

[Shri Arjun Arora.] the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs should be as greatly concerned as I am.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I would like to inform the hon. Member that we are going to take it up. Before the House adjourns we will take it up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 p.m.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half -past two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE in the Chair).

RESOLUTION BE. APPOINTMENT OF A PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE TO REVIEW EXTERNAL PUBLICITY—contd.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Madam Vice-Chairman, before the House adjourned, I was placing my point in respect of the failure in the policy ■decisions of the leaders in Delhi and I was attributing this failure as the root cause of the failures of our ambassadors in the various missions abroad. If that fact is accounted for and taken as a fact, then we should think more clearly about what should be done here. Then this question of funds, want, of funds which has been given as a reason, becomes of very little importance. Otherwise we would have found at least some diplomats to be successful and some diplomats to be failures. Now we find that all the diplomats are failures.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Almost all. Name one instance where we had placed our case successfully before world opinion. I am not talking of foreign publicity only in the context of the Indo-Pakistan conflict. Foreign or external publicity in times of peace is as important as it is in times of war. In times of peace also

we have had the same laments DM failure in this respect. Thousands and thousands of innocent people of the minority community were being butchered in East Bengal and they were forced to come to India for asylum as refugees. But our publicity machinery was such a failure that people outside India did not know what was happening here. The Human Rights Committee of the\* United Nations Organisation has never had a case to face placed before it by India about the minorities coming from East Bengal. This is an instance of our failure. Take the problem of Tibet. When the refugees from Tibet came here at least we did not have the publicity machinery to place before the world opinion what was happening here. So at critical times at crucial times, we have failed. This failure is firstly due to our policy here. Secondly it is due to want of initiative on the part of the diplomats outside. Why this want of initiative? That is because mostly they are service men and they are so bureaucratic in their attitude that unless any direction goes from here they will be very slow to take the initiative. Initiative can be taken only by political people, those who are politically informed leaders. But both politically and physically some of these political leaders are not here. Some of these discredited leaders as a matter of pension from politics, are sent abroad as ambassadors, as if those foreign countries are the best places for them to pass their last days of life. If we continue this attitude, then certainly we cannot achieve anything. If anybody deserves a political pension, let him have it here in this country, not in a foreign country. We do not mind spending several thousands of rupees. But we And that now several thousands are lost and the country's cause also is lost. Both these things we are losing. So my first suggestion, to be precise is this. This work should be allotted, or this assignment should be given to political people, to people who have political conception and who can take the initiative and

decide at the hour, who can take the initiative and decide independent of the central directives even on the spur of the moment, who know how to do it. And then, the person there should also have no pride of the position he holds. The man placed there should not be proud that he is the ambassador of a big country like India. He should consider himself a humble servant of India. He should mix with the common people there. That kind of an attitude should be cultivated. But here we send to the Foreign Service gentlemen who top the list in the All India Service examinations. They have no political background. They do not know the politics of India. They do not know the history of India, but because they stand first, second or third in the All-India competitive examinations, they are given the chance of going into the Foreign Service. *(Time bell rings)*. Just two more minutes, Madam, and I finish.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): You have already taken five minutes.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Please be kind enough to give me two more minutes only.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): But others also should have a chance.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Ladies are proverbially very kind; Madam, and since you are there, please let me have only two more minutes. The point I would like to make here is that old men should not be sent. Then who should be sent? You should send a person who has no pride of his position, who has political sagacity and who at the same time knows how to make friends. In a foreign country, who cares for your position? You should know how to mix with the common man. This "protocol" business is not followed by anybody here. They mix with the common men and go to meetings, to this place and that

965 RS—4.

place. But we do not see in any papers that our ambassador has gone to any meeting or that he goes round places, to public meetings and mixes with the common people. We find Ambassador Chester Bowles doing it here. But what do our ambassadors do?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Our ambassadors hate "Dhotiwalas".

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: So the real thing is that they must know the present Indian Government. They must know about Indian culture and about tradition, and they should place facts as they are, without any complex whatsoever. If we can do that then certainly we can win over the whole world. Since you are cruel I will thank you and end here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): No, you have already taken more than your time.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Vice-Chairman, however much I may like to support this Resolution on other grounds, on practical grounds, I want to oppose this Resolution.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Because you are the Party's General Secretary?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: No, no. No politics here. My view is that it is not possible for Members of Parliament whether they are 15 or 30, to go round the entire world and suggest ways and means of improving our external publicity. After all, Madam, I believe that external publicity also has got to be done on a certain basis and well-known methods have got to be adopted. It is not as if we are going to force every opinion of ours on other people. We have to carry conviction to the people. Our late Prime Minister used to say that it is not the number of leaflets that we produce that matters. It is not the number of speeches that we make

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

that matters. These things should be there. But you have to carry conviction to the people with whom you are associated.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: How will you do it?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: That you will have to do. At home there must be a policy. The basic policy that we follow at home must be a very sound one, one that will carry conviction to everybody. What we are doing at home is most important. After all, the world is not blind. Every country has its own embassy here and they have got their own information officers. They read papers here and they carry impressions from here. They send their reports. Therefore, it is not as if we can spend more and do very much more by way of more propaganda. We cannot do it. Therefore, basically our policy must be such that it gets broadly the approval of everybody. Of course, China and Pakistan may not approve but that is a different matter altogether but broadly speaking, on the human level, everybody must approve **our** policy. That should be the first criterion. It does mean that individual character and ability have no place in the scheme of things. We have functioned as an independent nation only for the last eighteen years and we are just now catching up with the rest of the world but I am sure we have done very well, whether it be in the African continent or the European continent or in the eastern countries. We seem to be doing not so badly as is depicted. Even this morning, Mr. Gujral said that the British Parliamentary Delegation had criticised our external publicity. I have a cutting with me. They said nothing in regard to our external publicity; they only enunciated principles and said that we must carry conviction to the people. It is not the number of people that we contact that matters. What matters most is that you must carry conviction.

