

Members to the Committee on Sub-ordinate Legislation:

1. Shri P. N. Sapru,
2. Shri K. Chandrasekharan,
3. Shri I. K. Gujral,
4. Shri N. Ramakrishna Iyer,
5. Shri Baharul Islam,
6. Shri Jagat Narain,
7. Shri D. P. Karmarkar,
8. Shri Akbar Ali Khan,
9. Shri R. S. Khandekar,
10. Shrimati Lalitha (Rajagopalan)
11. Shri Debabrata Mookerjee.
12. Shri Ram Sahai,
13. Shri M. Ruthnaswamy,
14. Shri D. L. Sen Gupta, and
15. Shri G. D. Tapase.

Under sub-rule (1) of rule 206 of the said Rules, the Chairman has appointed Shri P- N. Sapru to be the Chairman Of the Committee.

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR DEBATE ON INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 172 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, the Chairman has allotted one day for the consideration of the Government Motion regarding the international situation.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं इसके ऊपर एक निवेदन करता हूँ कि चेयरमैन के जरिये जितनी कमेटियाँ अप्पाइन्ट की हैं उसमें हमारा किसी पर कान्फिडेंस नहीं है।

THE INDIAN OFFICIAL SECRETS (AMENDMENTS BILL. 1967

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): Madam, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Official Secrets Act, 1923.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I introduce the Bill.

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Madam, I beg to move:

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

Madam, I have no intention to make an opening speech. I would initiate discussion by making this formal move. I wish this discussion had taken place when our Minister for External Affairs were available here. But in deference to the wishes of the House, the Government have taken the initiative of bringing forward this motion so that Government might benefit by the views that the hon. Members might be able to give in relation to the international situation.

SHRI A. D. MANI: (Madhya Pradesh) : Madam, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion—

(i) that Government should take the stand that no enduring peace is possible in West Asia unless the Arab States recognise the State of Israel and

(u) that the Gulf of Aqaba be recognised as an international waterway; and

(iii) that Israel should agree to give back to the Arab States areas which she had seized in the recent conflict and should also agree to pay compensation to the Palestinian refugees.' "

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

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that in view of the scandalous disregard of diplomatic etiquette by the Chinese Government in subjecting Indian diplomats, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay, to inhuman treatment and subjecting also the Indian Embassy at Peking to a siege, Government should instruct its delegation at U.N. to remain 'neutral on the question of China's admission to U.N. at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that in view of the explosion of a Hydrogen bomb by China, Government should not sign the non-proliferation treaty.' "

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the view that there should be a reorientation of our policy in respect of China and a more sophisticated projection of our policy towards the Arabs and Israel.' "

The questions were proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have received one notice from Mr. Tariq. He is not here now.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीया मेरा एक प्वाइन्ट ऑफ आर्डर है और वह इस तरह है कि श्री ए० डी० मणि और जिन जिन लोगों ने संशोधन दिया है वह किस चीज़ पर दिया है जबकि मंत्री जी ने कोई बयान ही नहीं दिया। मंत्री जी ने केवल यही कहा कि विदेश नीति पर चर्चा हो। इस बारे में कोई प्रस्ताव यहां पर...

श्री अकबर अली खान (आंध्र प्रदेश) : मोशन है।

श्री राजनारायण : मंत्री जी ने कहा कि इस पर चर्चा हो दैट डजनाट मेक मच डिफरेंस। तो मंत्री जी ने कहा कि इसमें चर्चा हो और श्री ए० डी० मणि जो कुछ कह रहे हैं, हो सकता है मंत्री जी की भी वही राय हो। जबतक मंत्री जी लिखित रूप से कोई प्रस्ताव नहीं रखते हैं मंत्री जी की यह राय है कि यह मोशन है तबतक उस मोशन में कोई अमेन्डमेंट कैसे आ सकता है मेरा यह वैधानिक प्रश्न है और आप कृपा करके इसका उत्तर देंगी।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the House knew that the international situation was to be discussed to-day and therefore the amendments came in and I find them in order. We shall begin the discussion with Mr. Patel.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): I want to move my amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have come very late. After giving the amendment at 12.26 you were not in the House. Therefore, I am sorry.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: We thought this will be taken up tomorrow but suddenly this was taken up to-day. I was not in the House then. I have given my amendment in time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your amendment was called. You should have been in the House. In any case, if the House agrees, I can allow it.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: I move:

5. "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 United States has committed an unfriendly act by resuming arms supplies to Pakistan which is likely to disturb the peace in the area.' "

The question was proposed.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया जब आपने
झरों का ले लिया है तो इन का भी ले लीजिये ।

(Interruption)

इस पर केवल यही मोजन हो सकता है कि
इस चीज पर इस शन न किया जाय ।
जब इस गजत दंग से बिजनेस यहाँ पर
चलेगी तो फिर किस तरह से काम चलेगा ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do
not know how work can be carried
on at this rate.

श्री राजनारायण : इस समय केवल
यही हो सकता है कि इस पर विवाद न हो
और उस पर कोई दूसरा अमेन्डमेंट नहीं
हो सकता ।

Rajnarain knows parliamentary practice. I am
not going to learn from anybody here.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat):
Madam, I have no intention of competing
with the hon. Member in his loud speech. I
have not the intention and I do not propose to
do either. I think there is a better course for
the hon. Member who tried to interrupt me.

I am grateful to the Government for
providing this opportunity to us to discuss the
international situation and I am grateful to the
Minister who moved the motion for not mak-
ing a lengthy speech so as to provide more
time to the other speakers to speak. I do not at
all agree with any type of point of order that
was tried to be raised. On the contrary

the Minister has been trying to be
accommodative and we appreciate it actually.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Thank you
for appreciating for the first time.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: We
always admit when something right is done.
We always like to agree but when we do not
agree, we say it very openly.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: When you
say good things, we appreciate.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I hope
you do. To-day the discussion on the
international situation must necessarily
concentrate on the West Asian situation and
the China policy of the Government
particularly—I do not mean the recent
irritation that has taken place either in this
capital or their capital there, but with particular
reference to the Chinese latest nuclear
explosion and how it affects this country and
its safety. I am one of those who had been
criticising the policy of the Government of
India for the last 18 years after freedom. We
have made many many mistakes and it would
not be out of place to roughly take account of
them.

The first mistake that we made was to
withdraw our victorious army from Kashmir.
They wanted two days' time and if those two
days' time had been given, if we had not
followed the foolish policy of running to find
a policeman when a thief was walking into
our house and allowed him to walk in—that is
what we did—we would not have been in this
situation, we would not have had to pay
crores and crores of rupees on an endless war
and we would not have a neighbour who is a
source of irritation and a neighbour who is
determined not to give us peace all the time.
If a permanent settlement had been arrived at,

all this could have been avoided and the amount of money that we have to spend on defence perhaps would not have been so large and things would have settled down once for all; A certain solution of the problem of borders after the partition was arrived at and We should have stuck to it. Instead of doing so, we ran to call the policeman, a policeman that did not have sufficient jurisdiction—I mean the United Nations, which was more or less in a formative position.

The second mistake that we made was the disregarding of the warnings of friends inside this country, right from the Cabinet Ministers downwards to Members in this House even before I came to this House, about what China was doing. Repeated complaints were made that the Chinese were building roads in our territory in the Himalaya. The Government of India turned deaf ear. Not the Nelson eye—I cannot say so because the Nelson eye was turned with a purpose and with the purpose of victory but here it is a deaf ear with the purpose of making room for someone. Is it what we should understand from the policies of the Government? In this connection may I point out that when I was Mayor of Bombay, I received a letter from the present Prime Minister asking me to arrange a welcome for another horde of Chinese that came. They were a party of nearly 700. They were supposed to be a cultural delegation. They toured all over India including Bombay, Delhi and other capitals and they were showing Chinese dances music, etc. I am not against cultural ties. The Chinese people are like people all over the world, like our people. They are an oriental people, they are fond of dance, music and their ancient tradition. They are fond of their culture as we are of ours. I have nothing against the people of China as such but the present regime of China, the Communist regime, utilised all this to

collect information, to find out where we were weak and the Government of India did not take note of that. Are the Government of India not aware of the normal communist tactics, how they infiltrate, how they find out, how they have their spy system and how (they find out which are the weak-spots and how they utilise them when they decide to take over and attack? The Government of India in this matter acted most irresponsibly, a folly for which we have been made to lose (Interruptions) and the Government had to wake up when the Chinese aggression came.

The third mistake that we made was with regard to our relations with Tibet. India will have to hang its head in perpetual shame every time the word 'Tibet' is mentioned. We were silent spectators to the rape of Tibet. Instead of moving our little finger, we should have moved our armies and come to the rescue of those ancient people, who depended on us and on our word that, their integrity would not be violated but we did not do so. I do not know whether the Government has yet, after so many years, revised their policy in this matter and whether they will now allow more latitude to the Dalai Lama to think of himself and his homeland as well as his people and how he can go back there. This is a matter on which I hope the Government, after so much experience, after all that has happened in all these years, will realise its mistake and retrace its steps.

Certainly another mistake that we have made is in sponsoring China's case in the United Nations repeatedly. At least we should stop any more sponsoring of China's case in the United Nations. We should sponsor the case of Tibet and other oppressed nations that have refused to succumb under the communist aggression, which has been encouraged by us. It is we who wanted to become the leader of the non-aligned nations.

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.] the Asian non-aligned nations. I do not know against whom. Today we are aligned to the communists. And we call ourselves non-aligned. What is our alignment? We are aligned to the communists when the neutral nations are non-aligned and we confuse words and language just as the communists do just to create confusion among the people. In another context the hon. Minister in replying to me said something like this—unfortunately Mr. Chagla is not here—"We don't talk to them; we don't deal with them, because they are aligned." They are neutral; they are not an aligned nation. Do we or do we not prefer to deal with the neutral nations? Or else we deal with only the aligned nations. Then what is our alignment? We are aligned with the communists. That is very obvious.

Madam, we helped to establish peace in Korea. We helped to prevent Korea being overrun by the communists, for which the Government of Korea and the people of Korea are always grateful to us. I have mentioned before in this House and I think it bears mentioning again. Two years ago, with the help of all free nations of the world which helped Korea in its struggle, a building was put up called the Freedom Centre. It is to commemorate Korea gaining back its freedom and saving itself from the communists taking it over. Unfortunately, this country was not represented. I am very sorry, we did not make even a small contribution; we were not even present at that opening.

Madam, in the matter of Korea our policy has been mistaken—I do not know for what reason. In December, 1948, when the United Nations recognised the Republic of Korea as the only lawful Government of Korea, the Government of India supported the United Nations Resolution. The same Resolution also recommended that all Member States of the United Nations, in establishing their diplomatic relations, should do so with the

Republic of Korea which was established as a result of U.N.-supervised elections, in which more than two-thirds of the people that lived in Korea participated. It would be much better for us to have established full diplomatic relations then and there. I do not know why we have not done so. Many a time the Annual Reports of the Ministry of External Affairs mention that India will be opening a Consulate-General in South Korea soon. I do not know when that 'soon' is. In fact, if I remember correctly, our Ministry of External Affairs was very generous to appoint Mr. Shivlal Chhibber as the first Indian Consul-General in Seoul sometime in July, 1965. I am speaking subject to correction; if I am mistaken the hon. Minister will kindly correct me. But nobody has gone to Korea. It is now very near to July, 1967, Madam; the announcement was made two years ago. How is this on the other hand, according to the information that I could gather, our trade relations with Korea are improving every day since the Trade Agreement in April 1964. Korea imports from India 10,000 tons of steel billets and is about to buy a large quantity of railway wagons for which negotiations are going on. The prospects of trade developing are on the increase, and I would suggest that Government should take note of this and appoint a Consul-General. If we are to have trade relations, particularly in matters like steel and railways which are State undertakings in this country, it will have to be somebody's responsibility who will have to do this, who will have to push up our trade with Korea. In these things, who will have to increase the area of trade relations between this country and Korea. We should treat Korea as we treat West Germany and East Germany. We have trade relations with East Germany although we have recognised only West Germany. Similarly we should have proper relations with Korea so that we have a friend and a friend in need. We have trade

because we need trade. The recession has been so much in this country that every little bit of trade would help us, as the hon. Finance Minister said in his speech the other day. I South Korea stood by India in its hour of need always. South Korea has one of the best equipped forces in Asia. South Korea has 600,000 in her armed forces in a population of thirty million. When India was attacked by China, South Korea came forward and offered readily to help us. South Korea, I think, was one of the first countries to offer troops to fight. Therefore, in view of the international situation and the developing might of China exhibited in its recent explosion of a hydrogen bomb, we need to "have a friend at the farthest end, near the north, that is, Korea, and we need to cultivate other Asian countries, Japan, Taiwan, the South-East Asian countries.

As regards the West Asian situation, I am afraid, we have been misled. Since Mr. Chagla went there first in May—I do not know for what purpose he went—he made a statement at one or two places, which was repudiated on Mr. Chagla's leaving those places. But this is what he has given us. I do not know what sort of account he has given. Is Mr. Chagla not aware of what has been happening? Is he not aware that since 1961 the Arab nations, under President Nasser, have been vowing to remove Israel, to wipe out Israel from the land of the Arabs? It means they want to exterminate these people. Therefore, . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): No, they, the Israelis, exterminated the Indian troops which were guarding their security.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes, Diwan Chaman Lall is, of course, a very great advocate of these people. I would like to hear more about this matter when we have General Rikhye here and why the Indian troops were placed near the gun emplacements of the Arabs and -who put them. It was very wrong, just as the Canadian Government pointed out, it was very

wrong of the U.N. Secretary-General to ask this force to move out without protection or without a Resolution of the United Nations. U Thant took the decision on his own without asking the two countries, and it was his duty to afford protection. If he did not, it is the failure of the United Nations also. It is the failure of the Arab nations, to whose rescue this force was sent, in putting this force in a position where they were exposed to danger.

(Interruptions)

Diwan Chaman Lall, you can have your say. Please do not disturb me. My time is limited. I would claim more time, Madam, if he goes on interrupting me. We know what you have been saying all the time.

It was May 16 when Egypt began massing troops in the Sinai peninsula as Syria claimed that Israeli forces were threatening her border. U.S. intelligence sources denied that there was any Israeli military build-up and so informed the Arabs. On May 17, Egypt demanded that the 3400-man UNEF be withdrawn from the Israeli-Egyptian border. On the 18th of May, Secretary-General U Thant yielded. Canadian Foreign Minister Paul Martin questioned U Thant's authority to pull out the men, and opposed removal of the 800-man Canadian contingent. There was widespread criticism of U Thant. The Palestine Liberation Army moved into the former UNEF posts on May 19. Cairo's Ministry of Religious Affairs ordered mosques to preach a jihad—our Minister never told us of this. On the 21st of May, Cairo announced mobilisation of reserves, adding more than 100,000 men to Egypt's armed forces, estimated at 200,000. The Arab nations declared solidarity with Egypt.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: What is the document that the hon. Member is reading from?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL I am reading my notes.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I thought it was some document.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am reading my notes. Otherwise how do I get these dates?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I got some impression as if the hon. Member was quoting from some document.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: They are my notes. I have no secretary to prepare notes for me. The hon. Minister has a host of Secretaries who do it for him. But I have to prepare my own notes and I am reading from them. I do not have secretaries who prepare notes and speeches which can be read out here. I am now giving you the dates of the events as they occurred. On the 22nd May, President Nasser told his troops in the Sinai Peninsula:

'The Israeli flag shall not go through the Gulf of Aqaba. Our sovereignty over the entrance to that gulf cannot be disputed. If Israel wishes to threaten war, we told her, 'You are welcome'.'

Madam, this is how the events happened and this is the course that they had taken. Unfortunately, even the hon. Minister Shri Chagla tried to misrepresent what I said in this House. When I pointed out that the Israeli Consul came here and tried to meet him but he could not do so and he met the Secretary, External Affairs Ministry, he misrepresented me as saying that I know better than he himself. I never said that I had written a letter to him and also pointed out this to the Chairman; yet he persists in saying that I said this. I have quoted from documents, from the records of this House saying that I had only asked questions and I did not think it was proper for the hon. Minister to misrepresent me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Patel, you will have to finish now.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I will have to take a few more minutes, Madam. Madam, if a lasting peace is to come in the West Asian context, proper steps will have to be consider-

ed, and we have to consider them seriously. The people of Israel the leaders of Israel have asked for direct talks and negotiations for a permanent settlement and they say that they would rather like to settle the matter between themselves without outside interference. I think this is a very reasonable solution and this offer should be accepted because otherwise there can be no permanent solution to a problem like this. A small country like Israel is surrounded by people who threaten to annihilate and exterminate that country. On the 20th June the Israeli Premier proposed a summit conference between himself and the Arab leaders to create a peaceful future for the Middle East. Speaking to a small garrison in the strategic tiran strait he said:

"I stretch my hand to Nasser and Hussein not from a position of strength but willing to forget the past and devote myself to a constructive peaceful future".

He also said;

"The arms of the Middle Eastern clock cannot be reversed."

He has also said that he was willing to meet and sit down with the U.A.R. President and Jordan's King, King Hussein or with any Arab leader "at any place, on land or sea".

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: What was that report?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: There is a news agency report.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It is reported in today's papers.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: About that address to that garrison I have not seen any report.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have received that report. It is a press report and if the hon. Minister has not seen it, I can send him a copy of that report. Now, this is the posture that the President of Israel has taken and I think that with the tradition that India has stood for and hopes to stand for and which we

have always professed to stand for, it should be up to us to support this stand and not necessarily try to impose what we think is the correct solution. If the aggrieved parties or if the belligerent parties, if the leaders of the two parties can be persuaded to sit together and discuss, then that would be the best thing. The President of Israel has handsomely stated that he did not want to take the position of a victor, that he only wants to take the position that he was there on one side and there was the other, that he wants to meet the other as two persons and settle the matter peacefully.

Madam Deputy Chairman, it is well known that the Suez Canal is a matter which affects us as much as it does anyone else. It affects our interests very much. I do not know if the Arab nations appreciate how much we suffered last time during the Suez crisis, and also how much we are suffering this time. All our foodgrain imports have got to come through that way. All our machinery imports have to come that way in order to help our plans to increase our food production. All these things will be delayed this time just as they were delayed last time and we will again suffer. The Arab nations who are our friends, should appreciate this fact and I would like to hear * word of appreciation from this side as to how much we are suffering because of this trouble.

Madam Deputy Chairman, we certainly would like to see peace established in West Asia. But on what terms? That is the point. If it could be established by mutual consultations between the two parties then there could be nothing like that. That would be the best solution because that solution would last. All imposed solutions, solutions imposed by outsiders, do not last very long. They leave an unpleasant taste in the mouth and there is always irritation left behind. Therefore, Madam, the Government of India should take note of all this and then try to revise its

policy. They should learn a lesson from their previous failures, from their dismal record of the past 15 or 20 years and correct their policy accordingly. We must have for our country friends and better friends, friends who would help us to improve ourselves. In the past we have shut our eyes to people who are our real friends, people who have given us correct advice, people who helped us to progress. For what have we done that? One does not know. It may be that we did it for certain notions, for certain notional ideas. We must get rid of this now. Let us correct our policy. Let our policy be corrected as well as oriented so as to be in the interest of India as much as in the interest of anybody else.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Anup Singh, please take only just fifteen minutes.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Madam Deputy Chairman, the foreign policy of India has been discussed here in this House and in the other so many times and it has also been fully understood by the people of India. I venture to make a broad generalisation and say that this policy up till now, barring perhaps a few variations of emphasis here and there, has represented the consensus of the people of India. It was so because this policy was based upon certain principles born out of our cultural heritage, born out of the political exigencies in which we found ourselves. We stood for peace and stood for it consistently as perhaps very few countries have stood. We stood for the freedom of the subjugated people not only as a matter of principle but also because we were the worst victims of imperialism for more few countries have stood. We stood for racial equality. And one aspect of the policy that has been criticised is the policy of non-alignment. The time limitation will not permit me to elaborate but I would say that that policy by and large has been vindicated. We decided to pursue the

[Dr. Anup Singh]

policy of non-alignment and we had opted for it at a time when the world was divided between the two blocs who became increasingly hostile to each other, the Soviet bloc and the United States of America. That conflict created tension all over the world and I might say that most of the problems during the last fifteen to twenty years, whether it is in Korea or Indo-China or West Asia, could have been solved more satisfactorily had there been any real abiding accord between the two great Powers. If we had joined, as many others did, either one bloc or the other, we would have inevitably added to the tension. We would have accentuated it and I think it was perhaps a wise course consistent both with our national approach to problems and consistent also with our national interests. I am fully conscious that this policy of non-alignment was condemned, criticised and ridiculed by both the Soviet bloc and the United States of America on different occasions but it is also a matter of record that when they fully appreciated the significance of that policy and its manifestations, its practical results, both the United States of America and their allies and the Soviet bloc not only appreciated but on many occasions called upon India to intervene to bring about a reasonable solution of the vexed problems. They may not fully endorse it but I think that, policy has been appreciated and accepted and I venture to suggest. Madam Deputy Chairman, that that policy alone even today in spite of the Chinese provocative attitude, in spite of what Pakistan has done, is the sensible policy in the best interests of India.

With this little background and recapitulation, I would like to touch very briefly upon two of the most provocative episodes which have preoccupied our mind. One is West Asia. Our friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, has been very critical of this foreign policy and I would leave it to the

acting Minister of External Affairs to give the appropriate answer but I would simply say this that his analysis of the West Asian problem has been very one-sided. He has attempted, not very successfully, so far as I am concerned, to vindicate the position of Israel. Now one may project one's own predilections and prejudices on these issues which are controversial. One can take sides but one cannot legitimately completely ignore the historical facts, and I think the basic mistake in considering West Asia is to confuse the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish people and what Zionism stands for and what the State of Israel has stood for. I am quite sure that there is no civilised human being anywhere in the world who has not completely sympathised with the plight of the Jewish people. They were uprooted, they were persecuted, they were killed by the thousands and millions but the question is, what the State of Israel has done ever since they were planted in this part of the world. I do not want to inflict many quotations, but just to refresh our memories here is one quotation out of the many from Mahatma Gandhi who, certainly, was second to none in his solicitude and concern for the oppressed and the depressed and the tortured people. He said on many occasions, and I am quoting only one here:

"The Jews have erred grievously in seeking to impose themselves in Palestine with the aid of America and Britain and now with the aid of naked terrorism. Why should they depend on American or British arms for forcing themselves on an unwelcome land?"

"The Palestine of Biblical conception is not the geographical tract. It is in their hearts but if Jews must look to the Palestine of geography as their national home, it is wrong to enter it under the shadow of British guns. Nothing can be said against the Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds."

Now this is the historical background. I am one of those who fully subscribe to the idea that if that State has come into existence we must—and Arabs also I think must eventually in the long run, reluctantly perhaps, have to—get reconciled to the idea that that State has come into existence but to say, as Mr. Dahyabhai Patel has tried to imply, that the truth is on the side of Israel and that the Arabs are the aggressors, is completely off the mark and at -variance with the record of established facts. I am just mentioning here -a few matters of historical record.

The Israel State has been criticised, censured and condemned by the United Nations on more than 25 occasions; not one single Arab State has ever been accused of aggression up till now. I want Mr. Dahyabhai Patel to absorb these facts because facts are stubborn and they are very unpleasant but there they are. Secondly, Israel has been condemned by the Security Council six times and the point that I would like my hon. friend to realise is that not one of the friends of Israel—and there are at least three or four of them—ever vetoed the Resolutions which they could have done. So Israel has been condemned by the United Nations Assembly 25 times, condemned six times by the Security Council where there are permanent Members sympathetic and friendly to Israel but still they were unanimous votes. And not one single Arab State has ever been condemned either by the United Nations Assembly or by the Security Council.

Another fact which I think is relevant in this context is that when the State of Israel was brought into the United Nations, it was the only State in whose case a stipulation was made; I do not want to quote the lengthy Resolution but the gist of the Resolution was that the State of Israel should be brought into the United Nations because she has pledged to abide by the principles on

which the United Nations was founded and by the Resolutions of the United Nations. Ironically enough—I would say tragically—within a week or so the Israel Government passed a Resolution that the United Nations has no business to interfere in the internal affairs of Israel the implication being that they should be at liberty to deal with the Arab States as they chose without interference from the United Nations. They were saying this to the organisation which was responsible by its Resolution of 1948 for the recognition of the State of Israel.

About Jerusalem, I am sure hon. Members would realise that according to the original partition the Israelis were to occupy or take control of 55 per cent, of the area and some years ago it was 72 per cent. How much more per cent they have managed to add I do not know but the State has been enlarging itself through aggression systematically and deliberately in defiance of the U.N. Resolutions and in defiance, of course, of the collective wishes of the Arab people who are the original inhabitants of that land. Then, of course, 1956 is too recent; we all know what happened; the attack on Suez by Britain, France and Israel, condemned by the United Nations, condemned by the entire world. And now we had the recent aggression. This is the record which speaks eloquently for what the Israel State has done. It is all very well to say, as my hon. friend has said, that a very great, very honourable, very magnanimous gesture has been made, that they are willing to sit round the table and to thrash it out. I personally feel that under the prevailing circumstances, under the present political psychological tension, it would not be possible for the two parties alone to sit round the table and work out any good solution. May I remind my hon. friend that we had our conflict with Pakistan? The Tashkent Declaration was signed in all solemnity by both parties . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
What happened to it?

