ENQUIRY *RE* CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh) : I had given a Calling Attention Notice. Today two million goldsmiths of India are launching on a countrywide agitation. For the last 43 months the Government has been telling us that their question is under active consideration. This procrastination of the Government has aggravated the situation. May I request the Government through you that they should make a final statement on the matter stating that the demands of the goldsmiths would be considered ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have passed on the Notice to the Government.

MOTION *RE* INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—*eontcl.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mani. You had spoken for four minutes and you have another 11 minutes.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, yesterday wTTen the House adjourned, I dealt with the implications of the Tashkent Agreement and the need for India informing the Soviet Union that if Pakistan continued to violate the terms of that Declaration in spirit, we would be compelled *to* take the initiative to see that our interests are safeguarded,. I would like to go to another point that figures in the debate and that is the question of Vietnam. I have an amendment on the subject. I en-(ire)y agree with the Government of India's policy that the solution of the Vietnam question should be sought within the general framework of the Geneva Agreement. I am not suggesting that the same conference should be convened but if there is to be a settlement, both the parties must meet across the table—the Viet Cong on the one side and the U.S. on the other with the other representatives who would be concerned in the matter. I find that in the communique issued in Moscow, there was a reference to imperalists and reactionary forces. I have referred *to this* matter in my amendment. Whatever might be the fault of the U.S., it must be conceded that the U.S. does not want to annex Indochina or Vietnam.

SHRI ARIUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : How do you know ?

SHRI A. D. MANI: The history of the U.S.A. shows that they are not an imperialist Power like Britain was, or like Portugal. It has never been suggested that the U.S. Is going to annex Vietnam and make it an American colony. I think it will be very unfair to call the U.S. an imperialist nation Since some suspicion has been aroused that this was a reference to the U.S., I hope the Minister for Foreign Affairs would make the position of the Government of India clear that we did not have the U.S. in mind at all when we made that reference. Yesterday my friend. Mr. Niren Ghosh, referring to what was happening in Vietnam, said that the U.S. was the worst enemy of mankind. These phrases travel from one chamber to another and they go to the U.S. If some obscure Congressman in the U.S. House of Representatives says something derogatory about India, we get highly sensitive and we resent whatever is said about our country. Such extreme expressions should not be used about any country and least of all, about the U.S.A. which has demonstrated its friendly intentions towards India I feel that the *U.S.* is certainly a much better friend of mankind than the present rulers of China, with whom my friend Shri Ghosh wanted India to reopen negotiations on the question of the border. I have suggested in my amendment that the atrocities committed by the Viet Cong should also be condemned. Recently in the press of the East European countries, particularly in Czechoslovakia, a detailed account appeared about the atrocities committed by the Viet Cong on the Vietnam population. If such atrocities have been committed, India being the Chairman of the International Control Commission, such information would have come to our possession and we should, as Chairman of the Commission, try to be impartial to the two sides and also convey the atrocities committed by the Viet Cong probably on the Vietnam population. We are trying to seek a solution and not sit in judgment over any particular country.

1 would like to go on to the question of the need for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. I have had the privilege of visiting both East Germany and West Germany as a guest of both the Governments. I have received the hospitality of both the West German Government and the East German Government and so I can be presumed to be a little neutral in the matter since I had been very well treated by both the Governments. The position is that East Germany has come to stay. They have put up eleven steel plants in East Germany. I was greatly struck by the advance they have made in metallurgy. If at this stage after the war has concluded, we take up the position that East Germany does not exist, we would not be accepting the realities of the situation. The Government of India is under constant pressure by the West German Government not to recognise the German Democratic Republic. I quite agree that it may not be politic for us to recognise the German Democratic Republic tomorrow but a stage will come when we have to recognise that Government and the Government of India has been following a consistent policy in reepatedly stating that there are two Germanies. The West German Government have taken serious exception to the communique which was issued in Moscow after the visit of the Prime Minister but what the Prime Minister said had been said by Mr. Shastri also and by Mr. Nehru in 1961 when a joint communique was issued by him with Mr. Khruschev but the point that has to be borne in mind is that we have very strong trade contacts with East Germany. There is a proposal to open an office of the S.T.C. in East Berlin. We want such trade contacts to be strengthened. It has become necessary to appoint a Trade Commis-sionw because the East Germans are purchasing a lot of articles from us and we require valuable foreign exchange at the present time and we also require their machinery but I would not go to the extent to which the Government has gone and said in the communique in Moscow that the fact of the existence of the two Germanics has got to be recognised as a reality and a solution should be sought only on that basis because in both the Germanics there is a strong sense of re-unification and a feeling that one of these days both West Germany and East Germany have to be united and we do not want to stand in the way of these two Germanies being united if that is the real desire on both the sides. So we should keep the question of the recognition of the Government open till it is clear that there is no chance of reunification of the two Germanies. I thought that it is necessary for the Minister for External Affairs to make a statement on the subject because there were reports that Dr. Erhard was about to postpone his visit to India, which happily he has not done, on account of the communique which was issued in Moscow.

My third amendment refers to the question of non-alignment as a concept. I have no objection to the Government of India attending as many of the so-called non-aligned summit meetings at it likes but we have reached a certain level of maturity in international affairs. Words like 'imperialism', 'reactionary forces' etc. remind us of the musty roofs of the Fabian society of old London of thirty years ago. It is not only imperialism that is a menace to the peace of the world. It is the imperialism of China, it is' the imperialism of a totalitarian regime which is . , .

AN HON. MEMBER : Like Russia ?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Not Russia. I have been to the Soviet Union. I am more or less satisfied that there are democratic and liberal trends working in the Soviet Union but I am not satisfied that China is a factor which can be considered as working for international peace. We should avoid these extreme expressions of imperialists and reactionary forces. The Government of India need not be led by the African nations in using such expressions in the communique. Whatever jhe policy that the Government of India might be following in regard to non-alignment, the position remains that when China attacked us, we did not have a single friend in the African world.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : In the whole world.

SHRI A. D. MANI : We had the U.S. as our friend, we had Great Britain as our friend. We did not have much sympathy from these nations when Pakistan attacked us in 1965. So let us not get too

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

much mixed up with these concepts. You should attend such non-aligned summit meetings but I would like the Government of India to take a purposeful initiative of participating in the Asian and Pacific Co-operation plan which has been drawn up by the Government of Australia, the Government of New Zealand, the Government of the Philippines, the Government of Taiwan and the Government of Japan. These people have drawn up a plan. They have got a Pacific Council which meets at Seoul. We have much more in common with these countries. We have much more in common with Malaysia than with some remote African country which talks of imperialism and reactionary forces. We should try to develop therefore a sense of co-operation with these nations and not -be frightened by these catch slogans and phrases like imperialism and reactionary forces.

Sir, the fourth point I would like to refer to is the question of the judgment of the International Court of Justice, to which a reference has been made in my amendments. Sir, I was present at the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly when Sir Benegal Narasing Rao, as he then was, was elected a Judge of the International Court of Justice. I do not accept the procedure of election of the Judges of the International Court by the Security Council or the General Assembly as a proper procedure.

There is something wrong with the International Court of Justice. Fortunately there is no contempt of court with reference to the International Court of Justice and so we can say what we like. I think this Court has discredited itself by giving this judgment on South-West Africa. In 1962 it accepted the position that the provisions of the Mandate of the League of Nations applied to South-West Africa. By taking the present stand they have gone back on the original decision. Yesterday somebody raised the question about China about the role played by China's representative there. Fortunately the Chinese representative was one of those who dissented from the majority judgment of the International Court of Justice. Whatever stand the Government of India may take on the question of the International Court of Justice, I think they should move for an amendment of the Charter. The Judges of the International Court of Justice should not be elected, but they should be nominated by the Chief Justices of the countries concerned of which they are the representatives. We disfavour election because we want dispassionate judgments to be given by the International Court of Justice.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) : जनाब सदर, 10 साल में इस दुनिया में बहुत से हेरफेर हुये, नये नये राष्ट्र पैदा हुये, पुराने राष्ट्रों की ताकतों में फर्क आया, जो शक्ति का तराजू था उसमें हेरफेर आया। 10 साल पहले दुनिया दो गुटों में बंटी हुई थी और आज दोनों गुट धीरे धीरे टूट रहे हैं, वारसा पैक्ट और नार्थ एटलांटिक ट्रीटी आर्गेनाइजेशन दोनों गुट ढीले पड़ रहे हैं, दोनों में कमजोरी आ रही है, नेटो से फ्रांस करीब करीब अलग हो गया और वारसा पैक्ट में भी आवाजें उठ रही हैं जो यह चाहती हैं कि जिस कदर रूस का आज वारसा पैक्ट पर प्रभुत्व है उस प्रभुत्व में, उस हुकूमत में, कुछ कमी हो। अब ऐसा वक्त आ गया है जब कि सारे राष्ट्रों को यह सोचना होगा कि जिस बुनियाद पर वह 10 साल, 15 साल से काम करते आ रहे हैं जब वह बुनियाद नहीं रही तो वह पुरानी ही नीति पर चलेंगे या कुछ नया रवैया अपनाने की बात सोचेंगे या कुछ नया ढंग अपनायेंगे। सबसे बड़ी बात 10 साल के अन्दर यह हुई कि चीन एक शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र बन गया है, चीन ने अपने को बहुत ताकतवर बना लिया है, उसने बड़ी जबरदस्त सेना तैयार की है और अणुबम्ब तथा अणु शस्त्र भी बना लिया है।

इस दुनिया में मैं यह समझता हूं कि जहां तक हमारी नान-एलाइनमेंट पालिसी, असम्बद्धता की नीति का सवाल है, असम्बद्धता की नीति

अभी तक जायज नीति है क्योंकि जब गुट टूट रहे हैं तो सवाल उठता है कि हम किस के साथ सम्बद्ध होंगे । जब दोनों गुटों के जो बड़े बड़े नेता हैं जिन्हें हम सुपर-पावर्स, परम शक्तियां, कहते हैं, वह दोनों चाहते हैं कि दुनिया में अमन चैन बना रहे, दुनिया में कोई ऐसी गड़बड़ी पैदा न हो जिसकी वजह से दुनिया में एक भयंकर युद्ध फिर से शुरू हो जाय जिससे सारे संसार का नाश हो, जब ऐसी स्थिति है तो जैसा कि मैंने कहा कि हम किस के साथ अपने को सम्बद्ध करेंगे वह सवाल उठता है । दूसरा सवाल उठता है कि किस के विरुद्ध करें क्योंकि जो दोनों महान शक्तियां हैं वे तो चाहती हैं कि दुनिया में अमन चैन बना रहे तो जहां तक हमारी नान-एलाइनमेंट, असम्बद्धता की नीति का सवाल है मैं समझता हूं कि आज भी वह जायज नीति है । लेकिन असम्बद्धता की नीति का एक दूसरा पहलू यह था कि असम्बद्धता की नीति बरतने से दुनिया में शान्ति बनी रहती थी और जब दुनिया में यह उम्मीद की जाती थी कि शान्ति बनी रहेगी तो यह जायज था कि हम भी अपने यहां शस्त्रीकरण पर, आर्मामेंट्स पर, जितना जोर देना चाहिये था उतना नहीं देते थे, हम समझते थे कि दुनिया शान्तिपूर्ण रहेगी अतएव हम भी शान्ति से रह सकेंगे इसलिये बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर शस्त्रीकरण को हमने कबूल नहीं किया, उसको नाकबूल किया । लेकिन आज गुट टूट रहे हैं, नई नई शक्तियां पैदा हो रही हैं और ऐसी शक्तियां जो कि संसार में शान्ति नहीं चाहतीं । ब्रिटेन आज एक यूरोपीय पावर, एक यूरोपीय ताकत रह गया है, ब्रिटेन स्वेज से पूर्व अपनी जितनी ताकत है अपना जितना सैन्यबल है उसको हटाना चाहता है, उसको वह हटायेगा और जरूर हटायेगा सवाल सिर्फ इतना ही है कि कितने समय में हटायेगा, तो जहां तक हालत पैदा हो रही है वहां हमारे लिये यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि हम अपने सैन्य-बल को बढ़ायें क्योंकि आज की दुनिया में जो है उसमें हालत यह है, परिस्थिति ऐसी है जैसा कि कहते हैं :

Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) : What is its equivalent in Hindi.

श्री ए० डी० मणि : हिन्दी में बता दीजिये ।

श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह : हिन्दी में दूसरे प्रावर्ब हैं । यह कि हर एक इंसान अपनी सोचे और जो सब से पीछे रह जायगा दौड़ में उसको शैतान जो है वह निगल जायेगा । जब ऐसी परिस्थिति आ गई है तब ऐसी परिस्थिति में हमें शक्ति-संचय करना आवश्यक है । ऐसी परिस्थिति में सिर्फ इस भरोसे पर कि निरस्त्रीकरण सम्मेलन सफल होगा, हम अपने को सबल न बनाएं यह मेरे खयाल से बड़ी भारी गलती होगी । दुनिया का अनुभव है कि पहले भी निरस्त्रीकरण सम्मेलन हुये, लीग आफ नेशन्स के जमाने में, लेकिन वह कामयाब नहीं हुये और जो थोड़ी कामयाबी हुई भी तो कोई विकट समस्या सामने आई तो वह कामयाबी खत्म हो गई । फिर भी हम आज निरस्त्रीकरण पर अपनी उम्मीद बांधे हुये हैं । उम्मीद बांधना मैं गलत नहीं समझता लेकिन इस उम्मीद पर कि किसी दिन उसमें सफलता प्राप्त होगी हम अपनी सैन्य-शक्ति को न बढ़ायें यह मेरे खयाल में बड़ी भारी गल्ती होगी ।

जनाब सदर, संस्कृत में कहा जाता है : "वीर भोग्या वसुन्धरा" यह जमीन जो है उसको वीर ही भोग सकते हैं, जिनमें शौर्य है, वीर्य है, पराक्रम है वह इस दुनिया का, इस धरती का भोग कर सकता है, कमजोरों के लिये यह दुनिया नहीं बनी है । और हमारा पुराना इतिहास भी बतलाता है कि जब जब हिन्दुस्तान कमजोर हुआ तब तब हिन्दुस्तान गुलाम हुआ और जब जब हिन्दुस्तान की तलवार तेज रही तब तब हिन्दुस्तान न सिर्फ दुनिया का सरताज रहा बल्कि यहां कि संस्कृति, यहां की सभ्यता दुनिया की सब से अच्छी संस्कृति और सभ्यता रही । इन हालात में मैं समझता हूं कि

[श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह]

निरस्त्रीकरण पर भरोसा कर अपने को सबल न बनाना बड़ी भारी गल्ती होगी ।

आज हमारा सब से बड़ा खतरा चीन है, चीन और हमारा रिश्ता आज बहुत कड़वा है, चीन और भारत का सम्बन्ध तीन हजार साल का है । 20 वर्ष के पहले जो जमाना था उस जमाने में भारत और चीन में मित्रता थी, सौहार्द्र था और अपनाने का, भाईचारे का भाव था । बदकिस्मती से वह हालत अब नहीं है, और हम एक दूसरे को अपना दुश्मन समझ रहे हैं । चीन और हमारे रिश्ते में फर्क आया, चीन ने बड़ी गलतियां कीं लेकिन गल्तियां हमने भी कीं । क्या गलतियां कीं, यह कहने का अभी वक्त नहीं है लेकिन वक्त यह आया है कि जब हम सोचें कि चीन के सम्बन्ध में हमारी नीति क्या होगी । मैं देखता हूं कि आज हमारी चीन के सम्बन्ध में जो नीति है उसमें न कोई दिशा है न कोई गति है । हम एक जमाव में पड़ गये हैं, हम जहां थे वहीं पड़े हुये हैं ।

मैं समझता हूं हमारी चीन के प्रति-नीति को तीन पायों पर रखना होगा । पहला यह कि चीन की शक्ति का मुकाबला करने के लिये हम अपनी शक्ति बढ़ायें और शक्ति को बढ़ाने के लिये यह जरूरी होता है कि हम आणविक अस्त्रों और अणु बमों को बनाएं । आज जब अणुबमों को बनाने की चर्चा आती है तो लोग हमारी पुरानी संस्कृति और सभ्यता की दुहाई देते है । लेकिन मैं फिर भी इस सदन की तवज्जोह इस तरफ दिलाऊंगा कि हमारी वह संस्कृति और सभ्यता केवल शांति और अहिंसा की नहीं है । हमारी संस्कृति और सभ्यता ने सबसे ऊंची जगह दुनिया में तभी हासिल की है जब हमारी शक्ति सबसे ज्यादा रही है । जब महाराजा चन्द्रगुप्त और समुद्रगुप्त की तलवार तेज बनी, उनकी तलवार पर सान चढ़ा तभी भारतीय संस्कृति और भारतीय सभ्यता बहुत ऊंची चढ़ी और जब हमने तलवार को फेंक कर शांति शांति के नारे लगाने शुरू किये तो जमाना यह आया कि हिन्दुस्तान छोटे छोटे मुल्कों के द्वारा रौंदा गया और पीसा गया । इसलिये संस्कृति और सभ्यता की दुहाई देकर देश को निकम्मा बनाए रखना, नपुंसक बनाए रखना, मेरे खयाल में बहुत गलती होगी । जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि हम अणुबम न बनाएं, उनका यह दावा होता है कि आणविक अस्त्र लड़ाई के अस्त्र नहीं हैं, ये सर्वनाश के अस्त्र हैं । शायद वे सज्जन यह नहीं समझ पाते कि लड़ाई का जो भी अस्त्र होता है वह नाश का अस्त्र होता है । यदि अणुबम लड़ाई का अस्त्र नहीं होता तो अमरीका सिर्फ दो बमों से इतनी बड़ी लड़ाई नहीं जीत पाता । तो लड़ाई के अस्त्र को न बनाना मेरे खयाल में बड़ी भारी गलती होगी । जो लोग यह राय देते हैं कि हम न बनायें उनके दिल के भीतर यह बात रहती है कि जब भी कोई कठिन समय भारतवर्ष के लिये आयेगा तो पश्चिमी राष्ट्र हमारी मदद पर आयेंगे । लेकिन यह साफ है कि पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों को अपनी फिक्र है, उन्हें अपनी सुरक्षा की फिक्र है और आज की परिस्थिति में जब चीन अमरीका को, सारे यूरोप को, पांच साल के अंदर अपने अणु आयुधों के खतरे में डाल देगा तो शायद, भारत को जब खतरे का समय आये, तो दूसरे राष्ट्र हमारी मदद के लिये तैयार नहीं होंगे । यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स जिसकी आज चीन से सबसे बड़ी दुश्मनी है, वहां भी मैंने एक नयी तहरीक देखी, वहां के लोग भी इस बात को सोचने लगे हैं कि क्या यह सही नहीं होगा कि चीन के प्रति अमरीका अपने रुख को बदले, जब ये हालात हैं तो हमें सशक्त बनना है, हमें शक्ति संचय करनी है, और उसके लिये जरूरी है कि हम आणविक अस्त्रों को बनाएं । लेकिन इतना ही काफी नहीं होगा । हमारे माननीय मित्र मणि जी ने कहा कि एशियाई राष्ट्र जो आज चीन से सशंकित हैं, जिनको आज चीन से खतरा है, भारत उनमें से एक है—उन राष्ट्रों को आपस में बातचीत करनी है, एक दूसरे के नजदीक आना है, एक दूसरे के खतरे को समझना है। मैं आज यह नहीं कहता कि ये राष्ट्र एक गुट बनायें लेकिन यह

जरूरी होता है कि हम एक दूसरे के नजदीक जायें, हम एक दूसरे को समझने की कोशिश करें, हम एक ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा करें जिसमें आड़े वक्त हम एक दूसरे के काम आयें। तो दूसरा पहलू चीन के प्रति हमारी नीति का, मेरे खयाल से, यह होना चाहिये। लेकिन हम न शक्ति संचय कर रहे हैं और न हम एशियाई राष्ट्रों के बीच कोई कामचलाऊ ढंग पर कोई बातचीत करने की बातें सोचते हैं।

तीसरी चीज, शायद बहुत लोगों को अखरेगी, तीसरा पाया हमारी चीन की नीति का जो होना चाहिये वह मेरे ख्याल में यह है कि हमसे और चीन से बातचीत होनी चाहिये। हमने कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को माना है, चीन ने कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को ठुकराया है। आज यह संभव नहीं है, जब चीन हमारी जमीन को अपने कब्जे में रखे हुये है हम अपनी तरफ से कदम बढ़ायें अपनी तरफ से हाथ बढ़ाएं और चीन से बातचीत शुरू कर दें। चीन का रुख साफ है। लेकिन आज भी दुनिया में ऐसी ताकतें हैं, ऐसे लोग हैं, जो यह चाहते हैं कि भारत और चीन एक दूसरे के नजदीक आयें। कम से कम जो दुश्मनी है वह दुश्मनी न रह कर अगर भाई भाई न बन जायें, जैसे पहले थे, तो दुश्मन भी न रहें। अगर ऐसी ताकतें, ऐसे राष्ट्र, ऐसे लोग, कोई इनिशियेटिव्ह लें, कोई कदम उठायें कि जिसमें हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के बीच का रिश्ता जो खराब है वह धीरे धीरे संभले तो मैं समझता हूं भारत सरकार के लिये यह जरूरी है कि उसकी प्रतिक्रिया सकारात्मक हो, नकारात्मक न हो। अगर चीन से हमरा संबंध सुधर जाता है तो मैं समझता हूं हमारी बहुत सी समस्यायें सुलझ जायेंगी।

जहां तक कश्मीर का मामला है पाकिस्तान और भारतवर्ष पहले एक देश थे और आज भी प्रकृति ने इन देशों को एक ही भूखंड का टुकड़ा बनाया है, यह बदकिस्मती है कि पाकिस्तान ने एक दूसरा रवैया अपनाया है, उसका ढंग दूसरा है। ताशकंद घोषणा के बाद भी वह युद्ध की तैयारी करता है, सैनिक शक्ति को बढ़ाता है। तो हमें भी अपनी सैनिक शक्ति को बढ़ाना चाहिये, लेकिन मैं इतना कहूंगा कि ऐसे वक्त पर हमें अपने दिमाग को बंधक रख देना नहीं है, ऐसी स्थिति में हमें शांति से और धैर्य से काम लेना है। हम तैयारी करें पाकिस्तानी खतरे का सामना करने के लिये लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं यह समझता हूं कि हमारी तरफ से कोई ऐसा कदम न उठाया जाय जिसकी वजह से हमारे और पाकिस्तान के रिश्ते जैसे हैं उससे भी खराब होते चले जायें। क्योंकि ऐसे ही वक्त पर धीरज की जरूरत होती है और ऐसे ही वक्त पर शांत दिमाग की समझदारी की, जरूरत होती है। तो जहां हम शक्ति संचय करें वहां हम कोई ऐसा कदम न उठायें जिससे हमारा और पाकिस्तान का रिश्ता खराब हो जाय। मुझे आज पाकिस्तान के बारे में जो सबसे बड़ा खतरा मालूम हो रहा है वह है चीन से पाकिस्तान का गठबंधन। ऐसा न हो कि कोई वक्त आये, जिसका इंगित कल जो डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर ने स्टेटमेन्ट दिया था उसमें था, कि पाकिस्तान शिखंडी की तरह आगे बढ़े, पीछे चीन उसके रहे और जैसे शिखंडी को सामने देखकर भीष्म पितामह चुपचाप बैठ गये थे वैसे ही जब पाकिस्तान आगे बढ़े तो ऐसा न हो, कि हमारे पश्चिमी राष्ट्र पाकिस्तान को आगे देखकर हमें हथियार वगैरह न दें, हमारी मदद न करें और चुप हो जायें। इसलिये जरूरी है कि हम कश्मीर के मामले का खयाल रखते हुये इस बात के ऊपर गौर करें कि हमारा रूस के साथ जैसा संबंध है, जैसा मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध रहा है, वैसा ही मैत्रीपूर्ण आगे भी रहे। रूस के दिल में कोई संदेह नही पैदा होना चाहिये कि हमने अपना रुख अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामले में बदला है। मैं पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों की दोस्ती भी चाहता हूं लेकिन इतना में समझता हूं कि रूस की दोस्ती जो है वह पक्की दोस्ती है, आज तक रही है और आगे भी रहने वाली है।

मैं एक मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूं। इसलिये हमें रूस की भावनाओं का खयाल करना है और हमें रूस की दोस्ती को पक्का करना है।

[श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह]

आखिर में मैं वियतनाम के बारे में सिर्फ एक बात कहूंगा । वियतनाम की समस्या बड़ी जटिल समस्या है लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि वियतनाम की समस्या का समाधान प्रकट राजनय से नहीं हो सकता, गुप्त राजनय से हो सकता है । खुली डिप्लोमेसी से, भाषणों से, अखबारों में सुझाव देकर, हम वहां के मामलों को सुलझा नहीं सकते । जैसे गुप्त राजनय पहले चलती थी, अगर उसी तरीके को अपनायेंगे तो मुझे उम्मीद है कि जेनेवा कान्फरेन्स की बुनियाद पर वियतनाम समस्या का हल हो जायेगा ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूं ।

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : Sir, the statement made by the Defence Minister yesterday which was supplemented by the Foreign Minister this morning is the most disquieting news' that we have received during the last few months. It is time that we look back and view the whole thing in its proper perspective. My mind goes back to 1947, namely, the division of India. That I think was the first blow administered to this sub-continent by the British before they withdrew and I think we are still reeling under the forces released by that blow. In one of his conversations which was reported somewhere Mr. Nehru told Mr. Attlee some time in 1949 : "You have divided India but I feel that the forces that this division has released will have their effect for a long time to come not only in the east but they will shape the course of world history to a very large degree." I think Mr. Nehru was in one of his prophetic moods when he made that statement. I recall another statement of his in 1959 when the Chinese hostilities began in a small way. He said in one of his reflective moods when he put aside his papers : "These are perhaps the first phases of a chapter which is opening and may last for the rest of the century." So We must envisage that we are today moving in the midst of forces which are not going to last for a short time but which will have their repercussions throughout the century and may be later too.