We are spending a fairly good amount on external publicity, nearly Rs. 1,21,49,800. Considering the size of our country, considering the number of countries in which our country is represented and also the number of problems that we have to pose to the various countries, I think this expenditure is too modest a sum. It has got to be increased. I am of the view that at least double this sum has got to be spent on this business and we have got to do that. Therefore, what we are spending on external publicity is not far too much considering the situation we are placed in. These Information or Publicity Officers have to work under an able Ambassador. Our country is represented in about one hundred and fifty-three countries of the world where we have Embassies, resident and non-resident, High Commissions, resident and non-resident, Deputy High Commissions, resident, Commissions, resident and non-resident, Legations, Consulates and Vice-Consulates, Trade Commissions, Special Emissaries, etc. We have these organisation\* doing this job outside our country. The most important thing that every Mission has got to do is to interpret our country to the other country and try to interpret that country to us. This is the most important job. If one has got to do this job efficiently, one must be posted with all the facts, one must be accomplished in the matter of history, in the matter of tradition and in the matter of culture. He should also know what his home country stands for. This must be very well known to the person. He must be a very intelligent man, a man of great courage, energy, tact and intelligence and should be a person who can take decisions. A man who tries to sell hard will not be able to carry any conviction. China did over-propaganda in the African countries with the result that in most of the African countries China today is the most unwanted country. They do not want China at all. Such a situation must not be allowed to develop in the other countries. Interpreting the home country in the other countries

and interpreting the other countries to the home country are the most important jobs that have got to be done by an efficient set of people starting from the higher officer, the presiding officer, whom we send there. Proper care must be taken in selecting that person. As my friends say, a person who goes to another country must know the language of that particular country. That certainly would be of very great advantage. This is a human problem and has got to be approached in that way. We must carry conviction to the people of the various countries. I am sure we have done fairly well and not as badly as people depict. The very fact that India is a friend of almost every country, barring the Chinese bloc, goes to show that our Ambassadors have done well. Our publicity has paid dividends.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Could I interrupt' the hon. Member for a minute? Could we have the views of the Secretary-General of the Congress Party about the appointment of some Ambassadors who were found to be old and infirm here?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): He is not speaking in that capacity, as General-Secretary of the Party.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am certainly not going to support an old or infirm person or an unwanted person. After all, care must be taken to see that the man who is sent to another country is capable of taking on that particular job. The late Prime Minister was also referring to this. Mr. Mani was saying about the journalists but in one of his speeches, the late Prime Minister said that he tried the journalists but found them not so competent, I will not say useless, compared to the regular service people.

SHRI DEVABRATA MOOKERJEE (West Bengal): Present company excepted.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Knowledge of law is very very essential and it helps a man to function more efficiently, I am sure. The late Prime Minister said this:

"We have tried the experienced journalists and found they did not succeed."

This is what he said in one of the speeches. The best thing that could be done in the circumstances is to develop a special cadre for this purpose. We have been trying to do that. The cadre is a very young one and slowly and steadily this is gaining ground. There are eminent men who have distinguished themselves as Ambassadors. There is the case of the late Mr. Panikkar who did well in China. We know the case of Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit. Our own President himself was the Ambassador in Russia and he did exceedingly well in developing the closest friendship between Russia and India. There is, therefore, no use indulging in wholesale condemnation, in saying that we have not been doing well anywhere. This is a criticism which is on the side of exaggeration which we should avoid especially at this particular juncture when we must be very careful of what we put out to the countries of the world, when the eyes and ears of the world are on us. We are passing through a very critical stage.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Unless you twist the tail of the Government, it does not function.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Mr. Reddy, you will get only fifteen minutes.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Madam, of course, I believe very much in teetotalism but if we try to sell this idea to all the countries it may not catch up. I too, long back, Madam, in 1952 tried to contact the various embassies in the countries that I visited and I found that everywhere

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.] Pakistan in a way was 'overtaking us in the matter of propaganda and the chief thing that I was told was that Pakistan threw out a numb?r of parties, evening parties, cocktail parties and so on. They entertained quite a lot and were thus able to win over the journalists in those countries with a view to seeing that Pakistan's viewpoint is put out in those countries or sometimes with a view to seeing that India is run down very much. All these things have happened. But I think that even that game does not succeed for long because truth ultimately comes out in all its glorious colours; nobody can prevent that.

Having said all this, I do not think I have much more to say. I would only once again repeat that there is a great necessity for building up a very efficient foreign service, as efficient as can be compared with that of any other country like America or Britain or other countries. We must also develop side by side—if we don't have the means that is a different thing—our cultural centres in foreign countries. That is very necessary because Indian culture, Indian tradition and Indian way of thinking, as we all know, are the basis for everything including our foreign policy and those who go out whether it be as Information Officer or Publicity Officer or as Consul, in whatever capacity they go, must be believers in our foreign policy. He must not be a person who simply acts on ther basis of that policy; such a person I think will not be able to deliver the goods in the way we want him to do or in the way the country's interests demand Therefore we must be very careful to see that the person selected has complete faith and belief in the policy that the home country adopts, especially the foreign policy. I would, therefore, oppose this Resolution; I would particularly request my hon. friend, Mr. Abraham, to withdraw it and not press it for a vote.

SHRI LOKA.NATH MISRA: Madam, T object to this; the Secretary-General

of the Party should not make a request like this.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI (Madras): Madam, the object of my participating in the debate is to oppose the Resolution moved by my hon. friend from Pondicherry. He said the other day that the Publicity Department of our country is not good. At the same time he also took to task the Ambassadors who are accredited to the various countries from our country. The other Members who have taken part in the debate also followed in the track that has been cut by my hon. friend from Pondicherry. I do not agree with my friend that our Publicity Officers are bad. These officers, it should be remembered, were and are even now selected by the U.P.S.C. from among the journalists in the country and while selecting them the aid of some of the editors in the country is also taken and only the best elements from among the journalists are selected.

Now let us take England. After we attained freedom our country was represented there by no less a person than Mr. Menon and he was succeeded by Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit. Who is there in the House who will say that they have not done very well? Who is there in the House who has got the courage to say that they have not done very well? That being the case, it is my opinion that England is purposely misrepresenting our country. A question may be asked: why should they purposely misrepresent our country? They do so because we always rub England on the wrong side. The English people are much more loyal than the Queen herself. But what have you done? Some iconoclasts in our country have disfigured the statute of their king. Why should they keep quiet? What would be our feelings in such a situation? Suppose Mahatma Gandhi's statue was disfigured in England; I ask this question: what would be our feelings? Not only that; let us take Lord Irwin.

t should be remembered that Lord , Irwin has done some good to us. Hon. Members on all sides of the House will remember the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. But we have disfigured his statue also. Then we are changing the names of the roads and streets.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: The nation has not done it; that has been done by some persons.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: Why don't you punish them severely?