DR. ANUP SINGH: We have not been able to bring about or start a dialogue with Pakistan, in spite of our repeated efforts. Does he, in all seriousness, believe that, merely because the Prime Minister of Israel, in his great benevolence, has offered to sit with the Arab leaders, it will solve the problem? I think it is too naive and too simple. I personally believe, speaking for myself, that some kind of solution will have to be worked out by the United States and the Soviet Union, the two powers who have the strength, who have the necessary resources to restore peace and amity in this area. I also believe that any abiding solution of this very great problem will have to be worked out under the auspices of the United Nations. I am not going into the details or the merits of the resolution that has been sponsored by India. I think the Minister of External Affairs will deal with the details. All that I am trying to suggest is that this attempt on the part of my hon. friend to put the Foreign Minister of Israel on the back for his offer is not a very practical solution. I believe that the Government of India's policy regarding West Asia, whatever the critics might say, is not something which has been suddenly improvised to please either President Nasser or the Arabs. Of course, we seek their friendship and that is reciprocally. They want our friendship, just as we want their friendship, but that is part of the legacy. Even before India became free, long before India became free, the Indian National Congress year after year passed resolutions in sympathy with all the people who were struggling for their freedom, whether they were in Asia or Africa, and our relationship with the Arabs has a particular and significant place for which we need not make any apology. I repeat once again that this policy represents, if prejudices are discarded, the best interests of India and it

is in consonance and in complete conformity with the policy that we have pursued consistently before independence and since independence.

Now, about China, I am sorry I have to refer to the hon. Member, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, because he was the only speaker before me. He gives the impression of a man who has become very wise after the event. He has postulated half a dozen 'ifs'. If we had not done this in 1942, the situation would have been averted. If we had not given away Tibet, according to him, the situation would not have arisen. History is full of 'it's' but I believe that India's trust, faith and friendship with China was not misplaced. What has happened, I think, is one of the biggest betrayals in history, but is India the only country that has been subjected to this kind of betrayal? I have a catalogue of some of the betrayals in the history of many countries. Mr. Wendell Wilkie—I am sure hon. Members will recall his name—during the second World War went on a world tour. He wrote the book "One World". He addressed a meeting in New York and I also happened to be there as one of the participants. He said and I am quoted in my memory: "There are many problems in Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America, but I have come back convinced about one thing namely, the stability of Asia can be taken for granted because of the amity, friendship and goodwill that exist and prevail between India and China." He was no student of history. That was his opinion. I do not know of anybody, any historian, any writer of significance, who has not always pointed out that India and China have abiding, almost eternal, friendship.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PAT.
Until the communists came.

DR. ANUP SINGH: That is a different matter.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
That is the trouble.

DR. ANUP SINGH: I am not going into that now . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Where have the communists "acted their aggression? Did they vacate in Korea?

DR. ANUP SINGH: Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, the discussion is not about communism . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Have they vacated in Viet Nam? Have they vacated in India? Where have they vacated it?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): The United States has committed aggression in Viet Nam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. ANUP SINGH: Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, I have listened to you with the greatest respect and in silence, although I disagree with everything that you said. We are not discussing . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Do not mislead the House.

DR. ANUP SINGH: . . . the merits or demerits of communism in theory and in practice. We are discussing the foreign policy. We are not discussing the Swatantra Party's policy.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You will have to very soon. You are going to pieces.

DR. ANUP SINGH: So far as China is concerned...

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You will have to do it very soon.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. ANUP SINGH: So far as China is concerned, there is no one in this House or in the other House or in the country at large who has not condemned in the strongest terms the

behaviour of the Chinese Government towards our diplomats. In his context I think it would be of interest to mention one or two things to show how the character not of the Chinese people but of the ruling group has perhaps been transformed beyond recognition. Leibnitz, the great philosopher of the 18th century, at one time advocated that Chinese missionaries should be sent all over Europe to civilise them, because they had good manners, they had geniality and they had good temper. Lord E. H. Russell, a very great admirer of the present-day China, wrote a little e called "The Chinese Character" in 1924 when he was the Head of the Philosophy Department at Peking University. Please bear the date in mind as 1924, long before, more than forty years ago. His first opening line is: "the Chinese are peaceful by nature. The gravest issue with them can be settled over a cup of tea." When I brought it to the attention of our late Prime Minister—I had underlined it he looked at it and said: "Well I shall send them *soma* tea, if that is so simple." And something certainly has happened. In spite of all their provocations, we should not compete with them or emulate them in bad manners. Secondly, I do not think that we should be pushed into taking any action. I believe that if it becomes utterly imperative, we may have to break off diplomatic relations, but not at their choosing. My own personal suggestion is suspending of relations, as we have done in the case of South Africa, or suspended immigration. We do not break off relations. We can send our diplomats if and when we feel like that. I think that in the present circumstances perhaps that will be a feasible and practical solution.

Finally, I just want to make one submission. It is easy enough to pick any isolated incident and say that the Government of India has gone wrong in the case of the West Asia, that the Government of India went wrong in the case of Hungary and it was not

[Dr. Anup Singh] ,
wrong here and there. But the intrinsic merit and efficacy of the foreign policy should be judged, appraised and assessed in its totality, keeping in view the best interests of the country, keeping in view the interests of mankind at large. If we apply that criterion, I believe that the Government of India's foreign policy has been vindicated and I for one would like it to be continued. Try to be flexible and resilient, when the situation demands. We can emphasise here and there, but the basic principles on which this policy is based are absolutely and essentially correct and in tune with our best interests and the interests of mankind at large.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have received an amendment from Mr. Rajnarain rather late, after the debate started. Really it is not acceptable at this stage.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया क्योंकि इस मोशन पर अनेडमेंट हो सकता है इसलिए हमने भी दे दिया है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion was on the order paper. Therefore, the amendment should have come in time.

श्री राजनारायण : डाह्या भाई के खड़े होने के बाद अरिक् साहब ने दिया था।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Since I have allowed Mr. Tariff's amendment—he was not in the House—I am allowing you to move it, but this, will not form a precedent for future occasions.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Madam, I move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the

foreign policy of the Government of India has been unrealistic, inert and against national interest from the very beginning and has been serving by turn the Russian and American Camps, which should be abandoned and replaced by an active, creative and neutral policy directed towards organising a Third Power with a view to eradicate poverty, eliminate arms, and exploitation of man by man and of nation by nation and towards establishing a World Government."

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Ahmad.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I want this discussion to be concentrated, really sp on the West Asian situation, because there are so many other developments in the international situation which are of comparatively less importance. The West Asian problem is the problem of the day. As you know, very important discussions are going on at the United Nations. The discussions are being led by Heads of States, very important people, and it would be really a strange thing if today we start talking of so many other things which Mr. Dahyabhai Patel has talked about—our relations with Korea, our relations with Taiwan, some mistake we committed 25 years ago, and so on. In what world of fantasy are we living, I ask him. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Dahyabhai Patel and men like him are really not interested in bringing about a peaceful solution of the outstanding problems of the world today.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Then surrender to Communism.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: They are really interested in projecting their own reactionary outlook, in reversing basically the policies of the Government, the policy of non-alignment.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Which is another name for Communism.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: I never interrupted you. I do not interrupt anyone. I do not expect that a Member of your age should shout here like a child. He is really interested in pushing his ideological positions, I do not call them ideological positions but some basic class positions he holds in the sphere of international politics. Mr. Swaran Singh very correctly asked him, "What is the document you are reading from?" I have a strong suspicion that the documents which a person cannot even read out properly are written by some other agencies, and they are agencies which can provide him with all information about Korea, about what happened 20 years ago in India, what happened in Israel, and all that. All those documents are given to him. I pity him that he cannot even read them properly. That is unfortunate. The leader of a party sitting here cannot even read out a document that is supplied to him by somebody else. This is unfortunate. *(Interruption)*

Mr. Patel talked about Communist tactics, infiltration, sabotage, and so on. I think he is properly briefed by the C.I.A. because he knows much more than I know. I have been a member of the Communist Party for thirty years. I do not know as much as he knows. So in his greater wisdom he has spoken. I do not want to say much about all the things that he said. I find nothing but his "master's voice" in what he says. Therefore, I do not take him very seriously.

Coming to the main problem, the problem of West Asia, the West Asian situation, the West Asian war as it has developed, I am really surprised to find that some Members opposite shake their heads very violently in agreement when gentlemen like Mr. Patel start speaking. I am really surprised, and there is a young lady sitting there who was in absolute agreement with Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

305 RSD.—S

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: I am really surprised. After all even the ruling party has a background, has a tradition, has an outlook, and if you are divided against yourselves, that is a very unfortunate state of affairs.

I submit that our support to the Arab World in this conflict is absolutely consistent, not only with the international policies that we have pursued so far, it is consistent with our traditional anti-imperialism; it is consistent with the world outlook evolved by our national movement during the last 40 or 50 years. Therefore, if there are some members of the ruling party who set aside that great traditions of the national movement and start nodding their heads to all sorts of claptrap of Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, I think they are not really true to their traditions. Have we forgotten history? When the Arab people were suppressed and oppressed, when for the liquid gold petroleum, the imperialist powers enchained the Arab world, set up puppet Governments, crushed the liberation movement of the Arab people, and when the new renaissance and resurgence of the Arab people started, hatched conspiracies in order to crush that renaissance and resurgence it was Nasser who led the Arab renaissance. He gave to the Arab people a sense of unity, a sense of solidarity, of anti-imperialism, of fighting for their freedom, of standing up and facing all oppression and he gave them the confidence that they as a nation and people shall live and exist with honour in this world. We got tied up with them. We got linked up with them. Our struggle and their struggle against imperialism was one basically, indivisible. Therefore, we stood by them and they stood by us. That is a historical reality. That Mr. Patel should not forget. This cannot possibly get into his head. When we talk of solidarity with the Arab people, it is this background that we have in mind, it is this hard reality and a common future. After all we

[Dr. Z. A. Ahmad.] in independent India have to stand up and fight against the imperialist conspiracies in the world, against attempts of imperialism to create tensions in different parts of the world, against policies of neo-colonialism. All this is there, and it is a similar struggle that the Arab people are waging.

• The State of Israel was created at a time when many people thought that it was good to give the Jews a place under the sun; let them live, let them exist, because they as a people were tortured, they were people massacred by reactionaries, by Fascists, all over the world; and therefore, it was a natural desire on the part of all progressive people that they should have a place under the sun. But what has happened since then? After the formation of Israel, this State became an instrument in the hands of imperialist powers for hatching conspiracies against the growing tide of Arab nationalism. This State became an instrument, in their hands for crushing the liberation movement of the Arab people. Soon this State became itself aggressive; because it was an instrument of imperialism, naturally its character became aggressive. It started expanding, it started hitting out, 2 P.M. penetrating here and there. And as has been very well said by our friend here, the hon. Dr. Anup Singh, it was about 28 times that Israel was warned by the United Nations about the massive aggression, it had launched. Migration on a big scale was started. The Arab population was pushed out of Palestine to other areas; they were dispossessed, pushed out, tortured and killed, with lakhs and lakhs of refugees uncared for, dying like flies on the borders of the Israeli State. Gradually, this State which was born, out of a sense of pity for the Jewish people—a really good people—who had suffered, became a monster in the very heart of the Arab world. Madam, we have to recognise this reality.

Now, we cannot also forget the fact that in 1956 when the French and British imperialists started their aggression against the UAR, it was the Israeli rulers who were the first to advance and penetrate into the Peninsula of Sinai and wanted to get hold of it. It was a record of aggression. Coming to the latest developments, can we deny this fact that aggression was committed by Israel, that there was proper preparation for the commission of that aggression, that a warlike atmosphere was created that threats were held out and that a whole plan was laid in order to start an unprovoked war against the Arab people? I have not much time but I may tell you that the bellicose statement of the . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The articles say that.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD; I need not go into details. But the fact of the matter is that after all the statements and pronouncements and announcements made by the Israeli leaders, even U Thant had to condemn those announcements. I will read out one statement of U Thant. It was on the 16th of May:

"In recent weeks, reports emanating from Israel have attributed to some high officials in that State statements so threatening as to be particularly inflammatory in the sense that they could only heighten emotions and thereby increase tension on the other side of the line."

Later on, the Secretary-General says:

"There have been in the past few days persistent reports about troop-movements and concentrations particularly on the Israeli side of the Syrian border."

Now, these are facts. I think my friend there will not recognise these facts; some others will also not recognise them. But these are indisputable facts to show that Israelis committed aggression, that they were the first to shoot, that they had well-laid-out plans, that they were fully armed'.

All this aggression which they committed, cannot be denied.

Now, it is said that the Arab people, the UAR, wanted to stop the Israeli boats in the Gulf of Aquaba and in Tiran and that this was the initial provocation. No, Madam, the real fact of the matter is that strategic materials were being sent to Israel through these waters and the UAR wanted to stop the supply of those strategic materials to Israel and therefore they said that they would not allow those ships to pass through those waters. That was an act of self-defence on the part of the UAR.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: In any case, it is their internal waterway.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: I am coming to that. In any case, it was an act of self-defence and an act committed in an area over which the UAR has absolute sovereignty. You cannot question the sovereignty of the UAR over the Gulf of Aquaba and Tiran. In international law that is unquestionable and it is their right. If they think that there is a neighbour who is going to commit aggression, who is getting strategic material from other countries and that a war plan is being laid, then it has every right to prevent it, especially when that area belongs to it. How can you object to that? Therefore, Madam, this is the position.

I will not take more time. But I would certainly say that everything that Israel now claims is the fruit of her aggression, not only of this aggression but of earlier aggression also. The fortress of Eilat—it was through aggression that Israel got it. Now they claim the Port of Sharmul-Shaikh that they have occupied and they say that they propose to stay there. That is a fruit of their aggression. Would you allow one small State to go on committing aggression after aggression and depicting the whole situation as if it is an innocent victim of aggression by some others, who were seeking to annihilate it. Who is going to annihilate Israel?

Who is so well equipped with American arms, with British arms, with other imperialist arms..

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): West Germany.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: Not only are they well-equipped with arms but actually they are acting as a militant vanguard of imperialist aggression in that area.

Now, Madam, I will just refer to the question of the survival of the Israeli State. "Oh! Poor Israel is going to be annihilated by Nasser!" There are people who say this after shedding tears. I am sure Mr. Dahyabhai Patel weeps every night for poor Israel which is going to be annihilated. No one wants this. I can assure Mr. Dahyabhai Patel and all those people who are so much worried about Israel that nobody wants to annihilate Israel because Israel is also inhabited by common people from all over the world. They have got their factories, their farms, their homesteads. Who wants to annihilate Israel? But, surely, we want to put an end to the aggressiveness of Israel; we want that Israel should not be an instrument of imperialist aggression in that area; we want that Israel should not be the base for imperialist conspiracies against the rising tide of Arab nationalism; we want to put an end to all that. Let the Israeli people, the Jewish people, in Israel lead a peaceful life with their neighbours, come to an understanding with them, prosper together, live together. They are culturally Very close to each other. Many of them speak the same language. Let them live together. **But** surely world democratic opinion, progressive opinion, will never tolerate a State which is a gangster State, which takes up arms on behalf of imperialism and tries to annihilate the rising and growing Arab national movement. Therefore, I can assure Mr. Dahyabhai Patel; let him feel reassured and let him not shed tears about the future of Israel.

[Dr. Z. A. Ahmad.]

Madam, I want to say only one or two things more. A debate is going on in the United Nations. I think that on the whole our Government has taken a very correct position and I congratulate our Government for that. They have asserted the solidarity of the Arab people and the Indian people. They have stated that Israel has been aggressive; they have underlined the aggressiveness of Israel. They have defended the U.A.R. They have categorically stated that the aggressor will not be allowed to retain the fruits of aggression. They have also demanded that the Israelis should go back to the positions occupied by them before the aggression started. But along with that, I want my Government also to say, in whatever manner it chooses to say—but it must say—that there is a hidden hand behind Israel, that the American and British imperialist forces are there, that they supplied them with arms just as we said in the case of Pakistan that it was the planes and tanks supplied by America that enabled Pakistan commit aggression against our country. We should also, in all fairness, state frankly and candidly that there is a hidden hand behind Israel that gave Israel that strength. Can we forget that nearly 500 planes were sent there? I think I have got the figures here somewhere.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Four hundred.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: Four hundred American planes were sent to Israel just on the eve of the aggression committed by them. Seven squadrons had already been supplied by the Americans. And millions and millions of dollars worth of arms were supplied by West Germany during the last 15 years. Can you forget this fact? Therefore, we have to raise our voice against this imperialist conspiracy, so that hidden hand to exposed and got hold of. According to our tradi-

tions, let us clearly and categorically understand that an American and British conspiracy has been hatched, that they have supplied arms to Israel and are responsible for provoking this trouble and that they should fairly and squarely take the blame. (*Time bell rings*) Two minutes more.

Now, Madam, the matter has to be settled. We must stand firmly and take a clear-cut position that the Israelis have to go back to where they were before the aggression started on the 4th of June. They have got to go back. They will not go back easily. We have not to vacillate; we have not to compromise our position on that question. After all, there are big forces in the world which are taking that position. Is it not an ordinary thing that the Soviet Union and many other Communist countries excepting China—well, I do not include China in that category at all—are taking a very firm position on this question? The entire Arab world, progressive forces all over the world, the peace-loving forces are taking that position. Therefore, there cannot be any compromise on that question. Israel has got to go back. It may be a long-drawn out struggle. It may take time because, after all, the puppet Israeli State is not going to give in easily because their masters are there. They may not allow her to give in easily. Therefore, the struggle is to go on. But I am confident that we shall win.

Here in passing I will say only a word or two about China. Lately China has been again taking an aggressive posture. I regret to say that a big country like China should take that position. Madam, China says that when the war broke out in West Asia, when aggression started, the Soviet Union did not rush to the help of the U.A.R. It is very strange that a country like China, which had in the past peaceful traditions, today is acting objectively in support of the

plans and policies which are advocated by imperialist powers. When the problem of Cuba came up, they wanted to know why Khrushchev did not fight with the Americans. When the U.A.R. and the Israeli question comes up they ask why the Soviet Union did not jump into the fray and started a world war. I think this posture is consistent with the present outlook of the rulers of China. They want to bring about a world conflagration somehow. On other. Madam, we have got to condemn that attitude. We have got to disassociate ourselves from it. After all it is the Soviet Union that not only gave moral strength to the U.A.R. but also gave her abundant material help. All the arms supplied to the U.A.R. were from the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and other Communist countries. If due to the aggressive acts of Israel, due to their treachery, those arms should not be used, how do you expect the Soviet Union to jump into the fray? China wanted the Soviet Union to bring all its jet planes and start a world war. That is not the way. That is not how a big, peace-loving power behaves. I think the attitude adopted by the Communist countries was good and correct. The attitude taken up by us was good and correct. In unity with all the progressive forces of the world, we shall stand for achieving the basic rights of the Arab people, against imperialist aggression launched by Israel, against attempts to redraw the map of Western Asia and for peace for the peoples of the world and for the progress of humanity, I think we shall put our full weight on that side. Due to pressures—internal pressures of Mr. Dahyabhai Patel and other reactionaries in India, and external pressures of imperialists—let us not vacillate or try to compromise our policy. If we take a firm stand we are confident that we shall succeed.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I had better begin with a problem with which we are more immediately concerned. It has

been one of the weakness of the Indian character and the conduct of our foreign policy also to be busy more with others than with problems that immediately concern us. Madam Deputy Chairman, China is the biggest question mark in the comity of nations. That question mark has assumed gigantic proportions after the test explosion of hydrogen bomb by China. Madam, Mr. Lapp, one of the eminent nuclear physicists of the world is of the view that by 1970 China will have a complement of 150 atomic and hydrogen bombs and by then it will have developed an offensive delivery system for these bombs. They may not be very sophisticated but they shall be effective enough.

We know, Madam Deputy Chairman, that for thousands of years India and China had been at peace with each other. Even for nearly a decade, after independence, after China became Communist we lived in peace and amity. But thereafter our relationship has been extremely unhappy. In view of the growing strength of China I do not know what we propose to do. When I try to find out the China policy of the Government of India. I confess I do not know what is our policy. I doubt if we have a policy in regard to China at all.

Madam, we should have, as I have already said, better relationship with a nation which is our neighbour and which is getting more and more powerful as time passes. I can think of only three approaches in our foreign policy towards China. I hope hon. Members will not get excited when I say that one line of approach is that we try to mend the broken bridges between India and China. We have got entangled in certain cobwebs and we do not find it possible to get out of that. I do not say that is the only approach. But that is one of the approaches that is possible. I am sure the leaders of the Government of India — n-

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha]

people of China would be equally anxious to mend these bridges.

Madam, I am reminded when in 1955 the President of India went to Rumania after our war with Pakistan, the Chinese Ambassador was demonstrably present on all suitable occasions. He was present at the airport to receive him. He was present at the airport to give him a send off and he was present at most of the official functions. That was a hint that China was not averse to mending the bridges. The then President of India, thereafter made a statement that we have to improve our relationship with all our great neighbours with whom our relationship is not very happy, namely, China and Pakistan. But that line was not pursued. And when some people want (this line to be pursued the reply is, "Well, the ball is in the court of China and it is for China to take the initiative."

But this initiative can be taken by third parties, by neutral forces, by forces in the world who want that India and China should live in amity and peace. If such initiative is taken, I do not see why we should reject it. That is one line of approach, but that line of approach, I am afraid, we are not following. The other line is: we build up our own strength commensurate with China, at least build up nuclear weapons. When people talk of it, we are told with great pomposity by people who should know better, that atomic weapons are not weapons of offence or defence, but they are weapons of destruction. Well, it is a great truth, the discovery of which is comparable to the discovery of our great forefathers "Aham Brdhmismi, Latwam, Asi" I would like to know from these modern political Newtons or political Einsteins, who propagate that these are not weapons of offence or defence but are only weapons of destruction, which weapon of war is not a weapon of destruction. Is not a shell a

weapon of destruction? Is not a bomb a weapon of destruction? Why do they close their eyes to the lesson of history? It was because of two atom bombs that Japan capitulated six months or one year before it would have capitulated. Therefore, to say, in the face of all this, that these atom bombs are weapons of destruction and, therefore, we do not go in for atom bombs, is in my opinion to advance an argument which, I am afraid, is not convincing even to a child in this country.

Next, we are told that this is the land of Gandhiji, it is a land of peace and, therefore, we should not build up atomic weapons. Madam, if the land of Gandhiji can build huge cannons, huge bombs, huge tanks, fighters and bombers, if Gandhiji's philosophy is not violated by these endeavours, if the culture of India is not *set* at naught by these endeavours than I do not see how the manufacture of atom bombs will make a difference. There is a proverb, Madam, "once bitten, twice shy." But we are acting on a different basis. The basis is "once bitten, always complacent." We are complacent in our dealings with China. We neither try to mend our fences, neither we try to mend the bridges that have been broken, nor do we want to build up our own strength. And we are told that the Chinese threat is ideological and not military. And this is being told even after this country was massively invaded by China and humiliated in the way that it was.

The third course is that we get a guarantee, though in my opinion, no guarantee at the present stage of world development could be a viable guarantee. No nation can rely on a guarantee from foreign powers. No nation can rely effectively on a guarantee even from the United Nations or through the United Nations. But even then there is something in it. But we rejected even that. I would like to know from those who are in charge of

conduct of the foreign relations of this country with China how they propose to meet the challenge of China. My own feeling is that even now if third parties, if others, take any initiative to bring China and India together, our reaction should be positive. But then we watch helplessly while China grows in strength and it seems we feel lost. Our attitude seems to be the attitude of a person in a family who finds that one of its members is on the deathbed and no medicine can save him and helplessly watches the death of that person. Our attitude is the attitude of a person who swims in a raging torrent, gets exhausted, does not know what to do and gets drowned. Therefore, I would like to urge on the Government of India to reorient its policy in relation to China, to bring fresh thinking in its approach towards China and to evolve something which will give this country security. I have indicated three approaches. I am not fond of any of them. If the Government of India has a fourth approach which can ensure the security of this country, I shall be happy. But the way in which we are going, I am afraid, we are moving towards a situation which is not very happy.