The second blow that was administered to the sub-continent of India was by the United States in 1954 when Mr. John Foster Dulles took the decision to enter into a military pact with Pakistan. Mr. Nehru gave warnings of the future course of events that would flow from this but Mr. Dulles was adamant and went ahead with it. We said at that very time that the arming of Pakistan was one of the most dangerous ventures which they were undertaking and that these forces will ultimately be used against India but the United States paid no heed to our words and the Press reported at that time that the consideration for this was the bases that the United States got in Chitral and other areas from which ultimately we found that the U-2 flew and a general reconnaissance of tha whole of Russia was undertaken by the planes that flew from this region. Whatever may be the truth of the real consideration that flowed from Pakistan, history has shown conclusively in 1966 that the forecast which Mr. Nehru made proved completely true. So I say that before the bar of history both Britain and the United States will stand on trial as it were for these two deeds, namely, first the partition of India and second the arming of Pakistan.

Speaking only a few weeks before his death—and I think it was his last speech in the Lok Sabha—Mr. Nehru said that "with the coming of China, as more or less an ally of Pakistan, Pakistan has become even more aggressive. I do not know what understanding they may have come to with each other but such understanding cannot be of advantage to India. It is extraordinary that even in these circumstances some of the Western Powers incline towards Pakistan and help her in regard to Kashmir. The Kashmir issue would have been solved long ago but for this Western help to Pakistan." I think the situation which Mr. Nehru summed up at that time still remains true. On a cool analysis one is unable to comprehend the policy of the United States. They tell us that they are fighting the war in Vietnam to save freedom and that River Mekong is the real frontier. Whatever may be the truth in those observations the fact remains that they have taken in the past, and are likely to take in the future, steps to arm Pakistan which weaken not only India

but Pakistan also because my approach is that these actions of the United States weaken the hole of the sub-continent. If there is any bulwark against the expansion of China, it is the Indian sub-continent which has the largest armies in the east and any steps that the United States take to weaken India and consequently Pakistan also—because that will be the result of a war between the two countries—will ultimately weaken the forces of peace in the east.

Now that a war between India and Pakistan has taken place and the United States is also fully aware of the expansionist tendencies of China it passes our comprehension how they can still imagine that aid to Pakistan is for the good of the world and for the good of the American policies. It is now patent that China will operate under the cover of Pakistan and it may well be that the next invasion may not be in Kashmir but may be somewhere in the East. Pakistan has always felt the military weakness of her eastern region. I well remember how Mr. Liaquat AH Khan came here to negotiate because Mr. Patel had threatened that in order to save the minorities we would march into East Pakistan. Fortunately that step never became necessary but that has been one of the biggest factors in the mind of Pakistan that before they take any large-scale operations in the west it is necessary for them to safeguard their military position in the east and I think in this China is their ally. Such is the position to which we have come now and which the United States is unable to comprehend. I do not for one moment forget the good side of the United States' activities for instance, the support both moral and material they gave us in 1962, the food aid and the economic aid that has flowed from the United States. I am well aware of the generous impulses and the democratic instincts of the American people and I am therefore unable to comprehend this divergence in their approach to the problems of the Indian sub-continent.

While I was in the United States in 1963 with a parliamentary delegation I had very good opportunities of talking to a large number of officials in the State Department and we found that however much we explained to them the collusion between China and Pakistan it left no impression on their minds. This is something which we found that in 1963 in any case their mind was completely closed. They seemed to believe that Pakistan is with them and that this alliance with China is merely to equip themselves in various ways to launch their offensive against India and that it is not directed against the United States or their policies. I feel that this is a very short-sighted view in which American diplomacy is at the present moment enmeshed. It was a refreshing contrast from these officials to go to President Kennedy and sit in his presence. It was a meeting that we had with him a few months before his assassination. We found the President a remarkable person. He analysed the whole position and the Kashmir problem for us with great skill and understanding and explained to us that he himself felt that these problems were very difficult; he was not prepared to offer any advice and stated that the problems could only be solved by mutual understanding which could not be built up in a day. He cited to us the example of Monsieur Monnet of France who in his private capacity undertook the task of building up a united Europe and a rapprochement between Germany and France. He suggested that the best way to deal with these problems would be that at unofficial levels there should be various meetings between Pakistan and India and some leading personalities in both the countries should not only talk from time to time but should exchange their ideas and evolve proposals at various levels which should then be propagated and inculcated in the public mind. We found the President very farsighted. As we left him I reflected : what is this disharmony between the President explaining the whole thing in a manner which carried conviction and th$_e$ Administration acting in a different manner ?

1 P.M.

At that time I recalled an observation of President Roosevelt to Mr. Churchill. At one of their meetings Mr. Churchill was very much disturbed at a certain proposal which President Roosevelt was determined to enforce. When he found that Mr. Churchill was very unhappy, he soothed him with this observation: "Remember, my dear friend, the President

[Shri M. N. Kaul.]

of the United States issues orders, but the administration is so vast, so complicated, that I do not know what ultimate shape and form my orders would take." It is a curious phenomenon of American politics that you get now and then Presidents like Woodrow Wilson, Roosevelt and Kennedy, who were far-sighted, but in the short tenure of their regimes they were not able to inject into the slow-moving American administration their ideas, so that they may last a long time. I narrate the story in order to show that I know both sides of the picture. I feel very disturbed that America is not changing its policies. What we would have welcomed not only in our own interests but also in the interests of the entire sub-continent was something on the lines of Marshall Aid. Look at the aid that America gave to Europe to put it on its feet. That is the kind of aid that the United States should have Riven to both India and Pakistan, economic aid, to put them on their feet, in a massive way. That would have been the biggest contribution that the United States would have made, out of its own prosperity, towards the prosperity of the East, but that step they had never felt bold enough to adopt. And 1 have always felt that it was a great tragedy that President Roosevelt died because from his writings, memories and notes that have survived it is apparent that he had a different vision of the post-war world. But that did not happen and we are now faced with the present situation.

Here is America involved in Vietnam. Now, what is the position in Vietnam ? My heart goes out to these simple people of Vietnam, who are undergoing great sufferings at the present moment. That impinges on our mind. These people are really fighting for their freedom. 1 marvel at their bravery, that, In the face of all these attacks by the United States and the military might of that power, they are still confident that they can go ahead. Whatever our own views and proposals may be, we should not forget that they are a brave people. I cannot say much about South Vietnam. As Mr. Anthony Eden, in a recent article, says—and he was one of the architects of the 1954 Geneva Agreement—in the South the United States policy has not succeeded in throwing up a Government which enjoys the confidence of the South Vietnamese people. That is the biggest weakness of American diplomacy in the Far East.

It was said in the House of Lords in 1946 or 1947 that when the British withdrew from India there would be a vacuum in this area from the Yellow River to the Red Sea, because they had filled the role of a dominant power in this region for two hundred yean. The struggle, as we view it even today, is between the great powers and the incipient power of China. Today why America is in Vietnam is, to my mind, plain. They want to resist the extension of the spheres of influence that were settled at the end of the last war. I would recall to the minds of Members the earlier days of colonialism when Portugal and Spain were in the field. At that time there was a lot of conflict as to the spheres of influence between Spain and Portugal. The Pope was at that time the ruling authority. He took a blue pencil and drew a line across the world. He said : "This side is for Portugal and the other side is for Spain." His decision was adhered to and there was no conflict between these two powers. Unfortunately the Pope does not have that power today and there is no corresponding authority to replace him. The real struggle is that the great powers resist an extension of the spheres of influence as they existed at the end of the last war. That is the struggle which we watch from a distance. As Nehru said in one of his speeches in Lok Sabha, and I think that is an observation that we should always remember, ultimately in deciding these matters it is the great powers who count. We can only give a helping hand. When Members suggest to the Government 'Do this, do that', they should know what the exact position is. It is not India which is ultimately going to decide. It is the great powers which will settle this issue and India can only give a helping hand and that helping hand it has given in a very admirable manner.

Thank you.

SHRI ARIUN ARORA : Mr. Chairman, I join those Members of the House, who have congratulated the Foreign Minister, on his excellent speech yesterday in which he reviewed not only our relations with

our neighbours, but also the world situation as such. The manner in which he conducted our foreign policy has ensured that the moral force, which Shri Jawahar-lal Nehru built up, is going to be preserved by this country. I must, however, say that there has been on many occasions absence of initiative in our Foreign Office. There is, for example, the case of Indonesia, which the Foreign Minister mentioned yesterday. Our relations with Indonesia were very good. For no fault of ours the rulers of Indonesia decided in 1963 that their relations with us would not be so friendly as we, Indians, wanted. Since October, 1965 there had been developments in Indonesia which pointed to the fact that there was going to be a reversal of those policies. We have been sitting quietly waiting for events to so shape themselves that the attitude of Indonesia towards India would change and then we would welcome the return of the prodigal friend with open arms. I personally feel that our Foreign Office should have taken the initiative in the matter when changes began to take shape in Indonesia. The energetic Foreign Minister of Pakistan, who is no more the Foreign Minister, paid a visit to Indonesia to ensure that Indonesians did not, in their desire for change, change their attitude towards India, but our Foreign Office did not think it proper to send even a special envoy to that country to encourage the process which was taking place there.

Almost every speaker has mentioned China and there is no denying the fact that the Chinese are adopting mad policies, policies which are aimed against the maintenance of peace in the world and which are against the desires of the newly independent countries like India, to develop themselves. Somehow the Chinese rulers have adopted a hostile attitude not only towards India, but also towards the Soviet Union, and they go on denouncing everyone as American agents, whereas, as was disclosed by the Defence Minister yesterday, the Chinese Government itself is arming an ally of the United States. There can be no two opinions that the policies pursued by the Chinese Government are neither socialist nor are they aiming at building world peace. They are policies which can only endanger the peace in this subcontinent, and there can be no stronger terms than those used by the Members of this House to condemn the activities of China in supplying arms, tanks, aeroplanes, etc., t» Pakistan. But I must say that while the Chinese go on doing these warlike acts, the correct attitude is the one which our Prime Minister has adopted, which she has declared more than once, that she will not refuse to talk to the Chinese as soon as she feels that there are some reasonable chances of success of those talks. I think that attitude is a sound attitude. That policy is a correct policy and that policy must be persisted with in spite of what the Chinese do. It is obvious that if the Chinese go on supplying tanks and MIGs and whatever they have to the Pakistanis to enable the Pakistanis to attack India, the circumstances do not warrant our opening any talks with the Chinese. It is only infantile leftists like Mr. Namboodiripad who will say that we should talk to the Chinese in every circumstance. No, we cannot talk to the Chinese in every circumstance. But our attitude should be, let the Chinese show some signs of return to sanity and we will be willing to talk with them and settle our disputes with them peacefully.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, Chin* is not the only abettor. The real abettor is the Government of the United States which for the last twelve years has been supplying arms to Pakistan. It was the American Patton tanks and Sabre Jets which killed innocent Indians in September 1965, and it is obvious that American spares and American weapons cannot reach Pakistan *via* Iran and Turkey if the Government of America, mighty as it is, wants to prevent that. The fact that America's allies in the CENTO Pact, Iran and Turkey, go on supplying arms and spares to the Government of Pakistan to enable it to regain its military strength cannot continue for months together without the American Government knowing of it and without the Government of the United States helping that process. There are alomst daily reports that the Americans are pressurising the Government of India to open talks with Pakistan and hand over the whole of lammu and Kashmir to Pakistan. That is the American desire. Our Government has correctly stated that it *is* not going to be pressurised by the United States Government over surrendering any part of its territory either in Jammu and

[Shri Arjun Arora]

Kashmir or elsewhere to Pakistan. This declaration was repeated by the Foreign Minister this morning. While I welcome that assurance and while I welcome that declaration, I cannot forget that in the matter of devaluation it was the Government of the United States working through its instruments, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which brought pressure on the Government of India, forced it to devalue the rupee and bring economic disaster to this country. If this Government could not resist American pressure on devaluation, it is open to question whether it will go on heroically resisting American pressure over Jammu and Kashmir. I hope the lessons of devaluation, the economic disasters which have followed devaluation—as a matter of fact political disaster also as far as the Government and the Congress Party are concerned—have made the leaders, of our Government wiser, and I hope they will tell the Americans, "we can kick back all your aid", for which Mr. A^oka Mehta went to the U.S.A. in April this year. We should be able to tell them: "we do not want your aid; we do not want your monetary aid, and we do not want your rotten PL 480 wheat, but we will not allow you to poke your nose in the matter of Jammu and Kashmir which is our territory and shall remain so". I think Mr. Bhandari was right when he said yesterday that we should be able to tell the Government of the United States that we will not enter into any negotiations with Pakistan as far as our sovereignty over Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. The only negotiation which we can hold with Pakistan over Jammu and Kashmir is over the vacation of that area which Pakistan has forcibly and illegally occupied for a pretty lone time.

Mr. Chairman, Vietnam is such an important international phenomenon that almost every speaker has mentioned it and I want to join them in emphasizing the significance of that subject. Vietnam is important not only for the defence of independence of a small country in Asia at the moment, it has become significant in so much as it will decide whether we are going to have a third world war immediately or we are going to have peace. In this context, Mr. Chairman, I welcome the initiative that the Prime Minister took on July 7th in her broadcast. There **were** some drawbacks in the proposal. That proposal was welcome because it emphasized that the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam had to be given a place in any conference over Vietnam. It was important when it called for stoppage of
American bombing over North Vietnam, but the silence over immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam was not such a welcome feature. I feel there was also one big mistake for which not the Prime Minister but the Foreign Office is responsible. There was not adequate preparation before this initiative was taken. Normally when great countries and great Governments and leaders of great people take initiatives in settling international disputes, some preparations **are** made in world capitals. People are sounded, people are persuaded and it is after that home work that the proposals **are** made in the open. In this case, this was not done. Shri Dahyabhai Patil cannot speak on anything without mentioning Shri V. K. Krishna Menon. But any student of history will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it was Shri V. K. Krishna Menon's initiative; and hard work that led to the success of the 1954 Geneva Conference. That Conference did not succeed in one day . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab) : He was the man who told the truth before the United Nations.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : That is correct. I was not repeating all that he has said. But in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora, the time is running out.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : In the matter of Viet Nam, I am afraid that sort of work was not done by anybody on behalf of the Government of India, as> was done by Shri V. K. Krishna Menon in 1954. Our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, has an excellent Foreign Minister. But many people are asking whether she can succeed in handling world affairs without having a person like Shri V. K. Krishna Menon. It may not be Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, it may be a younger man, some-

body who can play that role in the world capitals, somebody who can bring out formulas, who can persuade people, who can . . . *(Interruptions)* I cannot suggest your name, Mr. Kumaran.

My hon. friend, Shri Mani, has brought forward a novel sort of amendment when he expresses some sort of worry about the Vietcong and accuses the Vietcong of committing crimes against their cwn people. Well, he speaks about the atrocities committed by the Vieteong on the South Vietnamese population. Shri Mani is not here. But even an infant in arms knows that the Vietcong are the South Vietnamese people. They are the sons of the soil. If there is any atrocity, it is the atrocity committed by more than three lakhs of Americans, Australian and New Zealand troops over the Vietcong who are the sons of the soil of South Viet Nam. They are fighting for the independence of their own people. Shri Kaul who is a very seasoned parliamentarian—though his membership of Parliament is new, he has got such a big experience—has quoted Mr. Anthony Eden to say that the Americans have failed to produce a Government in South Viet Nam, one which represents the South Vietnamese people. From 1963, Mr. Chairman, there have been thirteen Governments in South Viet Nam. A number of leaders were killed at the instance . . .

(Time bell rings.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am afraid . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: ... of **the** Americans.

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) : چیرمین صاحب—مجھے اپنے فارن منسٹر کی اس بات سے اتفاق ھے جو انھوں نے فرمایا کہ کچھ ھمسایہ دیشوں سے ھمارے تعلقات بہت اچھے ھیں - میں اس بات سے خوش ھوں کہ ھم غیر جانبدار ھیں لیکن یہ ایک بڑا ھی نازک مسئلہ ھے کہ اپنے آپ کو ساری دنیا سے الگ تھلگ رکھا جائے - اس میں کافی حد تک ھمارے دیش کو کامیابی ھوئی لیکن بہت سی ترٹیاں ھیں جن کی طرف ھمارے فارن منسٹر صاحب توجہ نہیں دے پائے اور وہ مجھے معاف فرمائیں اگر میں کہوں کہ ۵۰ پرسنٹ سے زیادہ توجہ ان کی پنجاب میں لگی رھتی ھے وھاں پٹواری سے لے کر چیف منسٹر تک کیا کرتے رھتے ھیں -

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : और बाकी का 50 परसेंट जालंधर में ।

شری عبدالغنی : تو میں نے کہا کہ ترٹیاں ھیں - برما سے ھمارے تعلقات اچھے ھیں - انڈونیشیا سے اچھے، لنکا سے اچھے ھیں افریقہ کے دیشوں سے اچھے ھیں لیکن وہ مدراس کے بازاروں میں جائیں - صرف مدراس میں ھی نہیں بلکہ اور بڑے بڑے شہروں میں جائیں اور دیکھیں پٹریوں پر اپنے بھائی بہنوں کو - کس طرح ان کو اجاڑا گیا اور برباد کر دیا گیا - جو کروڑ پتی اور لکھ پتی تھے وہ آج بازاروں میں چھوٹی چھوٹی کپڑے کی دوکانیں کرتے ھیں یا کوئی اور دوکان کرتے ھیں - ان کے لئے کوئی شیلٹر نہیں ھے کہ بارش میں اور دھوپ میں اپنے آپ کو پناہ دے سکیں - ایسا کیوں ھوا ؟ کوئی نہ کوئی ترٹی اپنی فارن پالیسی میں ھے -

کے بارے میں کچھ نہیں کہا کہ ان کو بھی رکنا چاہئے - وہاں ہماری سرکار چپ ہے - ہماری سرکار اس پر کچھ نہیں کہتی - اس کا ایک نتیجہ ہوا ہے - فارن منسٹر صاحب اس پر توجہ دیں - کہ جب چائنا نے ہم پر ظلم کیا اور اگریشن کیا تو امریکہ نے فوراً ہی بغیر ہماری کسی درخواست کے ہماری مدد کی یا یوں کہئے کہ پنڈت جی نے سادھارن طور پر ان سے کہا کہ یہ ظلم کر رہے ہیں اور وہ فوراً ہماری مدد کو آیا - ان کو آنا ہی چاہئے تھا اگر وہ اس بات کا حامی ہے کہ دنیا میں امن رہے اور کوئی دیش دوسرے دیش پر ظلم نہ کر پائے تو اسے آنا ہی چاہئے تھا وہ ہماری مدد کو فوراً آیا لیکن امریکہ جو ہماری مدد کو آیا تھا اس کے لئے اس کو ہمارے دونوں ہاؤسوں میں بہت بری طرح سے کوسا گیا - اس کے بعد نتیجہ کیا ہوا - جب پاکستان نے ہم پر پھر ایگریشن کیا، اپنے وعدوں سے پھر کر وہاں ظلم ڈھانا شروع کیا، ہمارے علاقہ میں لوگ گھس آئے اور امریکہ نے جو زبان دی تھی کہ انکے ہتھیار جو پاکستان کو دیئے جا رہے ہیں وہ ہندوستان کے خلاف استعمال نہیں ہونگے لیکن وہ استعمال ہوئے اور پاکستان نے ایگریشن بھی کیا لیکن امریکہ بالکل خاموش رہا اس کے اندر وہ چستی

[شری عبدالغنی]