Now, as I said, we are changing the names of the roads and streets that have got European names. I shall tell you something that happened some years back. In 1933 when I was Mayor of Madras Mr. Satyamurthi was in the Corporation Council. At that time he was living in a street which was called then Thanikachalam , Chetty Street. Thanikachalam Chetty was the leader of the Justice Party. Mr. Satyamurthi brought forward a Resolution changing the name of that street from Thanikachalam Chetty Street to Rangaswami Iyengar Street. At that time fortunately Rajaji was the Chief Minister. When the Resolution went before the Government for approval he turned it down. He said: 'Why should you want to change the name of the street?' We must also remember, Madam, that this created anti-Brahmin feelings in Madras. Thanikachalam Chetty was a non-Brahmin and Satyamurthi was a Brahmin. So this created anti-Brahmin feelings in Madras. Rajaji then said: "Why should you change the name? For argument's sake even assuming that he has not done any good for the city, let it be there". But what have we done in the country today? Our Municipalities and Corporations are changing the names of streets and roads every day. I was living in a road which was previously called Roberts Road. Suddenly they changed the name and called it Tin Murti Road. One day a friend of mine was to come to my house from Madras. I had written to him that I was living in Tin Murti Road. He said

that he would be reaching my house at 7 o'clock. I waited and waited and he reached at 10 o'clock and when I asked him he said that when he asked the Taxi Driver to take him to Teen Murti Road, that fellow took him round and round and after two or three hours he came to my house. And that day I also missed my dinner waiting for my friend. So what I say is, we have a knack of rubbing people on the wrong side. We should be careful that we do not rub anybody on the wrong side. As I said, England is purposely misrepresenting our country. They know that Pakistan is the aggressor but why should they tell the truth? They are not Harischandras; we are not Haris-chandras. There is nobody who can call himself Harischandra in the country. Knowing fully well that Pakistan is the aggressor they still say that our country is the aggressor simply to wound our feelings. So we should take a lesson from this that we should not rub any country on the wrong side.

Some Members asked, what about the Yankees? What have we done to the Yankees or the Americans? They also misrepresent us. As you know, we are going to America with a begging bowl for our food, but so far as Vietnam is concerned what have we done? If we cannot support them, we must at least keep quiet. Let us not say anything. But we have indirectly condemned America. We should know that America is doing good to us if the Americans want to crush China. You should be glad of it. So what we should have done is—we need not support America—we should have at least kept quiet.

Madam, we have now the Congress Government and Mr. Kamaraj is the head of the Party. The one great quality of Mr. Kamaraj is that he is taciturn. He won't talk. Speak to him for one hour or *two* hours; he won't open his mouth but in the en-J he will say 'Parkalam'. He will liste to the people for hours together, ten hours, twelve hours; he would not

[Shri J. S. Pillai.] unnecessarily speak. In the end he will say 'Parkalam'. The word 'Par-kalam' can be interpreted in many ways. You can use that word for or against a proposition. This is a very important word. Our Ministers should learn a lesson from him. There is no use keeping him as Head of the Party if you do not learn this word from him, if you do not learn his nature. In my opinion, our Ministers should write this word "Parkalam" a thousand times as an imposition. Whenever anybody comes and talks to them, even for hours, they should not open their mouth. They should keep quiet and in the end say "Parkalaam". It can be interpreted any way you like. It is a Tamil word and it can be used in any way.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: What does it mean?

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: It means 'we shall see' or 'I shall see'. If it is good and if it is all right, you can say I said so. The next time if you wv. et him and you were nominated, he would listen to you and hear what ever you have to say and in the end he would say: "Did I not say 'Parkalaam'?" Suppose you were not nominated, he wou'd say. "Did I not say 'Parkalaam'? Take your chance now." In this way, one is free to interpret it. Ministers should learn how to be taciturn by nature. So this Resolution will not do any gjod to our country. It will not improve matters. We have got good Ambassadors and also we have got good publicity officers. People in England and in America have purposely closed their eyes and plugged their ears and misrepresent our country. So, I hope my hon. friend on the other side will withdraw the motion.

Thank you.

SHRI M AJMAL KHAN (Nominated): Madam, I support the resolution. I want to suggest that those persons who are sent from Indian as our Amassadors or as Information Officers should have attached to them certain students who might not have any official p'ost, but who might learn

the language and the customs of the people of the country where they are sent. In the eleven Arab countries their language is classical Arabic, but the people, who speak the language in the bazars and other places, use the colloquial language and unless our people know the colloquial language they cannot contact the people, nor the merchants nor any industrialist, nor anybody else. Even in the universities and other places when a Professor goes to teach philosophy or literature, he does not teach in the classical language but he speaks in the colloquial language. So, the difficulty is this. Those persons who want to do any kind of propaganda they are handicapped, because they cannot understand the people in the language in which they are speaking. So, I just want to suggest that those persons who are sent as our Ambassadors might have some students with them. They might go as students and they might not be employed there in our Embassy. They might be given some stipend so that they may learn the language of the country where they are going. Later on they may be appointed as Press Attaches or some such thing. Similar is the case in Iran as well as in Turkey. So, my suggestion is this, Either we may open some schools here to teach the colloquial languages of the countries where we are sending our people or we may send certain students there without consideration for their qualifications, so that they may go and study in the bazars and learn the colloquial language of that country. Then, our publicity will be very forceful and ideal.

The second thing I would suggest is that we should have certain lines of publicity. It may not be such a kind of publicity in which our honour may be compromised. We are not going as beggars asking other countries something which we need. We must have some honour. For that we might have a kind of directorate here in the publicity department to tell us what for we are going and what we have to do there.

appointment of a Parliamentary

external publicity

With these words, I support the motion.

**सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहारी (पंजाब) :**

बाइस-चेयरमैन साहिबा, मैं आपका मशकूर हूँ कि आपने मौका दिया। मुझ से लेकर अभी तक कारेन पब्लिसिटी की यहां काफी चर्चा हुई और आज के अखबारों में भी जो कारेन पब्लिसिटी की तारीफ ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरान ने की वह भी आपके सामने है। इससे पहले मिस्टर चेस्टर बाउल्स ने भी कहा था कि अमेरिका के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान का प्रोपेगेंडा बहुत ही कम है और वहां का लेमैन हिन्दुस्तान के प्रबलम को कुछ ज्यादा नहीं समझता है। अभी हाल ही में पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के झगड़े में—हालांकि रशिया हमारा सबसे ज्यादा दोस्त मुल्क है लेकिन उसके अखबारों में भी यह चर्चा आई कि काश्मीर सारा का सारा हिन्दुस्तान के कब्जे में है और उस पर कई एडिटोरियल वहां रशियन अखबारों में आये जिनका कांटाडिक्शन सत्य नारायण सिंह ने जब वहां गये तब प्रत काफ़ेज़ में किया। मैं यह अर्थ करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरीके पर हमारा बाहर की पब्लिसिटी इन बड़े बड़े मुल्कों में हो रही है—छोटे मुल्कों का तो कहना ही क्या, बाहर के जो बड़े मुल्क हैं वहां पर हमारी पब्लिसिटी कितनी कमजोर और निकम्मी है उस पब्लिसिटी के लिये इससे ज्यादा सर्टीफिकेट नहीं दिया जा सकता।