Coming, Madam, next to the issues that have arisen in West Asia or the Middle East, I believe in a policy of friendship with the Arab countries. The Arab countries constitute in their totality a large block of human population, a large trading block. They are guarding one of our flanks. Moreover, one of the vital arteries of this country, the Suez Canal, is in their possession. In the circumstances, it would be madness, simply because a few Arab countries ruled by reactionary regimes take a stand against us, to hit all the Arab countries. Therefore, I believe in the policy of friendship with the Arabs. But here my agreement ends. I feel that the projection of our friendship and the implementation

of our policy of friendship sometimes is not very sophisticated. Madam, friendship and subservience are two entirely different things. While we support the Arabs in all that is just, there is no reason why we should insult and humiliate the Israelis simply because that would please the Arabs. I am reminded of that incident, Madam, when the President of Israel, an old man was passing through this country on his way to Nepal. I do not think that this country's friendship with the Arabs and this country's policy of non-alignment would have been affected if we had allowed him to stay for a night in Delhi. But we didn't. We allowed him to go to Calcutta and then we placed a few cars at their disposal. And after he left, we sent a Bill of Rs. 400 to the Consul-General of Israel. Is that an exhibition of friendship? I am afraid, Madam, I would consider it an exhibition of subservience. There are other instances which come to my mind. They were going to celebrate their national day in the Ashoka Hotel. And anyone has the right to rent or hire a room at the Ashoka Hotel. But the External Affairs Ministry intervened at the last moment and the reservation was cancelled.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Last year.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Yes, last year. Recently there have been incidents. I do not want to relate them. Therefore, while I accept the basic soundness of the policy of friendship, I must sound a note of caution to the Government of India that they must project and implement their policies in a more proper manner. Madam, my fear is that because of the crudities of these incidents that I have related, the danger is that even that basic, correct policy of friendship may be affected. This is really a civilised country. We may not be very powerful. But we are civilised. We feel if such insults or indignities are offered to anybody. We do not like it. And I have found that the country has a feeling that

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.] we are not behaving properly in certain matters, and my fear is that if the people, whose will ultimately matters in a democracy, want to throw the bath-water of these crudities, it is just possible that the baby of friendship with the Arabs may also be thrown away.

Therefore it is in the interest of our policy of friendship itself that while we exhibit our friendship on moments of importance and crisis, we exhibit or project our policy in a proper manner.

Lastly I feel that the solution of the Arab-Israeli problem can come only by acceptance of the existence of Israel. None of us want peace to be disturbed in this world. There are many arrangements which have come out of force, I do not want to mention them. There are many other States which have been born out of aggression and fraud as well as chicanery but then, in the de balance of power to-day, to tr disturb any State, to try to annihilate any State is to bargain for a world conflagration is it that we support many arrangements in Europe? Why is it that we support many arrangements near about home? It is because we do not want to disturb the world peace and stability. Therefore, the existence of Israel has to be recognised and we have recognised it. Equally important is the issue of the Arab refugees. I feel that it has been cruel on the part of the Government of Israel to oust from their hearths and homes a million of the Arab people. It is their obligation to settle them and allow them to lead a life of honour, a life of human rights in the territories which they were occupying before.

Lastly I entirely endorse the view of our Government that aggression should not be rewarded by territory and therefore, no settlement would be just and fair, no settlement would be able to give peace and stability to

that area unless the armies of the two countries withdraw—but here it is only that of Israel because Israel intruded into Arab land—to the positions they were occupying till 4th June. Only that solution can be a viable one. I have nothing to say about the general problem of non-alignment and other things but let me again, in the end, say that I do not consider any foreign policy or for the matter of that, any policy to-be permanent and immutable. It is futile to talk to-day in context of present world forces, in terms of alignment or non-alignment. Non-alignment or alignment was a profitable concept on which we could base our foreign policy when there were only two power blocs. The power blocs are not only breaking but they have broken. The NATO alliance has broken and between the Warsaw Pact countries differences have arisen. There are some breakaway and expansionist nations like China which are not amenable to discipline either of one bloc or the other. In such a situation, a nation must think of its security on the basis not of the slogans of alignment or non-alignment but on a basis which suits the modern balance of forces.

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर
(मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति जी, विदेश
मंत्री ने जो यह प्रस्ताव रखा है वह काफी
व्यापक है जिसमें पूरी वैदेशिक नीति और
भारत सरकार की इसके संबंध में क्या नीति
है उसकी चर्चा करनी है। लेकिन जो हमारे
पास समय है उसको देखते हुए कुछ ही बातों
की चर्चा की जा सकती है

सबसे पहले मैं यह निवेदन करना
चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी देश की जो विदेश
नीति होती है वह उसकी आंतरिक नीति का
रिफ्लेक्शन होती है। विदेश नीति कोई
अलग नीति नहीं होती जो घर की नीति
से बाहर हो या उस से अलग हो। हमारी
घर की नीति क्या है? हम जानते हैं स्वराज्य

मिलने के बाद इस देश में कितनी भुखमरी कितनी गरीबी हुई और एक तरह से देश खोखला हो गया । हमने समाजवाद की बात की, लेकिन समाजवाद का केवल नाम रह गया और उस नीति का खोखलापन सिद्ध हुआ । उसी तरह से हमारी जो विदेश नीति है उसका भी खोखलापन सामने नजर आता है । विदेश नीति के बारे में हमारा रवैया ऐसा रहा कि हम वैसिलेट करते रहे । कहते हैं कि हमारी नीति पीस के ऊपर, नान-एलाइनमेंट के ऊपर आधारित है । पीस तो हम भी चाहते हैं; हम नहीं चाहते हैं दुनिया में युद्ध हो, और हम यह भी चाहते हैं कि हम किसी ब्लाक में न मिलें, लेकिन हम हर एक इश्यू को अपने देश की दृष्टि से देखकर ही अपनी नीति को किसी भी देश के बारे में बनाएं । लेकिन हमने क्या किया ? चाहे डागमेटिक प्रिन्सिपल से हो, यह नान एलाइनमेंट बड़ा अच्छा शब्द है, उसी से चिपक कर हम हर देश के साथ वैदेशिक संबंध स्थापित करके गोता खाते रहे वैसिलेट (vacillate) करते रहे । कभी हम ईस्ट के पक्ष में गये कभी वेस्ट के पक्ष में गये, लेकिन यह कभी नहीं देखा कि हमारे देश के लिये कौन सी नीति अच्छी है और देश के हित में कौन सी वैदेशिक नीति अच्छी है और यही कारण है कि हम आज पूरी दुनिया में फ्रेन्डलेस हो गये, अकेले हो गये, आज हमारा कोई मित्र नहीं रहा । हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में जो एक नक्शा था कि यह देश कुछ कर सकता है, दुनिया के अंगड़ों को ठीक तरह से हल कर सकता है, वह आशा खत्म हो गई । आज हिन्दुस्तान को कोई महत्व नहीं देता । मैं तो यह कहता हूं कि जब पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू प्रधान मंत्री थे उस समय भी हमारी वैदेशिक नीति में एक दरारा था, एक सम्मान था, लेकिन आज की परिस्थिति में कोई दरारा या कोई महत्व अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में हिन्दुस्तान का हमारी विदेश नीति के कारण नहीं रहा और वह फ्रेन्डलेस और अकेला देश रह गया ।

आज भी यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में हमारी पोजीशन यह है कि वैसे तो पहले भी हमारा मतभेद था हमारी बात को नहीं मानते थे, लेकिन आज यह परिस्थिति हो गई है कि हम इतने बड़े राष्ट्र होने के बावजूद भी मामूली राष्ट्रों में गिने जाते हैं ।

अभी समस्त देशों के बारे में हमारी नीति क्या हो उसकी चर्चा करने के लिये वक्त नहीं है । मैं सिर्फ दो तीन बातों को लूंगा । आज जो ज्वलंत प्रश्न है उसके संबंध में ही मैं अपने विचार रखूंगा । सबसे पहले तो, आज वेस्ट एशिया में जो परिस्थितियां हैं उसके बारे में हमारी क्या नीति होनी चाहिये, यह बात स्पष्ट है । लेकिन अभी तक जितने सम्मानित सदस्य बोले, किसी ने नहीं कहा कि इसराइल जो आज बना हुआ है उसको बने रहने का हक है । इसराइल एक राष्ट्र है, यूनाइटेड नेशन्स का सदस्य है, उसको खत्म करने की बात या उसको समाप्त करने की बात कोई नहीं समझता । सब कहते हैं, हमारे मित्र भी कहते हैं कि इसरायल को रहने का हक है लेकिन उसको एक्सपैन्ड करने का हक नहीं है । हम भी कहते हैं कि किसी राष्ट्र को एक्सपैन्ड करने का हक नहीं होना चाहिये लेकिन जब किसी देश के ऊपर आपत्ति आ जाती है, जब उसका एग्जिस्टेन्स खतरे में पड़ जाता है तो उसे क्या करना चाहिये ? हम कहते हैं कि अरब लोग हमारे मित्र हैं और हम उनको सपोर्ट करते हैं कि उनकी सेक्युलर पालिसी है, प्रोग्रेसिव पालिसी है, उसको हमें सपोर्ट करना चाहिये यह कहते हैं, लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं होता है जैसा कि कई प्रकार के जो अखबार के समाचार आते हैं उनसे सिद्ध होता है कि अरब लोगों के दिल में यह बात खटकती हुई है कि इसराइल का क्यों निर्माण हुआ, इसराइल हमारे दिल में एक तरह का कांटा क्यों बना हुआ है, इसको हम समाप्त करके रहेंगे । जिस प्रकार इसराइल को कोई हक नहीं है वह एक्सपैन्शन करें उसी प्रकार अरब

[श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर]

दोनों को भी अधिकार नहीं है कि वह इसराइल देश को खत्म करने की बात कहें। लेकिन इस विवाद में हमने तटस्थता की नीति अपनाने के बजाय, एक तरह से अरबों के पक्ष में नीति अपनाई जिसकी वजह से हमारी प्रेस्टीज आज यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में कमजोर हो गई। मैं तो कहता हूँ अरब कंट्रीज के बारे में हमारी जो स्थिति है वह "मोर लायल दैन द किंग" है, अर्थात् अरब लोग भी जितनी तरफदारी नहीं करते हैं उससे भी ज्यादा तरफदारी हम करते हैं और कर रहे हैं। अगर हम खामोश बैठते, न इसराइल के पक्ष में बोलते और न अरबों के पक्ष में बोलते और परिस्थितियों के बदलने के अनुसार हमको जो स्टैन्ड लेना था वह लेते, तो बहुत अच्छी बात होती लेकिन जैसे ही लड़ाई हुई तो हमने अरबों के पक्ष में कूट दिया कि इसराइल ने एक्सपैन्शन किया, इसराइल ने अटैक किया है, अरबों का पक्ष ठीक है, जस्टीफ़ाबल है, हमने किसी के न कहते हुए भी यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में प्रस्ताव रख दिया . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Nobody denies that Israel was aggressor.

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर : कौन कहता है लेकिन यह कहने की क्या आवश्यकता थी ?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Even Israel admits.

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर : जब हमारे देश में पाकिस्तान का निर्माण हुआ— मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी से, वे यहां बैठी हुई हैं, वे मध्य प्रदेश में अम्बिकापुर गई हुई थीं, उनका स्टेटमेंट भी हुआ है जिसके बारे में बड़ा वाद-विवाद हुआ है—वहां उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहा था कि जिस तरह पाकिस्तान की स्थापना हुई थी, उसी तरह से इसराइल की भी स्थापना हुई है।

जिस प्रकार इसराइल एक कांटा बना हुआ है— 'इन्टरनेशनल डिसयूट' का मामला बना हुआ है उसी तरह पाकिस्तान भी . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Nobody denies that Israel was the aggressor, nobody. Even Israel admits it.

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर : उसी तरह पाकिस्तान भी कांटा बना हुआ है। जिस समय पाकिस्तान बना था उस समय हम नहीं चाहते थे कि इस देश में दो टुकड़े हो जायें मगर जब पाकिस्तान बन गया है तो हम उसका स्वागत करते हैं। हम नहीं चाहते कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी लड़ाई हो। हम उस के साथ अच्छे संबंध बनाये रखना चाहते हैं और हम यह नहीं कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान एक कांटे के रूप में है और इन्टर-नेशनल डिसयूट बना हुआ है। हम पाकिस्तान को खत्म करना नहीं चाहते हैं। उसी प्रकार हम इसराइल के बारे में भी कहना चाहते हैं कि वह एक राष्ट्र है, वह यूनाइटेड नेशन्स का सदस्य है। तो फिर इस तरह की बात करना कि हम उसको खत्म कर देंगे, हमेशा के लिए रास्ते से हटा देंगे, इस तरह की बात करना किसी देश को शोभा नहीं देता है। इसराइल के बारे में जो हमारी नीति बनी हुई है, वह सही नहीं है। हमने इस संबंध में अरब कंट्रीज का पूरी तरह से पक्ष लिया है। लेकिन जब हम संकट में थे, जब हमारे ऊपर पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया, तब अरब राष्ट्र खामोश रह गये थे। उस समय उन्होंने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान ने पाकिस्तान के ऊपर एग्रेसन किया है। अभी हाल में जब चीन वालों ने हमारे राजनयिकों की ह्यूमिलेट किया, हमारे दूतावास वालों को तथा राजदूत को तरह तरह से परेशान किया, तो किसी भी अरब राष्ट्र ने प्रोटेस्ट नहीं किया।

ported the aggressor. They supported everywhere.

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकर राव खांडेकर : हमने जो बिना पूछे ही अरब राष्ट्रों की सहायता के लिए युनाइटेड नेशन में प्रस्ताव रखा और उस प्रस्ताव के रखने से हमारे जो दूसरे मित्र थे वे नाराज हो गये। जब हम यह जानते हैं कि हम खुद कमजोर हैं, तो हमारी जो नीति होनी चाहिये थी वह तटस्थता की होनी चाहिए थी। क्योंकि आजकल हम भिन्न भिन्न देशों से अनाज मंगाते हैं। मिलिटरी का सामान मंगाते हैं और इस तरह की कई वस्तुएं मंगाते हैं। इस तरह से हमने खाहमखाह और वगैर सोचे-समझे इस तरह का प्रस्ताव वहां पर रख दिया है। और विला वजह हमने अरबों का पक्ष लेकर अमेरिका को नाराज कर दिया।

अंग्रेजी में एक कहावत है : "The government of India rushes where angels fear to tread."

इस तरह से हमने खाहमखाह वहां जाकर अरब लोगों का पक्ष लिया। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी तटस्थता की नीति कैसी है कि हमने सिर्फ एक साइड का ही पक्ष लिया। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी जो अरबों के साथ की पालिसी है वह एक तरफा पालिसी है और इस तरह से हमारी जो पालिसी है वह अन्दर भी कमजोर है और बाहर भी कमजोर है।

अब मैं दूसरा सवाल चीन के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। अभी हमारे एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा था कि 15, 20 सालों से हमारी कोई पालिसी चीन के बारे में नहीं रही है। हमारी चीन के बारे में कोई पालिसी ही नहीं हम 10, 12 सालों से चीन को युनाइटेड नेशन्स का सदस्य बनाने के लिये कोशिश करते आ रहे हैं। लेकिन उसी चीन ने आज हमको चारों तरफ से घेरा दिया और आगे भी घेरा देने का प्रयास करता आ रहा है। अभी एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि चीन ने हमें विट्रियल किया, इसलिए हम कुछ

नहीं कर सकते थे। तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि डिप्लोमसी में हमें फारसाइटेड होना चाहिये था। यह जो बात कही गई है कि उसने विट्रियल किया, मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। फिर एक मामूली आदमी और बड़े बड़े राजनीतिज्ञों में क्या फर्क हुआ ? चीन के साथ हमने इतने ज्यादा संबंध बना लिये थे कि हम हर वक्त हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई के नारे लगाते थे। (interruptions) अब हम बाई बाई के नारे लगाते हैं। एक जमाना था जब हम इस तरह के नारे लगाते थे।

श्री अकबर अली खान : अब भी हम हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई के नारे लगाते हैं लेकिन वहां की गवर्नमेंट को कन्डम करते हैं।

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर : मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता हूं कि चीन की जनता अब भी इस नारे को लगाती होगी। हम वहां की जनता और गवर्नमेंट में कोई अन्तर नहीं समझते हैं क्योंकि वहां के लोग यह चाहते हैं कि किसी प्रकार हिन्दुस्तान पर कब्जा कर लिया जाय। हिन्दुस्तान एक जम्हूरियत मुल्क है, इसलिए उसको खत्म कर दिया जाय और उसकी अपने अधीन कर लिया जाय। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आजकल के जमाने में इस तरह की बात करना मुश्किल है। कोई भी कंट्री किसी दूसरे राज्य को समाप्त नहीं कर सकता है, कांकर नहीं कर सकता है। यह हो सकता है कि वह हमारे डब्लेपमेंट और हमारी इकोनोमी को फ्रस्टेट कर दे या खत्म कर दे और वहां पर अराजकता फैला दे। चीन एक डिक्टटरशिप वाला देश है और वह मिलिटरीशिप में यकीन रखता है और इस तरह से वह बार आइडियालाजी को बढ़ावा देना चाहता है और यही वजह है कि हमारे देश के ऊपर उसने हमला किया और हमारी 14 हजार वर्ग मील भूमि को अपने कब्जे में कर लिया है। इन सब बातों को

[श्री रमेशचंद्र शंकरराव खांडेकर]

जानते हुए हमने चीन के साथ दोस्ती करने की कोशिश की और यह कहना गलत है कि हमको उसने बिट्टे किया ।

मैं यहां पर इस बात की याद दिला देना चाहता हूं कि हमारी पार्टी और कई लोगों ने इस सरकार को सुझाव दिया था कि चीन सीमा में अपनी सड़कें बना रहा है, वहां पर लड़ाई की तयारी कर रहा है, इसलिये हमें भी उसकी तरफ से होशियार हो जाना चाहिये । उस समय हमारे सुझाव की ओर सरकार ने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया और कहा कि वहां पर इंच भर जमीन में घास नहीं उगती है । हमने उनसे कहा कि चीन ने हजारों मील लम्बी सड़कें हमारे बार्डर में बना ली है । तो सरकार की ओर से कहा गया कि इसमें कोई बात सच्ची नहीं है । तुम लोग वार-मार्गर्स हो, तुम खुद युद्ध चाहते हो और तब ही इस तरह की बात करते हो । लेकिन हमारी चेतावनी का परिणाम क्या हुआ ? सन् 1962 में चीन ने मासिव इन्वेजन कर दिया तब हमारी सरकार की आंखें खुलीं और फिर उसने बार्डर रोडों को बनाने की तरफ ध्यान दिया । उसके बाद भी जो कदम सरकार को उठाने चाहिये थे वह उसने नहीं उठाये ।

चीन के साथ दोस्ती करने का एक उदाहरण मैं और आपके सामने देना चाहता हूं । स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के जन्म दिवस पर उसने हिन्दुस्तानियों के कटे हुए शवों की भेंट दी थी । इस तरह से उसने हमारे सारे राष्ट्र की इन्सल्ट की । यही नहीं, चीन की जनता ने किस तरह से हमारे राजनयिकों के साथ दुर्व्यवहार हाल में ही किया । लेकिन हमारी ही जमीन पर, हमारे ही मुल्क पर उनके अम्बेसी के कार के ड्राइवर ने हमारे एक पुलिस कर्मचारी को थप्पड़ मार दिया ।

अभी तक उस कर्मचारी के विरुद्ध हमारी सरकार ने कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की है । भविष्य में वह चीनी पकड़ा भी जायेगा या नहीं, इस बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता है । तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी जो वैसिलेटिंग की नीति है, वह कमजोर नीति है, उसी की वजह से चीन हमारे साथ इस तरह का व्यवहार कर रहा है । इस नीति का परिणाम यह हुआ कि इन 20 सालों के बाद भी न हम एक्स्टर्नल तौर पर मजबूत हुए और न इन्टरनल तौर पर मजबूत हो सके हैं । हमारे देश की आबादी 50 करोड़ की है । दुनिया में दो हजार सालों से हमारा ट्रेडिशन होने के बाद भी आज हमारी आवाज दुनिया के छोटे-मोटे देशों में भी अपनी विदेश नीति की वजह से घट गई है ।

अब मैं एक बात तिब्बत के संबंध में कह देना चाहता हूं । हमारी पार्टी ने और कई लोगों ने सरकार से कहा था कि अंग्रेजों ने तिब्बत को एक बफर स्टेट की हैसियत से रखा था क्योंकि उनका खुद का इन्टरेस्ट था । और यह किसी भी देश के हित में होता है कि वह इस तरह के देश को बफर स्टेट के रूप में रखे । लेकिन हमारी सरकार सावरेन्टी और सुजेरेन्टी के क्विबलिंग में ही पड़ी रही, बिला वजह पड़ी रही और उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि आज हमें तिब्बत की यह हालत देखने को मिल रही है और उसका हम यह जानते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट इंडिया के दिमाग में दलाई लामा को रिकग्नाइज करने की बात आई है । उसने यह भी कहा है कि अब यूनाइटेड नेशन में तिब्बत का सवाल उठाया जा सकता है । तो मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी सरकार को पख्तूनिस्तान के सवाल को भी सपोटे करना चाहिये और इनकरेज करना चाहिये तब हूं हम अपनी विदेश नीति को बदल सकते हैं । तो कहने का

तात्पर्य यह है कि हमारी जो विदेश नीति है वह एक कमजोर नीति बन गई है इसलिए सरकार को अपनी इस नीति को बदलना चाहिये और ऐसी नीति अख्तियार करनी चाहिये जो पीस की नीति पर आधारित हो। वह नीति पीस आफ दी स्ट्रॉंग में होनी चाहिये, कमजोरी की नीति नहीं होनी चाहिये। इतना ही मुझे निवेदन करना है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Yashoda Reddy. On the Congress Benches there are eleven more Members who want to participate.

Therefore we can have only ten minutes for each. All must be accommodated.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, the hon. Member who just preceded me has in one word said that the whole of our foreign policy has been at fault, that our non-alignment policy has been all wrong. I would like to tell him that our non-alignment policy has certainly not failed. We had adopted that non-alignment policy of ours after due consideration, after taking into consideration our interests *vis-a-vis* the political situation in the world. If we failed in the case of China, certainly it is not because of any...

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: Not only in the case of China but everywhere we have failed.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I never interrupted the hon. Member and I have only ten minutes. If we have failed in China it is not our fault. It is because of the betrayal -by China. It is not correct to say that it was our folly. I do agree that the foreign policy, or any policy of any government should not always be permanently the same; I do not agree that it should not be changed.

Of course, we in India, are all sad at heart because of the barbarous,

almost mad dog treatment that China had given to our diplomats which *no* sane, civilised man can appreciate and which he will not condemn in the strongest terms.

Madam, China has succeeded in exploding her hydrogen bomb. She has been active in this direction for the last so many years and as a result of some five previous tests she has reached this result. Not only that, we also know that Pindi is also entering into the nuclear field in a very big way and there are reports in the press recently that they have spent nearly Rs. 12 million on atomic programme. The Defence Minister of Pakistan had gone to China and spent nearly a week there visiting their defence establishments and so on. And it is rather a rare thing, the Defence Minister of China giving dinners or even having any kind of talks with foreign countries. But as far as Peking and Pindi are concerned, they are together. There is no doubt about that. They have a common policy as far as India is concerned. We can see what is happening on our borders, both with China and with Pakistan. They are building roads and strengthening their defences. So it is high time that we reorient our policy as far as our defences are concerned.

I would agree with what Shri B. K. P. Sinha said and say categorically that we should not continue our diplomatic relations with China. We need not completely cut them off for good. But at least for some time we can suspend them till better relations are there between us and China.

My whole point now is not to criticise this or that. I want to pinpoint the lessons that we have to learn from what has happened *vis-a-vis* Pakistan and China and the Middle East. About the Middle East I want to say one thing. Certainly we have been great friends of the Arabs. But we do

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

recognise the existence of Israel. We do know and everybody knows how Israel came into existence after the Second World War. During all these years till 1947 they were trying and only in 1947 they could be given some homeland. Israel is a member of the United Nations and it has a right to live. Nobody can dispute it, neither our Communist friends nor anybody else. I was nodding my head when Shri Dahyabhai Patel was speaking, but that does not mean that I was agreeing with everything that he said. We have the right to befriend the Arabs. But let us not condemn Israel just because it happens to be the enemy of the Arabs. Our foreign policy and our non-aligned policy should not one where we say that the enemies of our friends are our enemies and the friends of our enemies cannot be our friends. It will not be logical. We cannot say that Israel is our enemy because she has attacked the Arab countries, and therefore we have to condemn Israel. Today, because China is supporting the UAR, are we to be friendly with China? That will be illogical. Let our non-alignment policy be an independent one, independent of changes in other countries. Let it be in keeping with our notional interest and our national self-respect.

I entirely agree that when the President of Israel wanted to come to Delhi We should have permitted him. We did not meet him and..

