

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

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

Sir, after the Rajya Sabha adjourned for recess, there have been many developments on the ground and also in the international sphere. It is not my intension to go into the details of the acts of aggression indulged in by Pakistan commencing from 5th of August. During the last session and also at the beginning of this session, this hon. House has been kept fully informed about the situation on the ground by the many statements that have been made by the Prime Minister of India and by the Defence Minister of India. Briefly, this massive aggression started on 5th of August when large numbers of armed personnel from Pakistan crossed into the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It was a regular aggression although the persons who committed aggression were not in uniform. It was an act of aggression undertaken after a great deal of preparation, a great deal of training, which was imparted to these groups in Pakistan's territory and in Pakistan occupied part of Kashmir. These persons who crossed over came well armed with modern automatic weapons and other communication equipment and several other facilities which are the normal concomitants of aggression by regular forces.

We approached Pakistan through our High Commissioner. But it is interesting that the President of Pakistan, notwithstanding the fact that the High Commissioner mentioned to him that he had a message from our Prime Minister, did not find it necessary to see our High Commissioner. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan and its Foreign Secretary did see our High Commissioner. But they said that

Pakistan had nothing to do with these armed aggressors and that it was some local revolution. The whole world knows by now that this story, this fiction, of armed revolution in the State of Jammu and Kashmir exists only in the imagination of Pakistani leaders but there is no such thing in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. When Pakistan did not accept the responsibility for this aggression, India had to take limited defensive action to deal with these infiltrators in our territory and it also had to take some preventive action and moved into the main points of ingress which were used by these infiltrators because we had definite information that several other groups in hundreds and thousands were poised for further aggression into our territory.

After this, the massive aggression by Pakistani forces started on the 1st of September, when Pakistani forces fully armed with modern tanks, with air support and in regular formations, crossed into the State of Jammu and Kashmir, crossing over not only the cease-fire line but also the international boundary, and for several days they were committing aggression advancing into our territory and were threatening the only lines of communication between the rest of India and the several parts of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. When we were faced with that position, we had to take defensive action in moving into the territory of West Pakistan on 6th of September when our armed forces crossed over into the Sialkot and Lahore areas. I am mentioning these dates because some supporters of Pakistan always pick up the thread relating to this aggression from 6th of September when the Indian forces in the exercise of their right of defending our country moved into Pakistan's territory when our own lines of communication and our territory in Jammu and Kashmir were seriously threatened by a full-scale aggression by Pakistan which had commenced on 1st September.

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

It is significant that Pakistan always talks of this conflict as having started on 6th of September and all that happened from 5th of August to 5th of September is conveniently forgotten. The world knows that Pakistan started this aggression, starting from the 5th of August, with all the facts which I have narrated a moment ago.

Then Sir, we have to see as to what were the objectives before the Pakistani leaders when they started this aggression and moved their forces into the State of Jammu and Kashmir on 1st of September and what were the postures of Pakistani leaders even subsequent to the 1st of September. It is important to note this because unless we know what were the particular objectives with which they had embarked upon this aggression, we will not be able to find out their subsequent postures correctly and we will not be able to make a full assessment of their designs.

Mr. Chairman, on 1st of September when the Pakistani armies advanced into the Chhamb-Jaurian Sector, President Ayub Khan of Pakistan made a statement saying that Pakistan was going to the assistance of the people of Jammu and Kashmir who were locked in a struggle against Indian armed forces. This was the object with which President Ayub Khan had embarked upon this aggression. Then, afterwards when the Secretary General made an appeal to both the countries in the month of September calling upon them to observe cease-fire immediately, in reply to that appeal, the President of Pakistan replied to the following effect; he said:

"The concern of the United Nations must extend to the implementation of UNCIP Resolution, as well as to the observance of the cease-fire Agreement. The cease-fire was only the first part to inter-related and integral whole and, therefore, insistence on a cease-fire can only

be meaningful if there is a self-implementing agreement to follow it."

At each stage, while embarking upon aggression, in response to any overtures or appeals made for restoration of peace, Pakistan was always linking the political objective with the starting of, or with any subsequent steps, in relation to this conflict.