बाइस-चेयरमैन साहिबा, आपने यह देखा होगा कि हमारी मुकतलिक इम्बेसीज़ में जो प्रेस अटैचीज़ हैं उनमें से 40 से 50 परसेंट तक ऐसे प्रेस अटैचीज़ हैं जिनको सेक्शन आफ़िसर में भर्ती किया गया था और बग़ैर उनको जर्नलिज़्म की ट्रेनिंग दिये हुए प्रमोट करके प्रेस अटैची बना दिया गया। आप जानती हैं कि प्रोपेगेंडा का काम एक अलग तरीके का है, उसको समझने-बुझने, स्टडी करने और उसमें स्पेशलाइज़

करने का एक अलग तरीका है लेकिन मुझको अफ़सोस है कि जो बहुत से सेक्शन आफ़िसर थे उनको जब प्रेस अटैची बनाया जाये तो वह क्या हमारा काम करेंगे और इसी तरीके से बाहर हर जगह पर हमारी पब्लिसिटी ज्यादा से ज्यादा कमजोर चलती आ रही है। मैं कोई सेक्शन आफ़िसर की तरक्की में रोड़ा नहीं बनना चाहता, उनको तरक्की जरूर मिले, लेकिन उनको दूसरे शोधा में दी जाये न कि पब्लिसिटी में।

आपने यह भी देखा होगा कि कई अफ़सर ऐसे हैं जो कि बारह बारह वर्ष तक और पन्द्रह पन्द्रह वर्ष तक बाहर के मुल्कों में रहे, हिन्दुस्तान में कभी वे इधर आये नहीं, और बाहर ही प्रोपेगेंडा का काम वह करते हैं। तो जो हमारे अफ़सर 12 साल तक हिन्दुस्तान नहीं आये व बाहर प्रोपेगेंडा का काम करते तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वे कुछ कर नहीं सकेंगे। लाजिमी तौर पर एक टाइम मुकदर कर देना चाहिये कि चार वर्ष में, पांच वर्ष में या छः वर्ष में बाहर जो पब्लिसिटी के प्रेस अटैचीज़ हैं उनको हिन्दुस्तान में आना चाहिये या हिन्दुस्तान में आकर पांच या छः महीने या एक साल यहां रह कर हिन्दुस्तान की हालत को स्टडी करना चाहिये—यहां की सियासी हालत कितनी बदला करती है यह देखना चाहिये—और उसके बाद फिर उनको बाहर के मुल्कों में भेजा जाना चाहिये, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

जब मैंने यह अर्थ किया कि वहां से हमारे आदमियों को बुलाया जाये तब उसी तरीके से यह अच्छा होगा कि इंफ़रमेशन एंड ब्राड-कास्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री में जो आदमी इस वक़्त पब्लिसिटी का काम करते हैं उनके लिये कुछ ऐसा परसेंटेज मुकदर कर देना चाहिये जो कि बाहर जाकर, हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर जाकर, इम्बेसीज़ के साथ पब्लिसिटी का काम करें। एक तो इससे यह फायदा होगा कि वे हिन्दुस्तान से ताजे जायेंगे, उनको यहां का ज्यादा पता होगा, वह ज्यादा काम



\* [सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहवारी]

करेंगे और दूसरे जब वह हिन्दुस्तान में आयेंगे तो वहां से एक आउटलुक लेकर आयेंगे जो कि हिन्दुस्तान की चीजों को समझने के लिये ज्यादा सच होना चाहिए। इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज करूंगा कि जहां हम बाहर के पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरान को यहां इन्वाइट करते हैं वहां के बड़े-बड़े आफिसर्स को इन्वाइट करते हैं, अगर हम वहां के प्रेस वालों को भी इन्वाइट करके हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर उनको दिखायें कि किस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान में सिक्कलरिज्म चल रहा है, किस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान में डिमोक्रेसी बाकी दुनिया से ज्यादा मजबूत तरीके से चल रही है तो मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि यहां से होकर जब बाहर के प्रेस वाले जायेंगे तो उनकी जरूर कोई न कोई राय बदली होगी और वे हिन्दुस्तान के हक में अच्छा लिखेंगे।

इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि कई प्रेस वाले हिन्दुस्तान में भी ऐसे हैं बाहर के, जो यहां रह कर भी यहां के हालात को अच्छी तरह देखते हुए भी अपना मिस्त्राविस्स प्रोपेण्डा बाहर के मुल्कों में करते हैं। तो उनके ऊपर भी नजर रख कर उनको बतलाना चाहिये कि हमारा प्वायंट आफ व्यू क्या है। अगर इसके बावजूद वे गड़बड़ करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूं बगैर किसी गुल या दुज्जत के उन्हें हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर निकाल देना चाहिये। अगर यह एक स्टेप लिया जाये और एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री होम मिनिस्ट्री और इन्फार्मेशन एण्ड ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री के साथ मिल कर यह काम करे तो मैं समझता हूं बड़ी जल्दी हमारे हालात और ठीक हो सकेंगे। लेकिन इसके अलावा अगर आप लोगों को भी बुलावें और उनसे काम करवायें और अगर आप एक कोऑर्डिनेशन कमेटी यहां बनाएं फारेन मिनिस्ट्री की, डिफेन्स की और इन्फार्मेशन एण्ड ब्राडकास्टिंग की, कोई भी हाई पावर कमेटी बनाएं जो प्रोपेण्डा की एक गाइडिंग

लाइन बना दे कि हमारी फारेन पॉलिसी सटीक ऐसी होनी चाहिये तो मैं समझता हूं इसका खासा असर पड़ेगा। अब हालत यह है कि इन्फार्मेशन एण्ड ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री अपना अलग राग अलापती है डिफेन्स मिनिस्ट्री अलग राग अलापती है और उसके अलावा एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री अलग राग अलापती है। अगर एक हाई पावर कमेटी बने और वह गाइडिंग लाइन रखे तो मैं समझता हूं पॉलिसी का अच्छा खासा काम हो जाये।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यह ठीक है हमारी किताबें और लिटरेचर खूब छपते हैं और छप कर बाहर जाते हैं। लेकिन होता क्या है? उनका कभी कहीं यूज नहीं होता। अभी हाल में जब चाइना से हमारा भगड़ा हुआ था उस मुल्क में यहां से लिटरेचर गया। दो तीन महीने के बाद एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री का कोई आफिसर वहां पहुंचा। उसने कहा कि हमने तो कुछ लिटरेचर आपके पास भेजा था। अम्बेसेडर ने कहा कि हमारे पास आया नहीं। इन्क्वायरी की गई। इन्क्वायरी करने पर पता लगा कि वह लिटरेचर गोडाउन में कहीं, महीने से पड़ा रह गया था और गोडाउन में पकड़ा गया।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : किस मुल्क में गया ?