دوسری بات جو میں کہا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ ہم نان الائینڈ ہیں - ٹھیک ہے لیکن مشکل یہ آ پڑتی ہے کہ اگر مصر پر برطانیہ نے حملہ کیا تو ایک ہی جست میں امریکہ اور رشیا نے برطانیہ کو صاف صاف کہا کہ اگر تم مصر پر نہر سوئز کے معاملہ میں کوئی ظلم کروگے تو تمہیں ظلم نہیں کرنے دیا جائے گا - بھارت نے ویٹ نام کے بارے میں اپنی پالیسی کا اعلان کیا اور وہ یہ کیا کہ ہم سمجھتے ہیں کہ امریکہ جو اس وقت بمباری کر رہا ہے وہ زیادتی کر رہا ہے - وہ اس کو نہیں کرنا چاہئے اس کو ہٹ جانا چاہئے - لیکن ہماری بد نصیبی یہ ہے کہ جب رشیا نے ہنگری میں ظلم کیا تو ہماری سرکار بالکل گم سم رہی بالکل چپ رہی اور کچھ نہیں کہا - یہ ٹھیک ہے کہ ساری دنیا مشرق اور مغرب میں بٹی ہوئی لیفٹ اور رائٹ میں بٹی ہوئی ہے - ہمارا اپوزیشن بھی بٹا ہوا ہے سرکاری پارٹی بھی بٹی ہوئی ہے - تو سرکار چپ رہی اور سرکار نے کچھ نہیں کہا کہ رشیا والے ہنگری والوں پر ظلم کر رہے ہیں - ویٹ نام کے بارے میں ہماری سرکار نے یہ کہا کہ امریکہ کو ہٹنا چاہئے بمباری روکنی چاہئے لیکن ساتھ ہی ساتھ چائنا اور رشیا وہاں جو رول ادا کر رہے ہیں اس

ہے تو چیرمین صاحب — اس کے سوا کوئی راستہ نہیں ہے کہ ایک دو دیش سے ہم مدد لیں جو کھلے بندوں ہمارے پلانوں میں مدد دے سکتے ہیں جن کی بےانت اپنی دولت بےشمار ہے اور وہ دے سکتے ہیں اور وہ ہیں امریکہ یا ویسٹرن جرمنی ۔ ایسی حالت میں کیا وہ ہماری مدد کرینگے ۔ اگر ہم ان کو کنڈم کرتے ہیں اور مشرق کو یعنی روس اور چائنا کو پورے زور سے کنڈم نہیں کرتے تو صلح کرانے میں مشکل ہو جائے گی ۔ اگر آپ کو صلح کرانی ہے تو دونوں کو کہیں کہ وہاں سے ہٹیں ۔ اس بات کا خیال کئے بنا کہ کون ہمیں امداد دیتا ہے ۔ وہ سب کے سب پیچھے ہٹ جائیں تب تو میری سمجھ میں آ سکتا ہے ۔ امریکہ کو بھی کنڈم کیا جائے لیکن مجھے یہ خطرہ ہے کہ اگر ہماری پالیسی یہی رہی جو آج چل رہی ہے ۔ تو میں نہیں مانتا کہ جانسن یا کوئی اور ہو وہ ہندوستان کو جس طرح سے ایڈ دینا چاہتا ہے وہ دے پائے گا ۔ جب پاکستان نے ہم پر ایگریشن کیا تو امریکہ نے کیوں پاکستان کے مقابلہ میں اسی وقت ہمیں ہتھیار نہیں دیئے ۔ جب پاکستان ہم پر ظلم کر رہا تھا میں مانتا ہوں ۔ لیکن کیا ہم اس بات میں سچے ہیں کہ ہم ان کو گالی دیتے رہیں ۔ کیا ہم اس بات میں سچے ہیں کہ ہم

پیدا نہیں ہوئی جیسی کہ چائنا کے وقت ہوئی تھی ۔ یہاں تک کہ چین والوں نے فرضی طور پر یہ بھی کہا کہ ہم پاکستان کی مدد کو آ رہے ہیں پھر بھی امریکہ چپ رہا ۔ تو میں کیا امریکہ کو اس کے لئے دوش دوں کہ جب مصر کے معاملہ میں بےتاب ہو گیا چین کے حملہ کے وقت بےتاب ہو گیا تھا تو پاکستان نے جب ایگریشن کیا تب اس کو بیتاب ہونا چاہئے تھا لیکن وہ نہیں ہوا ۔ تو اس میں آیا امریکہ کی صرف غلطی ہے یا ہم نے بھی کوئی زیادتی کی ۔ ہم اس پر غور کریں اور جو پالیسی ہم بنانا چاہتے ہیں اس کو دیکھیں ۔ میں مانتا ہوں کہ رشیا نے اس وقت ہماری مدد کی جب کہ پاکستان نے حملہ کیا ہم اس کے شکرگذار ہیں لیکن اس کے شکرگذار ہوتے ہوئے بھی اس بات سے کون انکار کر سکتا ہے کہ امریکہ نے ہر موڑ پر ہمیں مدد دی ۔ جب بھی ہمیں قحط کا سامنا ہوا یا کوئی اور مشکل آئی ہماری مدد کو وہ دوڑا ۔ کہاں تک دوڑا اس سے مجھے واسطہ نہیں اس کو سرکار بخوبی جانتی ہے ۔ لیکن سرکار یہ چاہتی ہے کہ پلان کے بارے میں میں یہ کہتا ہوں کہ سرکار ہمارے پلان کا اتنا بڑا گھروندا نہ بنائے اور پلان کو اتنا زیادہ پھیلا نے نہیں کہ جو اس کے بس سے باہر ہو ۔ اور اگر وہ پھیلاتی

مجھے اس بات کا بھی رنج ہے کہ پچھلے سال شیخ محمد عبداللہ جو ہماری نظر میں بڑے حب الوطن ہیں ۔ انہوں نے عرب میں مکہ معظمہ میں جب دنیا بھر کے مسلمانوں کی کانفرنس ہوئی ساری دنیا کے دیش وہاں تھے تو اس کانفرنس میں ہندوستان کی عزت کو بچانے کے لئے جو شاندار رول ادا کیا اگر اس کی صحیح اطلاع وہاں منسٹری کے ذریعہ ہماری سرکار کو ملی ہوتی تو میں نہیں مانتا ان کو دیش کا دشمن کہکر جیل میں ڈالا جاتا ۔ بلکہ ان کی سراہنا کی جاتی اور ان کو موقعہ دیا جاتا اس وقت جب کہ ویٹنام کے ساتھ ساتھ کشمیر بھی اتنا ہی الجھا ہوا مسئلہ ہے اس کی بھی پرابلم اتنی ہی نازک ہے کہ جس میں خطرہ ہے کہ پاکستان اور چائنا مل کر پھر سے ایگریشن کریں اور دونوں طرف سے ہمیں پریشان کرنے کی کوشش کریں ایسے موقعہ پر شیخ صاحب کو اندر رکھا ہے اور ان کی وفاداری پر شک کرنا مناسب نہیں ۔ جب نہ ہندوستان کے پاس کچھ تھا نہ مہاراجہ کے پاس کچھ تھا بلکہ وہ کشمیر سے بھاگ آیا تھا اور نہ کشمیریوں کے پاس کچھ تھا اسوقت انہوں نے اور ان کے ساتھیوں نے مرد میدان ہوکر ہمارے سارے کشمیر کا علاقہ تو نہیں لیکن جو آج ہمارے ہاتھ میں ہے اس کو حاصل کرنے میں شاندار قربانیاں دیں انہوں نے ہمیں موقعہ دیا جس سے

[شری عبدالغنی]

ان کی پالیسی کی مذمت کرتے رہیں ۔ یہ سچ ہے ایک طرف کمیونزم کا طوفان ہے جو بڑھتا چلا آ رہا ہے ۔ دوسری طرف امریکہ کی یہ خواہش ہے کہ کمیونزم جہاں تک ہے وہیں تک رہے آگے نہ بڑھنے پائے آگے بڑھنے سے نقصان ہے ۔ بہر حال یہ اب سرکار کا کام ہے کہ وہ اپنی پالیسی پر قائم رہتے ہوئے یہ دیکھے کہ کتنی حد تک وہ ویٹنام میں امریکہ کے ساتھ انصاف کر رہی ہے ۔

دوسری بات چیرمین صاحب — جو میں بڑی ادب سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ ہم نے کروڑوں روپیہ یا اربوں روپیہ اپنی فارن پالیسی کی کامیابی کے لئے خرچ کیا ۔ لیکن یہ بھی سچ ہے چیرمین صاحب — کہ جب پاکستان نے ہم پر زیادتی کی یا چائنا نے شیطنت کی تو بہت تھوڑے دیش آگے بڑھ کر آئے جنہوں نے یہ کہا ہو کہ چائنا اور پاکستان نے ایگریشن کیا یہ کیوں ہوا ؟ اس لئے کہ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ایسے لوگ فارن منسٹری کی طرف سے بھیجے گئے جن میں کنبہ پروری تھی، اور فیورٹزم تھا ۔ اگر وہ لوگ صحیح ہوتے ۔ صحیح اطلاع دے پاتے تو چیرمین صاحب — میں نہیں مانتا کہ ہم وقت پر باخبر نہیں ہوتے کہ چائنا کو کس طرح سے روکنا ہے اور ہماری جو ذلت ہوئی وہ نہ ہوتی ۔

ڈیموکریسی زندہ رہے دنیا میں غریبوں کا پلڑا بھاری رہے تو میں ادب سے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ اپنی پالیسی پر پھر سے غور کریں پیشتر اس کے کہ ان کا پلان ایڈ نہ ملنے سے رک جائے ۔ یہ کہنا بڑا آسان ہے چیرمین صاحب—کہ کچھ پرواہ نہیں کوئی ڈر نہیں ۔ آپ کا اتنا حوصلہ اتنی بلندی قابل تعریف ہے ۔ اور دنیا میں ایسا کہنا شاید خودداری کے مطابق ہے لیکن خالی خودداری جولاہے کی عقل سی ہوتی ہے ۔ جیسے جولاہے نے سخت ٹھنڈک میں خودداری کی وجہہ سے گرم کپڑا سسرال والوں سے نہیں مانگا تھا اور رات کو اسی طرح سو گیا مگر وہ جب صبح کو نہ اٹھا تو ساس نے اس کے دانت کھلے ہوئے دیکھے ۔ لیکن وہ تو سردی سے اکڑ کر مر گیا تھا تو اگر ہم نے پلان کو کامیاب بنانا ہے اور ڈیموکریسی کو چلانا ہے ۔ تو دانشمندی سے کام لینا ہوگا اس جولاہے کی طرح نہیں ۔

چیرمین صاحب— اس سلسلہ میں مجھے ڈر ہے کہ ایک دفعہ چاہے کسی کے دباؤ سے ہوا یا حالات نے مناسب طریقہ سے ڈی ویلیوشن کرنے کے لئے مجبور کیا لیکن کہیں ایسا نہ ہو کہ پھر ایک بار ایسا کرنا پڑے ۔ مجھے یہ بھی ڈر ہے کہ کہیں امریکہ نے پوری ایڈ نہیں

ہم اپنے اس کشمیر کو بچا پائے اس کو دیش کے اندر رکھا ۔ یہ فارن پالیسی کی کمزوری ہے کہ ان کے بارے میں پورے طور پر خبر نہیں ملی ۔ اور اصل حالات سے آگاہی نہیں ہوئی ۔

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : "फारेन" का मामला नहीं है यह । वह होम मिनिस्टर का मामला है ।

श्री सभापति : आपने कहा कि उनसे दुरुस्त रिपोर्ट नहीं मिली ।

شری عبدالغنی : ارجن اروڑا صاحب— میں نے کہا اگر عرب میں جو ہمارا سفیر بیٹھا تھا وہ ہماری فارن منسٹری کی معرفت ہماری سرکار کو صحیح خبر دیتا تو غالباً آج ہمیں یہ دقت نہ آتی ۔ میں دعویٰ سے کہتا ہوں کہ جیسے ہندوستان مہاتما گاندھی تھا یا پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو کا نام ہندوستان تھا اور ان کو یعنی گاندھی جی اور نہرو جی کو یہ شکتی ملی ویسے ہی یہ بالکل حقیقت ہے کہ کشمیر شیخ عبداللہ ہے اور شیخ عبداللہ کشمیر ہے اس بات سے آنکھ موندھنا اس بات سے آنکھوں کو بند کرنا اور پاکستان کو موقعہ دینا کہ وہ شطنیت کرے میں سمجھتا ہوں دیش کے اوپر انیائے ہے ۔ اگر ہماری فارن پالیسی وہی ہے جیسا سورن سنگھ صاحب نے بتایا ۔ چاہے وہ انگریزوں کا ظلم ہو افریقہ میں یا کہیں بھی ہو میں ایمانداری چاہتا ہوں کہ

[شری عبدالغنی]

دی تو ہماری انڈسٹری پٹ نیچے گرے گی اور اس کے گرنے سے بنکوں کا دیوالہ نکل جائے گا ۔ اس لئے میں ادب کے ساتھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یا تو موم یا سنگ ہو جائیے ۔ یہ نہیں کہ ایک طرف آپ کہیں نیوٹرل ہیں اور دوسری طرف میرے بھائی ارجن اروڑا کو خوش کرنے کے لئے یا رشیا کو خوش کرنے کے لئے یا لیفٹ والوں کو خوش کرنے کے لئے— کیونکہ ہم سوشلزم نہیں لا پائے سوشلزم کے نعرے زیادہ لگائے — اس لئے ہم صرف امریکہ کو گالی دیتے چلے جائیں اور کچھ نہ ہوا گر ایسا ہو تو دیش پر آنے والی تباہی کی ساری ذمہداری ہماری فارن پالیسی پر ہوگی فارن منسٹر صاحب پر ہوگی اور ان کو پھر ملک کے سامنے جواب دہ ہونا پڑے گا ۔

†**[श्री अब्दुल ग़नी** (पंजाब) : चेयरमैन साहब, मुझे अपने फारेन मिनिस्टर की इस बात से इत्तेफाक है जो उन्होंने फरमाया कि कुछ हमसाया देशों से हमारे ताल्लुकात बहुत अच्छे हैं। मैं इस बात से खुश हूं कि हम गैर जानिबदार हैं लेकिन यह एक बड़ा ही नाजुक मसला है कि अपने आपको सारी दुनिया से अलग थलग रखा जाए। इसमें काफी हद तक हमारे देश को कामयाबी हुई लेकिन बहुत-सी त्रुटियां हैं जिनकी तरफ हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब तवज्जो नहीं दे पाए और वे मुझे माफ फरमाएं अगर मैं कहूं कि 50 परसेंट से ज्यादा तवज्जो उनकी पंजाब में लगी रहती है कि वहां पटवारी से लेकर चीफ मिनिस्टर तक क्या करते रहते हैं ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : और बाकी का 50 परसेंट जालंधर में ।

श्री अब्दुल ग़नी : तो मैंने कहा कि त्रुटियां हैं । बर्मा से हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे हैं, इण्डोनेशिया से अच्छे हैं, लंका से अच्छे है, अफ़्रीका के देशों से अच्छे हैं लेकिन वह मद्रास के बजारों में जाएं सिर्फ मद्रास में ही नहीं बल्कि और बड़े बड़े शहरों में जाएं और देखें पटरियों पर अपने भाई बहनों को, किस तरह उनको उजाड़ा गया और बरबाद कर दिया गया है । जो करोड़पति और लखपति थे वह आज बाजारों में छोटी छोटी कपड़े की दुकानें करते हैं या कोई और दुकान करते हैं । उनके लिए कोई शेल्टर नहीं है कि बारिश में और धूप में अपने आप को पनाह दे सकें । ऐसा क्यों हुआ । कोई न कोई त्रुटि अपनी फारेन पालिसी में हैं ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं, वह यह है कि हम नान-एलाइंड हैं । ठीक है लेकिन मुश्किल यह आ पड़ती है कि अगर मिस्र पर बरतानिया ने हमला किया तो एक ही जस्त में अमेरिका और रशिया ने बरतानिया को साफ साफ कहा कि अगर तुम मिस्र पर नहर स्वेज के मामले में कोई जुल्म करोगे तो तुम्हें जुल्म नहीं करने दिया जाएगा । भारत ने वियतनाम के बारे में अपनी पालिसी का एलान किया और वह यह किया कि हम समझते हैं कि अमेरिका जो इस वक्त बमबारी कर रहा है वह ज्यादती कर रहा है । वह इसे नहीं करना चाहिये, उसको हट जाना चाहिए । लेकिन हमारी बदनसीबी यह है कि जब रशिया ने हंगरी में जुल्म किया तो हमारी सरकार बिल्कुल गुमसुम रही, बिल्कुल चुप रही और कुछ नहीं कहा । यह ठीक है कि सारी दुनिया मशरिक और मगरिब में बंटी हुई है, लेफ्ट और राइट में बंटी हुई है । हमारा अपोजिशन भी बटा हुआ है, सरकारी पार्टी भी बटी हुई है । तो सरकार चुप रही और सरकार ने

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

कुछ नहीं कहा कि रशिया वाले हंगरी वालों पर जुल्म कर रहे हैं। वियतनाम के बारे में हमारी सरकार ने यह कहा कि अमरीका को हटना चाहिये बमबारी रोकनी चाहिये लेकिन साथ ही साथ चायना और रशिया वहां जो रोल अदा कर रहे हैं उसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा कि उनको भी रुकना चाहिये। वहां हमारी सरकार चुप है। हमारी सरकार इस पर कुछ नहीं कहती। इसका एक नतीजा यह हुआ है, फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब इस पर तवज्जो दें, कि जब चायना ने हम पर जुल्म किया और एग्रेशन किया तो अमेरिका ने फौरन ही बगैर किसी दरख्वास्त के हमारी मदद की या यूं कहिए कि पंडित जी ने साधारण तौर पर उनसे कहा कि यह जुल्म कर रहे हैं और वह फौरन हमारी मदद को आया। उनको आना भी चाहिए था अगर वह इस बात का हामी है कि दुनिया में अमन रहे और कोई देश दूसरे पर जुल्म न कर पाए तो उसे आना ही चाहिए था, वह हमारी मदद को फौरन आया लेकिन अमेरिका जो हमारी मदद को आया था उसके लिए उसको हमारे दोनों हाउसों में बहुत बुरी तरह से कोसा गया। उसके बाद नतीजा क्या हुआ ? जब पाकिस्तान ने हम पर फिर एग्रेशन किया अपने वायदों से फिर कर वहां जुल्म ढाना शुरू किया, हमारे इलाके में लोग घुस आए और अमेरिका ने जो जबान दी थी कि उनके हथियार जो पाकिस्तान को दिए जा रहे हैं वे हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल नहीं होंगे लेकिन वे इस्तेमाल हुए और पाकिस्तान ने एग्रेशन भी किया लेकिन अमेरिका बिल्कुल खामोश रहा, उसके अंदर वह चुस्ती पैदा नहीं हुई जैसी कि चायना के वक्त हुई थी। यहां तक कि चीन वालों ने फर्जी तौर पर यह कहा कि हम पाकिस्तान की मदद को आ रहे हैं फिर भी अमेरिका चुप रहा। तो मैं क्या अमेरिका को इस के लिए दोष दूं कि जब मिस्र के मामले में बेताब हो गया, चीन के हमले के वक्त बेताब हो गया था तो पाकिस्तान ने जब एग्रेशन किया तब उसको बेताब होना चाहिए था लेकिन वह नहीं हुआ। तो इसमें आया अमेरिका की सिर्फ गलती है या हमने भी कोई ज्यादती की ? हम इस पर गौर करें और जो पालिसी हम बनाना चाहते हैं उसको देखें। मैं मानता हूं कि रशिया ने उस वक्त हमारी मदद की जब कि पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया। हम उसके शुक्रगुजार हैं लेकिन उसके शुक्रगुजार होते हुये भी इस बात से कौन इंकार कर सकता है कि अमेरिका ने हर मोड़ पर हमें मदद दी। जब भी हमें क़हत का सामना हुआ या कोई और मुश्किल आई हमारी मदद को वह दौड़ा। कहां तक दौड़ा इससे मुझे वास्ता नहीं, इसको सरकार बखूबी जानती है। प्लान के बारे में मैं यह कहता हूं कि सरकार हमारे प्लान का इतना बड़ा घरोन्दा न बनाए और प्लान को इतना ज्यादा फैलाए नहीं कि जो उसके बस के बाहर हो। और अगर वह फैलाती है तो चेयरमैन साहब, उसके सिवा कोई रास्ता नहीं है कि एक दो देश से हम मदद लें जो खुले बन्दों हमारे प्लानों में मदद दे सकते हैं। जिनकी अपनी दौलत बेशुमार है और वे दे सकते हैं और वे हैं अमेरिका या वेस्ट्रन जर्मनी। ऐसी हालत में क्या वे हमारी मदद करेंगे, अगर हमको कंडम करते हैं और मशरिक को यानी रूस और चायना को पूरे जोर से कंडम नहीं करते तो सुलह कराने में मुश्किल हो जायेगी। अगर आपको सुलह करानी है तो दोनों को कहें कि वहां से हटें, इस बात का ख्याल किये बिना कि कौन हमें इमदाद देता है। वे सब के सब पीछे हट जायें तब तो मेरी समझ में आ सकता है कि अमेरिका को भी कंडम किया जाए लेकिन मुझे यह खतरा है कि अगर हमारी पालिसी यही रही जो आज चल रही है तो मैं नहीं मानता कि जानसन हो या कोई और हो वह हिन्दुस्तान को जिस तरह से एड देना चाहता है वह दे पाएगा। जब पाकिस्तान ने हम पर एग्रेशन किया तो अमेरिका ने क्यों पाकिस्तान के मुकाबले में उसी वक्त हमें हथियार नहीं दिए, जब पाकिस्तान हम पर जुल्म कर रहा था ? लेकिन क्या हम इस बात में सच्चे हैं कि हम उनको गाली देते रहें। क्या हम इस बात में सच्चे हैं कि हम उनकी पालिसी की मजम्मत करते रहें ? यह सच है कि एक तरफ कम्य-

[श्री अब्दुल ग़नी]

निज्म का तूफान है जो बढ़ता चला आ रहा है, दूसरी तरफ अमेरिका की यह ख्वाहिश है कि कम्यूनिज्म जहां तक है वहीं तक रहे, आगे न बढ़ने पाए, आगे बढ़ने से नुकसान है। बहर-हाल यह अब सरकार का काम है कि वह अपनी पालिसी पर कायम रहते हुये यह देखे कि कितनी हद तक वह वियतनाम में अमेरिका के साथ इन्साफ कर रही है ।