Then, Sir, after these earlier resolutions of the Security Council in the beginning of September, the Secretary-General paid a visit to the sub-continent and visited both India and Pakistan and in the course of his talks with President Ayub and Prime Minister Shastri he discussed the various aspects and thereafter addressed an appeal to both heads of Governments to observe immediate cease-fire without any pre-conditions. President Ayub in his response, which is contained in a written letter dated the 13th September again linked political conditions to the following effect. In his reply he said:

"We would, therefore, urge that if the conflict is to be resolved and this sub-continent spared the horrors of even wider war, the cease-fire must be accompanied by action which should resolve the real cause of this conflict. This would be possible if the cease-fire is followed immediately by a complete withdrawal of the Indian and Pakistani Forces from the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the induction of the United Nations sponsored Afro-Asian Forces to maintain order in the State, and the holding of a plebiscite in the State within three months."

So this was the response to the call for peace. Whereas the whole world was anxious that the shooting war should come to an end, here was President Ayub who was trying to link it with impossible conditions, conditions which he knew would never be acceptable to India. To suggest that India should withdraw Indian Forces from the State of Jammu and

Kashmir is something which is preposterous and totally unacceptable to us. And still that was the condition, along with several others, that President Ayub put forward to the Secretary-General's appeal.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the Security Council met and adopted the Resolution of the 20th September. I will not go into detail because that matter was discussed in great detail on an earlier occasion; I would not go into these details at all. I would, however, like to point out one thing, namely, that the Resolution of 20th September, even when it was being adopted by the Security Council, was not acceptable to Pakistan because the Pakistan's representative made a statement towards the end of the Security Council discussions on the 20th September and said:

"I would, therefore, request the members of the Council to consider these aspects again and not to accept and adopt this draft Resolution."

This was a very clear stand that Pakistan had taken with regard to the Resolution of the 20th September.

Sir, I would also like to mention that the representative of Jordan, who during the Security Council meetings, from the very beginning had taken an attitude which was not an objective attitude but was heavily loaded in favour of Pakistan, abstained from supporting this Resolution of the 20th September presumably on the ground that it did not meet the Pakistani viewpoint. This is the Resolution that was adopted on 20th September. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, towards the conclusion of the last Rajya Sabha session, the Government was able to announce that cease-fire effective from the 23rd September was being accepted. We have now to take into consideration the events that took place after the cease-fire.

Sir, after a lapse of about two months, the position on the ground

is fully known to this honourable House. Unfortunately, violations of the cease-fire agreement by Pakistani troops still continue. Till today over a thousand of these violations have been reported by the Indian side through their representative and also through the Armed Forces to the United Nations Military Observers and to the United Nations.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): The hon. Minister said hundreds or thousands?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Over a thousand. The number runs into over a thousand, not hundreds because in all these sectors there are very large number of violations that are taking place, and the situation there is very, very uneasy.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): You mean thousands of violations after the cease-fire?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Violations really would be after cease-fire because before the cease-fire, fighting was going on. So, Mr. Chairman, the position on the ground, particularly in the Rajasthan sector, has been particularly disquieting. It appears that Pakistani leaders during the continuance of the hostilities had fed their people on exaggerated accounts of the Pakistani success on the battlefield, and when the actual cease-fire came about, then they knew that the real truth, the physical presence of the Indian Forces in the Sialkot and Lahore sectors would be there for anybody to see. They started thereafter the persistent effort to take possession by committing further aggression of large areas in the Rajasthan area because in that area, as the hon. Members are no doubt aware, there is not much population, and just by taking a few handful of troops they can demonstrate that they have taken possession of large areas. Just by taking a jeep round, they can tell their own people that they have taken possession of large areas in the Rajasthan territory.

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

I am mentioning all these facts because this attitude has to be weighed in the light of the various postures that had been consistently adopted by the Pakistani leaders. They had embarked upon this aggression with particular objective. At every stage they were trying to bring in efforts for peace with the realisation of their objective, and even after the ceasefire was brought about, they still continued to persist in pursuing their objectives.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the original rather bellicose statements when the Pakistan Foreign Minister talked of war of thousand years are now no longer heard, still the thousand-year war now is put forward as a continuous confrontation till the Kashmir problem is solved, not on merits or on facts, but in accordance with the way Pakistan desires that it should be solved. So, if this is the type of attitude, we have to very seriously consider as to whether Pakistan is serious in maintaining peace and in co-operating in a purposeful manner in working out plans for withdrawal of armed forces. We on our side have made the position clear that this war had been forced upon us by Pakistan aggression. That is the real fact, the central fact of this India-Pakistan conflict, namely Pakistan's aggression and Pakistan's aggression which they had started to realise certain objectives.