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did you meet him?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I wish I had met him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I too wish you had met him.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: But he was asked to go to Calcutta. Madam, are we that poor, or have we

gone down that much in our cultural and human approach to people that even for Rs. 300 we should send a bill to the Head of a State? I do not know whether the Prime Minister was aware of it. That certainly was not in good taste. Even towards our enemies we should be tolerant. That is the tradition in our country. Certainly we should have behaved differently especially towards a person like him.

All along when we have been following a policy of non-alignment right from the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, there was a feeling that we are a sort of elder brother to other non-aligned countries, that we were comrades. But nowadays there is a feeling that we are no longer comrades but camp-followers of some others. Let us not give room for such an impression. Let us be independent. I am not condemning the policy of non-alignment. I am not in favour of what Mr. Gupta said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Gupta knows that you are always not in favour.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I wish I were the leader of an independent party so that I too could have got 45 minutes. But now I have only ten minutes and so let me say what I have to say without interruptions. What I want to say is that we should learn the role that the great powers are playing in the international situation. For many years we have been hearing that great military power is a deterrent of war. Certainly it is a deterrent of nuclear war, but not all wars. It does not mean that the great powers stop other wars. They do not, and they to some extent even encourage wars between others. We have seen it ourselves and here in the Middle East we have have a classic example of it. The Middle East is a strategic place. Between these countries, namely, Russia, America and Britain, they are trying to have power in this strategic area. So they give arms to these countries

and they are playing their roles in this region. They would not go to any nuclear war. But certainly they do not mind abetting small wars. This is a lesson that we have to learn. There is another thing. In this Israel-Syria border question we And there has been a very good parallel in India also. Today there is no question of aggressor and aggressed. It is not logical nowadays. After any conflict only two parties remain, the victor and the vanquished. Who was the aggressor and who the aggressed^ it is difficult (to say. We have seen it in our own case. Some of our frtns have said that Israel has been the aggressor.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your own Party said it. Mr. Chagla said it.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: May be it was right. But very often it is difficult to say. Something similar happened in our case in the conflicts with Pakistan and China. When China came to Aksai Chin and Barahoti and Longju and we wanted to take back the places and start retaliatory action we were called aggressors. In-1965, when Pakistan sent her infiltrators into Kashmir and invaded India, we tried to prevent them and to take counter action. But then also we were called the aggressors. So whoever be the aggressor or the aggressed in the present case, the position now is that Israel has the right to live. She has a lifeline that is threatened. Theie is this Gulf of Aqaba. If we give her the right to live and to exist we must also allow these people the means to live. We may try to do some-3 P.M. thing. But we must also know what the effect of it would be. I would only like to say that one thing has happened. With the fall of Nasser . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Fall of Nasser?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Yes; in political popularity...

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: He has become more popular.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I do not think so. There has been a sort of ____

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She has learnt nothing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is her opinion.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Supposing we had some setbacks, certainly the popularity of that particular leader goes down because he is considered to be responsible for the setback rightly or wrongly.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: T^t was the U.S. theory about Jawaharlal but it has not been successful in U.A.R.

श्री राजनारायण : तारिक सहब के गाड़ आ गए ।

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: This question of a third Tower and non-alignment has to be <?one into a little more carefully and our thinking about it has to be reorganised. Non-alignment to a certain extent is good but we must remember that we are dealing with powerful countries like Russia and America. We must learn that today no war lasts 'ong. Wars have become very short ai'd the question of the aggressor and the aggressed has no meaning. The victor and the vanquished are the only two that remain. Therefore, as I have said, we should never depend on foreign countries for anything, whethar it is military aid or any other thing. We have seen what U.A.R. had in IF s struggle and even what Pakistan had wiier. we had our five-day bat'le with Paki-ian which had the Patten tanks and Sabre jets. Against all their Fatten tanks and Sabre jets it was internal strength and the valour of our young boys lhat got us victory. So what v/e snould learn from all these things is that we should not depend on foreign counties for our defence, whether it i_s U.S.A. or whether it is Russia. Let us build up our own defence. Why I am trying to pinpoint this today is with

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

Pakistan and China menacing our borders, we have to think about our defence in stronger terms and we should try to build up our own defence potential within our own country. Here I would like to point out to the Defence Minister who is here... (Time bell rings). I am finishing in two minutes. While our defence is allied with our foreign policy, our defence policy must be a little stronger. In this connection I would like to know why the compulsory training of the N.C.C. has been removed. "There must be compulsory training for all the young people of the country for the sake of the defence of our country. We should also reorient our policy about nuclear weapons. Our Intelligence should also be strengthened because the way it has been showing has been a very sad story. Here I would also like to bring it to the notice of the Government that the external forces are having a hand in the internal development", of our country, whether it is in the Mizo area or the Naga area or the Naxaibari area. Our defence, our foreign policy and these developments are all connected and we should be very careful about what is happening inside the country. They are all linked up whether it is in the strategic Assam border or the Pakistan border. Hon. Members would have seen reports in the papers that even in our Parliament there are some people who have got sympathy with the Chinese and their activities.

SHRI A. D. M&K: Who are these people?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: That everybody knows. We should not hesitate to ban such parties if it comes to that because all these have a bearing on our defence.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh); Mr. Dahyabhai Patel will ban your party.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: If he ever comes to rule and if ever we become traitors to the country he can

but I do not think we shall ever be traitors like some hon. Members or like some parties here. I am talking about those people whose interests are nearer to China and other countries than to our own country. So our overall policy of non-alignment should be a little more sophisticated and we should have a rethinking on whether or not we should go in for nuclear weapons because I feel that it is high time that we should have nuclear weapons and an integrated view of our external policy, our defence and our internal developments should be taken.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : मैडम, डिपुटी चेयरमैन, पिछले दिनों में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति में जो परिवर्तन आया है उसी के कारण सदन के सदस्यों की यह उत्सुकता थी कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर विचार किया जाय और आज उसी सन्दर्भ में जो तत्कालीन समय की कुछ घटनाएँ हैं उन्हीं की तरफ मैं अपने विचार केन्द्रित करने का प्रयत्न करूँगा। इन सारी परिस्थितियों का परिणाम हमारे देश पर होता है और इस प्रस्ताव का अर्थ ही यह है कि इस सन्दर्भ में हम देश की सर्वसाधारण राय का पता लगायें कि परिस्थिति का मुकाबला करने के लिए हम अब तक की अपनी नीतियों पर चलते जाय या नहीं। इससे बदली हुई परिस्थिति का सामना करना और इन समस्याओं में से अपने देश को आगे ले जाना हमारे लिए अधिक और सम्भव हो सकेगा।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN in the Chair.)]

जो तत्कालीन घटना अभी हुई है वह है चीन में हमारे दूतावास के ऊपर संकट, और आज भी वहाँ पर ठहरे हुए हमारे कर्मचारियों को सुरक्षित रूप से अपने देश में नहीं लाया जा सकता। यह विषय ऐसा है कि जिसके परिणाम बड़ी

गम्भीरता से हमें देखने पड़ेंगे। मुझे इस बात की ख़ुशी है कि सरकार ने बराबरी की नीति या टिट फार टेट की नीति अपनाना पसन्द किया है, उन्होंने हमारे हवाई जहाज के वहाँ जाने से इन्कार कर दिया तो हमने उनके हवाई जहाज के यहाँ आने से इन्कार किया। अच्छा हो यह नीति—क्योंकि इसमें देश के स्वाभिमान का प्रश्न जुड़ा हुआ है—और भी जगहों पर लागू करें। यह किसी एक देश के प्रति विद्वेष की धारणा है, इस लिए अलग लेल पर लेकर चलना चाहते हैं, इसी से गाड़ न हों। यह नीति जो इस समय चीन के साथ अपनाई है वह केवल दूतावास तक सीमित न रहे, वह चीन के साथ बाकी के सम्बन्धों में भी आनी चाहिए।

चीन में हमारा दूतावास बना रहे, इसके लिए बार-बार तर्क दिया गया कि इससे कम से कम हम लोगों को वहाँ एक खिड़की मिलती है कि चीन की घटनाओं की ओर देख सके, चीन में क्या हो रहा है यह जानने की सुविधा मिलती है। मुझे लगता है कि उस खिड़की के शीशे फोड़ दिए गए हैं। वह खिड़की हमें कोई खास जानकारी दे पाएगी या वहाँ पर दूतावास रखना किसी प्रकार का लाभ पहुंचाएगा, इस पर नए सिरे से हमें विचार करना चाहिए। हम इस बात की भी प्रतीक्षा न करें कि चीन की तरफ से पहल हो दौत्य सम्बन्धों को तोड़ने के लिए। मैं जानता हूँ चीन को, दौत्य सम्बन्ध अच्छे आधार पर न भी चले फिर भी दूतावास हमारे देश में बनाए रखना बड़ा लाभ पहुंचाता है। दुर्भाग्य से इस देश में ऐसे तत्व मौजूद हैं जिनको चीनी दूतावास के कारण बन्ध मिलता है जो जानकारी पिछले दिनों में मिली है अर्थात् नक्सलवाड़ी की घटनाओं के पहले उससे पता चलता है कि चीनो दूतावास के कर्मचारी कलकत्ता भी गए थे ये वास्तव में सन्देह पैदा करने वाली बातें हैं कि इन

घटनाओं का इन के साथ कुछ सीधा सम्बन्ध आता है या नहीं आता है और इस कारण से वह चाहे भारत और चीन के सम्बन्धों को सुधारने में काम न दें लेकिन चीन के माध्यम से प्रेरित गतिविधियों को इस देश में चलाने में चीन के दूतावास से उनको लाभ है, इसलिये महज इस वजह से कि चीन अपने दूतावास को यहाँ से बन्द करने का विचार नहीं कर रहा केवल यहाँ एक विचार हमारे आपस के इन सम्बन्धों की दृष्टि से नहीं होना चाहिये। मुझे खेद है कि आप इस राय से सहमत नहीं हैं लेकिन जो घटनाएँ हैं कि चीन ने हमारी ज़मीन पर हमला किया है उसको देखें, आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है। हम यह सिद्धान्त मानते हैं कि फ़ूट्स आफ एग्जेशन नहीं मिलना चाहिए, किसी को आक्रमण का लाभ नहीं मिलना चाहिये, अगर दूसरे देशों में इस प्रकार की चीज़ हो जाय तो उसको रक्षा करने को हम दीड़ते हैं लेकिन हम खुद इसके शिकार हैं कि इस आधार पर पाकिस्तान ने और चीन ने अग्जेशन के द्वारा हमारी ज़मीन पर कब्ज़ा कर रखा है, आज इस फ़ूट्स आफ एग्जेशन को, एग्जेशन के लाभ को, कांस्टीट्यूशनली माना नहीं, हमने अपना अधिकार उस इलाके पर नहीं छोड़ा लेकिन इतने वर्षों की चीज़ यह हो गई कि हमारे न मानते हुये भी इतने वर्षों से आक्रमण का लाभ इन दोनों देशों को मिल रहा है हमारे बाकी के सम्बन्धों में अगर कोई परिणाम, हमें दिखाई दे, इन दोनों देशों के साथ हमारा राजनैतिक सम्बन्धों के निर्धारण करत समय अगर यह सवाल सामने आये तब तो यह सिद्धान्त जिसको ले कर हम दुनिया के दूसरे देशों के हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए आग्रह करना चाहते हैं उसमें ज़रूर वजन मिलेगा लेकिन अगर हम अपने देश के लिये भी इन समस्याओं का कोई समाधान नहीं निकलवा सकते तो हमारी दूसरे देशों के लिए की गई बकालत कितना वजनदार साबित होगी इसका हमें ज़रूर विचार करना चाहिये।

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

एशिया के पश्चिम में जो स्थिति पैदा हुई उसके सम्बन्ध में भी मैं समझता कि जितनी जल्दबाजी में और जितना उत्साह का अतिरेक दिखा कर हमने अपना दृष्टिकोण बनाने का प्रयत्न प्रारम्भ किया उसमें अब धीरे-धीरे हम सम्भलने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, यह जरूरी भी है, क्योंकि हमारे में और अरब देशों में एक मौलिक मतभेद है, अरब देश आज इजराइल के अस्तित्व को समाप्त करना चाहते हैं किन्तु हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने आज तक कम से कम इजराइल की समाप्ति का समर्थन नहीं किया, इजरायल को हमने रिकगनिशन कर रखा है और अगर हमने रिकगनिशन किया है, दुनिया के देशों ने रिकगनिशन किया है, तो जिन कारणों से 48 की या 56 की घटनायें हुई, आज मैं मानता हूँ कि उसने जिस हद तक युनाइटेड नेशन्स की सीमाओं को पार किया उसको कंडेम किया गया और उस कंडेमनेशन में हम उसकी रक्षा करना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन यह घटनायें एक के बाद एक दुहराई जा रही हैं और 1967 में भी ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ पैदा हुई जिसमें कि एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय तनाव पैदा हो सकता था, फिर भी इजरायल जिन्दा रहे और इजरायल के लिये जो समुद्री सुविधायें हैं वे मिलें। इजरायल को न मानने वाले देश तेरान में या अक्राबा की खाड़ी के सम्बन्ध में यह एटीट्यूड ले कर यह बात तो समझ में आ सकती है, वह तो इजरायल के अस्तित्व को ही स्वीकार करने को तैयार नहीं, उसको वहाँ से अपने जहाज ले जाने की इजाजत दे इसकी अपेक्षा उनसे नहीं की जा सकती लेकिन वह देश जो इजराइल के अस्तित्व को स्वीकार करते हैं वह आज केवल यह कह कर कि चूँकि आज इजराइल दूसरे देशों का सैनिक अड्डा बना दिया गया है इसलिये हमने चाहे उसके अस्तित्व को स्वीकार किया होगा अब हमें पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये, बच नहीं सकते। मैं माफी चाहता हूँ, पाकिस्तान भी आज कई देशों के

सैनिक अड्डों का एक अखाड़ा बना हुआ है, पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में चीन अपने सैनिक अड्डे बनाने की कोशिश कर रहा है, पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान और गिलगिट तो अमेरिकी अड्डों की जगहें हैं, तो क्या सैनिक अड्डों के कारण, कोई देश अपनी आक्रमक मनोवृत्ति को इन सम्बन्धों का फायदा उठा कर किसी के लिये इस्तेमाल करना चाहता है तो हम उस देश के अस्तित्व को स्वीकार करें या न करें यह इस पर जायगा या नहीं जायगा। दूसरे देशों की जमीन पर कोई सैनिक अड्डे बनाये, एक चीज है, जो देश आज स्वयं अपने यहाँ पर सैनिक नीतियाँ अपना कर या विकास की, साम्राज्यवाद की नीतियाँ अपना कर दुनिया को हड़पने की कोशिश करना चाहते हैं, इसी आधार पर हम उसको कटेन करने की कोशिश करेंगे लेकिन क्या उन देशों की समाप्ति इसमें से पैदा हो सकती इस आधार पर हमें इजरायल के सम्बन्ध में एक व्यावहारिक नीति अपनानी चाहिये। उसको अगर तेरान केरास्ते और अक्राबा की खाड़ी का उपयोग करने का अधिकार न मिले तो जो हम एक स्थायी शान्ति इस इलाके में चाहते हैं और यह चाहते हैं कि पश्चिमी एशिया के क्षेत्र में बार-बार किसी तरह की गड़बड़ न हों, स्वेज का रास्ता खुला रहे, जो हमारे लिये भी आवश्यक है और जिसका सीधा परिणाम आज हमें जो खाद्य सामग्री मिल रही है उस पर पड़ता है, वह कैसे होगा। अगर हम यह चाहते हैं तो फिर हमें इस सारी समस्या को सुलझाने के लिये अपनी तरफ से भी एक ऐसा रवैया अपनाना होगा जिसमें से एक शान्तिपूर्ण तरीका निकल सके।

यहाँ पर अपनी नीति से हमने अरब देशों का समर्थन करने के लिये इस तर्क को देने की कोशिश की थी कि चूँकि इजराइल ने लड़ाई पहले छोड़ी इस कारण से हम उसका कैसे समर्थन कर सकते हैं। विदेश मंत्री महोदय इस बात को देखें

समाचारपत्रों में यह आया है कि रूस के प्रतिनिधियों के कारण ही यह सलाह दी गई थी यू० ए०आर० को कि तुम लड़ाई मत शुरू करो। यह सलाह दी गई। आज इसके लिये शायद वह उसको उलाहना भी दे रहा है कि तुमने हमको रोक दिया नहीं तो हम इन मुसीबतों से बच जाते। लड़ाई शुरू कोई करे लड़ाई की तैयारी तो थी अनप्रोवोवड लड़ाई की हो मुझे दुख है मैं इस सिद्धांत को स्वीकार नहीं करता।

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल : लड़ाई का आवाहन किया।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भण्डारी : लड़ाई की गोली किसने चलाई इस पर विवाद करते रहें लेकिन यू०ए०आर० और इजराइल दोनों में परिस्थिति साफ हो गई थी। यू० ए०आर० के लोग इजरायल को सहन करने को तैयार नहीं थे फिर पहल किसने कर ली और किसको इसका लाभ मिला अगर इसी में से हमारी नीति निर्धारित होगी तो मुझे दुख है कि हम असली मुद्दे को छोड़ कर एक ऐसे तर्क को लाने की कोशिश करेंगे जिसका सिद्ध होना बड़ा कठिन है। यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है कि इसी कारण से अब “युद्ध की पूर्व की स्थिति पर” हम आ गये और यह व्यावहारिक मार्ग है कि युद्ध की पूर्व की स्थिति पर ये सारी सेनायें चली जाय, शान्ति स्थापित हो, फ्रूट्स आफ एग्जेशन का लाभ आक्रमणकारी को न मिले ज्यादा अच्छा है कि हम भी इस सिद्धांत को अपने ऊपर जिन्होंने आक्रमण किया है उन पर भी लगवाने के लिये वर्ल्ड ओपीनियन बनाने में अपनी शक्ति का ज्यादा इस्तेमाल करने की कोशिश करें।

चीन का संकट हमारे सामने है। आज चीन को सेनायें बड़ी हैं। सारी वर्ल्ड ओपीनियन को चीन के इस संकट के प्रति हमें

बनाना चाहिये। चीन के प्रति आज तक का हमारा क्या रवैया है ? हम चीन के लिये वकालत करते रहे हैं संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सदस्यता के लिये। समझते हैं कि अगर उसको राष्ट्र समूह में शामिल करवा दिया तो हम उस पर डिसिप्लिन लागू करा सकेंगे। मुझे दुख है कि वह युनाइटेड नेशंस डिसिप्लिन स्वीकार करने के लिये न तो तैयार है और न हम अपनी वकालत से चीन को उस बात के लिये तैयार कर सकेंगे। बहतर यह होगा कि हम अपना रवैया इस मामले में साफ बतायें तो दुनिया को भी हमारी तकलीफ समझने में मदद मिलेगी। हमारे ऊपर जो चीनी खतरा है उसके बारे में लोग और सही तौर पर परिस्थिति को समझ सकेंगे।

दूसरी एक चीज पाकिस्तान की चल रही है। पाकिस्तान का खतरा बढ़ा है। राजस्थान के बार्डर पर उसने फिर से अपनी सेनाओं का जमाव किया है उसने सड़कें बनाई है। उसने हमारी सीमाओं का उल्लंघन किया है। हम ताशकंद घोषणा की दुहाइयां देकर पाकिस्तान से अच्छे संबंध एकतरफा आधार पर बनाने की कोशिशें करते रहे हैं। हम बिल्कुल बिना किसी शर्त के किसी भी सवाल पर बात करने के लिये तैयार होकर अपनी उदार दिली का परिचय देने की कोशिश करते रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान इन सब चीजों को ठुकराता रहा है। उसने सीटो संधि से अपना संबंध तोड़ने की बात कही। इसमें कहीं से भी यह विचार पैदा करने की गलती नहीं होनी चाहिये कि उसके आक्रामक रूपों में कोई परिवर्तन हुआ है। चीन ने उसको जो मदद करने की बातें कही हैं चीन से जो उसको सहायता मिली है और आज हाइड्रोजन बम का अधिकारी होने के बाद चीन ने उसके साथ जो सैनिक साठगांठ की है उससे वह युद्ध-संधियों से बाहर निकलेगा इस संबंध में कोई उसकी नीति बदल गई इस भुलावे

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

हा भी देश के अंदर इम्प्रेशन पैदा नहीं होना चाहिये। आज पाकिस्तान का खतरा बना है और इस के संबंध में हमारी विदेशनीति पाकिस्तान के साथ भी स्पष्ट नहीं हुई है हमने बराबर उसके आक्रमक रवैये को सारी दुनिया के सामने रखने की कोशिश नहीं की। पिछले जून में काश्मीर के सवाल पर और बाको सवालों पर जो हमने बल्ड ओरिनियन बनाने की कोशिश की उसमें हम पूरी तौर पर कामयाब नहीं हुए बल्कि खतरा हमें फिर उठाने की नीबत आ सकती तो ज्यादा अच्छा है अगर हम शुरू से अपनी नीतियों को स्पष्ट बनायें। काश्मीर के संबंध में पाकिस्तान को फूट आफ अप्रेशन मिलते हुए आप उससे बात नहीं करेंगे यह नीति लेकर आप चलेंगे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा लेकिन हम दूसरे दूसरे सवालों का उल्लेख करने की कोशिश करते हैं। (Time bell rings) पाकिस्तान ने तो उनको हल आऊँ किया है और कहा है कि जब तक काश्मीर का सवाल हल नहीं करोगे जब तक काश्मीर पर विचार करने के लिये तैयार नहीं होंगे कोई दूसरा सवाल नहीं है जिसको हमें आपस में एक दूसरे के बीच में तय करना है। तो फिर हम अपनी तरफ से इस प्रकार की गलतफहमियाँ दुनिया में पैदा करेंगे तो अपने देश में भी ऐसे तत्व जिनको उससे बल मिलता है पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी नरस नीति होने के कारण पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी दरियादिली की नीति होने के कारण जो यहां पाक तत्व फिर जगह-जगह सक्रिय होकर केवल काश्मीर में ही नहीं देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में भी हैं बल प्राप्त करते हैं। इस नीति में भी अगर हम पाकिस्तान के साथ अपनी विदेश नीति में स्पष्टता लायेंगे तो यहां के ऐसे तत्वों की भी इस प्रकार की गड़बड़ कराने की ताकत घटेगी और उनकी हिम्मत यहां

नहीं बढ़ पायेगी। (Time bell rings) मैं एक मिनट में समाप्त करूंगा। तो मेरा निवेदन यह है कि आज हमारी विदेश नीति स्पष्ट रूप से प्रकट हो, इसके लिये आवश्यक था कि वे तत्व जो यहां पाक मनोवृत्ति रखने वालों को प्रोत्साहन देते हैं, कम से कम उनके ऊपर हमारी विदेश नीति के बारे में भ्रम न रहे इसलिये हमें अपनी नीतियों को साफ तौर से कहना पड़ेगा। मुझे दुःख है कि राजस्थान के अंदर होने वाली जिन घटनाओं के लिये जो लोग जिम्मेदार हैं, जिसकी सूचनाएं भारत सरकार के पास हैं, राजस्थान की विधान सभा में भी अभी पिछले दिनों जिनके ऊपर कुछ आरोप लगा, आज जिन लोगों पर ये आरोप लगे हैं सरकार उन पर चुपचाप बैठती है और आज उन लोगों को मंत्रिमंडलों में समाविष्ट किया जाता है, बिना उन पर से वे सारी बातें साफ हुए तो ऐसा करने से तो उन सारे तत्वों को बल मिलेगा कि अभी तक तो बाहर से अब तो सरकार में भी, हमें पिछपोषण करने वाले हमारे हिमायती मित्र लोग मौजूद हैं, अब हमें डर का कोई कारण नहीं है सरकार की नीति के कारण हम को कोई खतरा नहीं है, हम सब प्रकार की हरकतें भारत की सीमा में आसानी से कर सकते हैं।

इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है जो संकट हमारी सीमा को छू रहे हैं, देश में बाहर से आने वाले संकटों का सामना करने के लिये और दुनिया के देशों में उन संकटों के प्रति हमारे लिए सहानुभूति का वायुमंडल निर्माण करने के लिये जो अधिक प्रभावी कदम होना चाहिये, अगर वह उन तत्वों के प्रति उठे तो आज के संदर्भ में यह विदेश नीति की चर्चा अधिक व्यावहारिक होगी बजाय इसके कि हम अपना गुणगान करें कि हमारी नीति सफल रही है संकट अगर घटता नहीं है, दुश्मन की संख्या बढ़ती है और हमदर्दी रखने वाले देशों का दायरा

अगर छोटा होता जाता है तो फिर उन नीतियों पर हम गंभीरता के साथ पुनर्विचार करें और नये सिरे से स्वतंत्र नीति, स्वयं की नीति बिना किसी दबाव के अपनाएं— केवल गुटों से अलग रहने वाली ही नहीं परन्तु स्वयं अपनी एक इण्डिपेन्डेंट विदेश नीति बनाएं और केवल यह कह कर कि हम इस गुट में शामिल नहीं हैं, हम उस गुट से बचे हुए हैं, हम दोनों गुटों पर समान रूप से हाथ रखते हैं, इससे काम नहीं चलेगा। आज की परिस्थिति में जब कि दुनिया के अंदर हमारे बारे में अनेक भ्रम हैं, हमारे शत्रुओं को समझने के लिये भी, हमारे सही मित्रों को समझने के लिये भी वे भ्रम बदस्तूर कायम रहेंगे जब तक कि हम एक बल्ड ओपीनियन अपनी समस्याओं के बारे में पैदा नहीं करेंगे, जो एक कसौटी है विदेश नीति की, तब तक हम उसमें किसी तरह से अधिक कामयाब नहीं हो सकते। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Sapru.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: What about me?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): His name is above you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I have been given in writing that my name is fourth in the Congress list. What is happening? Why am I not being allowed? In the Budget discussion I was not allowed to speak. Today also I am not allowed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You are the next speaker.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: In the Budget I was not allowed to speak. Today I am not being allowed to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You will be allowed.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Everyone says I will be allowed but nobody allows me to speak. What is this? I have given in writing. I have shown you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): In my list Mr. Sapru is above you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Everybody is above me.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: My name is next to Mr. Sapru and I have given an amendment too, which my friend, Mr. Arora, has not given.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You will be allowed.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Why was I not allowed to speak on the Budget? Now I have given in writing that my name is fourth. Still I have not been allowed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): After Mr. Sapru you will have a chance.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is very unfair to me.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have covered a very wide ground, and I propose to refer briefly to the question of China.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Ten minutes, Mr. Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: In ten minutes I cannot finish. I thought I would be given fifteen minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Congress Members' are given ten minutes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: If you will accommodate me with a few more minutes, I will be able to finish my speech.