दूसरी बात, चेयरमैन साहब, जो मैं बड़ी अदब से कहना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि हम ने करोड़ों रुपया या अरबों रुपया अपनी फारेन पालिसी की कामयाबी के लिये खर्च किया। लेकिन यह भी सच है चेयरमैन साहब, कि जब पाकिस्तान ने हम पर ज्यादती की या चायना ने शैतानियत की तो बहुत थोड़े देश आगे बढ़ कर आए जिन्होंने यह कहा हो कि चायना और पाकिस्तान ने एग्रेशन किया। यह क्यों हुआ ? इस लिए कि मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसे लोग फारेन मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से भेजे गये जिनमें कुनबा परवरी थी और फैवरिटिज्म था। अगर वे लोग सही होते, सही इत्तलाह दे पाते तो चेयरमैन साहब, मैं नहीं मानता कि हम वक्त पर बाखबर नहीं होते कि चायना को किस तरह से रोकना है और हमारी जो जिल्लत हुई वह न होती। मुझे इस बात का भी रंज है कि पिछले साल शेख मुहम्मद अब्दुला जो हमारी नजर में बड़े हुब्बुलवतन हैं, उन्होंने अरब में मक्का मुअज्जमा में जब दुनिया भर के मुसल-मानों की कांफ्रेंस हुई और सारी दुनिया के देश वहां थे तो उस कांफ्रेंस में हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत को बचाने के लिए जो शानदार रोल अदा किया अगर उसकी सही इत्तलाह वहां मिनिस्ट्री के जरिए हमारी सरकार को मिली होती तो मैं नहीं मानता उनको देश का दुश्मन कहकर जेल में डाला जाता बल्कि उनकी सराहना की जाती और उनको मौका दिया जाता। इस वक्त जब कि वियतनाम के साथ-साथ काश्मीर भी इतना ही उलझा हुआ मसला है उसकी भी प्राब्लम उतनी ही नाजुक है कि जिस में खतरा है कि पाकिस्तान और चायना मिल कर फिर से एग्रेशन करें और दोनों तरफ से हमें परेशान करने की कोशिश करें। ऐसे मौके पर शेख साहब को अन्दर रखना और उनकी वफादारी पर शक करना मुनासिब नहीं। जब न हिन्दुस्तान के पास कुछ था, न महाराजा के पास कुछ था बल्कि वह काश्मीर से भाग आया था और न काश्मीरियों के पास कुछ था उस वक्त उन्होंने और उनके साथियों ने मर्दे मैदान होकर हमारे सारे काश्मीर का इलाका तो नहीं लेकिन जो आज हमारे हाथ में है उसको हासिल करने में शानदार कुर्बानियां दीं उन्होंने हमें मौका दिया जिससे हम अपने उस काश्मीर को बचा पाए उसको देश के अंदर रखा। यह फारेन पालिसी की कमजोरी है कि उनके बारें में पूरे तौर पर खबर नहीं मिली और असल हालात से आगाह ही नहीं हुई।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : 'फारेन' का मामला नहीं है यह, यह होम मिनिस्टर का मामला है ।

श्री सभापति : आपने कहा कि उनसे दुरुस्त रिपोर्ट नहीं मिली ।

श्री अब्दुल ग़नी : अर्जुन अरोड़ा साहब, मैंने कहा अगर अरब में जो हमारा सफीर बैठा था वह हमारी फारेन मिनिस्ट्री की मारफत हमारी सरकार को सही खबर देता तो गालबन आज हमें यह दिक्कत न आती। मैं दावे से कहता हूं कि जैसे हिन्दुस्तान महात्मा गांधी था या पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का नाम हिन्दु-स्तान था और उनको यानी गांधी जी और नेहरू जी को यह शक्ति मिली वैसे ही यह बिल्कुल हकीकत है कि काश्मीर शेख अब्दुला है और शेख अब्दुला काश्मीर है। इस बात से आंख मूंदना इस बात से आंखों को बन्द करना और पाकिस्तान को मौका देना कि वह शैता-नियत करे मैं समझता हूं देश के ऊपर अन्याय है। अगर हमारी फारेन पालिसी वही है जैसा स्वर्ण सिंह साहब ने बताया चाहे वह अंग्रेजों

का जुल्म हो अफ्रीका में या कहीं भी हो मैं ईमानदारी से चाहता हूं कि डेमोक्रेसी जिन्दा रहे, दुनिया में गरीबों का पलड़ा भारी रहे तो मैं बड़े अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह अपनी पालिसी पर फिर से गौर करें। पेशतर इसके कि उनका प्लान एड न मिलने से रुक जाए—यह कहना बड़ा आसान है, चेयरमैन साहब, कि कुछ परवाह नहीं कोई डर नहीं, आपका इतना हौसला इतनी बुलन्दी काबले तारीफ है। और दुनिया में ऐसा कहना शायद खुद्दारी के मुताबिक है लेकिन खाली खुद्दारी जुलाहे की अकल सी होती है। जैसे जुलाहे ने सख्त ठंडक में खुद्दारी की वजह से गर्म कपड़ा सुसराल वालों से नहीं मांगा था और रात को उसी तरह से सो गया मगर वह जब सुबह को न उठा तो सास ने उसके दांत खुले हुये देखे। लेकिन वह तो सर्दी से अकड़ कर मर गया था—तो अगर हम ने प्लान को कामयाब बनाना है और डेमोक्रेसी को चलाना है तो दानिशमंदी से काम लेना होगा जो इस जुलाहे की तरह नहीं।

चेयरमैन साहब, इस सिलसिले में मुझे डर है कि एक दफा चाहे किसी के दबाव से हुआ या हालात ने मुनासिब तरीके से डीवेल्यूएशन करने के लिए मजबूर किया हो लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि फिर एक बार ऐसा करना पड़े। मुझे यह भी डर है कि कहीं अमेरिका ने पूरी एड नहीं दी तो हमारी इण्डस्ट्री पट नीचे गिरेगी और उसके गिरने से बैंकों का दिवाला निकल जाएगा। इस लिए मैं अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि या तो मोम या संग हो जाइये। यह नहीं कि एक तरफ आप कहें न्यूट्रल हैं और दूसरी तरफ मेरे भाई अर्जुन अरोड़ा को खुश करने के लिए या रशिया को खुश करने के लिए या लेफ्ट वालों को खुश करने के लिए—क्योंकि हम सोशलिज्म नहीं ला पाए, सोशलिज्म के नारे ज्यादा लगाए—इसलिए हम सिर्फ अमेरिका को गाली देते चले जायें और कुछ न हो, अगर ऐसा हुआ तो देश पर आने वाली तबाही की सारी जिम्मेदारी हमारी फारेन पालिसी पर होगी, फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब पर होगी और उनको फिर मुल्क के सामने जवाबदेह होना पड़ेगा।]

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

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-seven minutes part one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, the VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AH KHAN) in the Chair.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, the policy we are pursuing in international affairs has been considered by the most advanced nations of the world, by almost the whole world with very few ei-ceptions, as being sound, objective and mature in character. It is not on a few occasions that India's counsels in international affairs have prevailed and have solved some of the international conflicts. Examples of some have been given by Mr. Karmarkar and I am not going to tax this House by reciting them but it is amazing that we should find in our own country some friends characterising our policies in international affairs as failures. The hon. Leader of the Swatantra Party, spoke and, amid all the sound and fury which accompanied his words, I could only discover two things, failure and Formosa. He characterised our policies as failures. A country can fail in one or two things, anybody can understand but to say that it has failed, failed and failed in everything is something which is taking exaggeration in language to the very limits. That has been very fittingly answered by friends on this side and I am not going to take the time of the House on that but one appeal I would like to make to Shri Patel when he said that we have to learn from Formosa. In a general sense there are good points in every country and one may observe good points in others, there is nothing wrong in it but to say that a country like India should learn from a country like Formosa is something which is underestimating our own values and doing injustice to ourselves. I think

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy] we are far more mature, far more advanced and when we have been respected in international affairs, that one should say that we have to go to Formosa and learn is not fair. If he had said that there is progress in agriculture, probably I can agree that there may be good points in Formosa. We are not enemies of Formosa. The only thing is on account of liistorical circumstances, it so happened that we were strained but we are not enemies. That he should go to the extent of saying, being a Leader of a Party here, that we should go and learn from Formosa is something which I think he is doing injustice to himself.

Mr. Niren Ghosh's language is very familiar to us. That language comes with the clandestine circulation of pamphlets of one Embassy here and the clandestine broadcasts that We are familiar with and therefore I do not think anybody need attach much value to that. When Mr. Raj-narain was speaking—he spoke in Hindi but I think I followed him—he was saying that our policy was Videshi. That he is Sadehi he has demonstrated in this House, but to say that this is Videshi is something that discloses that he is blind and though he has eyes, he has eyes only to see 'bundhs' and 'nirbandhs', that he has no eyes to see political development. I think when he said that we have been observing the policy of 'Ghulami', I think for an Indian to attribute that word to our policy, whether national or international, is something which is highly insulting. I think no Indian can think of saying that without experiencing a sense of deep shame. That we have amply proved that in international affairs we have not followed any other country. Have we not disapproved of the U.N. when it sent its army to Korea in 1951 and have we not, while disapproving of the U.N. action, still been able to solve the Korean tangle and have we not at the time of the invasion in Suez Canal crossed swords with great powers ? There have been numerous instances where we had opposed the big powers because our cause was right. Regardless of the consequences of the displeasure of those Powers, we have pursued what we have deemed to be right according to our own lights. The whole world knows this and still that an hon. member of the House belonging to India should use that word is something which he ought to feel ashamed of.

I would like to come to Vietnam in making my own remarks. Unfortunately :i Member from this side of the House—I was not present and I had gone for lunch just to come in time to take my turn— seems to have reflected on our Prime Minister in a statement issued in regard to Vietnam. With regard to the question of Vietnam, our policy has been made very clear, absolutely clear on the floor of this House and in the other House and also in the country and abroad, that in order *to* establish peace here, all foreign troops should be "brought to a conference table stand for long and that these powers should be brought to a conference table and everybody should assist in that. That has been our stand. To say that the Prime Minister omitted to say something and that was due to some pressure from some outside power is something which is doing gross injustice to the merits of the case. Our Prime Minister, whatever may be said of her, carries a very wise head upon young shoulders and she has been able <o discharge her onerous duties very ably to the admiration of not only us but the whole world. That we should try to cast any reflection on the Prime Minister is something which we should feel sorry for. Again he seems to have said that she did not have a good adviser and suggested a name here. I am not going to take up the name here. It is not propriety. It was not good propriety on the part of the gentleman to have not only cast these reflections and to have taken the name in contrast to some other name. It was all wrong. Obviously it was a great impropriety but without taking the name, the name which he has taken has been very controversial in this country and the policies pursued by the person bearing that name have not received acclaim in this country, have not been free from doubt also and the present Foreign Minister has been very ably discharging his duties. We all know that, and the whole country and others too know that, he has been very ably carrying on the very onerous duties that hav$_e$ been put on him and still, that he should think of giving the Prime Minister a separate adviser is something which is not only grossly unfair but which is something which is a gross impropriety, I believe the House

will agree with me that the Prime Minister has a very capable adviser in regard to foreign affairs.

Then I come to Vietnam. Now the situation in Vietnam is very difficult. Everybody knows, that the solution for the Vietnam tangle has been made more difficult by America bombing the demilitarised zone. Whatever the merits of America's argument, to go and bomb the demilitarised zone, which is under the control of the International Control Commission, on any pretext whatsoever, is something which is against reason. Now the argument of Mr. Dean Rusk is that North Vietnamese were infiltrating into the demilitarised zone and that they had concentrated their troops there. Suppose it were the case—when a great authority like Mr. Dean Rusk says something, there may be truth in it—the proper course for the U.S. Government would have been to appeal to the International Control Commission and take them there to see things for themselves and leave the matter of remedy the situation in their hands. But instead of that, bombing the demilitarised zone is something which makes it difficult for neutral friends to appreciate this stand of America.

He said again that there are so many American troops and that therefore America is the aggressor. Well, about that we cannot quite see what justice there is in America going there with troops and for whom she is fighting and all that. It is no use now blaming one power or the other if we want to help in a solution of this problem.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Not blaming but acknowledging this fact. If it becomes a blame,, of course I cannot help it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR An KHAN) : No interruptions, please.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Then Mr. Vice-Chairman, we would like our Government to play a vital role with regard to Rhodesia, and the stand that they hav$_e$ taken is quite a valid stand. But with regard to Southern Rhodesia as well as to with regard to South-West Africa, now things have to move forward in a brisk manner. We have taken in consultation and with the help of other countries a stand which is in favour of the peoples of Rhodesia and South-West Africa, but in the face of the decision given by the International Court of Justice, a more active role is called for on the part of those who are in favour of the people of South-West Africa. We have to take a step which is a more active and brisk step. Whether liberating South-West Africa would not be quite proper and whether a resolution should not be moved in the United Nations in order to see that the Security Council takes physical steps *to* liberate the people of South-West Africa or to take away the Mandate from the Union of South Africa is something which our Government have to consider, and in this respect we have to initiate a step which will further our object in helping the people of South-West Africa and in doing away with the regime of the Union of South Africa there.

I welcome the opportunity that the Government have taken to invite the three-power summit conference to Delhi. These powers count in the world, and 1 think that, when this summit conference meets in Delhi, proper steps will be taken to present not merely the African problems and the Vietnam problem but also the warlike preparations that Pakistan is making against us and its collusion with China and the arms supplies that are both legitimately and clandestinely being made to Pakistan by certain powers. They should also be brought before these powers.

I would also very humbly suggest to the Government to invite the Commonwealth Conference here. Now I have heard the Foreign Minister say in reply to a question that they are prepared to play host to the Commonwealth Conference, but to go and invite it is something which is not called for. But speaking for myself I do not consider it wrong to invite the Commonwealth Conference here. I am making this suggestion specially because in the Indian atmosphere the Commonwealth nations are going to play a great peaceful role, and specially with regard to Vietnam. In solving the troubles of the Vietnam situation the Commonwealth powers can be won over. It is something very great. And there are the problems before the Commonwealth, the Rhodesian problem and the South-West African problem. And this problem of Vietnam of course does not

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] come under Commonwealth. Still, to win their good opinion it would be better to invite the Commonwealth Conference here, and in the peaceful atmosphere of India, in this Buddha's and Gandhi's land it is possible that the Commonwealth powers may come round to the point of view of the Government of India.

Now the next topic which I would like to bring to the notice of the Foreign Minister is the one of dealing with the Indians living overseas. Now I won't call them people of Indian origin; I would call them Indians living overseas. I must congratulate the Government for the successful negotiations they have had with the Ceylo-nese Government in easing the situation there with regard to the registration of Indians there. That is a very happy solution. But in East Africa and in Zanzibar— Mauritius was mentioned by some other friend—and in Burma, the situation is not very happy. Although these countries are friendly to us, still we have to exert our utmost in order to see that our people either live there peacefully and with self-respect, not as second-rate citizens but as citizens of those countries as any other citizens of those countries, or if they had to be repatriated, they would be repatriated on honourable conditions. Now in Burma the question of compensation occurred this morning. I think the Foreign Minister paid a visit and he seems to be satisfied with the attitude of the Burmese Government. But the attitude of the Burmese Government requires to express itself in concrete terms in order to make us believe that the Burmese Government wants to do fairly by our people there. I would suggest creation of a cell or a department. I do not know if there is one now and if there is not, I would suggest a department being opened in the External Affairs Ministry for attending to the question of Indians living abroad. Now there are several questions. For instance, in the East African countries it is necessary for the Indians there to live as citizens of Africa if they want to make it their home. And in order to do that we have to educate them. People may not exactly know the implications of separating themselves from the main bulk of the people of that country. They may not know. And then, if they want to come back to India, we have to secure for them certain facilities in consultation with foreign Government*. For all these things, to attend to the matters concerned with these people, it is better that a special section is created and then attempts are made. But when we go and very crudely tell them—and sometimes people have rudely told them—that "you have to forget India, you have to live like Africans and all that", the people do not quite realise the good motive behind that advice and may take it amiss. Some people met me both here as well as in London and they expressed their fears that the Government of India may not be interested in them. I told them, I assured them that the object of saying so is only to make you to consider the bulk of the people of Africa as your brothers if you want to make it your home; that is all. It may have been put in some other way, I do not know, but that is the object, and the Government of India, take it from me. is very seriously concerned with the interests of the people living in East Africa. Therefore I think having a separate section would be a good attempt to make in this direction.

Now Mr. Karmarkar while referring to our diplomats outside made some remarks. Of course he said that there have been diplomats who have done very good work. I agree with him. I have seen some. There have been very competent people. But there also have been people whose conduct has not been quite free from blame. There have been a few against whom, I hear, investigations also have been conducted in the past.

Now this question has to be reviewed and I would humbly suggest to the Minister of Foreign Affairs to deal with this question not only with regard to the existing incumbents of those posts but also about others. Wherever they are competent we have all praise for them. But wherever there are incompetent people or people who have conducted themselves not so well, who have been found blameworthy of certain irregular transactions and so on, they should be dealt with and there should be no question of such people being the representatives of our country in foreign lands.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Your time is over.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I will just finish in another two minutes, Sir. With regard to these appointments, the view has to be considered by the Government of appointing non-officials. I am a believer in that. We are following the tradition or legacy which has come to us of appointing people from the services. But the modern trends and the modern circumstances require people to know how to move with the people, who kiiow how to cultivate relations with people. They are the people who properly serve the country. I think this is the outlook that is necessary and that is found wanting in many diplomats. And in order to substitute this attitude, to bring in this attitude, 1 think the Foreign Affairs Ministry should consider making appointments from non-officials from chosen individuals. In this connection I may say that the Pillai Committee's report has been submitted, I think. I read it in the papers. We do not knew the recommendations in that report. Whatever may be the recommendations in that report this view that I just now suggested, should be borne in mind by the Foreign Affairs Minister in making further appointments.

With regard to our external publicity, Mr. Karmarkar had dealt with that subject and made some good suggestions. I would only like to bring to tne notice of our Foreign Minister that the lack of timely publicity abroad has done great harm. In the African countries, for example, when Pakistan invaded bur country, the people in those African countries had no knowledge that Pakistan had invaded us. On the other hand they thought that our troops were marching towards Lahore. These were the broadcasts put out by the BBC and Pakistan. Friends have told me that our diplomats abroad also found it very difficult to get interviews with persons of importance there. They did not know the real position and thought we were the aggressors because we weie not quick in sending our messages. I think this is something which our Foreign Affairs Ministry must look into and set right.

There is another small suggestion that I would like to make and it is this. Where-ever we go the question is put to us, "Why can't you be friendly with Pakistan ?" Well, we have done a hundred and one things for developing friendly relations with Pakistan. In many of the outstanding questions we have unilaterally fulfilled our obligations whereas Pakistan has sot fulfilled hers. There had been a number of incursions from Pakistan. These incursions had taken place and yet we have agreed to small territorial adjustments and so on. A hundred and one things we have done in order to create good relations, but these things have not received publicity abroad. These are facts the publicity of which should go to foreign lands and convince them that we have gone out of the way to be friends with Pakistan. Thank you.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, as I was listening to the speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs—it was a long speech though he said in the beginning that it would be a short one and it had *to* be long because he had to explain many things and also explain away many more things. I was reminded of the little English nursery rhyme I learnt as a little boy :

Little Jack Horner sat in a corner
Eating Christmas Pie; He put in his thumb and took out a plum
And said, "What a good boy am I".

The big plum that the Minister of External Affairs has taken out—it rather looks more like a pie in the sky—was our peaceful relations with the whole world except China and Pakistan. And he took the case of a number of neighbouring countries like Burma, Nepal, Ceylon and so on. with whom we have good friendly relations.

As for Burma he said that we are on friendly relations with that country, that it has sent us rice, not as a gift, I suppose; we have to pay for it. But what about the thousands of refugees who had to come away from Burma and whose property was confiscated and who had very little compensation and who were driven from Burma almost at Hi moment's notice ? Many of them can be found in the streets of Madras and on the pavements, selling nicknacks in order to eke out a living. Questions have been put in the House about what action our representatives in Burma have taken and we have been told

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.l that they have been taking continuous action. But the results are nowhere to be seen.'

then with regard to Nepal, we have allowed Nepal which was almost dependent upon India, to fall into the friendly arms of China. Nepal has allowed a great road on its borders with Tibet from Kath-mandii to be built by China, whereas the first great road in Nepal was built by us, by Indian engineers.

Ceylon is one bright spot in our relations with our neighbours. And that bright spot is due to the fact that there has been a change of Government there, a welcome change in the Government in Ceylon. But

ITHE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

there was not a word of praise for the present Government of Ceylon and for its treatment of the Indian settlers in Ceylon of Tamil origin, as contrasted with the treatment given to them by the late lamentable government.

And then with regard to Indonesia, here again there has been a great contrast between the present government and its attitude towards India and that of the late government. Here again there is not a word of praise for the present Government and its behaviour as contrasted with the behaviour of the former Government.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : I would hesitate to interrupt, but I think the hon. Member perhaps missed what I said, because I did make a reference in very friendly terms to both the present Government of Ceylon and to the present Government of Indonesia.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You are on friendly terms with all reactionary Governments.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: What I said—and I say it again—is that there was not a word of praise for these two Governments which had replaced Governments which were not so sympathetic towards India.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Mr. Gupta has his own definition of "reactionary".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cannot have your definition. How can I?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : With regard to the confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia, there has been a comment on it. But may I ask what has India done towards the ending of that confrontation ? It just looked on as an impartial spectator.

As for Vietnam, of course, the Government of India in its usual sermonising attitude about the evil deeds of other countries, has been denouncing the bombing. I can understand the Government denouncing the war in Vietnam. But once the war has been accepted we must allow the countries to use all the usual methods of conducting a war. It is only moralists like Gandhiji or like the Pope who can from a moral plane advise countries not to use certain methods of warfare. But we cannot and we do not speak as moralists. We speak as a Government and a Government which has a large army and which uses the usual methods of warfare. When we waged war did we allow any country to criticise our methods of conducting the war with Pakistan, when we crossed the international border in order to prevent further successes of Pakistan ? Why do we go out of our way to condemn the actions of other powers ? And do we use the same strong language with regard to the actions of North Vietnam ? Do we publicly denounce their uncooperative attitude in regard to bringing about negotiations ? And is the only condition of bringing about peace in Vietnam the withdrawal of American forces ? Has the Government suggested any alternative in order to bring about peace in Vietnam in order that peaceful methods may be resorted to and applied ? Have we suggested the sending of a U.N. force instead of the American forces there in order to preserve peace while the negotiations go on between North Vietnam and South Vietnam ?

3 P.M.

Then the Minister congratulated himself on friendly relations with Philippines,

Japan and a number of other countries. Is it due to our diplomacy that these countries are friendly ?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : Certainly.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : We had no bones of contention with these powers with Philippines, Japan, Malaysia and others. So what is the point in congratulating ourselves on peaceful relations with these countries ?

Then we come to Russia. In the Moscow Declaration the Prime Minister referred *to* the two Germanys. We have always—even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru—stood for the unity of countries. Is it because we allowed our country to be divided, to be partitioned, that we look with complacency upon the forceful division of Germany into two parts ? East Germany exists with the force of the Russian armies. Take them away and hold peaceful elections and you will see the whole of Germany will become united. It was after centuries that German unification was brought about and it is this German unification which the Prime Minister allowed to be treated in such a cavalier manner in that joint Declaration. It looks as if the politeness of the civilised guest has scored over the caution of a seasoned politician. And now that we have come into the Russian sphere of influence why do we not exploit it? Why do we not influence Russia to make a diversion upon our borders with China so that the military impact of China upon India may be eased ? As early as 1950, Madam Deputy Chairman, Russia had sought to establish air bases in the areas around the lakes of Rahas and Mansarover in order to take precautionary action against China. Why not ask Russia to influence China in regard to its conduct with Tndia ?