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहवारी : सीलोन और कुछ और मुल्कों में। इस तरह से जो मिसयूज होता है इसको भी ध्यान में रखना चाहिये। जो ऐसे मुल्क हैं जैसे लाओस है, कम्बोडिया है, थाइलैण्ड है या और दूसरे मुल्कों को आप देखिये, वहां पर हम कोई बातचीत करते हैं तो फ्रेंच में करते हैं। फ्रेंच लैंग्वेज में लाओस और कम्बोडिया में पम्फलेट भेजते हैं। ठीक है, वहां फ्रेंच भी चलती है; क्योंकि फ्रेंच ने वहां रूल किया और उसी तरह से रूल किया जिस तरह से अंग्रेजों ने हमारे ऊपर रूल किया। लेकिन अंग्रेजी पढ़े-

लक्षों की परसेंटेज यहां कितनी होगी ? होना तो यह चाहिये कि वहां पर हमारा प्रोपेगेंडा उनकी अपनी लैंग्वेज में हो। अगर हम उनकी अपनी लैंग्वेज में छाप कर दें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उसका ज्यादा फायदा होगा लेकिन यह नहीं हो रहा है। यही नहीं बल्कि एक बड़े कण्ठी में मैं गया वहां एक बात सुन कर मुझे हैरानी हुई। मैंने वहां के अम्बेसेडर साहब से पूछा कि यहां पाकिस्तान का प्रोपेगेंडा बहुत ज्यादा है, नैचुरली वे झूठा प्रोपेगेंडा करते हैं, आप बड़े कण्ठी हैं, आप उनके प्रोपेगेंडा का जवाब नहीं दे सकेंगे, लेकिन आप जवाब कुछ देते होंगे। बड़ी शान से उन्होंने कहा : हां साहब, हम अच्छा जवाब देते हैं, उनके फजूल प्रोपेगेंडा को हम इग्नोर करते हैं, हां एक बात जरूर करते हैं कि वहां के फारेन मिनिस्टर को मिल लेते हैं वहां के जो फारेन सेक्रेटरी जनरल हैं उनकी मिल कर अपना प्वायंट आफ व्यू बताते हैं। तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता अगर इन दोनों आदमियों को मिलने का काम हो तो वहां प्रेस सेक्रेटरी और दूसरा पैरा-फर्नलिया रहे यह जरूरी नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वहां पार्लियामेंट के 450 मेम्बर हैं 450 मेम्बरों को पूरे हिन्दुस्तान का प्वायंट आफ व्यू समझाया जाये, उनका प्वायंट आफ व्यू समझा जाये।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

लेकिन अगर फारेन मिनिस्टर और फारेन सेक्रेटरीज को मिल कर हिन्दुस्तान का अपना प्वायंट आफ व्यू रखना चाहिये तो मैं नहीं समझता हमारा प्रोपेगेंडा ज्यादा चल सकेगा। इसलिये मैं ज्यादा न कहते हुए आपसे यही निवेदन करूंगा कि इस वक्त जो प्रोपेगेंडा की मशीनरी है इसमें इस्टिक चेंज होना चाहिये और जब तक यह चैन नहीं आया तब तक आप किसी तरह से कामयाब नहीं होंगे। यू० एन० ओ० में पोलिटिकल ऐंग्लिस में कितनी मदद मिली आपने देखा। किस कण्ठी के अखबारों ने आपका साथ दिया वह भी आपके सामने है। अभी मिसाल के तौर पर अर्ब

करूँ, कौन नहीं जानता कि काश्मीर हमारा है और बगैर काश्मीर के हम नहीं रह सकते हम काश्मीर का एक इन्च भी किसी को देना नहीं चाहते लेकिन किसी मुल्क के प्रोपेगेंडा का असर इतना तो हुआ कि वहां पर भी हमारे इन्सान यह कहने को तैयार हो गए कि काश्मीर का कुछ हिस्सा उनको देना चाहिये या काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा न रहे पाकिस्तान का भी हिस्सा न रहे और उसका कोई और ही स्टेटस बनाया जाये। अगर हमारे यहां पर उस चीज का असर हो सकता है तो दूसरी कण्ठी में हमारे प्रोपेगेंडा का असर क्यों नहीं होगा। आज कोई ब्रिटिशर नहीं है जो हमारे खिलाफ न हो। हमारे खिलाफ प्रोपेगेंडा करते हैं। यही नहीं हमारे कई इमीनेन्ट डिप्लोमैट जो यू० एन० ओ० में भी रहे जब वे गवर्नमेंट से अलग हो चुके — गवर्नमेंट भी हमारी बड़ी मेहरबान है — उनको बाहर से अलार्क कर दिया गया कि आप सर्विस कर सकते हैं हालांकि डिप्लोमैट का काम होता है कि जब उनका जीवन खत्म हो जाये तो हिन्दुस्तान में आकर रिपोर्ट करते हैं और तब रिटायर करते हैं। उन्होंने डेमिजिन रिपोर्ट दिया काश्मीर के मामले में — सन्दन के अखबारों में आया। लेकिन क्या हमारा कान्ट्रेडिक्शन हमारे हाई कमिश्नर की तरफ से गया ? एक वहां अखबार में वह भी लेटर टु बी एडिटर के नाम पर गया और उसमें कन्ट्राडिक्शन आया। अगर इस किस्म का प्रोपेगेंडा आपके यहां चलेगा तो मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई कामयाबी आ कर सके। इसलिये मेरा तो यह निवेदन है कि इस्टिक चेंज इसमें माना चाहिये जिससे हिन्दुस्तान का प्वायंट आफ व्यू हर इन्सान को जो बाहर के मुल्कों के लेमैन हैं, उनको अच्छी तरह से पता चल सके, सिवाय इसके कि एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स और फारेन मिनिस्टर तक ही महदूद रहे।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora. The time allotted for this today was one hour and thirty minutes.

We have exceeded that time. So please finish in five minutes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I will try.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I have heard with great interest the speeches on external publicity of the Government of India and I find that there is a great deal of justified and unjustified criticism. We, it appears, suffer from a sense of isolation, and because of that complex we think that nobody is with us, and if nobody is with us, our publicity is bad. I personally feel that publicity cannot help. The Americans, for example, spend millions or billions of rupees on publicity in India. The U.S.I.S. budget in India is unknown to us, but I am sure it runs into hundreds of crores. Every morning every Member of Parliament gets at least three publications of the U.S.I.S. without payment. As far as I am concerned all the three go to the waste paper basket. Many others, I know do the same. And I know nobody has the time to read all the literature which the U.S.I.S. sends gratis because, if Members of Parliament, for example, begin to read that literature from beginning to end, they will never be able to come to Parliament, and they will never be able to read anything else. Mere publicity is not going to help anybody. What is going to help external publicity is our policy. If our policies are correct, they will triumph. This country built an image in the world under the leadership of Prime Minister Nehru. But I find that there are many in our country- who are doubtful about the wisdom of our foreign policy. If we are ourselves doubtful about the wisdom of our policy, particularly the policy which such a good image of India : the policy which impressed the world with the moral stature of India, if we begin to doubt the correctness of such a policy, the world is not going to respect us, the world is not going to listen to us howsoever great our publicity may be. I feel