[Shri P. N. Sapru]

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have taken a consistent attitude towards this question of China. I was the first person in this House to suggest that the Colombo Proposals are not sacrosanct. I was the first to suggest that we should have negotiations with China on the basis of a talk between the Foreign Ministers. I suggested even a summit talk with China in regard to the issues that divided us. The fact of the matter is that China is a country of 700 million people. It is a country with which we had friendly relations for the last two thousand years, and whether we like China or whether we do not like China, we cannot ignore China.

Therefore, I have been pained at what the Chinese have done to our men. The anguish through which I passed, I cannot tell the House the story of that anguish. It has given me real pain to find that China treated our diplomats in the way in which it did. The question that I pose for myself is whether it is worth while our having any relations with them on the basis on which we are having those relations with China. I have come to the deliberate conclusion that by having a Charge d'Affaires with minor officials of the External Affairs Ministry, we cannot have a window on China or we cannot improve the relations with China. I would, therefore, for the time being, suspend relations with China. I am using the word 'suspend' deliberately because I would like the question whether our relations with China on an ambassadorial basis should not be resumed to be taken up at a suitable opportunity by the External Affairs Ministry. That is a solution which I would like to commend for the consideration of the External Affairs Ministry. Mere abuse of China is not going to help us. We want a solution of that problem. The problem exists and it will continue to exist.

Let me also say a word about the hydrogen bomb. I have looked upon

the hydrogen bomb and the atom bomb as evils and I am not prepared to compromise with evil. And while I can give you many reasons of a military character against our making the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb, I would say that I am unhesitatingly against our manufacture of atomic bombs or hydrogen bombs. I think we should strengthen ourselves in conventional weapons and it is the conventional weapons which will make us stronger *vis-a-vis* China. I am not in love with spending a lot of money on defence. Perhaps it is unavoidable and, therefore, I would concentrate on conventional weapons.

Now, I would like briefly to refer to the question of Israel. Let me first of all condemn in no uncertain terms the brutal behaviour to which our nationals, the international military servants, were subjected by the Government of Israel. U Thant had no alternative but to recall our men and the Israel Government behaved very badly. There is no doubt that Nasser is a very great man and his greatness can be measured by the dedication that King Hussein showed while he visited him. Nasser was asked by the Arab world to continue the war. President Nasser has now chosen to be the Prime Minister of the UAR also. The Arab world is important for us for many reasons. We are a secular State and we do not want this concept of Muslim brotherhood to develop in the Arab world. I think it is, from our point of view, a wise step to befriend the Arab world. This, of course, does not mean that we are in complete agreement with almost everything that they say. No complete agreement is possible in this world. For example, let me say that it has become imperative for the Arab world to recognise that Israel has come to stay. It is the fruit of aggression, it is the seed of aggression but it has come to stay. We have got to reconcile sometimes with evil and we must therefore . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE
(Bihar): What about Pakistan?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I would not compare Israel with Pakistan because with Pakistan I want friendly relations, brotherly relations.

I would, therefore, say that we must cultivate good relations with the Arab world and we must give good support to it. Mr. Chagla is doing a magnificent job at the United Nations.

Let me, however, say that there are one or two questions on which my mind is not very clear. Take, for example, the question of the Gulf of Aqaba. It can be argued from the point of view of an International lawyer whether the Gulf of Aqaba is international and whether the Strait of Tiran is international. Well, these are questions, matters, which can be referred not to the International Court of Justice in which we have ceased to have confidence after their judgment in the South West Africa case but to a tribunal such as the one which we had constituted for determining our relations with Kutch.

May I say, before I conclude, one or two words about two matters in regard to which I feel very strongly? First of all, I think that we, as Members of this House, must give our unstinted support, unstinted sympathy, to the brave people of Vietnam. Never has man struggled more bravely than the Vietnamese have done against the heavy bombing by barbarous American bombers. Then the second point on which I wanted to say was that President Kaunda was here a few days back. We know that President Kaunda is a highly respected figure in the world of Africa and with Africa the future of mankind is bound up in many ways. Now, Mr. Wilson has not been playing a fair game by Southern Rhodesia. I have respect for Mr. Wilson. My affinities are with the school of thought which Mr. Wilson represents. But I think that this country owes it to the Commonwealth to administer a serious warning to Britain not to let the Rhodesian white regime have its own way. Mr.

Albert is going there to negotiate with Mr. Smith. This is in contravention of the original stand taken up by Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson has departed from that original stand.

Having said this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would say that there is no doubt that our policy of non-alignment is a wise and sound policy. And by non-alignment I mean independence of judgment, independence of action in regard to matters of the international world.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Arjun Arora.

श्री राजनारायण : टर्न तो हमारा था ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :
इवर तादाद ज्यादा है । इनके बाद आप को मौका दूँगे ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इवर से दो इवर से एक ।

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, we have got so many speakers on this side. And at 5 o'clock the debate has to end.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा यह कहना है कि यह सदन देख ले कि जब हमारा टर्न आता है तो दूसरे को बुला लिया जाता है । मैं इसको इस्टेब्लिश कर देना चाहता हूँ ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :
मैं आप को यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि आप को जरूर मौका दूँगा इनके बाद ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : हम ही दो सताये हुये हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : असल में यह मेरा सवाल नहीं है, यह सवाल हमारी पार्टी का है । हमारा क्लेम था । आपने हमें न बुला करके कांग्रेस पार्टी से क्यों बुलाया ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :
देखिए...

श्री राजनारायण : शुरू से मुझ को यह कहा गया था कि पहले स्वतंत्र पार्टी फिर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, उसके बाद प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, जन संघ और तब हमारा टर्न आयेगा। हमारा टर्न आया तो आपने बुला लिया श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा को। चकि अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी जरा गरज कर बोले गये इसलिये चेयर ने उनको बुला लिया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :
इनके बाद हम आप को ही चॉंस देंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : वैसे अर्जुन अरोड़ा हमारे मित्र हैं वे कहें कि हम को बोलने का मौका दो तो हम उनको मौका देने के लिये तैयार हैं। लेकिन यह चेयर को ओर से जो इस तरह का डिस्क्रिमिनेशन होता है इसके विरोध में मैं प्रोटेस्ट करता हूँ। (Interruption)
मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि चेयर ने हमारे साथ इंसाफ नहीं किया है और जो हमारा राइट है उसको चेयर ने छीना है। इतना कह कर मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : बन्दवाद है आप को बैठने के लिए।

Mr. Vice-Chairman, while we have been talking of the Chinese aggression against India, Pakistani aggression against this country which we heroically met, and the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries, it appears the attention of the hon. Members of this House has not been drawn to an aggression against India which some people in West Germany and West Berlin are planning. I take this opportunity to draw your kind attention and the kind attention of the House to the aggression planned by some people in West Germany against India.

I have with me. Sir, a photostat copy of a bulletin issued from West Berlin by an agency which describes itself as B.P.A. The name is given in German. I do not know German. 1

will give you the English translation. The agency is "Federal Press Service". This Federal Press Service of West Berlin has produced a bulletin, called "Independent Bengal" which is being distributed in India and Pakistan by an agency describing itself as T.P. which perhaps means "Tarun Press", I do not know. But it describes itself as "T.P.". The bulletin is a very sinister one because it preaches the creation of an independent Bengal. With your permission. Sir, I quote from the bulletin. It says:

"The developments taking place in the Eastern states of India show that their people are also being ignored by the Delhi government." and it mentions further:

"In the town of Agartala crowds of demonstrators attacked the Central Intelligence office Headquarters, set fire to a police car and wrecked a telephone exchange."

Well, that is not so harmful. But it further says:

"Trot national leaders of East Pakistan and West Bengal realize that the emancipation of their peoples from misery, hunger and lawlessness can be achieved only by uniting together in their struggle to separate from Pakistan and India in order to establish a united and independent Bengal."

The Bulletin goes on:

"The separatists are counting upon the United States and other Western powers to give them necessary assistance. They are confident that the free world is interested in establishing an independent state in South East Asia, which could help to normalise conditions there and which would provide a shield against Chinese aggression."

The details of the "Independent Bengal" are also given in the bulletin which says:—

"... a united and independent Bengal, with its capital in Calcutta, should include East Pakistan, the India States—West Bengal, Assam,

Nagaland, neighbouring territories of Tripura and Manipur, Indian protectorates Sikkim and Bhutan."

This is the full picture.

The bulletin also contains a map of the so-called "Independent Bengal" of the dream of the West Germans. I have already on June 21 drawn the attention of the Prime Minister to this bulletin and I have sent her a photostat copy of the bulletin. I again repeat that the authors and producers are from West Berlin who describe themselves as B.P.A. and the Indian and Pakistani counterpart are T.P., "Tarun Press".

This is a most sinister thing to which I think, the attention of the Government must be drawn. The Government must do something about it. They should at least ensure that this bulletin is not distributed in India. They may distribute it in Pakistan. And we must also learn a political lesson. The West German State has bullied us into not recognising the German Democratic Republic. It is time that we learn to stand against the bullying tactics of the West Germans and recognise the G.D.R. which is a real friend of India.

Sir, Mrs. Yashoda Reddy gave a most eloquent speech. A young Congress Member she does not appear to distinguish between the aggressor and the aggrieved. I want to draw your kind attention to what appeared in the *Statesman* of June 21. The U.N. Secretary-General, U Thant, has clearly and categorically accused Israel of aggression. And he has said that this is not the first time that Israel has committed aggression. "U Thant," *Statesman* says, "charged that the Israeli version had no validity and accused Israel of having created provocations during the last 10 years by repeatedly violating the border at the Gaza strip." He has mentioned only 10 years. But the fact is that right from 1948, the year of creation of Israel, Israel has been an aggressor. When the United Nations in their wisdom created this American tool,

the State of Israel, in the Middle East, the Israelis were given only 50 per cent, of Palestine. But even before June 4, 1967, they were occupying 80 per cent, of Palestine. How did they enlarge their area from 50 per cent, to 80 per cent? That was by repeated aggression and now they have again committed aggression. Our Foreign Minister Mr. Chagla, is doing a real service to this country and doing a real and correct projection of the image of this country when he is insisting in the United Nations that the fruit of aggression will not be available to the Israelis and that they will have to go back to the June 4 line. But, Sir, that is not enough. A time must come when the Israelis have to go back to the 1948 line when the State was originally created by the United Nations, and I am sure this will happen in spite of Mr. A. D. Mani.

श्री राज नारायणः श्रीमान्, (Interruption)

हल्ला मत करिए ध्यान से सुनिए। अभी वहस सतही हुई है। सतही वहस से मेरा ताल्लुक नहीं है। सतही वहस से अलग होने के लिये मैं आपके जरिए एक सवाल अपने मित्र अर्जुन अरोड़ा से कर देना है।

उपतभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान): आप तकरीर कीजिए, वे सुन लेंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : तकरीर ही कर रहा हूँ। मान लीजिये कि इसराएल एग्रेसर है तो अर्जुन अरोड़ा क्या कर लेंगे। अर्जुन अरोड़ा ऐसे बोल रहे हैं जैसे (Interruption) रूस की तरफ से बोल रहे हैं। रूस अगर कहें कि इजराइल एग्रेसर है तो उसके कहने में दम है, कह रहा है तो इजराइल का बिगाड़ देगा। ये क्या बिगाड़ लेंगे, यह तो केवल बकवास है। मान लो...

श्री चन्द्र शेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : राजनारायण जी, आप भी बैठ जाइये क्यों बकवास कर रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि यह दिमाग क्या है। यह समझने के लिये जरा पीछे चला जाय। मैं अब शुरू

[श्री राजनारायण]

से चला रहा हूँ। श्री अनूप सिंह जी ने मुझे यह प्रेरणा दी कि इस डिबेट को शुरू से चलाया जाय। उन्होंने कहा कि स्वतंत्रता हासिल करने के पहले और स्वतंत्रता हासिल करने के बाद से एक पालिसी हमारी चली है, कांग्रेस की सरकार की...

DR. ANUP SINGH: By and large.

श्री राजनारायण : आप कोई एडजेक्टिव या विशेषण हमें दें उससे कोई मतलब नहीं है। उनका कहना सही है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, अपने मित्रों से कहना चाहता 936... कुछ लोग साइ की तरह भड़कते हैं...

شہی اے - ایم - طارق : ڈاکٹر لوہیا
کی کتاب پیش کر دیجئے -

†[श्री ए० एम० तारिक : डा० लोहिया की किताब पेश कर दोजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं बिल्कुल दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह मुल्क तभी बच सकता है जब डा० लोहिया की फारेन पालिसी मानेगा यह मुल्क तभी बच सकता है जब डा० लोहिया की फारेन पालिसी को एडाप्ट करके आगे चलेगा। आज की बात नहीं है, यह नक्शा है, श्रीमान् सारा सदन देखे।

श्री टी० पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं कहना चाहता कि डा० लोहिा जो है वे अपने हाउस में और समूचे देश में अपनी नीति का प्रसारण करते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्री राजनारायण सिंह स्वयं उनकी जो मौलिक नीतियां हैं उन्हें बताएं।

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे माननीय मित्र को समझना चाहिये इसी। हम समझते थे कि वे राजनीति के पुराने खिलाड़ी हैं।

†[] Hindi transliteration.

जब डा० लोहिया कांग्रेस में थे तो कांग्रेस पार्टी के विदेश विभाग के इनचार्ज थे, यह श्री पांडे को समझना चाहिये। जब सोशलिस्ट पार्टी थी तब डा० लोहिया सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की विदेश नीति के संचालक थे, आज भी डा० लोहिया देश की विदेश नीति के संचालक हैं। दो नीतियां शुरू से चली हैं। नक्शा अगस्त, 1949 में लन्दन में पत्रकार सम्मेलन में डा० लोहिया ने दिखाया और पालिसी बताई जो सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की थी—यह आज की नहीं है—कि आजाद तिब्बत या आजाद कैलाश मानसरोवर हमारा, आजाद तिब्बत और भारत के बीच की सीमा मैकमहोन रेखा है, अगर तिब्बत आजाद नहीं तो चीन और भारत के बीच की सीमारेखा मैकमहोन रेखा से भी लगभग 80 मील उत्तर मानसरोवर झील, कैलाश पर्वत, पूर्व वाहिनी ब्रह्मपुत्र नदी है। यह नक्शा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य देख लें और स्वर्ण सिंह जी के पास तो मैं भेज दूंगा।

श्रीमान्, देखा जाय, 1942 से यह चीज चल रही है। जब 1942 में लड़ाई छिड़ी जंगे-आजादी की तो पीपुल्स बार का नारा यकायक लगा। पीपुल्स बार का नारा क्यों लगा? क्या वह किसी विदेशी नीति की तह में न था? वह किसी पार्टी की विदेशी नीति की तह में था। मैं आज जानना चाहता हूँ कांग्रेस पार्टी के ट्रेजरी बेंच में कितने लोग हैं जो पीपुल्स बार के नारे को कबूल करते हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कोई नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : मगर हमारे कुछ मित्र पीपुल्स बार के नारे को कबूल करते थे कि यह लड़ाई हमारी है, यह जंगे आजादी है। उसके पश्चात् जब तक हिटलर और स्टालिन में गोलडन चेन आफ फ्रेंडशिप

थी तब तक अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ लड़ाई साम्राज्यवादी थी और जब तीन मित्र राष्ट्र बन गये, रूस, अमरीका और ब्रिटेन, तब भारत की जनता की लड़ाई, साम्राज्यवादी लड़ाई न रह कर पीपुल्स वार हो गई।

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON
(Kerala): So many countries also got independence.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं केवल इसको इसलिये कहे देता हूँ क्योंकि यह भी किसी विदेश नीति की तह में थी। मैं बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ और उसको नेता मानता हूँ लेनिन को। लेनिन ने एक पुस्तिका लिखी "नेशनलिज्म"। उसमें उसने कहा है कि जब दूसरे के हाथ में ताकत हो तो right of self-determination with power to secede रखो, तब आत्मनिर्भरता के हक की मांग बुलन्द करो और केन्द्र से अलगा की शर्त रखो और जब अपनी सरकार बन जाय तो फिर अलगाव की कोई जरूरत नहीं। उसी तह में हमारे देश में नागालैंड और सिखिस्वान की मांग की गई। उस दिमाग को पकड़ो, वह मानूली दिमाग नहीं है। भारत वर्ष के दो टुकड़े हों, हिन्दु और मुसलमान एक साथ नहीं रह सकते, यह भी किसी राजनीतिक जन ने कहा था। यह केवल यकायक नहीं हुआ, इसकी तह में नीति है। आज मुझे बड़ी खुशी हुई कि डा० जेड ए० अहमद ने हमारे मित्र नीरेन घोष के बारे में कुछ कह दिया, चीन के बारे में

श्री विभलहम, राजाला जॉर्ज चोरड़िया
(मध्य प्रदेश): नीरेन घोष कोई चीन थोड़े ही हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आप लोगों
4 P.M. से कहना चाहता हूँ 28 अक्टूबर
1962 के बाद 28 अक्टूबर 1962
तक एक राय थी रूस और चीन और
मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी विदेशी
नीति की तह में यह नारा लगता है कि

चीन तो हमारा भाई है और भारत वर्ष
हमारा मित्र है, ये दो शब्द हैं, भाई और
मित्र। इसको अच्छी तरह से, वाइसचेयरमैन
साहब, आपके जरिये मैं सदन के सम्मानित
सदस्यों को समझा देना चाहता हूँ। मुझे याद
आ गया, अभी मेरे मित्र श्री ए० डी० मणि
ने बताया कि मोसले की एक किताब लिखी
हुई है "लास्ट डेज आफ ब्रिटिश राज"
जिस में मोसले ने कहा है कि भारत के प्रधान
मंत्री ने मुझ से यह बात कबूल की कि हम लोग
लड़ते लड़ते थक गये थे, जेल जाना नहीं
चाहते थे इसलिये मुल्क के बंटवारे की तजवीज
को हमने कबूल कर लिया। फिर मैं जानना
चाहता हूँ कि अपने दोस्तों से कि जब क्रिप्स
यहां पर आया हुआ था, सन् 1942 में तो
क्या क्रिप्स के प्रस्ताव को पंडित जवाहरलाल
नेहरू, मौलाना अब्दुल कलाम आजाद और
सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल कबूल नहीं कर
चुके थे ?

SHRI A. D. MANI: How is this
relevant?

श्री राजनारायण : It is relevant
फारेन पालिसी उससे होती है। वह कबूल
कर चुके थे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): We all know
that.

श्री राजनारायण : अगर जानते हैं तो
फिर उसको बदलें। वह कबूल कर चुके
थे। श्रीमन्, जब गांधी जी के पास प्रोपोजल
गया तो गांधी जी ने कहा It is a post
-dated cheque. हम को वह चेक दो जिसको
हम अभी भुनायें और अपने मुल्क की गरीबी
को दूर करें। मैं सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी
से पूछना चाहता हूँ, 1947 की 15 अगस्त,
को भारत आजाद हुआ मगर क्या जापान
और जर्मनी से हजाना भारत ने नहीं
लिया ? क्यों लिया, किस विदेश नीति की

[श्री राजनारायण]

तह में लिया ? उस विदेशी नीति की तह में लिया कि भारत की विदेशी नीति उस समय इंग्लैंड के खूटे से बंधी थी, अगर कोई स्वतंत्र भारत होता और भारत की विदेशी नीति स्वतंत्र होती तो हाँगी हाँगी जापान से जो हारा हुआ था, नहीं लेता। विजित और विजेता दो हैं, हमारी क्या पालिसी है, हम विजित के साथ हैं या विजेता के साथ हैं। स्वतंत्र भारत चार साल तक विजेता के साथ रहा और विजेता के साथ रह कर इसने जापान से हरजाना लिया। यह स्वतंत्र भारत की नीति थी ? वही नीति अब भी चल रही है। श्रीमन्, मैं बिल्कुल ठीक तरीके से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर उस समय नेहरू जी कहीं स्वतंत्र भारत की नीति को चलाते और भारत की विदेशी नीति को इंगलिस्तान के खूटे से न बांधा होता तो पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू लेनिन की जगह ले सकते थे। मगर एक छोटा सा छिद्र भयंकर गड्ढे में गिरा देता है इसलिये बह गिरे।

अब हम यह निवेदन करना चाहते हैं कि हुआ क्या ! आज जो अपने को फासिस्टवादी कहते हैं, हमने डाक्टर सप्रू को सुना ...

DR. ANUP SINGH: May I ask a question?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He has not much time.

श्री राजनारायण : लैक्चर देना कोई धर्म नहीं है, कोई मजहब नहीं है, समझने और समझाने दीजिये।

DR. ANUP SINGH: The hon. Member has agreed that my intervention is pertinent. It is a very pertinent question. I would like to ask the Minister of External Affairs whether it is true that we have accepted and received indemnity from Japan and Germany. I am not quite sure about it. If somebody else is sure

about that I would like that to be stated. I am rather doubtful. I am not sure about it. So far as I remember, no indemnity from either country was taken.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Just hear me. I will read from a chapter:

"What these old influences have been is perfectly clear from the face of India's foreign policy from 1948 to 1957, or rather, from 1947. You might remember that although free India had nothing to do with the war against Germany and Japan, the State of legal war between India on the one hand and Germany and Japan on the other lasted until 1950 or 1951. For four years free India was at war with Germany and Japan. Why? Again because of the intellectual enslavement to Great Britain. Because Great Britain was at war with Germany and Japan, in a legal way, not actually, therefore India also continued to be at war. India took reparations."