In regard to Pakistan, the way in which Pakistan has observed the Tashkent agreement has come in for a certain amount of criticism. Since the Tashkent agreement was concluded, unfortunately for Tashkent mere has been a number of earthquakes, a series of earthquakes and I do not think that the people of Tashkent will be enthusiastic about any other international conference being held in that territory. I hope *the* Tashkent agreement also will not suffer a similar earthquake. With regard to the military conditions of the Tashkent agreement I think they have been scrupulously observed by the two armies. But the conduct of Pakistan is said to be not in the spirit of Tashkent because it is building up its forces. But India is not the only frontier of Pakistan. It has another frontier and Pakistan, is ruled by a dictator. And dictators arc very fond of building up their military- forces because they have not only external forces *to* contend against but they have also .internal forces. The only self-respecting reply of India would be to build a military force of its own, a defence force which would act as a counterpoise to the defence forces that Pakistan is building up. Put your trust in the Tashkent agreement but keep your powder dry would be the advice of any citizen to the Government. If it is necessary to cut down the Plans in order to meet this extra defence outlay we must hurt ourselves to that extent because after all 'we must live and then only think of living well. If it is necessary to sacrifice any portion of our Plans in order to build up our defence forces we should do so because we have to bear the facts in our mind. Here again I might say that we might try, more than what we have done in the past, to use Russian influence in order to influence the conduct of Pakistan towards India because Pakistan has also come into the sphere of Russian influence as a result of the Tashkent negotiations.

Then we come to the greatest enemy of us all, namely, China. Against the results of the past aggression of China the Government of India has no remedy. 42,000 square miles of Indian territory are in the hands of China and we seem to have reconciled ourselves to the loss. What action are we taking against future aggression ? It is not only the defence of the border States of Sikkim and Bhutan that are important things. China might be diverting our attention purposely to the defence of Sikkim and Bhutan in order to make us concentrate our forces oh the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan. And with that salient between Sikkim and Bhutan our armies are in a perilous condition. But more insidious than the concentration of armies on the border of China are the measures towards infiltration, towards subversion, towards penetration that the Chinese are organising

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.] all along the border and maybe within our own borders also. Mao Tse-tung has said in one of his great writings in Protracted Warfare:

> "It is extremely important to keep the enemy in the dark as to when and where our forces will attack. This creates a basis for mis-conception and unpre-paredness on the part of the enemy."

Therefore, it is not mere open warfare that we must be prepared against but also against this insidious method of penetration and subversion which may be going on for all we know at the present moment in Sikkim and Bhutan and in the border areas.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is getting over.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : Mr. Karmarkar has congratulated the Government, his own party and himself on the rich dividends that non-alignment has given us. Well, with regard to dividends of any foreign policy, the best dividend is peace for the country. Now has non-alignment given peace for our country ? On two occasions we have been invaded by a foreign power, in 1962 by China and in 1965 by Pakistan. The great objective of any system of foreign policy is the maintenance of peace for the country. If non-alignment has not achieved peace for our country, what is the earthly use of this policy ?

Lastly, Madam Deputy Chairman, may I say a word about the summit conference which India indulges in ? Is this the time. the time of austerity, for Ministers and Members of Parliament going on international delegations ? Is this the time for inviting Foreign Ministers, foreign Heads of States, to visit this country ? Is this the time, the time of austerity, the post-devaluation period, for holding summit conferences in Delhi ? What do all these conferences, all these delegations, all these ministerial visits do for the maintenance of peace for India, for procuring peace for India ? That is the great objective of our foreign policy. Just for raisine the prestige of our country, just for keeping the image of our country before the eyes of people all around, just because we can boast that international conferences are being held, are we to sacrifice the much-needed money that is required in this period of austerity 7 Therefore, I think that the foreign policy of our country, although ambitious, has not been the success that we expected of it.

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion of Mr. Karmarkar endorsing the policy of the Government of India in regard to its foreign affairs. Now, Mr. Ruthnaswamy, our esteemed colleague from the Swatantra Party, has attacked non-alignment and said it has not paid us dividends, as Mr. Dahyabhai Patel said yesterday. Another esteemed colleague of ours, Mr. Niren Ghosh, a left communist, told us that we are now the agents of American imperialism. Mr. Rajnarain also said that we are pursuing a confused policy, that we are the satellites of not one Government but of two Governments by turns. Now, let us examine the criticism that has been levelled against our foreign policy, which I believed and which the country believes has stood the test of time.

Now, let us, first of all, examine tha conditions of countries which have been aligned, for instance, Pakistan. Pakistan only recently has turned to what is termed ihe policy of non-alignment. It is paradoxical that, while we are being asked to abandon the policy of non-alignment, Pakistan is assuming a posture which makes us believe and which makes tin world believe that Pakistan is pursuing an independent foreign policy, the policy of non-alignment. It has invited, first, th<*. Americans, then the Chinese and now the Russians are also wanting to win over the heart of the fair lady of Pakistan. Now, what happened when there was a conflict between India and Pakistan ? Pakistan was. of course, aligned as an ally of America, but did America come to the rescue of Pakistan at that time ? On the contrary, spare parts were denied to Pakistan and American aid, at a time when it was needed most, was denied to it. Of course, the aid was denied to us also. But, then, we were able to build up our economy in such a way—because we have a public sector against which our friends from the Swatantra Party have a standing grouse—

that we were able to build up our heavy industry. Because of the policies pursued by the previous Government, led by that illustrious son of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, we were able to build up our defence potential and build up our country in such a way that in times of stress We did not depend upon a foreign power to defend us. It is this which made us win the war against Pakistan and Pakistan lost because it was depending upon the borrowed wings of another power. When spare parts were not forthcoming, when oil was not forthcoming, when no moral support was forthcoming from any quarter, it fell to the ground. What happened to Cuba? Cuba was aligned to Russia. Russia had to withdraw from Cuba its missile bases because it was threatened by America. Russia refused to confront America in Cuba. What happened to China ? China was aligned to Russia, but when it came to a crucial point, both separated. What happened to Indonesia ? What happened to so many other countries, which were aligned ? What is happening to NATO and SEATO ? What has happened to France ? They want to pursue an independent poficy, in spite of the fact that they were one of the pillars of NATO. Therefore, when the whole world is now accepting the policy of non-alignment which only means an independent foreign policy, pursued so faithfully and so honestly by the Government of India, our own countrymen are asking us to abandon this policy in favour of a policy which is not in the interests of this country. If it was in the interests of our country, I would be the first person to support that policy. After all, non-alignment is not a sacred cow that we have to protect it at all costs. If it is in the interests of this country to abandon the policy, certainly we should do so, but if it is paying us dividends, if we are offered aid from both sides, both by the United States and by the Soviet Union, if the whole world is our friend, except China and Pakistan, if the whole world understands, including the United States and the Soviet Union, that it is a correct policy that is being pursued by India, why should we give up this policy ?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: It is for their sake ?

DR. GOPAL SINGH : We are pursuing that policy for our sake and, therefore, we shall continue to follow this policy, so long as it serves our needs, so long as we have friends abroad who welcome this policy. Of course, when there was an attack on us by China, our policies were misunderstood in Africa. I was one of those persons, who along with the hon. Member Diwan Chaman Lall, was in Africa on tour in those days. We attended the Afro-Asian Conference and we were able to recognise that there were many African countries which did not understand our case. I do not know why. But we told them, "You are pursuing a path that will recoil on you. You will regret the posture that you are now taking." And now it is Africa, even more than us, that has become anti-Chinese. Anybody who has toured the African continent now-a-days would know what is the Chinese image now in Kenya, in Uganda, in Ghana, in Algiers, Morocco and Nigeria and even in Cairo and other African countries. *(Interruption)* They, then, thought that perhaps there was some dispute which the Chinese wanted to settle with us. They thought that probably we were in the wrong and w_e should go out of our way to settle things with China, an Asian country. They thought that perhaps we were pursuing an intransigent policy, a pro-American policy perhaps and not doing things which would help the Afro-Asian non aligned world. But fortunately they have also now realised to their cost that China, which was then only the enemy of Asia, has now become an enemy also of Africa not merely of the United States but also of the USSR, which built up the great country of China. We have nothing against the Chinese people. We are not even against their bein* communists, because we believe in co-existence. Even the Americans say they are not fighting international communism, but they are fighting only against Chinese aggression and Chinese imperialism. Why should we, then, go out of our way and £ive up our policy of non-alignment and co-existence ? As I have said, we are not fighting against a communist State, nor are the United States wanting to do so. What we are opposed to is the Chinese brand of communism, Chinese imperialism, as I would put it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Chinese aggression against us.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Chinese expansionism.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Once they vacate their aggression, we have absolutely no grievance against them. We are not against either communism or capitalism.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You are forgetting Tibet. You have forgotten the Tibetan people.

DR. GOPAL SINGH : I am coming to that. We are not forgetting them.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Your Prime Minister did let them down very badly, for which you should hang your head in shame.

DR. GOPAL SINGH. We have committed a mistake. I believe we have committed a grave mistake over Tibet and we should rectify it. As soon as the question of the admission of China comes tip before the United Nations, for the recognition of China as an independent entity, when it is discussed, we should take up the question of Tibet at that time and take up the question of Formosa also at that time and try to get them admitted as independent nations in the United Nations. But we should not accuse our Government merely because it has on occasions committed mistakes. Every Government has committed mistakes, every Government's image has gone down, not only ours. If you. say that it is only the Government of India's image which has gone down, I would ask you if the image of the U.S.S.R. is the same as it was ten years ago, if the image of the U.S.A. is the same, if the image of Britain is the same. There are ups and downs in the fortunes of nations. It is not on account of us that we went to war with Pakistan and with China. What we did with Pakistan was that we accepted to live in peace with them by splitting our country into two. We offered them a no-war pact which they refused to accept. We offered them a Canal Waters Treaty when they said : "All the sources of our rivers are in Kashmir, and it is on account of this that we want Kashmir." We entered into a Canal Waters Treaty with them under the auspices of the World Bank so that they did not have a grievance on this account. Then they said that Kashmir was very vital for their defence. We said : "All right, we offer you a no-war pact; we will not go to war with you on any account to settle any of our differences." So much so that when they took over the so-called Azad Kashmir through force, even then we did not go to war with them to reclaim it though legally it is part of our country. I wonder why is it that we are told that we should not talk to Pakistan on any account. Maybe they say that the Tashkent Declaration has failed and therefore we should not talk to them now on airs account whatsoever. So long as Pakistan has that portion called Azad Kashmir with them, so long it is our business to talk to them. Unless it is passed by Parliament and conceded by this country that that part belongs to Pakistan, so long we will go on fighting for our just, legal rights on Azad Kashmir. Therefore, if we do not want to go to war with them, what other course is open to us except to have a dialogue ?

In regard to China, my esteemed friend. Dr. Sapru, has thrown up a proposal that we should have talks with them also. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was so reasonable that he went out of his way to make proposals to them that he had never made to Pakistan. If he had made the same proposals to Pakistan, our troubles with that country would, perhaps, have ended. He said : I am prepared to accept arbitration of a power acceptable to both parties; I am prepared to accept the Colombo Proposals as the basis of discussion; I am prepared to go to the World Court to get an adjudication, to get a verdict, an award. We know what the World Court has done in regard to South West Africa. In spite of knowing full well the composition of the World Court, how it is constituted and by whom, still Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru went out of his way to suggest that he was prepared to refer this case to the World Court. China had spurned not only the Colombo Proposals but even these two proposals which are, I hope, still valid. If the Chinese intentions had only been to negotiate peace with us, to live in peace with us, if their intentions were not imperialistic then I think no reasonable nation could have ever spurned the offer that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had made to them. But they are fighting for something

else, something more. That is where I come to Vietnam.

Our Communist friends become rather jittery about what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam. South Vietnam so far as it stands at present, whatever the constitution of its Government, howsoever -* unpopular it may be, is a legally constituted Government so long as it stays, and is recognised by the Government of India. Those people are in military alliance with the United States. They needed their help when they were attacked. The United States came to help them as allies. They are there. We want them to quit. We want them not to escalate the war.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are three hundred thousand American troops.

DR. GOPAL SINGH : There may be three hundred thousand or five hundred thousand troops. It is a war after all. We tell them not to escalate the war. Wars are meant to be escalated. When we were at war with Pakistan, the world asked us not to bomb their bases. We had to do that. We told everyone that without Bombing their bases we could not tackle with them. Therefore, whenever there is a war, there is always a danger of escalation so long as war does not end. The war must end and there should be peace. They should have peace in Vietnam. Bombing should stop. We all agree that bombing should stop. But when the bombing stopped last time, nobody came to the conference table. Now you say : stop once again and see what happens. They have been experimenting with this stopping of bombardment and then nothing happens. When nothing happens, they have to fight on or they have to quit. They do not want to quit and therefore there will be a war. The other party does not come to *the* conference table. If the other party is coming to the conference table and if my friends opposite know that they are willing, if they know it, then let us talk in these terms. Let them come to the conference table without any preconditions. But, they say that the Americans should quit first, that the Vietcong are the only people that they recognise in South Vietnam, that they will only deal with them. So that they want to hand it over to China, the whole of Vietnam, and that is the whole trouble which men like me would resist. We in this country are also being opposed by the same Chinese imperialism which has invaded South Vietnam. It is not North Vietnam fighting with South Vietnam. It is America fighting Chinese imperialism. It is said, Americans have become imperialists. If so, let these two imperialisms exhaust themselves. Why are you worryinj? in this country? Two imperialisms are exhausting themselves. Why are you worrying ? We must pursue a foreign policy which should help this country. Why do nations have a foreign policy ? Why does any country havo a foreign policy ? Each country has its foreign policy in order to build up its trade, in order to get aid, in order to build up its economy with that aid, in order that there might be some help forthcoming in case of aggression on it, in order to spread an ideology though we do not want to spread any ideology like the Communists. We want to ensure peace on our borders. If any other country can help us as much as the U.S.A., I am prepared to be friendly with it. My ideology is, we shall be friends with every country unless that country chooses to be unfriendly with us. That is my ideology. This is non-alignment. I want to judge every issue on its merits and not be led by slogans and not tie led by the interest of any other country. 1 will be led by the self-interest of my country. That is my whole problem. Therefore, any country that comes to our rescue at the time of a crisis—as for instance, the Americans came to our aid when we were attacked by China—is our friend.

AN HON. MEMBER : Umbrella.

DR. GOPAL SINGH : We are not going in for any umbrella, Russian or American. We will have our own umbrella. But of course so long as we do not have that indigenous umbrella, so long as we do not have the economic wherewithal with which we can build our country, we will have to get help from every country including the Soviet Union. You do not have to tell me that every country should stand up on its own feet. It is a very brave slogan. I want to live on my own. Unfortunately I cannot. Therefore, I have to ask everybody to help me, and whoever therefore" helps me is my friend, whoever attacks me is my enemy. That is my policy.

[Dr. Gopal Singh.]

In regard to the U.A.R. and Israel, if we have sided with the U.A.R. so long and we have not recognised Israel, it is because of the fact that the U.A.R. is very vital to our trade, to our image abroad, in Africa and in the Muslim world. On many an occasion we have taken this stand that we shall not recognise Israel on account of the fact that there is a dispute between Israel and the Arab world, and so long as they do not settle their dispute amicably amongst themselves we will not have diplomatic relations with them, even though we have recognised them.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Israel is the creation of the Western powers.

DR. GOPAL SINGH : Pakistan is also the creation of the Western powers.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Both on a communal basis.

DR. GOPAL SINGH : That is not the problem. The problem is that if we now go out of the way to recognise Israel, it will create problems for us in the Muslim world and the Arab world specially. Only Pakistan would benefit from it. But we should be friendly to Israel and we should not show them any discourtesy as we were supposed to have done at Calcutta to their esteemed President. If they want to help us to reclaim the desert in Rajasthan, we should certainly welcome it. And it should not offend our friends if we take help from Israel; we should be able to dine with an Israeli friend without provoking the wrath of an Arab country. Similarly, in regard to West Germany and East Germany, we should accept the *status quo* so long as the two parties do not come together. With regard to Formosa and China also, when China is to be admitted into the U.N., certainly we have a right to table an amendment that unless Formosa and Tibet are recognised as sovereign nations, we will not vote for China coming into the world body. It is in our interest and also that would be a moral and the right thing to do. I must warn the Government that all our agreements in regard to the Himalayan borders are with Tibet and not with China. China flouted the agreement of 1914 and then earlier in 1842 when we entered into an agreement with China, Tibet was a party to the agreement on Ladakh also. Therefore, we cannot forget that all our agreements in regard to the borders on the Himalayas are with Tibet as a sovereign nation and if Tibet is not to be recognised a sovereign nation, we have no claim on our borders which China claims. If we do this, we will only be doing what is historically correc, what is morally right and also what is in our self-interest.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, it is my misfortune that I have been called ucon to speak after a blatantly reactionary speech which could have been well delivered at the Parliament in Saigon or in Thailand or in the Philippines. But nowadays we are living in a situation when we have to put up with that kind of thing in the Indian Parliament. Madam Deputy Chairman, after Pandit Nehru's death, well, our foreign policy, if I may say so, is fast losing its shine and so is our foreign affairs debate. Whatever little attraction it had is now gone, and look at the House here . . .

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY. Yours is more attractive.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Who is responsible for it 7 Not we, because even at the time of Pandit Nehru we were here and therefore you cannot lay the blame on us. If the foreign affairs debate is losing its shine or its interest, somebody else mutt be responsible. Well, one is our Minister of External Affairs. I realise that it is not easy to occupy Nehru's place. But had you pursued vigorously the policy which was positive in Nehru's time, perhaps, more interest would have been roused in this debate. Therefore, actually, the loss of interest in the debate on foreign affairs is mainly due to the fact that the present foreign policy has lost much of its strength and force, it is becoming more ineffective, in fact, in some ways, the laughing stock of the world. Hon. Members opposite may very much feel flattered that it is not so. But we know from the newspapers abroad in friendly countries that little interest is now evinced in the foreign policy of the Government of India and people outside think that much will depend,

in respect of the direction "of the foreign policy, on what the United States of America tells the Government of India to do. It is not that the Government of India has become a completely subservient to the United States Government. But the Government of India is not today in a position . . .

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : ... to take a bold and forthright stand in defiance of the policies and the blandishments of United States imperialism, of President Johnson and so on.

Now, I was not here to listen to the speech of the Minister of External Affairs of our country. But I have taken pains to go through the speech and it does not show an elementary comprehension of the world situation today. Of course, there are a lot of things which have been said about China and Pakistan. It is not that certain things should not be said but I believe that the world affairs are something much larger than the scope of India-China or the India-Pakistan border. I think world affairs extend far beyond that and embrace the many continents in this world. Therefore it does not show any comprehension whatsoever.

There is not even an attempt, feeble attempt, at understanding the role of the United States today in world affairs. Yet, there is a lot of thunder and fire against China, against Pakistan. Perhaps, it is necessary for them to do so in the preelection year because as the election draws nearer, there is no doubt in my mind that they will be more and more indulging in political demagogy to divert the attention of the people. That does not mean that I have no criticism against China or Pakistan. I have serious criticisms against China and Pakistan. But this Government today initiates a foreign affairs debate without trying to give an account of the world's current developments which at least the late Prime Minister Nehru always tried to do. Whether one agreed with him or not was a different matter. But he looked at the world, gave a panoramic view or picture of the world and then he interpreted the development as he thought best. Here is a speech made, which could have been delivered by any Under Secretary of the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You do not require a Minister to tell what has happened in Nepal and other things. That can be easily done, you, could have easily sent a letter or a bulletin from the Ministry tabulating this kind of visits by such and such persons. That is usually done in the President's Address. When the President opens the Budget Session he tells us how many dignitaries have come to this country and how many dignitaries from this country have gone abroad. Therefore, there is no comprehension whatsoever here. How could that be ? The intelligence of the Government, is at a heavy discount; and from that quarter you cannot get an all-sided and objective assessment of the world situation or a sound political approach.

Now, what do we see in the world today ? The outstanding event in the world today—alarming though it is—is the increasing aggressive offensive of the United States of America, the US imperialists, in economic, political and military fields. That is the main feature of the world's situation today and that is what is threatening the peace in the world and endangering the peace and the security of various nations and undermining even the independence of some nations which have newly won their freedom. All that is completely missing. Now take the case of India. *{Interruptions).* Let me at least give some ideas to you because you cannot get them from that side. Now, look at the world situation. If you look at the economic offensive of the United States of America, it is primarily directed against our country, India. Devaluation is *to* be viewed in the context of a global strategy of the United States imperialism. I am not discussing the economic side of it. It is there. Already you have seen what has happened. We will discuss it tomorrow again. As far as the political side is concerned, you will find that the Government of Ghana, Nkrumah's Government, with whom we were friendly, had been over-thrown by a treacherous *coup d'etat* engineered by the CIA and the British Secret Service in his absence. And you will find that they are building up in Saudi Arabia, they are building up in

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] Jordan, military forces in order to provoke them against the UAR and direct them against the freedom-loving Arab people in that part of the world. Then in the Dominican Republic they had openly intervened, the US imperialists. In Cuba, they even recently tried to start another round of provocative aggressive actions. Indeed, they committed some crimes. Now, in Central Europe, in the Continent of Europe, there is more encouragement to the West German Government which wants access to the nuclear weapons under the cover of multilateral forces, so much so that it has created a crisis in the NATO. President de Gaulle is coming out of the NATO more or less, from its integrated military command, and has asked the NATO Headquarters to quit Paris. There is not even a mention of that outstanding thing in the foreign affairs speech. Now, we have been against the military blocs and so on, especially against the NATO. Nehru made many speeches in his time about it. Now, when there is a crisis in the NATO, when one Western Power of the stature of France comes out against, certain policies of President Johnson and the NATO overlords, when he gives a quit notice to the NATO Powers and when there is a crisis as to where it should go—there is an agitation in Brussels, even Belgium says that it should not come there—when many other Western countries belonging to the NATO bloc are disassociating themselves from the Vietnam policy and other policies of President Johnson, here is a Government utterly incompetent, which does not even take note of this fact and tell the nation that these are favourable developments from the point of view of peace. These show that our attitude in the past of peace and against military blocs and so on has gained ground. The result is that you have this kind of performance by Dr. Gopal Singh. I do not know in which subject he is a doctor but certainly not in Dolitics. This is the position.

As far as the military side is concerned, well. Vietnam is the burning issue. There is tight-rope walking over Vietnam all the time going on by this Government. This is a disgrace to our nation. We are an Asian nation committed to stand by the Asian people. I may tell you that in 1928-29 at the Calcutta Congress we had a representative of the Vietnamese people—at that time Indo-China—who came here and we gave our support to them. Similarly, in 1945 when the Vietnamese people were fighting against intervention by the French and the British were at that time to support the French in order to reconquer the liberated Vietnam. Jawaharlal Nehru and other leaders and the Congress Working Committee came out with full-throated support to the cause of Vietnam independence. In the streets of Calcutta, Communists, Congress, Muslim League, everybody **led** demonstrations against the French and their intervention, and I am proud to say that Chowranghee was in flames. On that day we were there. We were all participants in that majestic and gigantic support of the people of India to the Vietnamese people. And there people died as a result of the shooting by the police.

Then, in 1947 at the Asian Conference here, in the Central Hall came the representative of Vietnam, President Ho Chi Minh, and we all supported the cause of Vietnam and the fight against imperialism was reiterated forcefully by Jawaharlal Nehru. All supplies that overflew this country from France were stopped. Planes were not allowed to touch any Indian airport carrying weapons. That was the noble anti-imperialists sentiment of our people expressed by the leaders of the Congress Party, expressed by the Congress Government. The Government stopped the use of Indian airports for transporting military and other equipment to the **French and** other British Forces. But today, nothing. Platitudes and sentimental expressions will not take us very far.