that the correct thing is to adhere to the policy, be firm about our policy and act upon our pronounced policy. If we do that, the world will respect us howsoever inefficient or efficient our publicity may be. If in the matter of Kashmir today the United Kingdom and the United States are against us and if during our conflict with Pakistan the Press in the United Kingdom and the United States exercised all sorts of pressures upon us, that was due to our vacillations in 1962-83 when we erroneously entered into talks with Pakistan. There were Swaran Singh-Bhutto meetings—and they gave the world the impression that Kashmir was negotiable. It was because of that wrong impression, of I policy error which we made—I am sorry to say—under Anglo-U.S. pressure that some people thought Kashmir was negotiable. And it is that mistake which has cost us dear and which is responsible for the hostility of many people abroad towards our present attitudes in this matter of Kashmir.

Madam, when I say this, I am not unconscious of the drawbacks of our diplomats, the drawbacks of those responsible for our publicity abroad. My own experience is that we send diplomats abroad who do not know our own country. My first encounter with an Indian diplomat abroad was in 1955, when I visited Moscow along with the INTUC leader, Shri Ambekar. We were received by the Third Secretary because the Ambassador was away on tour, the First Secretary was on holiday, the Second Secretary was sick and the Third Secretary received us. We also had with us Shri Ram Singh Bhai Verma of Indore. We introduced ourselves. The Third Secretary, who turned out to be third class, did not know where Indore was. He said, "Oh, you come from Indore. I know it is very near Bombay." Now, a gentleman who does not know where Indore is and where Bombay is, is sent abroad and in some circumstances becomes our Charge-de'Affaires. Before we send our diplomats abroad for publicity or

negotiations, let us make sure that our diplomats know our own country. They should also know about our policies. They should have faith in those policies. Many Members of this House and elsewhere are great advocates of the cause of career diplomats. I am sorry to say that many of our career diplomats do not have faith in our policies. If they do not have faith in our policies and you cannot dismiss them, make them Sub-Divisional Officers and ask them to collect revenue, do not send them abroad. If our personnel are wrong, howsoever good may be our policies, the publicity will be bad.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you should wind up now please.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: All right, Madam.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have heard with great interest the various speeches on external publicity and I must admit, after so many hours of speeches, that I am at a loss to understand what I have to say because some of the speeches were answered by some others. In many cases I found that there was a very strong difference of opinion. Some speakers want men from public life and non-officials to be sent as ambassadors; others want only career diplomats; some are satisfied with the kind of publicity that we give; others are not.

Now, there are one or two things which I would like to place before the House before I answer the points raised in the debate. Publicity cuts very little ice, as Shri Arjun Arora pointed out, because every Government lays down its policies according to its own interests in order to further its own interests. The fact that we are received well or that they are very polite to us or that there have been frequent exchanges of Head of State or of Prime Ministers or of other personnel, does not really mean

that there is a change of policy. It invariably happens that because we have supported a country in a particular thing we expect it to support us in all our policies and when that fails, naturally you take cudgels against the Ministry and external publicity. This has happened again and again, *lis* for instance, when the Chinese invasion took place, it was taken for granted that the rest of the world did not know that China had invaded us. Why?—because our external publicity was a failure. And recently, both in the case of the Rann of Kutch as well as the conflict with Pakistan because some of the Western Press—in some countries in the West the Press is free—did not support us, all kinds of argument would have put forward to say that but for our publicity, those countries would have been on our side. Let us take, for instance, a country like England. Now, there is no reason for anybody associated with the Government of England to say that they do not know anything about the Indo-Pakistan relationship. It is a question that they have created, it is a question that they have nurtured and it is a question which is insoluble because of them. And for either the members of the Parliamentary Delegation which is on a visit now or the Prime Minister of England, to say that he was not fully aware of what was happening in India or what was happening between India and Pakistan, is, in my opinion, just nonsense because there is no reason why they should not know. This is more or less true of all the chanceries of the world. Every country knows what is happening, but they pretend ignorance because it suits them. It is better for a country to say, well, we really do not know the exact points of dispute between India and Pakistan; therefore we would not like to express an opinion. That is the best and the most polite way of getting away from the responsibility.

I have myself talked these things over the people who should know about India and just because they do

[Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon.]

not want to give a categorical answer about a particular question, they will always say, well, the Indo-Pakistan dispute has been going on for the last 18 years; we have lost the thread and you would forgive us if we do not express an opinion. Now, this is a very polite way of doing it. Why? It is because those countries are not interested in taking sides. Why should they take sides with Pakistan or India? Why should they support one country or the other? It is not going to further their interests and they do not want to make enemies of one country or the other. Therefore you will find in those countries where there is no free Press, where the policies are dictated by the Government, that any amount of publicity material or any amount of propaganda will not have any effect at all. But we will do these things because our country is not a country which is intent on propaganda for its own sake. We have no ideology to promote; we do not want to force our attitudes on anybody. All that we want to do is to pass on information and news of what is happening here. And this is being done. Of course, it can be more perfectly done. But as some other Members have pointed out, it is not possible to compete with any country, either with the United States or the United Kingdom or even with Pakistan, because Pakistan can divert as much funds as is possible for publicity or it can waste its money and nobody is going to enquire about it. There is no Parliament which is going to ask questions every Monday and every Tuesday as to whether the money has been properly spent or whether external publicity has been properly done. There is no question of fixing priorities or even questioning the acts of Government. Let us not compare ourselves with Pakistan. I think it is a matter of great shame that we should always say that our publicity is so poor, that Pakistan's publicity is so good, it is so wonderful and our publicity is so poor because our Government has no policy, because our

officers are so inefficient and therefore, the publicity is so poor and, therefore, the rest of the world is against us. Madam, Mr. Arjun Aroia rightly pointed out very wisely that we are suffering from an isolation complex. We are so used to always getting support from other countries, we are so used to people talking highly of India's moral stature, India's leadership, India's greatness, India's planned development, etc. that today we are so weakened by these praises that we are not able to stand criticism or face criticism. That is what is wrong with us. It is not External publicity that has gone wrong. It is something which has gone wrong psychologically with our people. As was pointed out, what is it that makes a nation great or makes the image of the nation appear bright in the other countries? It is what we do within our country. If we are sure of our policies, if we are sure of our confidence, if we are sure that we can go ahead without looking either to the right or to the left because our face is turned to the right direction, then certainly all this would not have happened at all.