अब मैं वहाँ से फिर चल रहा हूँ। कि विदेशी नीति के लगाव में यह बला है। जो मैं ने अपना संशोधन पेश किया है उसको पढ़ लें तो उसकी तह में लोग मेरे भाषण को ठीक तरह से समझेंगे। मेरा संशोधन है कि प्रस्ताव के अन्त में निम्नलिखित जोड़ दिया जाय अर्थात्, "भारत सरकार की विदेश नीति आरम्भ से ही अयथार्थवादी, निष्क्रिय, राष्ट्रहित विरोधी तथा रूसी और अमरीकी कैम्पों की बारी बारी से सेवा करने वाली रही है। अब तक अपनाई गई नीति को जोड़कर सक्रिय सृजनात्मक तटस्थता की नीति स्वीकार कर तृतीय शक्ति को संगठित करना और गरीबी तथा हथियारों को खत्म कर मानव के द्वारा मानव का और राष्ट्र के द्वारा राष्ट्र का शोषण समाप्त करने और विश्व सरकार बनाने की ओर भारत की नीति अप्रसर होनी चाहिये।"

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : अब मेहरवानी कर के खत्म कीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : अब हमारा खयाल कीजिये । हमको 20 मिनट दीजिये । सुनिये अब मैं आ रहा हूँ 1949 पर ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : अब मैं आपके कहने के मुताबिक पांच मिनट और देता हूँ । 15 मिनट हो गये हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : उस में डा० अनूप सिंह का भी है । ज्यादाती मत कीजिये । मुझको एक नई चीज कहनी है ।

मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1951 में फिर से सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की ओर से कहा गया कि पीकिंग और तायवान दोनों को मान्यता दिलाने की कोशिश करो । अब यह चीन को, पीकिंग को, मान्यता दिलाने वाली बात कैसे आई, जरा सदन के मासिक सदस्य समझ लें । कोरिया की लड़ाई हुई । सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह समझ लें । भारत ने उत्तर कोरिया को एग््रेसर माना, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने उत्तर कोरिया को एग््रेसर माना । अब जब उत्तर कोरिया को एग््रेसर मान लिया तो रूस हुआ नाराज, जब रूस नाराज हुआ तो रूस को खुश करने के लिए कुछ चाहिये, तब भारत की सरकार ने कहा कि अच्छा भाई हम पीकिंग को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले चलने के लिये अगुवाई करेंगे । एक मूर्तबा उत्तर कोरिया को एग््रेसर मान कर के एक बार अमेरिकी नीति ली गई और जब रूस को नाराज देखा तो रूस को खुश करने के लिये चीन को मान्यता दिलाने के लिये भारत की सरकार ने आवाज उठा दी ।

फिर अगे देखा जाय । दोनों जर्मनी विभाजित हैं—पश्चिमी और पूर्वी—दुनिया जानती है, नदों के सम सदस्य जानते हैं, जि जर्मनी के दो हिस्से हो गये । पश्चिमी

जर्मनी को भारत की सरकार ने इसी विदेशी नीति की तह में मान्यता दे रखी है, उसके साथ दौत्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित है और पूर्वी जर्मनी को भारत की सरकार ने किसी और विदेशी नीति की तह में मान्यता नहीं दी । यह नीति कही जायगी बिना लगाव की ? यह नीति गुलाम नीति है, इस मुल्क को तबाह और बर्बाद करने वाली नीति है । मंत्री जी जरा जवाब दें । क्योंकि पश्चिमी जर्मनी ने यह कह दिया कि अगर पूर्वी जर्मनी को केवल दो को छोड़ कर कोई राष्ट्र मान्यता देगा, रूस और चीन को छोड़ कर, तो उससे हमारा सम्बन्ध विच्छेद हो जायगा । पश्चिमी जर्मनी की पुस्त पर ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका है इसलिये उस वक्त हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी भारत की सरकार को कि ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका को नाराज करे और पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता दे । आज भी हमारी मांग है कि यह सरकार बिना लगाव की नीति पर चलना चाहती है तो पूर्वी जर्मनी को अभी, अविलम्ब, मान्यता देने की घोषणा विदेश मंत्री करें ।

उसी तरह से मुझे कहना है कि इसराइल के बारे में । इसराइल का मामला बहुत आखिर में आयेगा । यह सरकार अपने को दिखाना चाहती है : हम अतिशयवादी हम व्यवहार कुशल हैं । यह व्यवहार कुशल कोन होगा ? व्यवहार कुशल वह होगा जिस के पास खुद ताकत हो; और जो दूसरों की ताकत पर थिरकना और नाचना चाहेगा, अगर वह खुद की ताकत नहीं होगी तो हम देख रहे हैं उसी का नतीजा खमियाजा भारत भोग रहा है । इसलिये आज मैं डंके की चोट पर कहना चाहता हूँ : भारत सरकार उस नीति को बदले और कहे जहाँ हम चीन की मान्यता की बात करते हैं वहाँ फारमोसा की मान्यता की बात भी करें । दोनों साथ साथ रहें ।

उसी के साथ साथ एक तिरस्कार की नीति अब तक भारत सरकार ने चालू रखी है।

[श्री राजनारायण]

वह तिरस्कार की नीति छोटे राष्ट्रों के साथ है। यह सरकार रूस और अमेरिका के पीछे लगे रहना चाहती है। इस सरकार ने मलेशिया को नहीं देखा, फिलीपीन्स को नहीं देखा, थाइलैण्ड को नहीं देखा, ये छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र डूबे हुए हैं भारत सरकार की विदेश नीति को लेकर। नेपाल राष्ट्र को, नेपाल के सम्मान को एक मखौल सा बना दिया है भारत सरकार ने। उस पर ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ, केवल इशारे में कह देना चाहता हूँ।

श्रीमन्, सर चार्ल्स वेल्स ने जो तिब्बत के मामले में काफी जानकारी थे, एक आर्टिकल लिखा है और उस ने भारत को मुझाव दिया था कि अगर कहीं भारत की सरकार तिब्बत के सवाल पर वेल्स को बिगाड़ेगी तो उस ने चेतावनी दी थी कि भारत समझ ले कि फिर नेपाल, भूटान और सिक्किम भारत की ओर से मुंह मोड़ेंगे और चीन की तरफ देखेंगे। यह सर चार्ल्स ने 1924 में एक आर्टिकल लिख दिया था। उस आर्टिकल को 1954 में हमने श्री नेहरू जी के पास छांट कर भेजा कि जरा देखो, गलती मत करना, हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई कह कर देश को बर्बाद मत करना। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ : श्री स्वर्ण सिंह के पास क्या जानकारी है कि श्री राणा जिह ने तिब्बत पर चीन का हमला कबूल किया, चीन का कब्जा स्वीकार किया। न तो आज भारत की सरकार को अपने भूत का पता है और न आज भारत की सरकार को मौजूदा जमाने का ज्ञान है। भविष्य में क्या करना चाहिये उस चीज के बारे में भारत सरकार नहीं जानती तो मैं श्रीमन् एक ही श्लोक सुनाना चाहता हूँ जो कि महाकवि कालिदास रचित कुमार संभव में हिमालय के बारे में है :

अस्त्युत्तरस्यां दिशिदेवतात्मा
हिमालयो नाम नगाधिराजः

पूर्वा पर्यो तोयनिधि वगाह्यः

स्थितः पृथिव्या इव मानदण्डः

महाकवि कालिदास ने हिमालय के बारे में वर्णन करते हुये इस बात की चर्चा की कि वह भारत का है और भारत सरकार ने उसको दे दिया चीन को। मत्स्य पुराण का एक श्लोक हमें याद है जिसमें हिमालय की चर्चा इस प्रकार है :

अहीन शरणम् नित्यं अहीन जनसेवितम्।

अहीन पश्यन्ति गिरि अहीन रत्न सम्पदा ॥

हे हिमालय! तुम्हारे ऊपर वही रह सकता है जो ताकतवर हो, कुम्बत वाला हो, तुम्हारी ओर वही देख सकता है जो ताकत वाला हो, कुम्बत वाला हो, उसको देखते हुए भी इस सरकार ने तिब्बत पर चीन का कब्जा कबूल किया। तो मैं आज कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर भारत की सरकार ईमानदारी के साथ बिना लगाव की नीति रखती है तो यहां डंके की चोट ऐलान करे। जब तक तिब्बत आजाद नहीं होगा तब तक चीन से हमारा विरोध, हमारा युद्ध, निरंतर जारी है। वरना भारत सरकार कायर है, दुर्बल है, राष्ट्रहितघाती है। फिर आप धमकी क्यों देते हैं, चिल्लाते क्यों हैं? यह गलतफहमी है सरासर। भारत सरकार ने चीन को समझा नहीं। भारत की सरकार ने चीन को समझा कि शायद वह बड़ी क्रांतिकारी ताकत है, प्रसारवादी चीन को यह नहीं समझा कि यह तो जंगली भेड़िया है। जो खुद क्रांतिकारी नहीं होता वह किसी दूसरे क्रांतिकारी को छूना चाहता है। भारत सरकार ने चीन को समझा कि यह क्रांतिकारी है, तो क्रांतिकारिता के दर्शन के मुताबिक चीन को उसने पकड़ना चाहा, छूना चाहा। पर रूस और चीन की उधर सांठगांठ थी। जब तक चीन रूस की सीमा में नहीं बढ़ेगा तब तक उनमें बिलगाव नहीं होगा।

अब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ आज पालिसी क्या है, बराबर चर्चा होती है बेमतलब की। अणुवध खत्म करो। दूसरी बात कहते हैं : दो राष्ट्र बड़े तनाव में हैं उनका तनाव खत्म करो। आज समस्या क्या है ? अगर कोई विदेश नीति अपनानी है तो तीन समस्याओं को सामने रखो। पहले, सभी मानव, सारे इन्सानों का पेट भरे दूसरे, दिमाग की आजादी रहे, तीसरे, युद्ध बंद हो। युद्ध बंद और गरीबी की टूट दोनों साथ साथ, क्योंकि हथियार और गरीबी, ये दोनों एक दूसरे से ताल्लुक रखते हैं। जब तक गरीबी रहेगी, तब तक उस गरीब को दवाने के लिये ताकतवर अपने पास हथियार रखेगा इसलिये अगर हथियार को खत्म करना चाहते हो तो गरीबों की गरीबी को पहले खत्म करो, तब जाकर आपको कामयाबी होगी। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ : क्या भारत सरकार की वैदेशिक नीति इस नुकते नजरिये से आगे बढ़ रही है ? हर्गिज नहीं बढ़ रही है।

(Time bell rings)

श्रीमन्, हमारे तमाम फौजी कमान्डरों ने कह दिया है कि जब चीन का हमला हुआ था उर्वशियम में, जिसको आप नेफा समझें, तो हमारे हथियार अच्छे थे, हमारे फौजी जवान अच्छे थे, मगर हमारे पास संकल्प की कमी थी इसलिये हमारे लोगों को पीछे हटना पड़ा, राष्ट्र को पददलित होना पड़ा, असम्मानित होना पड़ा, अपमानित होना पड़ा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि किस विदेश नीति के तहत में भारत सरकार ने लाहौर को नहीं लिया ?

श्री ए० डी० भणि : हथियार अच्छे नहीं थे।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं गलत है। हमारे हथियार अच्छे थे, हमारे जवानों का हौसला ऊँचा था मगर भारत सरकार में संकल्प की कमी थी इसलिये भारत सरकार ने लाहौर को लेने की स्थिति में होते हुए भी लाहौर नहीं लिया। वह बिना लगाव की नीति पर चली गई।

[Time bell rings]

अब मैं अखबार पर आ रहा हूँ। हमारा यह कहना है : सरकार ने दक्षिण कोरिया को मान्यता क्यों नहीं दी? मैं एक जानकारी करना चाहता हूँ कि भारत की सरकार ने कहा कि अब दक्षिण कोरिया में भी हमारा एक काउन्सेल रहेगा और यहां पर एलान भी हो गया—कोई चिबर साहब है मैं उनके बारे में तय हो गया कि वे दक्षिण कोरिया में जायेंगे—मगर चूंकि रूस ने देखा कि अरे इतना इनको घमंड हो गया कि दक्षिण कोरिया में दूत भेज रहे हैं तो उनको हुड़क हुई। तो एलान होने के बावजूद आज तक चिबर साहब दक्षिण कोरिया नहीं गये, जब कि फैक्ट यह है कि दक्षिण कोरिया से भारत का ट्रेड उत्तर कोरिया की अपेक्षा ज्यादा है। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो अपने इसराइल के यहूदी हैं, ये क्या रुई हैं, मोम हैं कि “चाहे उड़ाये फूँक पहाड़ा” ? इनको समझ लेना चाहिये कि उन यहूदियों ने हिटलर को देखा है, उन यहूदियों ने आइकमैन को देखा है, आइकमैन और हिटलर को देखकर 50 लाख, 60 लाख यहूदी खत्म हो चुके हैं। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ आप बरें के छत्ते में हाव मत लगाइये। एक एक यहूदी अपनी जान को जोखिम में डालकर अपनी आजादी की रक्षा करेगा (International) उनका फैसला मजबूत है। इसलिये बेमतलब की टांयटांय, न कहीं ताकत है, न कहीं कुछ है...

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : यह कौन सी जवान है।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब (Time bell rings) हमको पांच मिनट दे दीजिए। पांच मिनट में श्रीमन्, कुछ नहीं बिगड़ेगा। हम खुद बैठ जायेंगे पांच मिनट में, घड़ी देखकर।

[श्री राजनारायण]

देखिये, अब ताकतवर मुल्क और कमजोर मुल्क, इन दोनों का दो तरीका होगा। ताकतवर मुल्क होगा तो वह किसी समस्या का तात्कालिक हल ढूँढ़ता है, कमजोर मुल्क आदर्शवादिता को ढूँढ़ता है जैसे गांधी जी ने—अब मैं कह नहीं सकता, अगर गांधीजी के पास पूरी ताकत रही होती तो वह अहिंसा का संदेश मजबूती से दे पाते या न दे पाते—मगर गांधी जी ने वह दिया। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ श्री स्वर्ण सिंह जी से, आप स्वर्ण भी हैं सिंह भी हैं, लेकिन हैं बड़े कमजोर, कि केवल सामयिक हल मत ढूँढ़ो, स्थायी हल ढूँढ़ो और स्थायी हल ढूँढ़ोगे तो आदर्शवादी नीति अपनाओगे। थर्ड कोर्स क्रिएट करो। थर्ड कोर्स को लाने के लिये भारत सरकार क्या कर रही है? तब हम समझते भारत सरकार विला लगाव की नीति में रह सकती है। अगर इसराइल, जर्मनी, पश्चिमी और पूर्वी, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान, जिनको कि द्वितीय विश्व युद्ध ने तोड़ डाला है, उनको जोड़ने की कार्यवाही क्यों नहीं भारत की सरकार करती है और जब तक जोड़ने की कार्यवाही नहीं करती है . . .

कॉर्नल बी० एच० जैदी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : हमारे भाई ने परसों कहा था कि जब हिन्दुस्तान नहीं है, मैं भारत कहूँगा।

श्री राजनारायण : येस। मैं गलती मानता हूँ। यू आर करेक्ट। आप सही हैं। मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ श्रीमान्। जब चीन का हमला हुआ था भारत पर, तो राष्ट्रपति कैनेडी ने अपना दूत सिडने हिल्स भेजा, उसकी भारत के प्रधान मंत्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू से भेंट हुई। उसने कैनेडी का संदेश देते हुए कहा कि यही मौका है जब भारत और पाकिस्तान के रिश्ते सुधर सकते हैं। उस समय भारत सरकार ने समुचित कदम नहीं उठाये। उसके बाद एक महीने या डेढ़ महीने पहले जब सिडनी हिल्स यहां आये तो उन्होंने डा० लोहिया भी से मुलाकात की। उसने डा०

लोहिया को यह बात बतलाई कि हमने जवाहरलाल जी से यह बात कही थी कि इस समय काश्मीर का सौदा पाकिस्तान के साथ कर लेना चाहिये। तब डा० लोहिया ने कहा था कि काश्मीर का सवाल जुदा करके नहीं सुलझाया जा सकता है, काश्मीर का सवाल सम्पूर्ण भारत के साथ ही होगा। इसलिए भारत और पाकिस्तान का एक कंफ्रेंडेशन बने। इसराइल और अरब का एक कंफ्रेंडेशन बने, दो जर्मनी का कंफ्रेंडेशन बने, दो कोरिया का कंफ्रेंडेशन बने, दोनों विएटनाम का कंफ्रेंडेशन बने। इस तरह से भारत सरकार एक तीसरे फोर्स बनाने में अगुवा बने। अगर सरकार इस तरह की कार्यवाही करती है तब ही उसकी बिन लगाव की नीति चल सकती है। यह कह देना कि इसराइल ने एग्रेसन किया है, उचित मालूम नहीं देता है। मैं दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ और क्या हम यह बात नहीं देख रहे हैं। (Interruptions) मैं दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि व.ग. यह बात गलत नहीं है कि श्री नासिर साहब ने चार बल्लबंद गाड़ियां गाजा में भेज दी थीं बिना यह ख्याल किये कि गाजा की परिस्थिति ऐसी है कि उसकी जमीन पर पानी नहीं है और रेगिस्तान में लोग क्या करेंगे? उसी तरीके से पाकिस्तान ने छम्ब और जोरिया क्षेत्र में पैटन टैंक भेज दिये मगर उनको बे चलाना ही नहीं जानते थे। हमारे एक वीर सैनिक श्री अब्दुल हमीद ने जितको परम वीर चक्र प्रदान हुआ पहले पैटन टैंक को अपने ही मामूली हथियारों से तोड़ कर रख दिया। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप बेमतलब को और गलत ढंग से कभी रूस और कभी अमेरिका की अगुवाई न करें। आपको अपनी नीति पर चलना चाहिये और बेमतलब से यह अग्रेसर है, वह अग्रेसर है, इस तरह से नहीं चिल्लाना चाहिये।

यह बात ठीक है कि इसराइल को चार जून की स्थिति पर लौट जाना चाहिये और हम इस नीति को ठीक नीति कहते हैं क्योंकि

हमने इससे पहले भी कह दिया था कि भारत ने जो चार जून वाली बात रखी है, वह उचित है। लेकिन मैं यह देखता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की कोई नीति ही नहीं है। इसलिए आपसे अनुनय, विनम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मौजूदा सरकार को अपनी विदेश नीति को बदलना चाहिये। हमारी इस तरह की नीति नहीं होनी चाहिये कि चीन हमारी छाती पर चढ़ आवे और हमारा आधा हिस्सा ले ले या एक तिहाई हिस्सा ले ले और हम शीर्षासन करें। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार की जो विदेश नीति है वह बेमतलब और गलत नीति है। इस नीति के रहते हुए वह इस देश की सुरक्षा नहीं कर सकती है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Dr. Gopal Singh. You have only six minutes please.

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): In that case I do not speak, Sir. My hon. friend there has taken half an hour and I can have only six minutes? I will not be able to finish in that time.

SHRI A. D. MANI: May I make a submission? This debate is to last till 5 o'clock. I would request you to consider that in view of the fact that a number of Members have put down their names for speaking on this motion, we may go on up to 6 o'clock and take up the motion on the Emergency the next day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That will be considered. Now let us go on. Dr. Gopal Singh.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the policy of the Government of India with regard to the Arab-Israel conflict. This has been a correct policy not only because the Arabs have been our friends but also because ... (Interruptions) Sir, I would like to be heard with some patience.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Yes, you go on.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Sir, I rise to support the policy of the Government of India with regard to the Arab-Israel conflict. We have supported the Arab cause not merely because they are our friends but also because we have all along stood by the forces of peace in the world. The Arab and the Arab world have been the victims of aggression by Israel. This has been admitted not only by the

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Order please.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: This has been admitted not only by the friendly nations of the Arab world, but also by the United Nations. U Thant also has criticised Israel for its aggression. Some people have said that we stand by the Arab world because we trade with them, that our trade with them has increased and it is now about Rs. 100 crores, that we need their oil, that because they are 13 members in the U.N., so, we want to be on their right side and so on. That is not so. To my mind, we stand for the Arab world because it is by and large, a progressive world, because it is a secular world, because, like us, they believe in fighting against reaction, it is a world which stands for progress, which does not stand for a Pan-Islamic bloc which our friends in Pakistan want. Therefore, in order not to be isolated from the progressive current of Afro-Asia, we stand by the Arab world. We want the forces of progress, the forces of anti-reaction, the forces of anti-imperialism, the forces of peace to progress and advance in the world.

When I say this, I may also say that it must be admitted that we should take a reasonable, sensible and impartial attitude with regard to the Arab-Israel conflict. We have not done so. This is my feeling. This is

[Dr. Gopal Singh] my conviction.. Just as Dr. Sapru pointed out, Israel has come to stay. Whether it is a creation of imperialist aggression or imperialist intrigue, is beside the point. There are so many countries in the world, including some Arab countries, which are the results of imperialist aggression or intrigue, for instance Saudi Arabia, Jordan and so many others. There are so many of them in South East Asia also which are result of aggression or intrigue. Our own MacMahon Line is the result of imperialist intrigue or aggression, or whatever else it may be called. Pakistan also is a result of such intrigue, so also Ulster. So we have to deal with the world as it is. We have to deal with the situations as they are, and not as they should be. Israel has come to stay. Israel is a member of the United Nations and it has to be recognised by us as well as by the Arab world. Then, there is this Gulf of Aqaba which they say belongs to the Arab countries. They say that the Arab countries have ownership of it. Why do they do that? That is because according to international rules and regulations the waters within a certain number of miles are called territorial waters and so they can be claimed by the nations which are bordering them. Therefore, four Arab countries claim the Gulf of Aqaba and this need not be disputed. But what is disputed is that they should not allow innocent passage through the gulf in times of peace. Today this has happened to Israel. Tomorrow it may happen to some other country. It may also happen in the case of the Suez Canal. Today President Nasser is our great friend. Tomorrow it may be that somebody else is in his place. Therefore we should guard against such things.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: What does "innocent passage" mean?

DR. GOPAL SINGH: I am coming to that. In times of peace innocent cargo ships should be allowed to proceed. They should not be blocked.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: And when there is war?

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Then it is different. If it is military equipment it is a different thing. But during peace innocent passage should be permitted and normal trade should not be blocked, whether it be in respect of Israel or anybody else. If therefore, as genuine friends of the Arab world, we want to bring these two people together it is also incumbent upon us that we should take such initiatives in the United Nations and also outside the United Nations which can help to bring about a rapprochement rather than take an extremist stand or a partisan stand in favour of one side or the other. The only thing that suggests itself to me is that we should impress upon our Arab friends that they should also try to enter into a no-war pact as we have offered to Pakistan, that they should also recognise the existence of Israel as we have recognised the existence of Pakistan. So many countries in the world have accepted the facts of history and facts of geography. For instance, West Germany, which until yesterday was inimical to East Germany, is today prepared to sit and talk to East Germany; similar is the case of Ulster: so also Germany and France; so Japan and China. The world is changing and therefore one cannot take a stubborn attitude in respect of any country.

In respect of Pakistan also we must take a realistic attitude. Pakistan has come to stay. Therefore, if any party, whether it is Jana Sangh or any other, thinks it can wipe Pakistan off the map of the world, we should realise that it is impossible; in the present day world you cannot wipe out any country, big or small. Therefore, what we have got to do is to get into conversation, get into dialogue of some kind with that country. All the time we go on saying that we are prepared to talk with Pakistan on any matter that they

may wish to talk to us about but somehow or other something happens and the talks do not proceed.

There is the problem of Kashmir. It is a very delicate matter and potentially also a very dangerous matter. We have to solve it somehow. All the time we go to the world forums, saying that we are prepared to solve the Kashmir question but somehow it eludes our grasp. I had been to the Communist countries also and they too suggest to us that we must come to terms with Pakistan on the question of Kashmir. That is the attitude of Anglo-Americans also and that is the attitude, I am afraid, of the Arab world too. And this is also the attitude of many people, sensible people, in the country. This volume of opinion is growing. You do not want to talk to Pakistan on the question of Kashmir because Pakistan has no *locus standi*; I accept that thesis but the Kashmir people have a *locus standi*. If therefore there are any people within Kashmir who are wanting to solve it—it may be Sheikh Abdullah, it may be Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, it may be Sadiq Sahib—they should be brought together at a conference table. (Interruptions) Please listen. I therefore, submit to you that these three leaders along with other leaders of the Kashmiri people should be brought together and they should be asked to thrash out a solution. Then we can say to the world, we have settled the Kashmir problem with the Kashmiri people. It is true that Pakistan has no *locus standi*; nobody else has any *locus standi* but at least in internal matters we can come to a settlement. (Time bell rings) One more minute. There is one more point in regard to China.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: He talks sense; he should be given more time.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Mr. Arjun Arora has brought forward a pertinent point in regard to West Bengal but my only regret is that what he has

said is completely off the mark. He said that West Germany was trying to bring about an independent State there. My own view is that it is China that is going to do it. It is the Left Communists who are trying to create a situation . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : Slander.

(Interruptions)

DR. GOPAL SINGH: You sit down. You have no business to talk. You are a party to it.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Order, order.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: That is the situation they are creating. My own impression is that the Chinese are not going to directly take us over physically. They will take us over only through the Left Communists, through West Bengal, then East Bengal, then by declaring their independence and later getting them together with NEFA, Sikkim, Bhutan and Nepal. Tibet, of course, they have taken over but it is a great shame that we do not take a very bold—and I should say a sensible—stand on Tibet knowing full well that all our agreements with regard to our eastern and Western borders are not with China; they are with Tibet. If Tibet had not been sovereign, then Tibet was not entitled to enter into those agreements with us. If those agreements are of any validity, then we must also exercise our commonsense and agree to the validity of Tibetan sovereignty. If we cannot do it, all our agreements with Tibet, which China, repudiates, will have no meaning.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Thank you. Now, Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for a number of years the international situation is taking a very ominous turn. A number of

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

Governments, people's Governments, democratic Governments at that, have gone out of existence through U.S. subversion, like Congo, Guatemala, Indonesia and others and there is stepping up of U.S. intervention in Laos, Cambodia and then naked aggression in Vietnam. Here it is pertinent to recall the statement of President de Gaulle of France which is an imperialist country. He too has been forced to say that Israel, the U.S. stooge, was encouraged to commit aggression against the Arab world because the world did not condemn, the United Nations did not condemn, American aggression in Vietnam and unless U.S. intervention in Vietnam is ended, there can be no peace. He said that unless this American intervention is ended there cannot be any peace and it is a strange commentary on this Government that they cannot say what even an imperialist spokesman can say. They have that much of independence at least. Can our Government not have that much of courage and independence? They know in their heart of hearts that it is the U.S.A. that is committing aggression; they admit it privately but they would not condemn it openly. So a situation is developing because of this process when the third world war may start. The aggressors, the U.S. imperialists, are being egged on and encouraged by the postures that are being adopted by different nations and our Government too at that.