Then, in 1958 Ho Chi Minh came here at the invitation of the Government of India in February and there was a communique issued after the talk between President Ho Chi Minh and the Prime Minister of India. You will find therein that solid support was expressed to **the** cause of national liberation against colonialism, against imperialism. And that is there. I should like to invite the attention of the hon'ble Minister to the statement that was made after the visit of Ho Chi Minh to this country because, I think, the Congress leaders some time should be reminded of what they did in the past. In an

earlier statement of 1945, let us see what Nehru said :—

> "... we have watched British intervention there with growing anger, shame and helplessness that Indian troops should be used for doing Britain's dirty work against our friends who are fighting the same fight as we . . . Our hearts are with Indo-China. The attempts to crush the spirit of freedom in Indo-China have deeply moved the Indian people."

Later on, in 1958 President Ho Chi Minh came to India and this is what Nehru said in the Joint Communique along with President Ho Chi Minh. I read from the Joint Communique'.—

> "The President and the Prime Minister agreed that colonialism and forcible occupation or domination of national territories by foreign powers have no place In the world today. They expressed deep sympathy for all people struggling for independence and sovereignty. They were glad that a number of other countries in Asia and Africa had achieved independence . , ."

Now, Ho Chi Minh was greeted by Jawaharlal Nehru in this very Central Hall and at the Municipal Reception as a piece of history. "Here is a living piece of history", that is how he treated him. Where are those sentiments ? Today we hear such speeches from the followers of Jawaharlal Nehru forgetting everything he had said in the past with regard to this Vietnam question. Therefore, I think there is a great departure from the approach to the entire problem of Vietnam. Today we do not even call an aggressor an aggressor.

I remember, before the second World War. when Hitler and Mussolini landed their troops indirectly or directly, in Italy Abyssinia, and then in Spain, and were taking aggressive actions against the Spanish Republic in the Mediterranean waters there was a demand that the Chamberlain Government should call it aggression. "Even Lloyd George demanded it. But at that time the British Chamberlain Government never called an aggressor an aggressor. And in the League of Nations when the collective security clauses were invoked, again this British Government and other imperialists refused. We have the reproduction of this in our country now. Naked aggression is taking place with all its barbarities the like of which we have never known since Hitler's war. Well, that is taking place before our eyes. Three hundred thousand American troops, together with 700,000 puppet troops have plunged Vietnam into a reign of horror. There is war, devastation and destruction in which napalm bombs, gas and so-called "lazy dogs" weapons among other things are being used. But here is a Government whose conscience is not twinged. Have we no conscience ? We say we oppose Eisenhower doctrine. It is Eisenhower doctrine to make Asians fight Asians. It is a preposterous doctrine. When at the time of the Geneva Agreement, Britain and America started their S.E.A.T.O. arrangement in the Manila Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru got up in this House and in the other House to denounce it as divided against the Asian people. Today we have travelled far away from that situation and we find today that nothing is said. Therefore, I say that the task before you today is not to praise the aggressor but to denounce the aggression and ask the Americans to withdraw their troops, stop bombing, demolish bases. The Government should take the initiative in this matter along with other like-minded countries to bring about aggression to a halt. It is fantastic. It is time, I should say, on the part of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to call it aggression. She issued a statement over the Radio about the so-called Geneva type of conference. She should realise that the world is not living on kindergarten, that the Co-Chairman Soviet Union and Britain, whatever you may think of them, are not run by kindergarten politicians, that she, advised by a second second-rate official, I believe in the Ministry of External Affairs or her Secretariat, went to the Radio to tell the world that that was her proposal on the eve of her departure. Stupidity should have some limit. I say, we do not expect a very high statesmanship from this Government. How can we ? But at least we should expect that it should not be so stupid in handling world affairs, in diplomatic matters as it has been, when it went over the Radio to make the proposal to the world about the so-called Geneva type of conference. What did she set out of it ? Nothing. No use telling us that everybody

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

has understood her proposal. Nobody has understood. Do you mean to say that the Soviet Union puts up with such nonsense. *(Interruption)* Do not tell me about that. The Soviet Union is helping the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Vietnam Liberation Front. The Soviet demand is quite clear that the American troops must withdraw, that the South Vietnam Liberation Front must be recognised, that bombing must be stopped and the criminals against Geneva Agreements must be called to order. This is the Soviet position. The Soviet Union is not the Congress Parliamentary Party which would ditto whatever the Prime Minister says. Mr. Kosygin is not a member of the Congress Executive Committee that just because the hon. Prime Minister has said it, he would accept it. Now do not try to tell us cock and bull stories about what is happening. What happened in the U.A.R. ? You could not get even President Nasser to support you. How can President Nasser support ? In a joint communique with Mr. Kosygin when the latter visited Cairo, President Nasser supported categorically, unequivocally, the Vietnamese people and denounced the U.S. aggression, calling it a 'horrible thing'. How can President Nasser support this kind of proposal which has no meaning except, well, perhaps, that by this they want to satisfy their own conscience and so they make it. Therefore I say, stop this kind of thing. You only lose your friends by this kind of thing, you disgrace the nation, demonstrate your barreness of ideas and imaginations in handling foreign affairs. I could have understood her not making any statement whatsoever and going there. Do you mean to say that you can talk over the radio to such people, even to Prime Minister Wilson, Britain being a Co-Chairman at the Geneva Conference ? Have you understood anything? Have you dismissed the person who gave such advice to the Prime Minister to speak on the radio ? Never. *At* the time of the Geneva Conference in 1954, Mr. Jawahar-lal Nehru sent Mr. Krishna Meno,, from London to Geneva so that he could lobby people, talk to them privately and initiate a process of discussion in order to brim? the Geneva Conference to a success but here we find that before she takes the plane, she makes a pronouncement as if they are all waiting for the command performance, that their command would go from a Government which does not know how to look after the rupee, the Indian rupee and to defend it. Has the world gone foolish ? Wou/d they believe it that this Government which does not know how to defend its vital interests, its own rupe$_e$ or currency, its own economic system and succumbing to American pressure, would be the Government which will take very great initiative and that too by making such a proposal as that when the American shadow is spreading over the country, when Mr. Asoka Merita becomes the adviser—I call him the political Rusputin, in a political sense, of our times—and when such people come and take the stage ? Are they to believe that you will do something good ? No. Therefore you have failed on that score. Even now they are sending trucks from Telco to South Vietnam and we are told that it is a commercial transaction. Yet we complain when America sends, and rightly so, materials to Pakistan or to China. We have complained that China gets from somebody else. Now yoii cannot have double standards in world affairs. Therefore the Vietnam policy is not only faulty, not onlj barren, not only not in keeping with the policy of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism but it tarnishes the name of our country. It is good that she has said that the bombing must stop before the negotiations can start but then, coming here, again she has started changing her accents. I do not know where Sardar Swaran Singh stands because he tries to explain away things in his own way, leaving people in an utterly confused state. Therefore I do not know about him but quite clearly you have to tell where you stand with regard to Vietnam. I would like to know whether we stand against American imperialism, American aggression and in support of Vietnam. If the Vietnam people quarrel among themselves, let them do so, let them settle their affair. Let the foreign troops be withdrawn. Even the Americans have not said that the Chinese troops are there in South Vietnam. Yet Dr. Gopal Singh has discovered the Chinese intervention in Vietnam. I do not know if he is suffering from hallucination. I believe some day he will start night walking because he might think that some Chinese troops are advancing into North Avenue to take possession of his house.

The Prime Minister said in Moscow that the responsibility for the world situation is on the imperialist and reactionary forces. It was a good utterance she made for once but coming back here she started prevaricating. She said : 'I did not mean America. 1 did not mean this or that. I meant somebody else.' Do you mean to say that Mr. Kosygin shares that view ? If Mr. Kosygin signed it, he must have signed it keeping the Americans in mind. I would like to know about this. You cannot have this kind of thing. You cannot play on both sides of the net—one thing with Kosygin in Moscow and another thing when you come here because Mr. Asoka Mehta is sitting next door to you. You cannot behave like that. Now anybody will hesitate to sign a joint communique with this Government because it can give any interpretation it likes. The Soviet Union has its understanding of imperialism and that is what it standt for when it signed it. Now she is importing another meaning. I would like to ask who these imperialists are ? Do they live in the backyard of the Prime Minister's house or do they live in the U.S.A. and currently in Vietnam'? Mr. Gujral is here and he should tell us where these imperialists are ? Are they in the Prime Minister's backyard in Safdarjung Road or are they somewhere else ? I remind her here that at the time of the Suez affair, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru took a firm stand against the British despite the fact that India was a member of the Commonwealth, against France despite the fact that we had good relations with France at that time. Mr. Nehru, took a firm stand and he came out full-throated against aggression, called aggression an aggression, a spade a spade. What about this Government ? I have never known such a cowardly Government. I can understand an irresponsible Government but I cannot understand a Government which is cowardly. It thinks at 10 O'clock one thing, at 11 O'clock another thing and at 4 O'clock another thing and by 5 O'clock it does not know what it had thought earlier. The Government does not know where the pressure is coming from. They want to deny it by saying that the U.S. pressure is not there but everybody knows that. They are not so bad. Intrinsically they are not so bad but they do not know what pressure is there. Therefore they are doing it under pressure and yet they want to put up a brave face by saying 'We are not under any pressure.' Who believes it ? Is anybody in the world in his senses believing that you are not subjected to pressure ? Even the New York Times does not believe that you are not subjected to pressure from the U.S. Why then this tomfoolery with the rest of the world and telling your own people that you are free and independent of pressures ? This hoax must end. You must recognise that you are subjected to pressure. You must recognise that you are vulnerable to pressure but here is a Government which does not know how to distinguish between kicks and kisses. When it is kicked, it thinks that it is being kissed and when it is kissed, it thinks that it is being kicked. This is the trouble with this Government. That is why when the Soviet Union and others do good things, some hon. Members there do not understand the implications of the action. When the Americans bully and badger them, they think they are being befriended. What to do with a Government of this kind ? Will Diwan Chaman Lall kindly tell me what to do with such a Government in power ?

Let me come to the German question. It was a good thing that Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in the communique from Moscow after the talks with Premier Kosygin at least recognised the reality of the two German States. That had been done earlier but the reiteration was good. Immediately after that what happened ? There was an uproar in the German press to begin with, in papers like 'Die Welt', 'Franfkurter Allgemeine', 'Berliner Morgen Post', etc. In all these papers there was tn uproar against the joint communique. Instructions were sent—let him deny it—from Bonn to the West German Ambassador here to seek explanations from the Foreign Office what they meant by the joint communique and to find out things from India and there was a meeting between him and the West German Ambassador in India and he gave an assurance to the West German Ambassador that whatever may have been said, the policy is not changed. We are not going to recognise the German Democratic Republic and the same assurance was given by Mr. T. N. Kaul. This was the report in the German press and what the German press says is significant. The German press told the German readers : 'Do not worry. There are people

[Shri Bluipesh Gupta.] in the Government of India who would never allow the German Democratic Republic to be recognised by the Government of India.' Let him say what he has to say on this matter. Was it not interference in the internal affairs of our country ? When our Prime Minister made the statement or signed the joint communique with Premier Kosygin in the Soviet Union, it our affair as to how we should speak but then, the German people came here, the West German people, and brought pressure. I say that this discrimination should end. The entire discrimination against the German Democratic Republic, a friendly country, should end and this kind of appeasement of West Germany should also end.

4 P.M.

West Germany, we know, at the time of India-Pakistan conflict openly sided with Pakistan and provoked Pakistan to continue this conflict. It called it a Hindur Muslim war and had it so published in the entire press of West Germany. To them they are very friendly and very courteous, but to me it appears very clear that they practise discrimination against GDR much *to* the disadvantage of India. I say that the policy of the Government with regard to the German question is one that encourages militarism in West Germany and comes in the way of a peaceful solution of the German problem in particular, and the European problem in general. It strengthens the revanchist forces and West German claim to N.A.T.O. nuclear weapons. Therefore, your policy in regard *to* West Germany is one that is disgraceful, I add, in regard tc the Continent. *(Rerring to Shri Dinesh Singh)* Here comes the building little Minister. Will he deny it ? Now that is there. Now this policy of discrimination is adhered to, and because the Americans in West Germany do not want it, therefore, you are not doing what you should do. I can say much more on the subject but I do not wish to.

The question of the admission of the German Democratic Republic to the United Nations is pending before the Government for some time. Why cannot they come wilh a categorical declaration that the Government of India would vote for admission of the German Democratic Republic to the United Nations, just as they should give full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic?

In this connection, before I pass on, I would like to ask why Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our Prime Minister, had a fling at the opposition parties in Moscow. I do not know why at a public reception she accused the opposition. We generally avoid publicly accusing the Government or any other opposition party. I may tell you. When the devaluation came, I was in Moscow. There was a suggestion by the Indian press people that I should make a public press statement in Moscow. I refused and I said, "I am prepared to make a statement to a representative of the Indian press or an Indian press agency, but in Moscow I will not make a public statement through the other agencies about the affairs in India." Therefore, I made a statement to a representative of the P.T.I, there and to nobody else. Now here Shrimati Indira Gandhi had a fling at us. Well, I do not know why. Mr. Nehru never did such a thing. Once it was done by Mr. Krishna-machari or somebody and Tie was pulled up, I believe, by Mr. Lai Bahadur Shastri. But here she went there to have a fling at us. If she thinks that she can raise her stocks in Moscow by attacking the Left parties, she may try there, but I do not think she will be well advised to pursue this there. If she likes, she may try it in the United States. But it is, of course, for the Soviet people to take it as they like. I do not wish to interfere in their internal affairs or in their internal policies, but it does seem to us that this kind of maligning does not help India very much, or her Government very much when they go to socialist countries and start this kind of attack against the opposition.

Now let me come to the neighbours' question. I think it should receive attention. I am not opposed to it. But one must not look at the world situation and world problems as the problem between India and China, or the problem between India and Pakistan. In fact, they are part of the world problem, the larger problem looming large and crying for friendly assistance from a country like India. But a solution

can be arrived at to our own problem with our neighbours. Now let us not be obsessed so badly with the problem on our frontiers important though it is. I am not denying the importance of the problem and we must pay full attention to it. I agree. But then we are discussing not the border situation but the world situation comprehensively. And there things should be discussed on a larger canvas. That is what I am suggesting.

As far as India-Pakistan relations are concerned, Madam Deputy Chairman, I think the Tashkent spirifTs to be carried forward. Whatever Pakistan may do, we must firmly adhere to the Tashkent Declaration and the Tashkent spirit. We must display a constant initiative. We must tell the world that the Tashkent spirit is our article of faith, that the Tashkent Declaration is our charter to govern the relations between these two countries. So all our energies, all our efforts, all our thoughts, all our ideas, all our sympathies, all our anxieties should be directed to the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration. But sometimes I find that some people in high authority compete ivith Pakistani authorities in saying things which at least on this side of the border had better not be said. They may not mean it, but things have their objective logic when heard by the entire world. Therefore I think the Government should be a little careful.

The Kashmir question cannot be bypassed. I know it is not a very popular thing to say. With regard to the Kashmir question, we do not of course support the Pakistani position. But reality has to be taken into account. Therefore our suggestion is: Revive Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's offer, namely that the cease-fire line be turned into the international boundary between the two countries with adjustments. I know Pakistan will not accept it. 1 know there will be a lot of things said against it. But in order to assume diplomatic initiative and offer a constructive approach we must show that we are not so blind to the reality nor rigid in our stand, and that in the changed situation we are prepared to try a formula of this kind. I think that will strengthen the progressive and peaceful forces in Pakistan. Hard battles they are fighting today. More than 3,000 people have been arrested in East Bengal alone. They are seeking India's friendship, many of them, and we should activise these forces from here by a positive initiative. Isolate those forces in Pakistan which are for tension between India and Pakistan, if not war. And that is very very important in the present context.

Before I leave Pakistan I should like to refer to only one matter. You know there was a question today about Shri Trailokya-nath Chakravarty, a veteran revolutionary of Bengal. I feel very deeply about it. I am a little emotional about it, Madam, when I see that he is in jail. He is 82 years old. I knew him as a child. As a young boy I knew him participating in the great revolutionary movement in East Bengal, rather in the united Bengal. There he was and there has been hardly a figure like him. Many brave men dominated the scene but never a more brave man with such a sterling character, such a man with great integrity, a man full of patriotism and with an unmatched courage. I can tell you that in many of the "terrorist activities," as the British used to call them, Shri Trailokyanath Chakravarty played a leading part. He was a brave man and was leader of the Anushilan Samiti at that time. And he comes from the same district as I do. So I knew him well. I did not belong to his party. I belonged to th* same party as Shri Surendra Mohan Ghose did. He belonged to another party. But all of us knew him, to whichever party we belonged, and respected this great man. Today he is in jail. He is suffering. I know the difficulty on the part of the Government. I also know that they are sympathetic to him but they are unable to take the matter up themselves. They should other-wine try for the release of Shri Trailokya-path Chakravarty also known as Maharaj. To do so will be an expression of our fffection to the person, to the living symbol of Bengal's revolutionary movement of those days. Therefore, I would appeal *to* this Government to take up his case, by whichever means' they can. They[1] can ask Britain to take it up with Pakistan. They can ask other countries to take it up with Pakistan. But it is agonising for us, painful for us, to see that man, Shri Trailokyanath Chakravarty, even at this ripe old age languishing in prison and counting his last days in life. As I said, he is about 82 years old. Therefore the Government should Uke the initiative.

[SHRI BHUPFSH GUPTA]

As far as China is concerned, Madam Deputy Chairman, yes, the posture of China-Pakistan relations is something which is thoroughly disapproved by us. We have many criticisms to make. Let there be no misunderstanding on that score. But there is the reality of the situation. You have to shape your diplomacy not out of anger, nor for the sake of election propaganda. I say this thing because Shri Krishna Ballab Sahay, an ex. Chief Minister, said the other day that we are carrying on agitations—the samyukta Socialist Party, the Communist Party and other—because we want to help China and Pakistan. Therefore do not use it for political propaganda purposes. The Chinese position is incorrect. The Chinese posture is wrong. China's present state of relations with Pakistan does not help either peace or other better causes in the world, it certainly does not help India-Pakistan relations, nor the relations among the neighbours including China. But then we should adopt a positive attitude. The Colombo proposals have been there for 3i years now and China, in our view, should have accepted the Colombo proposals. We said it then and I say it now. But let us not doggedly cling to one proposal as if that is the last word. Well, if the other party has not done it, does it niean that by its not doing so we should be precluded from aoing anything ? No. Therefore I say that you explore possibilities of negotiations with China directly, or through friendly powers. How to do it, it is for the Government to decide on and proceed. But the suggestion that exchange of Ambassadors should take place is a constructive suggestion, and it has been made by Mr. R. K. Nehru who was the Secretary-General in the External Affairs Ministry. Dr. Sapru suggested it and others also have suggested it. We can appoint our ambassador and force also China to appoint their ambassador. If they do not, they will be put in the wrong. Once we appoint our ambassador there we can seek ways of discussion, avenues of discussions and negotiations. This process should be started. After all, our line is one of peaceful settlement of questions. Our line is not one of war. Our line is not one of living in tension which involves so much expenditure and so on. Therefore, nothing will be lost by our making the effort in order to explore the possibilities and so OD, for peaceful settlement with China, directly or otherwise, through friendly powers. On the contrary, I think it will enhance our prestige in the world and that is also very important. It is important because world opinion does count. China, and no country for that matter, can for any length of time indefinitely ignore world opinion. Therefore, the initiative must come. I am talking of our Government, because I can only advise this Government. The Chinese Government, as I said, should have accepted the Colombo Proposals and I should be happy if they accept them even now. But if they do not accepted, let us not be precluded from initiating other processes which might start negotiations, healthy negotiations between these two countries. That is what I would like to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gupta, you should finish now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am just finishing Madam. There is another suggestion that I would like to make. You have offered a no war pact to Pakistan. Why not offer a no war pact to China unilaterally ? You offer it and let us see how they behave. Again you will not lose anything. Certainly you will not go to war in order to settle the dispute with China. Neither the Constitution nor your policy says that. What is the harm ?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY **(Mysore)** : First ask them to vacate the land which they have occupied illegally by force.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If you say you will get them vacated by war, then I can understand it. No, you will not. And Pakistan has not occupied areas in Kashmir legally. It is also there illegally. So don"t you go into deep waters, you will be in trouble. I say, it is this discriminatory approach which makes your position difficult and you are misunderstood. You say that we have some ideological war with China. What ideological war ?

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Officially China has never said it is at war with India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member understands neither war nor peace. That is the trouble with him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you will have to finish now in two minutes. I cannot allow more time. There are many more to speak and you have taken more than your time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will just finish.

SHRI M. GOV1NDA REDDY : He is an aggressor on the time of others.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA ; Therefore, I make this suggestion. I know the implications and I am not unconscious of it. But 1 think that will put you, in a better position and provide you with better force in the context of relations between these neighbouring countries. That is why I have made these suggestions.

As far as Indonesia is concerned, well, I do not talk much about the present Government. The present Government there is an utterly reactionary Government. It has slaughtered 200,000 communists and democrats and 60,000 were killed in one island alone—Bali. It is a Government based on religions fanaticism. Please understand that. You say you are a secular country and that your Government is a secular one, that you are a secular State. You criticise Pakistan for not pursuing "secularism. But here is the regime in Indonesia which is thriving on religious fanaticism which has been so roused against the communist, democratic and other forces in Indonesia. They slaughtered 200,000 communists and others. Something has been published, it seems. Well, for any party it will be a serious matter. I have given the figure. They had published it as 100000. But it is much more may be 300,000 if you take those killed in the Bali island. Therefore, I say you should be careful.

Finally, as far as the atom bomb is concerned, I think the Government, should be a little careful. It is a good policy of the Government when they say they will not manufacture the atom bomb, and I am glad that the new Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Sarabhai—a great name—has also said the same thing and has made a similar statement. But the Government always gives the impression as if it is considering the manufacture of the atom bomb.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Why not ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hound. You are a loyal signatory to the Moscow partial test-ban treaty, signed three years ago. At the same time you would say you are considering and examining the question of manufacturing the atom bomb. How can that be ? Your statement must be categorical. The atom bomb is not a defence weapon at all and it has no meaning in the Indian context except for the sake of prestige. And I do not know what kind of prestige we will be earning by spending so much money. Anyway we cannot easily be an atomic power and let us not be led away by our fear of the power of China. It is not easy even for China to become a nuclear power. It requires a strong industrial base and so on. The explosion of a nuclear device does not mean it has become a nuclear power. Therefore, in unnecessary haste we should not behave in this manner, and create the impression that we may in future enter the nuclear race and give up the opposition to nuclear tests and this test-Ban treaty.

Madam. I am just finishing. Before I sit down I only want to say this, that the External Affairs Ministry has lost all direction. It is led by pressures and counter-pressures, more by pressures than by counter-pressures, I would say, because they would not listen to what we say here. Otherwise we would have brought counter-pressure. It is led by pressures. Tts Secretaries are guided too much by America. I know for a fact that there are people in the External Affairs Ministry and in the Prime Minister's Cabinet who maintain direct contacts with Washington and take briefs from them.

