return to their country. We are second to none in our sympathy for the people of Czechoslovakia, in our admiration

[Srimati Indira Gandhi]

for the people of Czechoslovakia. We also feel deeply moved at what has happened. But a Government cannot be swept away by emotions. We have to see the facts in the world; we have to see how they have to be met. I do not know whether the decision we have taken, can be more helpful; only the future can tell. As the honourable Member, Shri Anup Singh, said in the past we have taken such decisions and we have been criticised even then. We have been accused of cowardice, of following one bloc or another. Yet we have stood our ground and, Madam, if I may say so in all humility, I do not think that had we been afraid, we could have stood our ground with these powerful nations trying to pull us one way or another. Would it not have been easier for me today to vote with the majority of nations? Even here is it not easier for me to say that since so many people are shouting, let me say, all right, I agree with you. It would be certainly easier for me to say this. But I have taken a particular decision. I have not taken it because it is past Indian policy. I have not taken it because I am afraid of the Soviet Union. I have not taken it because I am afraid of being called the stooge, or whatever word they may like to use, of the U.S.A. I have taken it because I consider it to be the only path along which we can work towards the lessening of tensions, we can work towards helping Czechoslovakia in the longer run. Therefore, Madam, I am going to stand my ground. I believe I am not deaf to the voice of the people. I think every Government, every political party, has to be alive to what the people are thinking. But, Madam, no person can be a leader, no person can be in the Government if he thinks that any voice that comes like this from the mob which is not in the position to know all aspects can sweep him off his feet and force him to give up what he considers to be in the national interest or in the interest of peace. Even if some people hold other views, I must state my view even if I stand alone. I must say clearly that this is the only way to save our national interest. I say I stand for peace, I stand for peace. . . (Interruptions) . . . and lessening of tension in the future.

Madam, let us use all our strength today to pull the world back into the path of sanity. Those who are breathing fire and brimstone today will not be

able to do much because their motives are sometimes well known and suspected. Centuries ago the Buddha said, "The victories of war are hollow, for the vanquished sleep in sorrow." Let this reminder go out from this House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I shall now put the motion to vote.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM : May I make a suggestion to the Prime Minister which may possibly be superfluous? It is desirable that the people of Czechoslovakia should know the true stand that we have taken because at the United Nations. . .

(Interruption)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Madam, I had earlier said that our representative had made our stand very clear at the United Nations and the latest report—it is Reuter or PTI—has also brought us the news that he made our stand very clear, that we supported these points which I need repeat because I have stated it earlier—our support, on principles, to the withdrawal of forces, sovereignty, independence of Czechoslovakia and so on. And also our views have been made clear to the Charge d'Affaires of Czechoslovakia in New Delhi.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now I shall put the motion to vote.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Madam, I want to seek some clarifications.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I cannot go on with the clarifications.

No more please, no more. (Interruptions)
I shall put the amendments. . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Madam, you do not listen to me because some people shout. I am not making a speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, please ask your clarifications.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : I had sought two clarifications. I had requested the Ministers who were sitting here to communicate to the Prime Minister that I had sought clarifications on two points. Number one : In the United Nations or in the Security Council, when our representative abstained, did he, before the vote or after the vote, explain the reasons for his abstention? Did he explain that? (Interruptions) . . . No. The Prime Minister explained

here, but I am concerned with our representative at the United Nations. That is number one...

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please, please, order, order.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : The second point is, I simply want to know, I had desired that we should be informed if the Government of India expected this sort of incursion of the forces there? And if they did, did they communicate, anticipating the reactions of the country, to the Russian Ambassador or their Charge d' Affaires here that this country will react adversely to this sort of incursion?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam Deputy Chairman,...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please, no more please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I should like to know from the Prime Minister, how many non-aligned nations' or non-aligned countries' Prime Ministers or the non-aligned heads of Governments have spoken in the way you have spoken? Kindly give the number. Have you got it?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is all right. Now,...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, not even two.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I shall try to reply to the hon. Member. We have the news that our Ambassador, Shri Parthasarathi, has made these points—it is not clear to me from the report whether he made it before or after. As far having news, the Czechoslovak Government themselves did not know, and as the honourable Member knows, four of their Ministers, important Ministers, were holidaying in Yugoslavia when this happened.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now I shall put the amendments to vote.

The question is :

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

'and having considered the same, this House deeply deplores the aggression against Czechoslovakia committed by the Soviet Union and some other Warsaw Pact countries'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

2. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

"and having considered the same, this House strongly condemns the armed entry of the troops of Soviet Russia and its Warsaw Pact Allies into Czechoslovakia as a wanton act of aggression against a peaceful neighbour and calls upon all peace-loving nations of the world to lend full support to the people of Czechoslovakia and their leader Dubcek in their movement to assert their national independence and right to determine their way of life freely."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The next amendment is in the name of Shri C. D. Pande.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Madam, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister's speech meets the substance of the amendment, I withdraw it.

**Amendment No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

4. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

'and having considered the same, this House recommends that the Government should take effective steps through talks with the U.S.S.R. and the U.N.O. and otherwise to secure the withdrawal of the Russian forces from Czechoslovakia so that the people of Czechoslovakia may live a life according to their choice'."

The motion was negatived.

**For text of amendment, vide col. 4266 supra.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The next amendment is in the name of Shri Mahabir Prasad Shukla.

SHRI MAHABIR PRASAD SHUKLA : Madam, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

**Amendment No. 5 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Amendment No. 6 is in the name of Dr. Anup Singh.

DR. ANUP SINGH : Madam, I withdraw my amendment in the hope that the Soviet troops will withdraw.

**Amendment No. 6 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The next amendment is in the name of Mr. Rajnarain.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He has himself withdrawn from the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

7. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the armed forces of Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland and East Germany have launched a naked imperialistic attack on Czechoslovakia under the leadership of the Russian forces and have encroached upon the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Czechoslovakia, and under these circumstances, this House strongly condemns the attack of Soviet imperialism'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the U.S.S.R. has committed clear violation of the United Nations Charter'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the action of the Soviet Union and four of its Warsaw Pact allies should be condemned and the Government of India should apprise those countries of this opinion of the House and ask the invading nations to withdraw their forces immediately from Czechoslovakia'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The next amendment is in the name of Mr. Pande.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Madam, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

**Amendment No. 10 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Amendment No. 11 is in the name of Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is infructuous.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is :

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

'and having considered the same, this House urges the Government to instruct India's representative in the U.N. Security Council to support and vote for condemnation of the aggression and breach of the U.N. Charter'."

The motion was negatived.

PROCLAMATION UNDER ARTICLE 356 OF THE CONSTITUTION IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF PUNJAB

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY) : Madam,

*For text of amendment, vide col 4267 *supra*.

*For text of amendment, vide col. 4268 *supra*.