Now I would like to say this with regard to West Asia. Imagine what would have happened if Suez Canal was situated in our country, if Gulf of Aqaba was in our country. Would we not have treated it as our own national waterway and established our rights there? Please judge this from that standpoint and in the light of a prolonged aggression by Israel. It is true that Israel has come to stay. It is there; nobody denies that but it has become the stooge of another

country and an aggressor country at that.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

And nobody can support an aggressor country because by doing that you bring the world nearer to the third world war. We would be committing a very serious crime and history will hold the Government of India responsible if it had adopted any other policy with regard to West Asia. But so far as Vietnam is concerned you will have to answer at the bar of history for the policy you are pursuing, of not openly condemning U.S. aggression there.

Now, I am a little surprised that suddenly the Government of India has come to give serious thought to the question of giving political recognition to the Dalai Lama and the question of the so-called human rights in Tibet is coming up. I have a suspicion that by taking up the position it had to take on West Asia it has incurred the displeasure of the Western Powers, primarily the U.S. Government, and in order to make up for that they are mouthing this anti-China slander on the question of Tibet and they have even been saying that they will violate their own 1954 Agreement.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): Are we anti-China or is China anti-India? We should like to know from you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Now coming to my friend, Mr. Rajnarain, it is strange that the S.S.P. on the question of foreign policy finds itself very close to the American position, only slightly differing from that. I need not comment more on that and it is for them to judge.

On the question of the non-proliferation treaty I would say that unless all the atomic stockpiles are destroyed and atomic weapons are prohibited, no nation can surrender its right to manufacture any weapon including atomic weapons for defence.

No nation can do that. Any non-proliferation treaty, without ensuring the complete destruction of the stockpile, which the super-powers and the US would have, would not be possible. Then, it is a surrender to the US blackmail and it will not bring peace. We cannot surrender our right to manufacture weapons unless their stockpiles are completely destroyed.

Then, the Government has said that the non-nuclear nations should have some sort of guarantee. Now, may I tell the Government that the US Government is talking of dropping atom bombs on Viet Nam? If some day they think of dropping an atom bomb on India, who is going to give you protection? Who says that such a situation can never arise?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Who gave you that information?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I do not yield. You have had your time and I have very little time.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He says that they are going to drop bombs on India.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: That being so, the atomic weapons and atomic blackmail and the non-proliferation treaty are not going to solve this issue in that manner. The only way is that all nations, irrespective of their creed or ideology, must strive for the complete elimination of atomic weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles.

SHRI M. N. KAUL ((Nominated): In the meantime?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: In the meantime, if you want, you manufacture your own weapons. You have that.

Then, another thing I want to say. Mr. Arjun Arora has told you one

thing. It is J.T. that—in private even the Government of India would admit it—there is Western conspiracy in the Eastern part, but here is another thing. A British writer, formerly in the British Intelligence Service, has written that the US is following a time-table with regard to Sikkim. First, they would persuade the King of Sikkim to achieve independence. That means, set up a US puppet State there first. Secondly, they would sign some sort of agreement for economic purposes. Thirdly, they would raise a scare saying that there may be subterfuge by China or by India or by any other country. Then, they would go in for military agreement. Lastly, by 1970-71, they propose to build their nuclear installations there, weapons directed at the Soviet Union and China. That is the conspiracy. I know and I do hope that the Government of India is aware of it. That is the sinister design that the US imperialists are having there. For that they bring pressure in order to get through these weapons. The so-called aid is the pressure they yield. To that pressure the Government is yielding. That is their calculation. The Government will yield to it.

As regards India-China relations I support the first alternative posed by Shri B. K. P. Sinha. China cannot be ignored, whether we like it or not. Today or in future we have got to settle this India-China problem. We cannot live with it for all time to come. May I ask the Government, is it not a fact that when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was alive, he thought of some solution and the question was very near a solution, if Pandit Nehru had his way but, he was overruled in the Cabinet? The course of events took another turn and that is true. If you have any moral sense, you cannot deny that. What happened there I do not know, but he was overruled in the Cabinet.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I had no intention to intervene, but because

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

he said that this is a fact, I would like to say categorically that the statement that he is making that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was overruled by the Cabinet is entirely incorrect.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He was a member of the Cabinet.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Being a member of the Cabinet does not mean that he always says the right thing. Mr. Arora has given charges against two Ministers, but they have been cleared by other Ministers. Please remember that. Therefore, I cannot accept his statement. I am repeating what I am saying.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Give him time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The only thing that I want to say' is that it is very unfair to Panditji that these things should be said about him. He is saying it without any information, without any knowledge. I was very intimately involved in all those talks and discussions and I can say categorically that Panditji had not suggested any solution. It is all a myth. I did not want to contradict several other myths which he has put forward, but because he has brought in Panditji's name I thought I should straightway contradict it.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I would say another thing also. In regard to Kashmir I am not prepared to accept his version. We have it on the authority of Pandit Sunder Lai that after the release of Sheikh Abdullah a formula was devised. It was discussed between Sheikh Abdullah and Pandit Nehru.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN (Gujarat): How do you know it?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: And it was approved. For a solution of the Kashmir question, Pandit Nehru asked Sheikh Abdullah to go to Pakistan and consult President Ayub Khan. He did it. He got his consent also but before he could return and solve it, unfortunately Pandit Nehru died. (Interruption) And then the whole question was shelved. This is another thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is an utter falsehood.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: As regards West Asia, I do think that when Israel committed aggression, when their troops were marching into the Arab world and when in a few hours the entire air power of Egypt was destroyed, I think it was the duty of the democratic powers at that time to rush military hardware, so that they could take a stand and beat back the offence. To have a simple ceasefire and for Israel to say that she is not going back to the previous position is an untenable position. I would also say that it is strange that when our personnel were killed by Israel I did not see any hysteria in many of these places, but for many other slight incidents I see hysteria. Is there any honesty in their feelings? I do not think so. Let them think it over.

Lastly, I would take this opportunity to request the Soviet Union to call for unconditional negotiations between India and China, as they did in the case of India and Pakistan. It is their primary duty as the greatest democratic and peace-loving power on earth. If they do not do so, I do think they are shirking their duty. It does not contribute to the peace of the world to keep alive tension between India and China. It is their elementary or primary duty and it is still a mystery to me why they are not calling for unconditional negotiations between India and China.

With these words, I would say that the Government of India have got to

have a look at their own policy. This policy should be consistently anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and not be a mere mouthing of phrases, a policy that would contribute to the unity of the progressive and democratic States and countries of the world, a policy directed against the scheme of the US imperialists to launch a third world war. But they are not doing it and they are deviating more and more from the interlude of the policy between 1954 and 1957, they are deviating *more and more from their accepted policy. This portends a very great evil for the future of our country. For the sake of our country, *they should have a reassessment of this policy and stop the deviations from the accepted policies. It is as if those three or four years have been forgotten. So, I would request the Government to give serious consideration to this matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tariq. Ten minutes.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Madam Deputy Chairman, my amendment reads as follows:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of United States committed an unfriendly act by resuming arms supplies to Pakistan which is likely to disturb the peace in the area."

میدم ڈپٹی چیرمین - جہاں تک سرکار کی پالیسی کا تعلق ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ پہلے بیس سالوں کے اندر ہماری فارن پالیسی ہمارے لئے بہتر رہی ہے اور ایک ہلدوستانی کی حیثیت سے اس ایوان کے ممبر کی حیثیت سے ہم نے ہمیشہ اس فارن پالیسی کی تائید کی ہے - میں دو باتوں کی طرف شروع میں اس ایوان کی توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں -

ایک جو میرے دوست ڈاکٹر گوپال سنگھ نے کشمیر کے بارے میں ذکر کیا اور دوسرے میرے چھوٹے بھائی نرین گھوش نے ذکر کیا اور شہنشاہ صاحب کے بارے میں کہا - جہاں تک اس بات کا تعلق ہے جو ڈاکٹر گوپال سنگھ نے کہی ہے کہ کشمیر کا مسئلہ اس وقت طے ہو سکتا ہے جب کشمیر کے اندر کے لوگ وہاں کے لہندہ صادق صاحب بخشی غلام محمد اور شہنشاہ صاحب مل کر بات کریں اور تب پاکستان کو ہم یہ یقین دلا سکتے ہیں کہ کشمیر ہمارا ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ غلط دلیل ہے - یہ کوئی دلیل نہیں ہے اور اس دلیل کی کوئی اہمیت نہیں ہے - یہ ہماری اندرونی بات ہے - ہندوستان میں مختلف جماعتیں ہیں - تو اگر کل کو ہمیں دنیا کو یقین دلانا ہے کہ ہندوستان کے سب لوگ ایک ہیں تو کہا ماسٹر تارا سنگھ سے الگ بات کرنی ہے - سلف فتح سنگھ سے الگ بات کرنی ہے اور ڈاکٹر بھائی سے الگ بات کرنی ہے تو یہ جو باتیں ہیں وہ ہماری اندرونی باتیں ہیں فارن پالیسی کی نہیں - جہاں تک اس بات کا تعلق ہے کہ پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو جی نے شہنشاہ صاحب سے کوئی فارمولہ طے کیا تھا میں اس بات کو چیلنج کرتا ہوں ایسی کوئی بات نہیں کی ہے - یہ حقیقت ہے کہ پلڈت جی یہ چاہتے تھے کہ

[شری اے - اہم - طارق]

شیخ صاحب صحیفہ بات سمجھیں صحیفہ حالات سمجھیں ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے اور تمام دنیا کے پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو اس بات سے واقف تھے کہ پاکستان کے اندرونی حالات اس طرح خراب ہیں اور اس قدر غیر سیاسی اور غیر جمہوری ہیں کہ اگر شیخ صاحب پاکستان جانچنے تو ہو سکتا ہے کہ وہ وہاں سے کچھ سیکھ آئیں گے شیخ صاحب کے وہاں جانے کا یہی مقصد تھا - شیخ صاحب کا وہاں جانے کا یہ مقصد نہیں تھا کہ پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو کی طرف سے کوئی فارمولہ لے کر وہ پاکستان جا رہے تھے - پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو میں اتنی جرات تھی - اتنا سیاسی اخلاق تھا اور وہ ایک عظیم لیڈر کی ہستی رکھتے تھے کہ اگر ان کے سامنے کوئی فارمولہ ہوتا تو وہ خود صدر ایوب سے بات کرتے - پاکستان کے لیڈروں سے بات کرتے ان کو اس کے لئے کسی تیسرے ہندوستانی کو استعمال کرنے کی ضرورت نہیں تھی - وہ صرف یہ چاہتے تھے کہ شیخ صاحب وہاں جا کر دیکھیں کہ پاکستان میں کیا ہو رہا ہے - اب اس کے بعد شیخ صاحب کی وجہ سے کیا کیا باتیں ہوئیں میں ان کا ذکر کرنا نہیں چاہتا لیکن یہ بات درست ہے کہ جب شیخ صاحب ہندوستان کے باہر گئے تو کچھ ایسے لوگوں سے ملے جن میں

خاص طور پر چو - این - لائی کا نام ہے جب کہ ہمارے چوئن کے ساتھ تعلقات بے حد خراب تھے جبکہ چوئن نے ہمارے ملک پر حملہ کیا ہوا تھا - اس نے شیخ صاحب کے بارے میں سارے ملک میں غلط فہمی پیدا کی - آج وہی لوگ جو شیخ صاحب کی رہائی کے لئے دعوہ دار ہیں وہی ان کی گرفتاری کے وقت اس کے لئے سب سے پیشتر تھے - تو ان دو باتوں کا میں ایک جواب سا دینا چاہتا ہوں - اصل میں بات ہے ہماری نہتی کی - ہماری نہتی کے بارے میں کچھ دوستوں نے یہ کہا ہے کہ ہم کو سچ نہیں کہنا چاہئے -

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : यह कौन दोस्त है ।

شری اے - اہم - طارق : یہ ہمارے

پی - ایس - پی کے دوست نے کہی - انہوں نے یہ درست بات نہیں کی - لیکن ان کا یہی مقصد ہے کہ خاموش رہنا چاہئے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ خاموش رہنا بہتر ہے - ہم اس دنیا میں رہتے ہیں جس دنیا میں اور بھی ملک اور قومیں ہیں -

श्री विमलकुमार भन्नालालजी चौराडिया : ताकत कौन सी आपके पास है ।

شری اے - اہم - طارق : طاقت ہو

نہ ہو - طاقت کے معنی یہ نہیں ہیں کہ کوئی انسان کافی مروتا ہو تھا کتا ہو اور تبھی آدمی سچ بول

سکتا ہے - سچائی کے لئے کسی طاقت کی ضرورت نہیں ہے - سچائی کے لئے کوئی تہر کوئی تلوار کی ضرورت نہیں ہے - سچائی کے لئے اخلاق کی ضرورت ہے - سچائی کے لئے محنت کی ضرورت ہے - ویلوز آف لائف جو ہوتی ہیں انسانی قدریں جو ہوتی ہیں ان کی ضرورت ہوتی ہے - وہ آدمی جس کی جھب مہیں پستول دھتا ہے وہ بہادر نہیں ہوتا - جو یہ کہتے ہیں کہ ہماری نیکی کہا ہے ہماری نیکی یہ ہے کہ ہم کسی فوجی طاقت کے ساتھ نہیں ہیں - ہم دنیا میں جنگ کرنا نہیں چاہتے ہیں لیکن یہ ہماری نیکی نہیں ہے کہ اگر کوئی شخص حملہ آور ہے تو ہم اس کو حملہ آور نہ کہیں - میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ اگر اس ملک کے لوگ ایک بہت بڑے فریب میں لائے جا رہے ہیں - مقدمہ تپتی چہر میں ہوتی صورت اگر اس بات کو آپ مان لیں کہ صاحب ہم حملہ آور کو حملہ آور نہ کہیں تو ہم پھر کس بات سے اعتراض کرتے ہیں امریکہ پر اور انگریزوں پر یہی جو ہم یہ کہتے ہیں کہ یونائیٹڈ نیشن میں اقوام متحدہ میں اسی بات کو جانتے ہوئے بھی کہ کشمیر پر پاکستان نے حملہ کیا ہے - امریکہ نے پاکستان کو حملہ آور نہیں کہا - آج ہم ہندوستان میں ایک پردہ کے پھچھے ایک سازش کے پھچھے امریکن پالیسی کا پروپیگنڈا کرتے ہیں - ہم ہندوستان کے لوگوں کو

امریکہ کی اس لائن پر لے جانا چاہتے ہیں جس سے کہ کل یہ بات صاف ہو جائے کہ پاکستان نے کشمیر پر حملہ نہیں کیا - پاکستان حملہ آور تھا - پاکستان حملہ آور ہے یہ ہماری رپورٹ نہیں ہے یونائیٹڈ نیشن کا کہنا ہے لیکن امریکہ کیوں خاموش ہے - انگریز وہاں کیوں خاموش ہے لیکن ہم ہندوستان کے لوگ جن کا ایک اخلاقی ہیک گرلنڈ ہے یہ کہتے نہیں ہیں کہ اسرائیل اور عرب آپس میں لڑیں لیکن عربوں کا بھی کچھ کہنا ہے عرب بھی اس دنیا میں رہتے ہیں - عرب کے ساتھ ہماری دوستی آج کی نہیں ہے - عربوں کے ساتھ ہماری دوستی اس وقت کی ہے جبکہ عرب میں جنگ ہلاشہ لہذا تھا جب کانگریس بر سر اقتدار نہیں تھی تب بھی 1928 میں کانگریس کے ریزولیشن سے ہم نے عرب کے مسئلے کے بارے میں فلسطین کے مسئلہ کے بارے میں کہا تھا -

عرب کہتے ہیں کہ آپ بسائے یہودیوں کو دنیا میں امریکہ بہت بڑا ملک ہے بسائے یہودیوں کو لیکن انہیں عربوں کے سہلے پر نہیں بسایا جا سکتا - عربوں کے سہلوں پر یہودیوں کو نہیں بسایا جا سکتا - آپ عربوں کو مظلوم نہیں سمجھ سکتے ہیں - عرب ایک بہت بڑی طاقت ہے - یہ بات بالکل غلط ہے اگر ہم یہ دیکھیں کہ عربوں نے ہمارے ساتھ کہا تھا - عرب کے معنی شاہ فیصل نہیں ہے - عرب کے

[شری اے - ایم - طارق]

معنی بادشاہ ابن سعود نہیں ہے۔ -
عرب کے معنی وہ معمولی عرب ہے وہ
ایک غریب عرب ہے جو پچھلے کئی
سو سالوں سے امپریلزم کے خلاف لڑ رہا
ہے۔ عرب وہ ہے جو آج آزادی کے لئے
عدن کی گلیوں میں جان دیتا ہے جو
کہ انگریز کو زندہ یا مردہ عرب کی
سوزشوں سے نکالنا چاہتے ہیں۔ امریکہ
کی اجارہ داری کو ختم کرنا چاہتے
ہیں۔ عرب وہ عرب ہے۔ ہماری اس
عرب کے ساتھ دوستی ہے جس کے دل
میں امریکہ سے نفرت ہے۔ ہماری دوستی
ابن سعود سے نہیں ہے کنگ فیصل سے
نہیں ہے ہماری دوستی عرب مجاہدوں
سے ہے۔ ان مجاہدوں سے جن
کو چراہر لال نہرو نے ہی نہیں
بلکہ مہاتما گاندھی نے اپنی وفاداری
دوستی اور امداد کا یقین دلایا۔ وہ
انگریزوں کے خلاف کھڑے ہوئے۔ کہا وجہ
تھی کہ مہاتما گاندھی نے خلافت
مرومیت کا ساتھ دیا۔ خلافت کوئی
ہندو جاتی کی نہیں تھی۔ خلافت کا
ہندو سے کوئی تعلق نہیں لیکن
اس وقت کانگریس نے سمجھ لیا کہ یہ
انگریز ایک امپریلسٹ سازش کے تحت
عربوں سے حق چھیننا چاہتے ہیں۔
شریف آدمی یہ کہہ نہیں دیکھتا کہ
اس کا ساتھ کسی نے دیا ہے یا نہیں
دیا۔ میں ایک آدمی ہوں اور اگر میں
ایسی بات دیکھوں کہ صاحب - ایک
مظلوم آدمی ہے وہ جا رہا ہے اس
کو ایک مضبوط آدمی طمانچہ مار

رہا ہے لیکن اس آدمی نے کہہ ہی مجھ کو
تلک کیا ہے اور اس کی مجھ سے
دوستی نہیں ہے تو کہا میں اس کی
مدد نہیں کروں گا۔ آپ اس کی مدد
نہیں کریں گے۔ کہا آپ کی مدد کے لئے
ضروری ہے کہ اس نے مدد کی ہو۔ ہم
انگریز اور امریکہ کو جانتے ہیں۔ کہا
میں امریکہ کو بھول سکتا ہوں۔ میں
امریکہ کا دوست نہیں ہوں میں اس
بات کو منظور کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ میری
امریکہ سے کوئی ہمدردی نہیں ہے۔
میری انگریز سے کوئی ہمدردی نہیں
ہے۔ ایک کشمیری کی حیثیت سے
میں جانتا ہوں کہ کشمیر کے معاملہ
میں امریکہ اور انگریز کا کیا رویہ رہا
ہے۔ وہ سازش کرتے ہیں کہ کشمیر کو
اتھا کر پاکستان کے حوالے کر دو۔ اس نے
ہندوستان کے خلاف پاکستان کو اسلحہ
دیا ہے۔ سامان دیا ہے۔ کہوں نہیں
تاکہ بھائی پھل اس کے خلاف پروٹسٹ
کرتے ہیں۔ کاش کہ سردار پٹیل زندہ
ہوتے۔ وہ تلوار لے کر اس سازش کے
خلاف لڑتے اس کا مقابلہ کرتے لیکن
بدقسمتی یہ ہے کہ سردار پٹیل نہیں
ہیں۔ آج تانہا بھائی پٹیل ہیں۔
تانہا بھائی اس بات کو بھول گئے ہیں
کہ ہندوستان کے سہلہ پر وہ زخم ہے جو
ہم بھلا نہیں سکتے ہیں۔ آج بھی
امریکہ ایک طرف بیٹھوں کو سامان
دیتا ہے دوسری طرف پاکستان کو
سامان دیتا ہے، صرف اس لئے کہ دونوں

ملک مذہبی حقارت اور مذہبی نفرت کی بنیاد رکھتے ہیں - انگریز اور امریکہ انسانوں کی دوستی کے دشمن ہیں یہ ان کی پالیسی ہے - انسان کی دوستی سب سے مضبوط ترین دوستی ہے - مذہبوں کی دوستی کبھی ہلکتی ہے کبھی توڑتی ہے - انسانوں کی دوستی کبھی نہیں توڑتی ہے -

میں ایک بات کی طرف توجہ دلاتا چاہتا ہوں - میں کمیونسٹوں کا وکیل نہیں ہوں - میں کمیونسٹ بھی نہیں ہوں لیکن اگر کوئی شخص مجھے کمیونسٹ کہہ دیتا ہے تو میں تردید کرنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہوں - میں انڈیا بڑا نہیں ہوں - اگر کوئی کہے تمہارا نام علی محمد طارق نہیں ہے - تمہارا نام رام داس ہے تو میں یہ کیسے بھلا سکتا ہوں کہ میں علی محمد طارق ہوں - رام داس نہیں ہوں - ایک چھوٹا سا ملک تھا چیکوسلواکیہ جس نے کشمیر میں امریکہ کی سازش کو ناکام کیا اور حکومت ہندوستان کو وارنٹ کیا کہ رپورٹ جو لکھی جا رہی ہے آپ کے خلاف ہے آپ خبردار ہو جائیں - کیا یہ صحیح نہیں ہے کہ اقوام متحدہ میں بہت سے افریقی ملکوں نے ہمارا ساتھ دیا؟ کیا یہ درست نہیں ہے کہ کئی موقعوں پر انگریز اور امریکہ نے ہندوستان کے خلاف ریزولیشن دیا ہے - اگر ہمیں دیکھنا کسی کے پاس بڑے بڑے

جہاز ہیں کسی کے پاس بڑے بڑے ہتھیار بڑے بڑے تیر ہیں تو ہمیں تیروں سے دوستی کرنی چاہئے - ٹیلکوں سے توہوں سے دوستی کرنی چاہئے؟ میں ڈاھیا بھائی پٹیل سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں ہمیں انسانوں سے دوستی کرنی ہے یا جہازوں سے کرنی ہے - اگر جہازوں سے دوستی کرنی ہے تو امریکہ بہت اچھا ہے - اگر انسانوں سے دوستی کرنی ہے تو عرب اور افریقی ملک اچھے ہیں - ہندوستان کی حکومت سے انہوں نے ہمیشہ دوستی رکھی ہے اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے - ہم نے چین سے دوستی کی - ہم ایک اچھے آدمی سے دوستی کرتے ہیں اگر ایک اچھا آدمی خراب نکلے بدعاش نکلے - تو اس کا کیا جائے؟ ہم چاہتے ہیں اقوام متحدہ میں چین چلا جائے ہم اس کی حمایت کرتے ہیں - ہمارے سامنے مثال ہے کہ جب کسی کا بچہ خراب ہو جائے تو ہم کہتے ہیں اسکو بھیج دو - اب چین کی حالت یہ ہے کہ ہم کہتے ہیں کہ اس کو اقوام متحدہ میں بھیج دو کچھ سیکھ جائیگا - انسانوں میں بیٹھ جائے گا - انسانوں میں بیٹھ کر کچھ تہذیب سیکھے گا - ہم کو بھی تلک نہیں کرے گا - ہمارے دوست اس پر بھی ناراض ہیں - آدمی کو شریف بناؤ تو ڈاھیا بھائی اس میں بھی ناراض ہیں - ڈاھیا بھائی تمہیں بتاؤ کیا کریں؟ یہ اور بات ہے کہ ڈاھیا بھائی پٹیل کے ذہن میں جنگ کی بات

[شری اے - اہم - طرُق]

ہے لیکن ہم جنگ نہیں ہونے دینگے -
جنگ انسان کی دشمن ہے - جنگ
انسانیت کی دشمن ہے - اس میں
کوئی شک نہیں کہ جنگ کا ہونا تمام
دنیا کے انسانوں کے لئے خطرناک چیز
ہے ظلم ایک وقت مت جانا ہے لیکن
صبر کی انتہا نہیں ہے - دباہیا بھائی
میں آپ کو یقین دلانا ہوں کہ اگر
آپ ہندوستان کے مستقبل کو اچھا
دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں تو آپ جنگ اور
جنگی چالوں سے دور ہٹ جائیے -
اگر آپ چاہتے ہیں کہ انسان کی
خدمت کریں تو سرمایہ داروں اور
سرمایہ داری کے قانون سے باز آئیں -
پس مائدہ لوگوں کی دوستی حاصل
کریں - ہندوستان میں اور ہندوستان
کے باہر بھی -