AN HON. MEMBER : No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA . Some day I would like to divulge this in this House. 1 will not name anybody now. That *is the* reason why America is full of praise for this change in our foreign policy that is

[SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA] taking place. They want to emasculate India's foreign policy. They know it is not easy to drive India into the imperialists' camp. Therefore, their policy today is to silence India on Vietnam, to make her identify herself with the Vietnam war and supply equipment and other things. They do not want India to remain firmly an anti-colonial and anti-imperialist power. But Madam Deputy Chairman, I want this Government to remember that if they give up their anti-colonial, anti-imperialist policy, and take to this line, India's name-will be in the mud in world affairs and those who are our genuine friends will become suspicious and sceptical about us and they will not help us.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have io finish now. Dr. Anup Singh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Therefore, I say this Government has to stick to its strong policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism and take a firm stand on the question of Vietnam and support the brave Vietnamese people who are the pride of all Asian people today.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I am painfully conscious of the fact that I am following Shri Bhupesh Gupta and I have been put not in a very happy position. But I would leave it to the lion. Minister of External Affairs to deal with him in his own quiet, inimitable way. But this I would like to say about the last two speeches from the Opposition. If you were to put them together and try to draw inferences and conclusions, then that will be the best vindication of the policy that the Government of India has been pursuing.

Prof. Ruthnaswamy said about the question of Vietnam, that once you accept war with all its implications and details, then the rest follows. So why interfere ? And Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said that we have not done anything. About Vietnam I will say something in a moment. Now about the German question. The learned professor said that once you withdraw the Russian troops, the two Germanys will automatically and spontaneously just come together and there will be an end of this greatly vexed problem. Mr. Gupta on the other hand says that we have been drifting, that we have not recognised the realities of the two Germanys, that we have not recommended the admission of East Germany into the United Nations, and so on and so forth. So each one is contradicting the other.,

Now, I would like to say one or two things which I had in mind before I heard Mr. Gupta and the learned professor. Listening to the speeches of the Opposition I had the feeling that according to them the foreign policy of any country is something that can be improvised and discarded any time you find it inconvenient. The basic fact about the foreign policy of India, and for that matter any country, is it is a combination; it is a legacy of the past, your habits, your culture, your political and economic set-up and institutions *plus* the compulsion of the circumstances that you have to meet on different occasions. Yon cannot improvise it but an impression is being created—at least in my mind— that, according to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, we have abandoned our foreign policy, we have drifted away, we are not left with anything, that we do not hear the voice of the late Prime Minister and so on. I am sorry I t:annot share that broad generalisation. What are the facts ? The foreign policy of India, if I were to simplify it, was made up of three or four essential ingredients, world peace and of course the security of India, non-alignment, opposition to military blocs and aliances, opposition to nuclear weapons, and opposition to racial discrimination. I would like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, for that matter anybody from the Opposition, to cite one single example during the last 15 or 18 years where the Government of India deviated even slightly from these basic principles.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Your Prime Minister went to the U.S.A. and signed a joint communique with President Johnson accepting the policy of containment of Communism. All the previous six joint communiques with the United States of America never said such a thing.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Did you expect her to go to the United States and

accept the doctrine of expansion of Communism ?

SHM BHUPESH GUPTA : No, no; I did not expect that but . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Please continue, Mr. Anup Singh. No dialogues.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ... the trouble is she . . .

DR. ANUP STNGH: Please, Mr. Gupta, I did not interfere when you were speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You asked a question and I replied.

DR. ANUP SINGH : I am perfectly willing to concede that there may have been some difference in the emphasis here and there and no policy in its implementation is based on immutable laws of nature. Sometimes there is a change in the wording; sometimes a word may not be very palatable to Mr. Gupta. I personally wish one could avoid some of these words like reactionary. Mr. Gupta got up and referred to the speech of Dr. Gopal Singh as a reactionary speech. Reactionary speech, reactionary imperialism, these words have become so common that I think they have lost their original meaning. When the Chinese Government can call the Russians American stooges what can we expect ? Therefore we should not feel even slightly irritated when they call us names.

Now to take some of the issues which are paramount today, let us take Vietnam. Now, it is very easy to denounce, it is very easy to fulminate but it is far more difficult to offer a solution. I do not think there is anybody in this country or there has been any statesman from this Government condoning the aggression in Vietnam. We have said that a military solution is no solution; there can be only a political solution through negotiations. Much has been made of the fact that we have toned down and we are asking for a Geneva type of conference.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is a Geneva type of conference ?

DR. ANUP SINGH : I think the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, pleaded more than twenty times for a Geneva type of conference. I do not have to go into details. This Government has not deviated from that. I am not sure whether Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has offered any solution except to say that the American troops should withdraw bag and baggage and then and then alone can there be any solution. Now I am personally in favour of it; let me make it very clear but let us be realistic. I was in America not very long ago and I have come back with the feeling that the American people by and large are very critical of the present policy of President Johnson. I attended some of the hearings before the Fulbright Committee; there again I came with the impression that the critics of the Government had a better case than the spokesmen for the Government. But when you talk to the average American, his attitude is that rather unfortunately they have got involved into this mess, that there is no way out and that somebody should come along with a formula which is reasonable and which is acceptable to all the parties. When they say all the parties, of course you can immediately say that the American people have not business there. That is perfectly true but you must take the political and the military situation as it obtains today. How it was brought about, what are the factors, all that is pertinent but you should recognise the unpleasant reality today that the Americans are there for good or for bad. What is the solution ? I must honestly confess that when President Johnson sent his emissaries abroad, I was convinced—maybe he has some mental reservations—that the American people in an overwhelming majority were perfectly sincere in trying to find a way out but there was no response. You can say that the North Vietnamese would like to see the Americans get out first bag and baggage and then and then alone will they talk but you must also recognise that the Americans have come down. The Americans have said that thev are perfectly willing to come to the table without any pre-conditions. At least that is what they have said. Secondly they have also said that they are willing to have the participation of the Liberation Front. These are two things which they never accepted before. What I am trying to suggest is—

[DR. ANUP SINGH]

I am not trying to vindicate or justify American presence there or their action— that from the practical point of view the American Administration, the American people, are slowly and slowly reconciled to the fact that they cannot have their way. Negotiation or any amicable solution means give and take and if we can help in that I think we will be doing a great service. As for the proposals of the Prime Minister it is true that they did not evoke that much response that was perhaps expected. I also feel that perhaps may be there was no sounding of the other Powers, er it was not adequate enough; perhaps we did not prepare the ground. I do not know what transpired but the proposals in themselves are reasonable. They do not become unreasonable merely because the American people have reacted favourably to them. That is not the test. I think they are reasonable and if the Prime Minister has been able to dramatize the issue, to pinpoint the issue, that bombing must stop first and other things should follow, I think she has done a great service. But if you want to say that it is a failure. I am perfectly willing to say, if it is a failure it is a splendid failure, as Lloyd George once said about Woodrow Wilson's fourteen points. On this Vietnamese i sue I think the Indian Government's stand has been consistent. There has been no deviation from the basic principle and the basic policy.

As for Pakistan and China, Madam Deputy Chairman, enough has been said but I would like to invite the attention of the Members of this House—I have done it once before but I think it is worth repeating—to an essay written by Bertrand Russell way back in 1924 or 1925 called Chinese Character. And Bertrand Russell then was the Head of the Philosophy Department of the Peking University. It is not a very long essay but I just want to refer to one or two lines from it. It says that the gravest issue with the Chinese can be settled over a cup of tea. When f brought this to the attention of the late Prime Minister he smiled and said, we will send them some tea. Then Bertrand Russell gees on giving the good and bad points of the Chinese and ultimately he says—I am speaking from memory and mind you this was in 1924 some 40 years back—that the Chinese people are emotional by nature. If a demogogue or an ideology were to seize hold of their hearts and minds, they might constitute the gravest danger to world peace. This was his philosophical observation in 1924. I feel that we should keep the door of negotiations open. We should explore every possibility of coming to some kind of understanding with the Chinese. Dr. Sapru has many times repeated the dialogue. It taJces more than one person to engage in some kind of talk. The Indian mind has not been closed. They have rejected the Colombo proposals. Nobody else has offered any plan. I leave it to Mr. Gupta. Perhaps some other formula should be tried. At the same time, I think we should be very careful and not be complacent once again and slip back into that "Bhai-Bhai" business. I am reminded of an observation that Bernard Shaw once made in his typical, characteristic mood. He was offering some amendments to the Commandments and one of them was : "Do not treat thy neighbour as thyself. His temperament may be different." The Chinese temperament today is very different. They are in a mood to crusade, trying to recreate the world in their own image. I think that everything should be done to strengthen our forces. I am not talking about the atom bomb, because there is no time. I personally think that we have not gone into it fully. We do not have enough information. I would be in favour of appointing a commission or committee to look into this problem from the economic, from the military, from the political, from the psychological, all points of view.

AN HON. MEMBER : And moral point of view.

DR. ANUP SINGH : From the moral point of view also. About Pakistan we are in the same situation again.

Finally, I feel that if we continue the course that we adopted—not as a matter of impulse, but as a matter of calculated policy—which is consistent with our past traditions, consistent with our best national interests, steadfastly, calling a spade a spade, but not depending merely upon denunciations as the solution of any problem, problems are too complex and not susceptible to easy solutions . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let there be a secret session and let them say there that America has committed aggression.

DR. ANUP SINGH : I think perhaps that will satisfy you, but that will not . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will they say it ? Even then they will not say it.

DR. ANUP SINGH : Mr. Gupta will derive merely emotional satisfaction if the Government were to say that the Americans were aggressors. But I would like to remind him that he had eulogised consistently the stand taken by our late Prime Minister. He must also remember that he never tried to use the word 'aggressor'. In fact, if you read his speeches—I am speaking from memory—you will find that he was not used to calling somebody as aggressor. It does not solve the problem.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right.

DR. ANUP SINGH : Let us offer a solution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right. Let them repeat the same statement which they made in 1958. Will they do it?

DR. ANUP SINGH : It is a 'Mantra' that you must repeat. Did the Communist Party for that matter—I will not enter into any ideological argument . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Is it a 'Mantra' that you must repeat the American policy ?

DR. ANUP SINGH : No, no. I do not know whether Mr. Gupta is aware that I have criticised American policies in Parliament and outside, perhaps more than anybody else and I feel that they are on the wrong track. They are absolutely on the wrong track, because wherever there is trouble they think they are containing communism. I think the policy has failed. *(Interruption)* But that is neither here nor there. To repeat what you said *in* 1958 does not solve any problem, because the situation changes . . .

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you must listen to him now. You have had your say.

DR. ANUP SINGH: I should have thought that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta know* that the situation changes and the world situation also changes. Finally, I am saying this in all seriousness, the real trouble with the Opposition is that they are too small and divided . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We are conscious, of it.

DR. ANUP SINGH : If some of the Members of the Congress—I am making the suggestion in all seriousness—will voluntarily abdicate their places and join the Opposition, and send those people who are considered to be very conservative and reactionary, that will restore some balance and sanity in the Opposition.

Thank you.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity, but as I have very little time before me, what I intend to do is to confine myself almost entirely to the question of Vietnam. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, gave a challenge to my hon. friend, the Foreign Minister, and he asked: Is he prepared to repeat the joint statement issued at the time when Dr. Ho Chi Minh came to India ? May I read out to him from his own pamphlet, the statement that is contained at page 25 of his pamphlet :

> "The joint statement of the two leaders emphasised peace in Vietnam on the basis of the fulfilment of the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam."

Is that what the Government of India has said ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is the trouble with my hon. friend.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Is that what the Government has said ? I want to know if Mr. Bhupesh Gupta denies his own words ? *(Interruption)* Now, let him have a little patience. He had made one of the most angry speeches that I have had the pleasure of hearing from him on the floor of this House. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel also made a very angry speech, but it was nothing compared with the speech that was made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

Now, ia.be prepared to accept this statement ? The statement has been made repeatedly by the Government of India and I am quite certain that my lion, friend, the Foreign Minister, will repeat the statment once again. This is the statement:

> "On the basis of fulfilment of the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam."

Now, there is another statement also in the joint statement that was issued by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Dr. Ho Chi Minh :

> "The President and the Prime Minister agreed that colonialism and forcible occupation or domination of national territories by foreign powers have no place in the world today."

Is there any objection to my hon. friend repeating this particular statement ? None whatsoever. I repeat it . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Ask him.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : I repeat it on behalf of the Congress Party and I am quite certain that my hon. friend . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: About that, will they say it that there are no other foreign powers there ?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: This was said by the Prime Minister of India, Pandit lawaharlal Nehru, and I am quite certain that my hon. friend, the Foreign Minister, who is sitting there now, listening to your speech and to my speech, will corroborate every word of what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said in regard to this matter. I repeat it on behalf of the Congress Party. I repeat it not only on behalf of the Congress Party, but I repeat it on behalf of the Government . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let him say.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : He will say it because he has shaken Tris head in consent of this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Shaken his head ?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Of course. he has.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know. There is nothing in parliamentary procedure about shaking one's head. First of all, you do not know what that head contains and how it shakes. You must look around.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is a little more insulting than I thought that he would be. He is talking something about things inside the head.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Nobody knows.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : My dear Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you may not have anything in your head, but other people do possess something in their head. Then, they expressed deep sympathy for all people struggling for independence and sovereignty. Is there anything objectionable in this ? I repeat the statement on behalf of the Members here present now in the Congress Party, because that is our policy. Is it or is it not our policy ?

HON. MEMBERS: It is, it is our policy.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Of course it is our policy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Nobody says yes.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: You unfortunately are so deaf that you cannot hear. They were glad that ajiumber of countries in Asia and Africa had achieved independence. We are all glad that they have achieved their independence. Perhaps my hon. friend wanted the independence that has been achieved by these countries in Asia and Africa to be of the type that the Chinese Communists want. That is what probably he wanted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : 1 did not want that. If you say this thing, I will say dirty things. Whv do you bring in China ?

(Interruption)

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend is a bit too sensitive, but when it comes to him, he can abuse the Foreign Minister to his heart's content, he can say ihe (widest thiits about the Foreign

Minister, he can say the hardest things about the Congress Party. But when it comes to a word or two being said against him, he rises up in wrath against the Congress Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA ; Why has he mentioned China ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You continue your arguments.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : I have accepted the challenge that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta gave me. I have read out from his own pamphlet the joint statement that was made by Prime Minister Nehru and by Dr. Ho Chi-minh. Now having read that statement, having corroborated that statement on behalf of the Congress Party, may I congratulate the hon. Foreign Minister for the Statement that he has made about Vietnam, and this is what he said. Unfortunately, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was unable to hear the words because he is deaf, physically deaf. This is what the Foreign Minister said: "We are in touch with friendly countries so that Vietnam is left to decide its future without outside interference". Is that his policy or not ? Of course it is his policy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : When aggression is going on, you would say that we are in touch with other countries in order to get American troops expelled from Vietnam. Is this your idea of keeping world peace ?

DTWAN CHAMAN LALL: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta can draw his own conclusion in regard to this particular matter as to whether the statement made by the Foreign Minister—"so that Vietnam is left *to* decide its future without outside interference"—means or does not mean the withdrawal of American troops.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Aggression is going on . . .

DtWAN CHAMAN LALL : It does not mean not withdrawing their troops.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : May I ask him . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There should be no interruptions.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : We applaud the wisdom of the Foreign Minister in making the statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is able to hear every word you say. You speak on the international situation. Give up comments on what you have read.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Madam, may I refer to Mr. A. D. Mani for a minute ? Since my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, is so very sensitive, I would confine myself to Mr. A. D. Mani.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you mean to say that he is insensitive?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : I interrupted my friend, Mr. Mani, and asked him how he knew . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You must address the Chair.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Madam, whether I have turned this side or whether I have turned that side or whether I have turned my back, I am addressing you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Hind is not the right side.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I do hope that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will certainly have some hind sight if he does not possess fore sight.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Then I will not look at you.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I ask Mr. Mani whether he had the authority of the United States Government when he said that the United States Government did not mean imperialism in Vietnam ? I want to remind him of the 'New York Times' which in the year 1950, as long ago as 1950, said :

> "In the North are exportable tin, tungsten, manganese, coal, lumber and rice; rubber, tea, pepper and hides. Even before World War II Indo-China yielded dividends estimated at 300 million: dollars per year".

Again :

> "Our own State Department told us what this war is about as clearly as anyone could wish, only one year later".

[Diwan Chaman LallJ

President Eisenhower just after he was elected—

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is that in the pamphlet ?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I will ask mv friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, to listen carefully to what I am saying.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have written this there, so I need not listen.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: If you have written this in your pamphlet, then you know perfectly well what it is all about. Then you can appreciate this a little better. President Eisenhower said :

> "Now let us assume we lost Indochina. If Indo-China goes, the tin and tungsten we so greatly value would cease coming. We are after the cheapest way to prevent the occurrence of something terrible . . ."

What is that something terrible ?—

> "... the loss of our ability to get what we want from the riches of the Indo-China territory and from South East Asia".

This is what President Eisenhower said soon after his election. This is the reason why the American troops are now in Vietnam, not the reason given by somebody else. The reason is that they are wanting the riches of South Vietnam, they want the riches of these countries.

AN. HON. MEMBER : By honest trade.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Imperialist trade, it is not honest trade. Imperialism does not work for honesty. We people have had the rule of an imperialist power here in India, and what is the result ?

SHRI A. D. MANI: The point is this. The classic definition of imperislism is to exercise political control over a territory for making ill benefits. These quotations which he has read out refer to the desire of the United States to see that Indo-China, as it was called at one time. Is open to the free world for purchase of goods on ordinary trade and commercial terms. This is not imperialism.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : That is my friend, Mr. Mani's understanding of it. The unfortunate trouble is that he is so completely ignorant of this issue, the ordinary background of this issue, that he does not realise that there is a war going on in Vietnam, one in which three hundred thousand American troops are involved, and possibly by the end of this year about one million soldiers will be involved in the fighting in Vietnam. How is this fighting in Vietnam going to give free trade to that country ? Can he tell me how free trade is going to arise in Vietnam and be effective ? I am sure that my hon. friend has not thought of it. The trouble with my hon. friend is that he is so completely ignorant of these issues. May I say that Eisenhowever . . . *(Interruptions)* The trouble with my hon. friend is that he is completely ignorant of these issues. He has not even read Eisenhower's book. One book he has written recently. If we read Eisenhower's book, on page 372 he says :

> "I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indo-China affairs who did not agree that, had elections been held at the time of the fighting, possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi-Minh as their leader. The mass of the population supported the enemy."

This is what Eisenhower says in his own book, a book that he has recently written and it is on page 372, if my hon. friend would care to read it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You present him with a copy of the book.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But he does not go as far as that.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : He does not read it. May I also ask Shri Mani and others who are involved in this matter . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI : Not involved.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : We are all involved in this debate. May I ask them to read the 1954 Geneva Agreement on Vietnam? Has he ever read that 7 I do not think so.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He says. yes. But I do not believe it because if he had read that, he would have seen that one of the first items in that agreement is that there should be neither military bases nor should military troops nor military armaments be sent there.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Only infiltrators.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend talks about infiltrators. Out of the 22 people who were captured who were supposed to be North Vietnamese infiltrators, 18 were found to be Sonth Vietnamese; about two, they did not know where they came from . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: How do you know all these things?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: How do 1 know ? If only my hon. friend reads th» material that is available to him and to me, he will be able to find out . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: Where 7

DTWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I draw his attention to the Geneva Agreement? Now, the first part deals with the Conference which was attended by certain countries, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, the Soviet Union, the Peoples Republic of China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Government of Bao Dai. Secondly, the Conference ended on the 20th July, 1954. *(Interruptions)* with the signing of the Geneva Agreement It says—

> "This agreement prohibits the introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel, of weapons and munitions. It bans the establishment of all foreign military bases in Vietnam and stipulates that the two zones of Vietnam shall not become part of any military alliance . . .
>
> "The Geneva Agreement stipulates that the two parties have the task of ensuring that the zones . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you going to read the whole Agreement ?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: No, I am noi going to read it fully.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have very little time left. Please come to the point.

SHRI A, D. MANI: On a point of information . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : I have no intention of reading the whole lot.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Give a gist.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Will the hon. Member yield for a moment ?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : It says:

"... the two parties have the task of ensuring that the zones allotted to them are not used for the resumption * of hostilities or in the service of an aggressive policy."

The United States was part and parcel of this Agreement. They signed this Agreement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. The United States was not a signatory.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friends are quite mistaken. If they only look at the text of the statement made by Under Secretary, Walter B. Smith, at the concluding Indo-China Plenary Session at Geneva on July 21, they will find that be has stated:

> "In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity, through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly."

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Like Berlin.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It further says:

> "... the United States reiterates its traditional position that peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that it will not join in an arrangement which would hinder this. Nothing in its declaration just made is intended to or does indicate any departure from this traditional position.

[Diwan Chaman Lall]

"We share the hope that the agreements will permit Combodi'a, laos and Vietnam to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations, and will enable the peoples of that area to determine their own future."

It is exactly what my hon. friend, the Minister of External Affairs, said only yesterday, that is to say, to enable thein to determine their own future.

SHRI A. D. MANI: There is a book, a pamphlet, on American administration in Vietnam by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. There is no reference there to these quotations of President Eisenhower which he read just now. Am I to understand that he also is ignorant of this fact?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has given you the page number of President Eisenhower's book.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : I am sorry that I was interrupted in regard to this particular, very serious matter. I would like you to remember that there are some people sitting here in the Opposition, particularly Prof. RuthnasWamy who himself sits in the corner, who talked about:

Little Jack Horner Sat in a corner Eating a Christmas Pie;

He put in his thumb And pulled out a plum

And said: What a bad boy am I ?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: What a good boy am I ?

AN. HON. MEMBER : It is all foreign to the debate.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend thinks that Vietnam is foreign to the debate. Vietnam is the crux of this I debate, Madam, and I entirely, cent per cent, agree with the Minister of External Affairs and with Shri Bhupesh Gupta in regard to the statement that I just now read out, in regard to the joint statement issued when Dr. Ho Chi-minh visited India and it was supported by the Minister of External Affairs.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Shri Bhupesh Gupta does not agree with you on one point. You said that the United States Government . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Will you please sit down ? The rules of this House do not permit a Member to get up and interrupt another Member who does not give way.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I thought you had the courtesy to sit down when I got up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Madam, my hon. friend interrupted me. I do not know what he wants to say. But if he wants to say anything, I will give in.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : There is a contradiction between you and Shri Bhupesh Gupta. You said that you supported fully . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is the Swatantra line.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Shri Bhupesh Gupta contradicted your statement when you said that the United States Government was a signatory to the Geneva Agreement. He says that it was not a signatory.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What he said is quite right. The United States wanted to participate in the Geneva Conference and therein Mr. Walter B. Smith was present and at the conclusion made a separate declaration on behalf of the Government of the United States which my hon. friend has very rightly and rele vently read.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend who interrupted me just now wanted me to sit down. I do not know what the interruption was about. But I think he was rightly dealt with by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. I had a lot more to say about this matter.

May I support the amendment moved by Shri Karmarkar supporting the foreign policy ?