Then, Madam, I come to certain aspects of our administration which were raised in the debate today. Some hon. Members said that because we promote Section Officers as Information Officers, that is why our Information Service is so ineffective. An hon. Member said that we do not draw from the professional class and, therefore, our Information Service is not so efficient. Now, let me inform the House that till July 1959 our Information Services were filled with recruits drawn through the U.P.S.C from professional journalists, and the reason why our late Prime Minister mentioned about the inefficiency of that procedure stands testimony to the fact that because you are a good journalist it does not mean that you will make a good Public Relations Officer just as Members said that because a person passes in an examination he does not become qualified to be a diplomat. It is quite true.

Madam, since 1959 we are not giving regular training but we are giving opportunities to our I.F.S. Officers to do Information work and we think they do much better work. To say that all these officers are bureaucrats and they have no love of the country, they have no sense of education is also wrong. Madam, love of the country, or patriotism, or dedication are not the monopoly of Members of Parliament alone. Everybody who is in service,—and I vouch for this because I am associated with the External Affairs Ministry for the last 13 years—I am not saying, all of them are perfect. In fact, there is no human being who is perfect. Therefore, I am not talking of perfection but as far as human abilities go, as far as devotion to service goes, I can say without hesitation that the officers who are looking after administration, who are looking after publicity, are as good as any that you can find anywhere in India, perhaps anywhere in the world. Well, I do not know about the world, but I know about India, and I can say without hesitation that they are doing an excellent piece of work against difficulties.

Madam, Members have pointed out that our financial resources are limited. If we want to do publicity in the West, we will have to buy space in the Press. No press is going to give you space to enable you to write everything about India so that the people become enlightened—certainly not—unless you buy space. And what is the price of space? You have to spend millions of pounds, millions of dollars if you want to have space in the newspapers to regularly publicise India. Even that will not educate the people. Now, what happens, Madam, is this. A certain Member of Parliament or a certain person from India goes along and he finds very nice people on the road. Then naturally with our enthusiasm to let the whole world know as to what is happening in India, we try to tell them about Pakistan. No it has happened with me also. When I said that Pakistan is divided up into

two portions by one thousand miles of Indian territory, their eyes popped out, "What? How can you have a country with two portions divided by one thousand miles of foreign territory?" However much you might tell them, you might show them maps, you might talk to them, people are not interested in knowing all that, in knowing where Pakistan is. Some people may be interested in knowing but not the ordinary run of people.

I remember after the police action in Goa, a lady got very annoyed with the idea that after preaching peace and peaceful methods we should go and take action against an island of Portugal. When we said that Goa is not an island, it is a part of India she said, "O, that changes the situation. That is a different matter."

Madam, you do not expect everybody in the world to know as much as a Member of Parliament knows about his own country. I would not say that we all know about other countries. I remember a Member of Parliament from the North said, "I do not know where Indore is. He must be a probationer and, maybe, after coming from one of the Northern States after his examination, after his probationership, he was sent to Moscow as a probationer and naturally he said that Indore is nearer Bombay than his home. And that is no crime. Certainly it is enough if he says that Indore is in India. It is somewhere in India. Certainly if he knows that Indore is in India, that is much better than if he says . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He must have come from Kanpur.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: That is right, Madam. I have come across post-graduate students from our Indian Universities. I have interviewed them. One of them did not know where Australia was. When I tried to persuade him to give me the answer, at the end of it, he said that it is on the west coast of India. That

[Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon.] does not mean that the whole educational system in India is bad, or the University in which he was admitted or where he was studying is really an inefficient University. We should not take these individual cases as an expression of national opinion.

Now, some Members said that people go there and meet the personnel of the Government and even they discuss with them. They said you must have big public meetings. Madam, big public meetings like the ones that we have in the Ramli'a Ground are not held elsewhere in the world unless it is for election purposes.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN:  
Madam, may I interrupt for a moment? I doubt whether there is quorum. There is decorum but no quorum.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON:  
Madam, it is said that Members of Parliament and others who go abroad must meet the ordinary people in big meetings. Now, who is going to arrange these big meetings I should like to know. And what guarantee is there that whatever you speak will be understood by the people, or they are going to take any interest in these things?

So, Madam, as I have said, the people who are manning the Information Service of our Ministry are not Section Officers promoted. They are really people who have the capacity, the talent, the training and the proficiency in the work that they do.

Many of the things that have been said are quite true, and I agree that we do not have enough of people who know foreign languages to take control of the entire publicity. You must remember, Madam, that this Ministry had started functioning only after Independence, and if the recruitment of personnel in the early stages was on an *ad hoc* basis, it was because we had to pick up people who were available. whom we

thought would be able to do a man's job in the particular sphere he was asked to function. Now things are changing. Slowly we are getting better and better people. We are organising ourselves better and better. But that does not mean that everything is all right with us. But everything is not wrong either.

Now I come to the other point. We have, for instance, 42 Missions. Of these Information Officers, 30 have been recruited through the U.P.S.C. Even now in 30 of our Missions the Information Services are handled by regular journalists recruited by the U.P.S.C. Now, Madam, one of the hon. Members said that one of the reasons why these Press Attaches are ignorant, according to him, or the Information Officers are ignorant, according to him, is because they have been away for 10 to 12 years and they never get a chance of knowing what is happening in India. This is also wrong. After each posting the officer is called back to India and sometimes he is given a Bharat Darshan tour and is briefed fully before he is sent back again. After about one or two terms, he is posted at Headquarters for one term. Therefore I think those points are not properly presented at all.

About briefing our Missions, we were told that one of the reasons why our propaganda has failed—I am sorry, I have to use that word a and again—is one, lack of coordination between the External Affairs Ministry and the I. and B. Ministry and the other, they say, is lack of coordination in other places. Let me talk about lack of coordination. This is not correct. There is proper cooperation. In fact there is absolute co-operation or co-ordination between the various Departments of the Government of India which deal with such materials. For instance, there is continuous discussion with the A.I.R., with the Films Division, because the films for external publicity are handled by them, with the Publications Division and the P.J.B. These discussions take the form of day-to-

many consultations and periodic meetings. There is collaboration also with the Territorial Division of the Ministry and with other Ministries and organisations, such as the Indian Council of Cultural Relations and the Education Ministry. One thing of course is rather unfortunate because external publicity through the A.I.R. is not in our control. It is really done by the I. and B. Ministry and there is scope for greater co-ordination, greater control and greater formulation of a uniform policy which would enable us to present the image of India better abroad.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Why does not the Minister take that Division out of the I. and B. Ministry and put it in her Ministry? What is the difficulty?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: There are certain difficulties and you must address the I. and B. Ministry. For one thing, most of these things have been part of our legacy and these things have stayed where they were irrespective of the irrational way in which it has come to work now.