ان الفاظ کے ساتھ میں سرکار کی
اس فارن پالیسی کی تائید کرتا ہوں
اور مبارک باد پیش کرتا ہوں -

[श्री ए०एम० तारिक: मेडम डिप्टी चैयर-
मैन: जहाँ तक सरकार की पालिसी का ताल्लुक
है मैं समझता हूँ कि पिछले बीस सालों के
अन्दर हमारी फारेन पालिसी हमारे लिए बेहतर
रही है और एक हिन्दुस्तानी की हैसियत
से, इस एवान के मेम्बर की हैसियत से,
हमने हमेशा इस फारेन पालिसी की तार्ईद
की है। मैं दो बातों की तरफ शुरू में
इस एवान की तवज्जो दिलाना चाहता
हूँ। एक जो मेरे दोस्त डाक्टर गोपाल सिंह
ने काश्मीर के बारे में जिक्र किया और
दूसरे मेरे छोटे भाई निरेन घोष ने जिक्र
किया और शेख साहब के बारे में कहा,
जहाँ तक इस बात का ताल्लुक है जो डाक्टर

गोपाल सिंह ने कही है कि काश्मीर का मसला
इस वक़्त तय हो सकता है जब काश्मीर के
अन्दर के लोग वहाँ के लीडर सादिक साहब,
बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद और शेख साहब
मिल कर बात करें और तब पाकिस्तान को
हम यकीन दिला सकते हैं कि काश्मीर
हमारा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ग़लत
दलील है, यह कोई दलील नहीं है और
इस दलील की कोई अहमियत नहीं
है। यह हमारी अन्दरूनी बात है।
हिन्दुस्तान में मुख्तलिफ जमायतें हैं तो अगर
कल को हमें दुनिया को यकीन दिलाना
है कि हिन्दुस्तान के सब लोग एक हैं तो क्या
मास्टर तारा सिंह से अलग बात
करनी है, सन्त फतेह सिंह से अलग बात
करनी है और डाह्या भाई से अलग बात
करनी है। तो यह जो बातें हैं वह हमारी
अन्दरूनी बातें हैं, फारेन पालिसी की
नहीं। जहाँ तक इस बात का ताल्लुक है कि
पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी ने शेख साहब
से कोई फारमूला तय किया था मैं इस बात
को चेलेंज करता हूँ ऐसी कोई बात नहीं
है। यह हकीकत है कि पंडित जी यह
चाहते थे कि शेख साहब सही बात समझें
सही हालत समझें, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान
के और तमाम दुनिया के। पंडित जवाहर
लाल नेहरू इस बात से वाकिफ़ थे कि पाकि-
तान के अन्दरूनी हालात इस तरह खराब
और इस कदर गैर-सियासी और गैर-
जम्हूरी हैं कि अगर शेख साहब पाकिस्तान
जाएंगे तो हो सकता है कि वह वहाँ से कुछ
सीख आएंगे, शेख साहब के वहाँ
जाने का यही मकसद था। शेख साहब
का वहाँ जाने का यह मकसद नहीं था कि
पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू की तरफ से
कोई फारमूला लेकर वह पाकिस्तान जा रहे
थे। पंडित जवाहर लाल ने इतनी ज़रूरत
थी, इतना सियासी अखलाक था और वह
एक अजीम लीडर की हस्ती रखते थे
कि अगर उसके सामने कोई फारमूला
होता तो वह खुद सदर अयूब से बात करते,

पाकिस्तान के लीडरों से बात करते, उनको इसके लिए किसी तीसरे हिन्दुस्तानी को इस्तेमाल करने की जरूरत नहीं थी। वह सिर्फ यह चाहते थे कि शेख साहब वहां जाकर यह देखें कि पाकिस्तान में क्या हो रहा है अब इसके बाद शेख साहब की वजह से क्या क्या बातें हुईं, मैं उनको जिक्र करना नहीं चाहता लेकिन यह बात दुरुस्त है कि जब शेख साहब हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर गये तो कुछ ऐसे लोगों से मिले जिनमें खास तौर पर चाउ एन लाई का नाम है जबकि हमारे चीन के साथ ताल्लुकात बेहद खराब थे, जबकि चीन ने हमारे मुल्क पर हमला किया हुआ था। इसने शेख साहब के बारे में सारे मुल्क में गलतफहमी पैदा की। आज वही लोग जो शेख साहब की रिहाई के लिए दावादार हैं वही उनकी गिरफ्तारी के वक्त उसके लिए सबसे पेश्वर थे। तो इन दो बातों का मैं एक जवाब सा देना चाहता हूं। असल में बात है हमारी नीति की। हमारी नीति के बारे में कुछ दोस्तों ने यह कहा है कि हमको सच नहीं कहना चाहिए।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : यह कौन दोस्त है ?

श्री ए० एम० तारिक : यह हमारे पी० एम० पी० के दोस्त ने कही। उन्होंने यह दुरुस्त बात नहीं की। लेकिन उनका यहो मक़द है कि खामोश रहना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि खामोश रहना बहतर है। हम इस दुनिया में रहते हैं जिस दुनिया में और भी मुल्क और कौमें हैं।

श्री विश्वनाथ भारद्वाज : ताकत कौन सी आपके पास है।

श्री ए० एम० तारिक : ताकत हो न हो। ताकत के मायने यह नहीं है कि कोई इन्सान काफ़ी मोटा हो, हट्टाकट्टा हो और नभो आदमी सच बोल सकता है। सचाई के लिए किसी ताकत की जरूरत नहीं है। सचाई के लिए कोई तीर कोई तलवार

की जरूरत नहीं है। सचाई के लिए इच्छा की जरूरत है, सचाई के लिए हिम्मत की जरूरत है। वेल्यूज आफ लाइफ जो होती है, इन्सानी कदरें जो होती हैं उनकी जरूरत होती है। हर आदमी जिसकी जेब में पिस्तौल होता है वह बहादुर नहीं होता। जो यह कहते हैं कि हमारी नीति क्या है हमारी नीति यह है कि हम किसी फौजी ताकत के साथ नहीं हैं। हम दुनिया में जंग करना नहीं चाहते हैं लेकिन यह हमारी नीति नहीं है कि अगर कोई शक्स हमलावर है तो हम उसको हमलावर न कहें। यह समझता हूं कि इस मुल्क के लोग एक बहुत बड़े फरेब में लाए जा रहे हैं। मेडम डिन्टी चेयरमैन, यही सूरत अगर इसी बात को आप मान लें कि साहब हम हमलावर को हमलावर न कहें तो हम फिर किसी बात से एतराज करते हैं अमेरिका पर और अंग्रेजों पर भी जो हम यह कहते हैं कि यूनाइटेड नेशन में, अकवाम मुत्तहदा मैं इस बात को जानते हुए भी कि काश्मीर पर पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया है अमेरिका ने पाकिस्तान को हमलावर नहीं कहा। आज हम हिन्दुस्तान में एक पर्दे के पीछे, एक साब्रिश के पीछे अमेरिकन पालिसी का प्रापोण्डा करते हैं। हम हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को अमेरिका की इस लाइन पर ले जाना चाहते हैं जिस से कि कल यह बात साफ हो जाए कि पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर पर हमला नहीं किया। पाकिस्तान हमलावर था। पाकिस्तान हमलावर है यह हमारी रिपोर्ट नहीं है यूनाइटेड नेशन का कहना है लेकिन अमेरिका क्यों खामोश है? अंग्रेज वहां क्यों खामोश है? लेकिन हम हिन्दुस्तान के लोग जिनका एक इच्छा की बैक-ग्राउंड है यह कहते नहीं हैं कि इसराइल और अरब आपस में लड़ें लेकिन अरबों का भी कुछ कहना है अरब भी इस दुनिया में रहते हैं। अरब के साथ हमारी दोस्ती आज की नहीं है। अरबों के साथ हमारी दोस्ती उस वक्त की है जबकि अरब में जुगल पाशा लीडर था जब कांग्रेस बरसिरे-इक्तदाद

[श्री ए० एम० तारिक]

नहीं थी। तब भी 1928 में कांग्रेस के रेजोल्यूशन से हम ने अरब के मसले के बारे में फिलिस्तीन के मसले के बारे में कहा था।

अरब कहते हैं कि आप बसाइये यहूदियों को। दुनिया में अमेरिका बहुत बड़ा मुल्क है बसाएँ यहूदियों को, लेकिन उन्हें अरबों के सीन पर नहीं बसाया जा सकता। अरबों के सीनों पर यहूदियों को नहीं बसाया जा सकता। आप अरबों को मजबूम नहीं समझ सकते हैं। अरब एक बहुत बड़ी ताकत है। यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है अगर हम यह देखें कि अरबों ने हमारे साथ क्या किया। अरब के मायने शाह फैजल नहीं है। अरब के मायने बादशाह इब्न सा'द नहीं है। अरब के मायने वह मामूली अरब है वह एक गरीब अरब है, जो पिछले कई सालों से—इम्पीरियलिज्म के खिलाफ लड़ रहा है। अरब वह है जो आज आजादी के लिए अदन की गलियों में जान देता है जो कि अंग्रेज को जिन्दा या मुर्दा अरब की सरजमीन से निकालना चाहते हैं। अमेरिका की अजारादारी को खत्म करना चाहते हैं। अरब वह अरब है। हमारी इस अरब के साथ दोस्ती है जिसके दिल में अमेरिका से नफरत है। हमारी दोस्ती इब्न सा'द से नहीं है, किंग फैजल से नहीं है हमारी दोस्ती अरब मुजाहिदों से है। इन मुजाहिदों से जिनको जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने ही नहीं बल्कि महात्मा गांधी ने अपनी वफादारी दोस्ती और इमदाद का यकीन दिलाया। वह अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ खड़े हुए। क्या वजह थी कि महात्मा गांधी ने खिलाफत मूवमेंट का साथ दिया। खिलाफत कोई हिन्दू जाति की नहीं थी। खिलाफत का हिन्दू से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं लेकिन उस वक्त कांग्रेस ने समझ लिया कि यह अंग्रेज एक इम्पीरियलिस्ट साजिश के तहत अरबों से हक छीनना चाहते हैं। गरीब आदमी यह कभी नहीं देखता कि उसका साथ

किसी ने दिया है या नहीं दिया। मैं एक आदमी हूँ और अगर मैं ऐसी बात देखूँ कि साहब एक मजबूम आदमी है वह जा रहा है उसको एक मजबूत आदमी तमाचा मार रहा है लेकिन इस आदमी ने कभी मुझको तंग किया है और उसकी मुझ से दोस्ती नहीं है तो क्या मैं इसकी मदद नहीं करूँगा। आप इस की मदद नहीं करेंगे? क्या आपकी मदद के लिए जरूरी है कि उसने मदद की हो। हम अंग्रेज और अमेरिका को जानते हैं। क्या मैं अमेरिका को भूल सकता हूँ? मैं अमेरिका का दोस्त नहीं हूँ मैं इस बात को मंजूर करना चाहता हूँ। मेरी अमेरिका से कोई हमदर्दी नहीं है। मेरी अंग्रेज से कोई हमदर्दी नहीं है। एक काश्मीरी की हैसियत से मैं जानता हूँ कि काश्मीर के मामले में अमेरिका और अंग्रेज का क्या रवैया रहा है वह साजिश करते हैं कि काश्मीर का उठा कर पाकिस्तान के हवाले कर दो। इसने हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ पाकिस्तान को असला दिया है, सामान दिया है क्यों नहीं डाह्या भाई पटेल इसके खिलाफ प्रोटेस्ट करते हैं, काश कि सरदार पटेल जिन्दा होते। वह तलवार लेकर इस साजिश के खिलाफ लड़ने इसका मुकाबला करते लेकिन बदकिस्मती यह है कि सरदार पटेल नहीं हैं। आज डाह्याभाई पटेल हैं। डाह्याभाई पटेल इस बात को भूल गए हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के सीने पर वह ज़ख्म है जो हम भुला नहीं सकते हैं। आज भी अमेरिका एक तरफ यहूदियों को सामान देता है, दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान को सामान देता है सिर्फ इसलिए कि दोनों मुल्क मजहबी हकारत और मजहबी नफरत बुनयाद रखते हैं। अंग्रेज और अमेरिका इंसानों की दोस्ती के दुश्मन है यह उनको पालिसी है। इंसान की दोस्ती सब से मजबूततरीन दोस्ती है। मजहबों की दोस्ती कभी बूबनती है कभी टटती है। इंसानों की दोस्ती कभी नहीं टटती है।

मैं एक बात की तरफ तबज्जो दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मैं कम्यूनिस्टों का वकील नहीं हूँ। मैं कम्यूनिस्ट भी नहीं हूँ लेकिन अगर कोई शक्स मुझे कम्यूनिस्ट कह देता है तो मैं तरदीद करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं इतना बुजदिल नहीं हूँ। अगर कोई कहे तुम्हारा नाम अली मुहम्मद तारिक नहीं है। तुम्हारा नाम राम दास है तो मैं यह कैसे भुला सकता हूँ कि मैं अली मुहम्मद तारिक हूँ राम दास नहीं हूँ। एक छोटा सा मुल्क या चौकोरखोवाकिया जिसने काश्मीर में अमरीका की साजिश को नाकाम किया और हुकूमत हिन्दुस्तान को वार्नड किया कि रिपोर्ट जो लिखी जा रही है आपके खिलाफ है आप खबरदार हो जाएं। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि अकवाम मुत्तहदा में बहुत से अफ्रिकी मुल्कों ने हमारा साथ दिया? क्या वह दुरुस्त नहीं है कि कई मौकों पर अंग्रेज और अमेरिका ने हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ रेज्यूशन दिया है? अगर हमें देखना है किसी के पास बड़े बड़े जहाज हैं किसी के पास बड़े बड़े हथियार बड़े बड़े जीर हैं तो हमें तीरों से दोस्ती करनी चाहिए, टंकों से, तोपों से दोस्ती करनी चाहिए? मैं डाह्याभाई पटेल से कहना चाहता हूँ हमें इंसानों से दोस्ती करनी है या जहाजों से करनी है। अगर जहाजों से दोस्ती करनी है तो अमेरिका बहुत अच्छा है। अगर इंसानों से दोस्ती करनी है तो अरब और अफ्रिकी मुल्क अच्छे हैं। हिन्दुस्तान का हुकूमत से उन्होंने हमेशा दोस्ती रखी है इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। हमने चीन से दोस्ती की। हम एक अच्छे आदमी से दोस्ती करते हैं अगर एक अच्छा आदमी खराब निकले, बदमाश निकले तो उसका क्या किया जाय? हम चाहते हैं अकवाम मुत्तहदा में चीन चला जाए, हम उसकी हिमायत करते हैं। हमारे सामने मिसाल है कि जब किसान का बच्चा खराब हो जाए तो हम कहते हैं स्कूल भेज दो। अब चीन की हालत यह है कि हम कहते हैं कि उसको अकवाम मुत्तहदा में भेज दो, कुछ

सीख जाएगा। इंसानों में बैठ जाएगा। इंसानों में बैठकर कुछ तहजीब सीखेगा। हमको भी तंग नहीं करेगा। हमारे दोस्त इस पर भी नाराज हैं। आदमी को शरीफ बनाओ तो डाह्याभाई इसमें भी नाराज हैं। डाह्याभाई तुम ही बताओ क्या करें? यह और बात है कि डाह्याभाई पटेल के जहन में जंग की बात है लेकिन हम जंग नहीं होने देंगे। जंग इन्सान की दुश्मन है। जंग इन्सानियत की दुश्मन है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि जंग का होना तमाम दुनिया के इंसानों के लिए खतरनाक चीज है। जुल्म एक वक्त मिट जाता है लेकिन सन्न की इन्तहा नहीं है। डाह्याभाई, मैं आपको यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान के मुस्तकबिल को अच्छा देखना चाहते हैं तो आप जंग और जंगी चालों से दूर हट जाइये, अगर आप चाहते हैं कि इंसान की खिदमत करें तो सरमायदारी और सरमायदारी के कानून से बाज आये। पसमंदा लोगों की दोस्ती हासिल करें, हिन्दुस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर भी।

इन इलफाज के साथ मैं सरकार को इस फारेन पालिसी की ताईद करता हूँ और मबारिकबाद पेश करता हूँ।

""THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani. Please be brief.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam Deputy Chairman . . .

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Madam, I want . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called Mr. Mani.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Madam, we have to start another discussion at 5.00.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know that.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD !
SINHA: How can that be changed?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I requested the House that we take up the next discussion a few minutes later. The House has agreed.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: The hon. Minister will not be able to reply to the debate today . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Please continue, Mr. Mani.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, I shall be very brief in my remarks. This debate on the international situation has been dominated by the situation in West Asia. I wish the Minister for External Affairs had made an introductory speech when he moved this motion because a number of developments have taken place during the last one week. I understand that the Government of Egypt is unwilling to clear the Suez Canal forcing many ships to come via the Cape of Good Hope, including ships bringing our foodgrains, and this has been used by the Government of Egypt, according to the allegations made in the West, as a lever to secure a settlement of the Israeli question at the United Nations.

Madam, as far as the policy of the Government of India is concerned in regard to our friendship with the Arab States, we recognise that such a friendship is necessary for the solution of our contentious problems with Pakistan because Pakistan has many affiliations with the Arab States. But I am afraid that in regard to the Arab States, we have forsaken what we call our non-alignment policy and have ranged ourselves as a partisan of the Arab States. I have stayed in Egypt. I have gone all over Egypt along with you, Madam Deputy Chairman, 15 years ago. Then we were the guests of King Farouk. We went all over Egypt. We went to Ismalia, we stayed at Luxor. And we stayed in Egypt for some time which is the cradle of Arab nationalism. And my

considered view at that time, which has not been changed since, is that Arab nationalism, if it not properly controlled, can be a very dangerous tendency because it is a kind of mania which has spread all over the Arab world. Arab nationalism has played a very useful part in combating colonial regimes in the Middle East and in Africa. But it has got to be controlled. In trying to befriend Arab States, we have treated Israel very unfairly. I was personally present at the United Nations General Assembly when the State of Israel was born, when the discussions went on on the question of Palestine. And you know how much the Israelis tried to create a State in spite of formidable opposition. It may be recalled that when Lord Balfour spoke about the State of Israel, he did not use the words 'State of Israel' but he called it a home for the Jews. And this was one of the declarations made in the First World War. In spite of the policy of the West to carve out a State for Israel in the Middle East which did not belong to the Jews at that time, we have to recognise that Israel has come to stay and that it cannot be wiped out of the map.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: On a point of order. Madam, Mr. Mani is not speaking from his own seat. He must be in his seat.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I permitted him to speak from there because he is nearer the mike.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is because I am not able to catch the mike from my seat.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is nearer the mike.

SHRI A. D. MANI: If the State of Israel has been created and has been recognised by us and by other members of the United Nations, there is no point in any Arab State saying that the State of Israel must be destroyed. The Arab States always counsel us to co-existence with Pakis-

tan. Whenever any trouble about Kashmir arises, the Arab States have always said, "Try to settle it between yourselves." When they want coexistence between India and Pakistan, it is reasonable to expect that they will also have co-existence between themselves and Israel. Israel has come to stay and they have to recognise the State of Israel if there is to be peace in the Middle East.

I was interested to hear the speech of my hon. friend, Dr. Gopal Singh, on the question of the Gulf of Aqaba. Now, I have got a number of facts on this question which perhaps I might bring to the notice of Dr. Gopal Singh. Egypt has always claimed that it has been an internal waterway while in terms of the judgement given by the International Court of Justice in the Carlu Channel case, in all such water ways, the right of innocent passage includes the passage of warships in times of peace. By blocking this Gulf of Aqaba, President Nasser tried to strangle Israel. There is no question of that. Israel has no other chance, no other alternative but to fight back. A good part of Israel's trade is with East Africa and it has to pass through the Gulf of Aqaba. If the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba are in his hands, Nasser could have strangled the State of Israel. I am not justifying the state of aggression. But we have got to understand the point that in our own interest, we should press for the internationalisation of all these waterways including the Suez Canal. The Panama Canal and all these canals should be internationalised. The Talaimannar Canal also should be an international waterway. I feel, therefore, that any settlement must recognise the international character of the Gulf of Aqaba.

There is another point . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may have come nearer the microphone but never nearer truth.

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . regarding my second amendment. That point is . . . RSD—8.

that Israel must surrender the territories which it has seized. I agree with Mr. Chagla that a person who has been guilty of aggression should not run away with the fruits of aggression he should be asked to surrender them. And, I think, Israel in the interest of peace should surrender all those territories which have been seized from Jordan, Sinai Peninsula and also from Egypt. All these territories must be returned.

Further, this question of compensation to the Palestinian refugees has been haunting the corridors of the United Nations for the past 16 years. The 11 million refugees who were forced to leave their homes in 1948 must be suitably rehabilitated. If necessary, this must be accepted as the United Nations responsibility, and Israel must be asked to make a substantial contribution. Other States also may be asked to pay their share so that all these Palestinian refugees haunting the markets of Damascus and Cairo may be given a proper shelter, so that their memories may be erased and both Israel and the Arab States can live in peace.

I would like to say something about my second amendment regarding our delegation to the United Nations General Assembly and the question of our remaining neutral. Madam, when the question of China's admission comes up in the forthcoming session as the hardy annual, we must take up a distinct attitude. Madam, I am not one of those who take an emotional view of what has happened to our two diplomats, Mr. Raghunath and Mr. Vijay. Somebody may say that it is a question of madness on the part of the Chinese. But it is the calculated policy of the Chinese to advertise the so-called cultural revolution. Their object is to destroy respect for the existing conventional order which includes the international order. They do not want the world to respect the conventions by which we are bound so far. They want new conventions to be created. This is the object behind the extraordinarily rude and

[Shri A. D. Mani] organised behaviour of the Chinese representatives both at Peking and at Delhi. I would, therefore, very respectfully request the Minister that when the question of Chinese admission comes up, we might take the opportunity of stating our attitude very, clearly.

Madam, we believe that China must be a member of the United Nations, that in the interest of disarmament, China's presence at the United Nations General Assembly is necessary, that before China is admitted to the United Nations, she must conform to certain civilised standards of behaviour. Since there are no signs that the Chinese are prepared to respect civilised standards of behaviour, the Indian Delegation should remain neutral on the question of China's admission to the United Nations. This would be a little diversion from our earlier stand.

I am coming to my last amendment. I will take only two minutes, coming to the question of hydrogen bomb, Madam, the Minister of External Affairs is being pressurized to sign the Non-proliferation Treaty in some sort of an amended form, and Mr. U. S. Jha. has been trying to get a guarantee from the United States and the Soviet Union of a nuclear umbrella. I am afraid, Madam, the United States might link up their food aid with our signing the Non-proliferation Treaty. This is the danger that I expect. But I would say that the non-proliferation treaty should not be signed largely because of the explosion of the hydrogen bomb, the sixth bomb which has been exploded by China within a period of three years after its explosion in 1964. China has emerged as a major nuclear power. We have got 2,000 scientists who have been trained by the Atomic Energy Establishment at Bombay. Let us give our Armed Forces a shot in the arm and ask the scientists to produce an atom bomb,

We also want to explode an atom bomb and become a member of the nuclear club. The nuclear club should not be confined only to the five States. It should include India also.

Madam, it has been said that at all these international conferences or disarmament conferences we should never go naked. At all these conferences, unfortunately, the position of India is that it is thoroughly naked because she does not have the backing, the military power behind it. I feel, therefore, that we must produce an atom bomb to give our scientists and the Armed Forces a shot in the arm and make them feel that this country is alive to its dignity, I hope, therefore, that the Government would not sign the non-proliferation treaty, and it would give instructions to the Atomic Energy Establishment to go ahead with the preparation of an atom bomb.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister will reply to the discussion tomorrow. We go on to the next item. Mr. Chordia.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 176 RE HOME MIN- ISTER'S STATEMENT ABOUT EMERGENCY

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जै चौर-
ङ्गिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया,
कल माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने संकटकाल की
स्थिति को बनाये रखने के लिए जो वक्तव्य
दिया था, उसकी चर्चा करने के लिए मैं
खड़ा हुआ हूँ। माननीय मंत्री जी ने माचें
के महीने में घोषणा की थी कि एक
जुलाई के बाद हम आवश्यक संशोधन करने
संविधान में, इस कानून को केवल कुछ सामान
क्षेत्र में ही लागू रखेंगे। लेकिन कल उन्होंने
अपने वक्तव्य में यह प्रकट किया कि
हमने संविधान में संशोधन करना चाहते