5 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may here inform the House that the Minister of External Affairs will give his reply tomorrow.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: How long are we sitting, Madam? Do we adjourn after his speech ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. **Jagat Narain.**

श्री जगत नारायण (पंजाब) : मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, आज पहली दफा मैंने इस हाउस में फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब की स्पीच सुनी और बड़े गौर से सुनी है। मैं बड़े अदब के साथ फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि मेरे जैसे ले-मैन के लिये तो उनकी स्पीच अच्छी हो सकती है, मगर जो बाहर अवाम पब्लिक के लोग हैं, वे तो इन्टरेस्टेड नहीं हैं कि वियटनाम में क्या स्टेटमेंट हुआ है, वह इस बारे में इन्टरेस्टेड नहीं हैं कि जर्मनी के बारे में क्या स्टेटमेंट हुआ है और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने क्या कहा है ? वह इस बात पर भी इन्टरेस्टेड नहीं हैं कि हमारी नान एलाइनमेंट पालिसी का क्या रिजल्ट निकला है ? वह तो सिर्फ यह जानना चाहती है कि महात्मा गांधी जी जो असासा भारतवर्ष को आजादी दिलाकर पंडित नेहरू के हाथ में सौंप गये थे, क्या वह असासा कायम है ? क्या वह असासा हमारी फारेन पालिसी की वजह से कायम है, यह वह जानना चाहती है।

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

वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि हमारे देश की जनता यह जानना चाहती है कि जिस वक्त भारतवर्ष आजाद हुआ था, उस वक्त उसके पास कितना इलाका था और भारत की जो सरहद थी वह चीन और तिब्बत के साथ कहां-कहां पर थी ? वह यह जानना चाहती है कि भारतवर्ष के लोग जो दूसरे देशों में रहते हैं—जब हमें आजादी मिली थी तो उस वक्त बड़ी शान से वे वहां पर रहते थे, उनको वहां से कोई नहीं निकाल रहा था—तो क्या उनकी आज वही पोजीशन है ? यहां की आम जनता यह जानना चाहती है कि बाहर के लोग इस देश की आजादी को देखकर इसलिये हैरान हुए थे कि एक नंगे फकीर ने नानवायलेंट तरीके से न तोप चलाई, न तीर चलाया और अंग्रेजी हुकूमत को मजबूर कर दिया कि वह भारतवर्ष से चली जाये। वह यह जानना चाहती है कि सरदार पटेल ने, जिसने अपने तदब्बुर से तमाम रियासतों को एक करके, भारतवर्ष में मिला दिया और वह जो असासा सपुर्द कर गये पंडित नेहरू और लालबहादुर शास्त्री जी को और उसके बाद फिर हमारी बहिन के हाथ में जो असासा ये लोग सौंप गये थे क्या वह कायम है ?

अब देखने की बात यह है कि हमारी जो फारेन पालिसी है क्या वह इस सिलसिले में कामयाब रही है ? अब आप ही देख लीजिये कि तिब्बत जहां पहले हमारे बार्डर की इब्तदा होता था, क्या वही पोजीशन आज भी कायम है ? यह ठीक है कि वह एक बफर स्टेट था और उसके साथ हमारी सब चीजें चलती थीं, ट्रेड होता था, फिर भी हमारी कोई सरहद चीन से नहीं लगती थी। आज हालत क्या है ? तिब्बत चीन के हाथ में जले जाने के बाद जो बफर स्टेट की उसकी हैसियत थी वह खत्म हो चुकी है और चीन का बार्डर हमारी सरहदों के साथ मिलता है। हमारी सरहद सिर्फ उसके बार्डर से ही नहीं मिलती है बल्कि चीन ने हमारा 20 हजार मुरब्बा मील इलाका भी अपने कब्जे में कर लिया है। भारतवर्ष की जो

[श्री जगत नारायण]

नीति है उसके बारे में उसके कानों में जूं तक नहीं रेंगती है । हमने इसी पार्लियामेंट में हलफ लिया था कि हम अपना 20 हजार मुरब्बा मील का इलाका वापस लेंगे, लेकिन आज तक हमने अपना वह इलाका वापस नहीं लिया । इसलिये अवाम जनता यह जानना चाहती है कि जो हमारी फारेन पालिसी है, वह कहां तक कामयाब हुई है ?

हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने बड़े जोरों से कहा कि हमारे ताल्लुक बर्मा, के साथ बड़े अच्छे हैं । हमारे ताल्लुक लंका के साथ बड़े अच्छे हैं, हमारे ताल्लुक नेपाल के साथ बड़े अच्छे हैं और दूसरे देशों के साथ भी हमारे ताल्लुक अच्छे हैं । जहां तक बर्मा का ताल्लुक है, श्री रत्नस्वामी जी ने और मौलवी गनी जी ने, अभी बतलाया कि बर्मा में हमारे लोगों की क्या हालत है और लंका में क्या हालत है । अगर आज लंका में पहले की प्राइम मिनिस्टर श्रीमती भंडारनायक होती, तो लंका में एक भी हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं रहने पाता और सब को बाहर निकल जाना था । आज जो वहां पर प्राइम मिनिस्टर है उसको हिन्दुस्तानी लोगों के वोट की जरूरत है, अगर वह कल बदल जाता है तो नक्शा ही दूसरा हो जाता है और इस तरह से लंका में कोई भी हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं रह सकेगा ।

जहां तक नेपाल का सवाल है, जब महात्मा गांधी जी आपके हाथों में असासा सौंप गये थे, तो मुझे अच्छी तरह से याद है कि मैंने पंडित नेहरू की एक स्पीच सुनी थी जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि नेपाल हमारा छोटा भाई है और हमारी सारी फारेन पालिसी पर ही वह चलता है । ठीक है, आपने कहा कि नेपाल के महाराजा यहां आये थे, परिषद् के चेयरमैन यहां आये थे और बड़ी हालत अच्छी है । आज ही के ट्रिब्यून में, जो कि पंजाब का बिल्कुल बेलाग अखबार है, श्री स्वर्ण सिंह की मैंने वह स्पीच पढ़ी, जिसमें उन्होंने नेपाल के मुताल्लिक कहा है कि हमारे ताल्लुकात नेपाल के साथ बड़े अच्छे हैं । उसी अखबार के कारोस्पोन्डेन्ट का एक नोट छपा है जो इस प्रकार है :

"It would do indeed no good to read too much in the increasing expression of friendship between Nepal and China but it would be equally wrong for her to minimise the significance of Crown Prince Birendra's recent visit to Communist China."

इसमें आगे लिखा है कि क्राउन प्रिन्स के साथ नेपाल राजा के छोटे भाई और उनकी बीवी भी गई थीं । इन लोगों का वहां पर बड़ा स्वागत हुआ और इन्होंने एक बड़ा अच्छा इम्प्रेशन किएट किया । मेरे पास टाइम शार्ट है, इसलिये मैं पूरी नहीं पढ़ सकता हूं । इसके साथ ही साथ उसमें यह भी लिखा है कि हमारे एम्बेसेडर जब हिन्दुस्तान आये थे तो उन्होंने एक तकरीर दी थी नेपाल के मुताल्लिक । उसके मुताल्लिक नेपाल के अखबारों में एक बड़ा तूफान मचा है कि यह तकरीर उन्होंने किस तरह से की । आज के ट्रिब्यून में एक आर्टिकल है और मैं चाहता हूं कि वजीर साहब उसको अच्छी तरह से देख लें । जहां तक यह कहना कि हमारे ताल्लुकात उनके साथ अच्छे हैं, यह बात तो ठीक है । मगर हालत यह है कि वहां पर जो हिन्दुस्तानी रहते हैं उनमें से दो-चार मुझे मिले थे तो उन्होंने यह कहा था कि हमारे लिये वहां पर रहना बड़ा मुश्किल हो गया है और हिन्दुस्तानियों से वहां अब नफरत की जाने लगी है । आप वहां की बात छोड़ दीजिये, हमारे जालन्धर से, हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब के जिले से बहुत-से लोग इंग्लैंड गये हैं । पिछले दिनों जब मैं जालन्धर गया था तो मुझे एक नौजवान लड़का जो एम० ए० पास किये हुए था मेरे साथ गाड़ी में आया । वह पहले हमारे अखबार में लगा हुआ था और बाद में इंग्लैंड चला गया और उसके साथ उसकी बीवी भी चली गई । वे लोग वहां जाकर काम कर रहे हैं । अभी वह पांच साल के बाद यहां मिलने के लिये आया है । मैंने

उससे पूछा कि तुम वहां पर क्या काम करते हो ? तो वह कहने लगा कि हिन्दुस्तान से जो लोग वहां जाते हैं सिवाय डाक्टरों को छोड़कर, सब लोग वहां पर लेबरर समझे जाते हैं और वहां की हुकूमत उन्हें किसी और पोजीशन में रखने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। मेरा ख्याल है कि डा० गोपाल सिंह जी भी इसकी ताईद करेंगे कि जो लोग वहां से आये हैं वे यही कहते हैं कि आज हमें वहां पर लेबरर की तरह ट्रीट किया जाता है। इसी तरह की हालत कमोबेश दूसरे देशों में भी हिन्दुस्तानियों की है। जब हमें आजादी मिली थी, उस वक्त इस तरह की हालत नहीं थी। हमारे लोगों ने बर्मा में बड़े-बड़े कारखाने खोले थे और उनकी वहां पर बड़ी-बड़ी दुकानें थीं। लेकिन आज हालत यह है कि उनकी सब चीजों का नेशनलाइजेशन कर दिया गया है। अब देखना यह है कि आपकी फारेन पालिसी इस लिहाज से कहां तक कामयाब रही है और दूसरे देशों में हिन्दुस्तानी किस शक्ल में रहते हैं ? इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि जो हिन्दुस्तानी दूसरे देशों में रहते हैं वे वहां पर आराम के साथ रह रहे हैं या नहीं, यह आप को देखना चाहिये। इससे ही आप अच्छी तरह से अन्दाजा लगा सकते हैं कि आपकी फारेन पालिसी कामयाब हुई या नहीं ? लेकिन जो कुछ नजर आ रहा है और जिस तरह से दूसरे मुल्कों में हिन्दुस्तानियों के साथ सलूक किया जा रहा है उससे मालूम पड़ता है कि आपकी फारेन पालिसी बिल्कुल नाकामयाब हुई है।

केनिया में मेरे अपने दामाद रहते हैं और वहां पर गुजरात और पंजाब के बहुत-से लोग रहते हैं। उन सब का यह कहना है कि जब से यहां पर हुकूमत बदल जायेगी या कम्युनिस्ट सरकार आ जायेगी तब हमें यहां पर से अपना बोरिया बिस्तर उठा लेना होगा और हम फिर यहां पर नहीं रह सकेंगे। तो क्या इसी तरह से आपकी फारेन पालिसी कामयाब हो सकती है ?

डा० गोपाल सिंह : वहां पर जो हिन्दुस्तानी गये हैं वे वहां के शहरी बन गये हैं।

श्री जगत नारायण : शहरी होने के बावजूद भी उन्हें यह कहना पड़ता है कि हमें यहां से निकलना पड़ेगा। इसलिये मैं सरकार से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि वह बतलाये कि हमारे हिन्दुस्तानियों की दूसरे देशों में क्या हालत है और इन 18 सालों के अन्दर फारेन मिनिस्ट्री ने अपने लोगों के लिये क्या कुछ किया है ? महात्मा गांधी जी जिस असासा को आपके सपुर्द कर गये थे क्या उसमें सरकार को कामयाबी हुई है ? आप देखेंगे कि चीन ने हमारा 20 हजार मुरब्बा मील का इलाका अपने कब्जे में कर लिया है और इसी तरह से पाकिस्तान ने आधे काश्मीर का हिस्सा ले लिया है। अब हालत यहां तक पहुंच गई है कि हमें हर वक्त फिक्र लगी रहती है कि आज हमला हुआ, कल हमला हुआ। और हम पड़े हुए हैं इस आइडियालाजी में कि आया यह जो वियतनाम की बाम्बिंग के मुताल्लिक कहा गया है, यह कहना चाहिये या नहीं कहना चाहिये। मैं एक बात बड़े अदब के साथ सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह साहब से पूछना चाहता हूं। वे पंजाब के नेता हैं, हमारे नेता हैं और फारेन मिनिस्टर भी हैं। जब पाकिस्तान के साथ एग्रीमेंट हुआ था, उस वक्त वे सीक्योरिटी कौंसिल में थे। पाकिस्तान के साथ जिस दिन लड़ाई बन्द हुई थी, उस दिन वह लड़ाई 11 या 12 बजे बन्द हुई थी, लेकिन 3 बजे पाकिस्तान ने छेहरटा पर इतनी जबरदस्त बमबारी की थी कि करीब सौ बच्चे, बूढ़े, जवान और औरतें मारे गये, एक करोड़ रुपये से ज्यादा की बिल्डिंग्स तबाह हुई और तीन-चार सौ आदमी जख्मी हो गये। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि वह जो पाकिस्तान ने बमबारी की थी, उसके सम्बन्ध में क्या किसी देश ने उस वक्त निंदा की, क्या वियतनाम के लोगों ने निंदा की, क्या किसी और ने निंदा की ? आज हम किन झगड़ों में पड़ गये हैं ? आज हम इन झगड़ों में पड़ गये हैं कि यह बयान देना है

[श्री जगत नारायण]

या नहीं देना है । मेरी बात कोई माने या न माने और मानी जानी तो है नहीं । लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर को, हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर का वहां के देशों में दो साल, तीन साल जाना बन्द कर देना चाहिये, कोई बयान नहीं देना चाहिये । हम क्यों पड़े हैं इन झगड़ों में कि हमारे बयानात से आज क्या होता है वियतनाम में और क्या नहीं होता है । हमें अपने को संभालना चाहिये । मैं यकीनन यह समझता हूं कि कामयाब फारेन मिनिस्टर वह होगा, कामयाब प्राइम मिनिस्टर वह होगा जो यह देखेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में जंग नहीं होती है, हिन्दुस्तान जंग का अखाड़ा नहीं बनता है । कोई दूसरा देश जंग का अखाड़ा बने तो मुझे इसमें कोई घबड़ाहट नहीं होती है । अगर हमारा देश जंग का अखाड़ा बनता है तो वाकई मैं समझता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान को जो आज तबाही हासिल होगी वह तबाही के दहाने पर ले जायेगी । यहां कल ही हाउस में डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने बयान दिया और आज सुबह मेरे लड़के का मेरे पास टेलीफोन आया । वह रमेशचन्द्र अखबारों में काम करता है । उसने कहा कि लोग हमसे पूछते हैं कि स्टेटमेंट में जो इतना सख्त दिया गया है तो क्या वाकई कोई लड़ाई होनेवाली है, क्या फिर हमला होनेवाला है, हमें बताइये पूछ करके, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछिये कि क्या कोई हमला होनेवाला है, हमें अभी तक कुछ पता नहीं है । तो हमला होनेवाला है या नहीं होनेवाला है, लोग इंटरेस्टेड इस बात में । उनको इस बात में कोई इंटरेस्टड नहीं है कि वियतनाम में क्या होता है और क्या नहीं होता है । वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं बिल्कुल दिल से बड़ी साफ बात कहता हूं । उन दिनों 15, 20 दिन जब हम पर बमबारी होती रही, अमृतसर में, जालंधर में और फीरोजपुर में तो हमारे अपने पंजाबी भाई जो दिल्ली में बैठे थे, उनको महसूस नहीं हुआ कि हमने कितनी तकलीफ में वह दिन गुजारे हैं । मुझे आप माफ करें इस साफ बयानी के लिये हमें इस वक्त वियतनाम की फिक्र नहीं है, हमें तो फिक्र अपने देश की है कि हमारे देश में लड़ाई न हो । अगर अमेरिका वाले और चीन वाले वियतनाम में लड़ते हैं तो उनको लड़ने दीजिये और जिस देश में झगड़ा होता है वह झगड़ा होने दीजिये । हम तो चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश में लड़ाई नहीं होनी चाहिये क्योंकि हमारा देश बड़ा गरीब है । हमारा देश इतना गरीब है कि इसके सम्बन्ध में आज हालत यह है कि यह हमारे राज बहादुर जी, जो हमारे पब्लिसिटी के मिनिस्टर हैं, वे वहां अफ्रीका में गये थे और उनका बयान मैं पढ़ देता हूं । यह उनका ही बयान है और किसी का बयान नहीं मैं पढ़ता:

"India's Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Mr. Raj Bahadur, today accused certain interested parties of waging a persistent campaign to sow seeds of discord between Indians and Africans.

He s_uspected these parties whom he did not identify, of wanting to further their objectives at the United Nations by damaging Indo-African accord.

The Minister was speaking at a luncheon meeting given in his honour by Mr. Prem Bhatia, India's High Commissioner in Nairobi.

The latter told newsmen that he was greatly hurt to find the radio and the press in East Africa swallowing the anti-Indian propaganda of some of the foreign journalists and news agencies in India. He referred to stories published in East African newspapers of Indian mothers selling babies for food and starving Indians- picking foodgrains from the excreta of animals."

यह हमारे मिनिस्टर का बयान है और किसी का बयान नहीं है । एक तरफ तो यह था कि हिन्दुस्तानी इतने बहादुर हैं कि बरतानिया को निकाल सकते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान से जाने के लिये मजबूर कर सकते हैं और दूसरी तरफ यह भी कि आप और हम, वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, अपनी तकरीरों में कहते रहे हैं कि जब

हिन्दुस्तान आजाद होगा तो यहां पर दूध और घी की नदियां बहेंगी, यहां पर अनाज सस्ता होगा, लोगों को कोई तकलीफ नहीं होगी । मगर आज हमारे हिन्दुस्तान की इमेज हमारी इस मिनिस्ट्री की वजह से, हमारी इस सरकार की वजह से यह है कि आज हमारे वजीर यह बयान देते हैं कि अफ्रीका के तमाम न्यूजपेपर्स में, वहां पर रेडियो में यह ब्राडकास्ट हो रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोग अपनी भूख मिटाने के लिये एनीमल का गंदा जो पाखाना होता है उसमें से अनाज के दाने निकाल करके अपनी पेट-पूजा कर रहे हैं और इसके मुताल्लिक हमारी सरकार की तरफ से कोई जवाब वहां पर नहीं छप रहा है। अगर हम यह कहें कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह साहब ने इसके मुताल्लिक ठीक काम नहीं किया है तो वे तो महज एक पुर्जा हैं, कागज साइन करने वाले हैं । मिनिस्ट्री फैसला करती है और वे कागज पर साइन कर देते हैं । इसलिये मैं उनसे यह कहूं कि वे खराब फारेन मिनिस्टर हैं तो यह ठीक नहीं होगा । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जब से हमें आजादी मिली है तब से बापू ने जितना सर्माया हमारे हाथ में सपुर्द किया था वह आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता हमारे हाथ से निकलता चला जा रहा है ।

तो मैं आपकी खिदमत में यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि हमें इधर-उधर के झगड़ों में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये, हमें इधर-उधर के बयानात नहीं देने चाहियें । इस पर यह कहा जा सकता है कि तमाम मुल्कों से हमारे सम्बन्ध हैं, इसलिये तमाम बातों पर हम बयानात दे रहे हैं । मैं कहता हूं कि इन बयानात को अभी मत दीजिये और कम-से-कम दो साल लगाइये हिन्दुस्तान की अनाज की समस्या ठीक करने में ताकि हम अपनी जरूरत का अनाज आप पैदा कर सकें । अगर हम ऐसा पहले कर सकते थे तो अब भी कर सकते हैं । जब इतनी हमारी जमीन है, इतने हमारे रिसोर्सेज हैं तो अब भी हम इतना अनाज पैदा कर सकते हैं कि अपने आदमियों को खिला सकें । आज आप देखिये दूसरे मुल्कों में क्या हो रहा है । रोम में चन्दा इकट्ठा करने के लिये और गरीब हिन्दुस्तानियों की भूख को मिटाने के लिये सन्दूक रखे गये और यह कहा गया कि चावल दो, दाल दो, रुपया दो । यह तमाम जो बातें हो रही हैं, इससे हमारी इमेज खराब हो रही है और यह इमेज तब ठीक हो सकती है जब हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने की कोशिश करें ।

(Time bell rings.)

वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं दो ही बातें कहना चाहता हूं । मैं आपका इशारा समझ गया हूं । एक तो मैं बड़े अदब के साथ यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि बाहर के देशों के टूर बन्द होने चाहियें । अपने देश में हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर भी रहें और प्राइम मिनिस्टर भी रहें और कोई बयानात न दें । अभी भूपेश गुप्ता साहब एक पार्टी की बात कह रहे थे और चमन लाल साहब दूसरी पार्टी की बात कह रहे थे । इन बातों में पड़ने से क्या फायदा है, ऐसे बयानात देने से क्या फायदा है ? आज कोई अमेरिका की बात करता है, कोई रूस की बात करता है । अगर आज अमेरिका और रूस दोनों झगड़ रहे हैं तो हम न अमेरिका के लिये बोलें और न रूस के लिये बोलें । आज जरूरत यह है कि हम अपने देश में अपने हाथ से इतना अनाज पैदा करें कि मवेशियों का जो गंदा पाखाना होता है उससे कोई अनाज इकट्ठा करके न खाये और यह चीज तभी हो सकती है जब हम बाहर के देशों में न जायें, कोई बयानात न दें और किसी झगड़े में न पड़ें । बाकी यह बात मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि हम कोई ऐसा रास्ता निकालें, ऐसी फारेन पालिसी बनायें जिससे दुनिया में हमारे मुल्क की शानदार इमेज बन सके । पहले हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी फारेन मिनिस्टर भी थे । जब तक हिन्दुस्तान में कोई लड़ाई नहीं हुई, तब तक उनकी इमेज बहुत शानदार थी और इतनी शानदार थी कि अमेरिका वालों ने

[श्री जगत नारायण]

उनसे कहा था कि वे चीन वालों से उनके हवाबाज छुड़वायें और उन्होंने छुड़वाया था । इसी तरह से मिस्र के मामले में भी उनकी आवाज को सुना गया था । मगर जब भारतवर्ष पर हमला हुआ चीन की तरफ से, उसके बाद से उनकी आवाज बिलकुल कमजोर हो गई थी । अब आप फारेन मिनिस्टर बने हैं । पाकिस्तान एक बार हम पर हमला कर चुका है । कल जो डिफेंस मिनिस्टर ने बयान दिया है, उसको देखते हुए पता नहीं फिर कब हमला होनेवाला है और हमला होगा या नहीं होगा । मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूं कि कामयाब डिफेंस मिनिस्टर वही होता है जिसके वक्त में देश पर हमला न हो बल्कि वह दूसरे देश को मजबूर करे कि वह उसके देश पर हमला न कर सके । वह ऐसी स्ट्रेटेजी बनाये और इस ढंग से बनाये कि हिन्दुस्तान में जंग न हो । मगर हिन्दुस्तान तीसरी जंग का अखाड़ा हो गया तो हम लोगों का, इस देश का बचना बहुत मुश्किल हो जायगा । मैं बार-बार आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूं ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty minutes past Ave of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 10th August, 1966.