I think one of the speakers, in fact two or three speakers, pointed out that if we want to present a bright image of India abroad, we must be bright at home, that is, there must be more uniformity, more co-ordination, more unity, more agreement on policies, etc. Now India is a free country. We have got freedom of the press and freedom of information and anybody who comes to India can see what is happening. They can see, hear and know all our weaknesses and all our points of strength. In fact, if you ask my opinion, I would say that we need not spend any money on publicity at all. We have for instance, the foreign correspondents here. We have to control them better so that they may send out less biased reports. Then we have the foreign Embassies here and they have all the freedom to gather whatever news they want. These are things

which you do not find in the most European countries or in the Latin American countries or in the South East and Asian countries where news is controlled, the gathering of news is not as free as it is in this country. Let us improve the image of India so that we can present a better image elsewhere.

Regarding the output of material, as I said, we do not do any propaganda. It is not our intention to do propaganda. Our intention is only to give them information. For instance, there are morsecast transmission services twice a day. About 5 000 words are sent abroad every day giving all our Missions news of what is happening. There is a teleprinter service which covers about forty-eight Missions and these Missions serve various other Missions around them and then of course there are press telegrams to those Missions where they do not have teleprinter link. To say that our Missions are not supplied with news and information is also not correct because enough information and enough news are given. One of the Members pointed out that in one place he found that they were not making use of the material but even that is not now possible because we exercise stricter control over them. Therefore, even that is not correct.

Now I come to the crux of the Resolution, namely, about having a Committee of fifteen Members of Parliament. Now what will the Members of Parliament do? For instance, we know the view! Members because in the last thirteen years I have been sitting here and listening to the views of Members regarding external publicity and these points are noted by the Government, noted by the Ministry and they are discussed in the Ministry at these coordination meetings and we find out how best we can implement the suggestions made by the Members. This is being done year after year. Then of course we have the P.A.C. and the Estimates Committee which also take



[Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon.]

into consideration these points which are raised by the Members. Therefore what more can the Members of Parliament do by going round? That is the point. Now we have about seven teams of Members of Parliament who will be going. Two have already gone and others are on their way and let us see what they will have to report when they come back. One thing I would like to tell you. People think that if a man from the public life or a team from the public life go to a new country, it will be able to do much more than the permanent diplomat who is stationed there. Now when they go, whom do they consult? Where do they get the information? From the permanent diplomat. With whom do they discuss? In the presence of the permanent diplomat with these officers.

How do we gain by it, I cannot understand. The idea that our . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Why are they being sent?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: I do not know. You must ask the persons or authorities who are responsible for sending them. What I am trying to say is this. Perhaps it is good to promote goodwill. Perhaps it is to see more people coming and going and perhaps it will mean that we are still keeping our friendly relations with other countries; otherwise, there is very little more that can be done than by the Ambassador who is already posted there who is fully informed about the situation there. To think that because they are service men they do not love our country or because they are service men they do not interpret our country properly, it is all being unnecessarily unkind because I would not like to be so uncharitable as to say that anyone of our officers or anyone of the officers of the Government of India is less patriotic than any of us. Everybody tries to do his or her job properly. Maybe they are not perfect. After all, we cannot have per-

fection. We can only try to be perfect and I think this is being done.

Therefore I do not think that a Committee like the one suggested in the Resolution will have any value at

<sup>1</sup> Moreover among the Members themselves I found great disagreement because some of the Members did, in their intervention, say that such a Committee may not be useful and the only reason why they have brought this Resolution is to get an opportunity to have a full-dress debate on external publicity. I think if they want to supplement this material, they should really have a debate on every Department of the Government because we have very little time for our Budget debate and other things and Private Members' Resolution time can be used to have a full-dress debate on each Department. I think I must say that our Ministry is unnecessarily harassed. It always happens as if everything, the entire image of India presented abroad . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Get help from the Ministry of Home Affairs.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: . . . the entire thing is really dependent upon the one Ministry which is not even an administering Ministry, which is only a representative Ministry, which tries to put out in the best possible way, the image of India and as I pointed out earlier, if the image of India at home is bright and shining, then we will have our job very easy indeed. We are a free country where we have freedom of information, where everybody has the right to think what he likes, say what he likes write what he likes, we are misunderstood because of the possibility of biased reporting.

One more point before I conclude. People think that if we have officers who know the language of the place, then that country will be on our side. Now all the people who are in England are people who know or speak

English and most of the people who are in Moscow are people who do not speak Russian and yet Russia is on our side all the time and England is not on our side but mostly against us. Why? Because the Russian policy is such that it wants friendship of India. England does not care for it and therefore—let us not think that by having an External Publicity Division going on full force in publicising whatever we have to do is going to bring us friends. As Mr. Sen Gupta has said, let us not be so naive as to imagine that by putting out a few pamphlets or giving a few interviews or writing a few articles we could change the policies of a Government. I am sure Members of Parliament are mature enough to know that these are only adjuncts to spread information, not a method to change the policy of any country.

Thank you.

SHRI P. ABRAHAM (Pondicherry): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very happy that the entire House has taken a keen interest in this Resolution of mine. Also I am grateful to the many hon. Members who have discussed at length the various weak points and suggested how our external publicity has to be reorganised to impress the nations of the world more effectively and purposefully with our stand, our policies. After prolonged discussion on the subject for two days, Madam, now my reply has become all the easier in view of the almost unanimous opinion that our external publicity is lacking in initiative and drive and therefore has to be reviewed without further loss of time. I think that the Government are now well aware of all the criticisms and all the suggestions from the various sections of this House. Stress has been laid more particularly on the functioning of our embassies abroad, on the proper selection of our ambassadors, envoys, press attaches, and go on to function in foreign countries, on the dissemination of news, on the character or

965 RS—5.

tone of our publicity, on the coordination of the concerned Ministries, on the training of the information personnel and also on the setting up of a central agency to co-ordinate the activities of the External, Information and Broadcasting, and Defence Ministries, and so on. Now I do not wish to take more time over the details as many of my learned colleagues have done full justice to the various aspects of this important subject, which has taken a considerably long time of this august House. The very purpose of the Resolution to focus the attention of the Government on this subject of the day has been, I think, well served, as is evident from the almost unanimous support I received from almost all the Members who participated in this discussion.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: If there is unanimity, let us put it to vote and find out.

SHRI P. ABRAHAM: Now, Madam, considering the present activities of our Government in this field and also taking into consideration the various steps; that our Government is tooo contemplating, and also hoping that our viewpoints and suggestions will be considered seriously by the Government, I feel it is not necessary for me to press this Resolution. Therefore, Madam, I beg leave Of the House to withdraw my Resolution.

*The Resolution was, by leave, with- drawn.*

## RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE THE FOOD POSITION OF INDIA

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 2 by Shri Sitaram Jai-puria. You seem to be hesitating. Have you not made up your mind?