We are prepared to observe peace. We are prepared to work out plans for withdrawals also. But such plans must include all armed personnel, and we must be assured that there will not be further repetitions of the state of affairs that we had to face starting from the 5th August. But any attempt to link these peace efforts with any so-called political issues is something which is totally unacceptable to India. We have made the position firmly clear in the U.N., in the international community and to all members of the Security Council

and all other States that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and no amount of pressurisation will deflect India from this firm stand. This is the clear position that we want to be understood and let there be no ambiguity on that score. In this light we have to view the meeting of the last Security Council or the series of the Security Council meetings. At the time of the last Security Council meeting, Pakistan had made a complaint that certain things were happening in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, particularly in the Valley which she wanted to raise in the Security Council. These related to arrests of the leaders, students' agitation and several other law and order matters which are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir. India made the position clear that India is prepared to co-operate with the efforts that might be made by the Security Council to restore peace and also to engage in working out plans for the withdrawal of all Armed personnel but the internal situation in Jammu and Kashmir is a matter which is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, a Government elected on adult franchise and responsible to the local legislature. Any dragging of India into any international forum and to make India answerable to what happens in the valley is something which is totally unacceptable to us. So it was on that basis that we took the stand and when Pakistan persisted and the Security Council actually brought on the agenda the Pakistani complaint, we made the position clear and we said: 'We are not prepared to participate in these discussions'. We dissociated ourselves from any discussions of a like description. In retrospect, I am fully convinced that the step that we took was the correct one, the right one and it did impress all members of the Security Council by the stand of the Government of India and also by the seriousness that India attaches to this problem. It is true that in the past sometimes discussions about purely this internal

situation not only in Kashmir but in several other parts of India did come up for a sort of mention by one party and contradiction by the other in earlier meetings of the Security Council but let us not forget that those meetings were held in a different context altogether. In the present stage when Pakistan resorted to acts of aggressions, when she sent these armed people in thousands and created a situation there which had to be tackled by the local Government, by the State Government, as a law and order situation, we cannot accept that position. Pakistan on the one hand continues to commit this surreptitious creeping aggression and at the same time drags us to the international forum and asks us to explain the various things which she herself had initiated by resorting to that act of aggression. This is a position which is a completely changed one and we cannot permit Pakistan to have it both ways—to continue this type of aggression and create difficulties and when a local Government established by law tackles it in a proper manner, in a manner which they think proper, they are not answerable to any international community. I want to make the position clear. I do not want other countries to have any misunderstanding about our position. We are anxious to explain to everyone that what is being done in Jammu and Kashmir is something normal, something usual and is the handling of a law and order situation but we are certainly not answerable or accountable to any international forum, not even the Security Council, about the manner in which we run our affairs or the Government of Jammu and Kashmir run their affairs in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This was a basic point and we stuck to it and it had the desired effect. In the Security Council discussions members were careful not to adopt anything which might go beyond the earlier resolutions and they reiterated only the earlier resolution of September 20. Suddenly this repetition or reiteration of 20th September resolution

which was unacceptable to the chief delegate of Pakistan when it was adopted on 20th September, when it is reiterated now, is described by Pakistani leaders as something acceptable to them. Well, I welcome this change and I hope that this change of attitude is genuine and they are genuinely interested in restoring peace but I am sorry that at the same time although they have come down a great deal from their original talk of a thousand years' war and are now talking of confrontation, even this talk of confrontation is nothing but bellicosity and the sooner they give up this bellicose attitude the better for them and they can view the whole situation in the proper perspective and may not continue to cling to shadows and some imaginary ideas about this.

During this conflict, Pakistan committed several other acts of a highly reprehensible character. The manner in which they treated our High Commission staff and the High Commissioner himself in Karachi and elsewhere is something which is unheard of in diplomatic history anywhere in the world. Hostilities had broken out in other parts of the world but that the residence of the High Commissioner should be searched and that members of the High Commission should be subjected to all indignities including searches is something which is unheard of in the international relations anywhere, in any part of the world.

Then these illegal acts like seizure of several cargoes and ships and the like is something which is absolutely unjustified. I do not want to go into all those details. There is one other thing which I would like to mention about this before I pass on to other matters.

The collusion between Pakistan and China about which we were aware for several years and some idea of which was available when the Pakistan and Indian Foreign Ministers' conference started in Rawalpindi in December 1962, appears to have become much deeper in the course of

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

these years. I would like to recall to this House that in 1962 also when the two Ministers, myself and Mr. Bhutto, were to talk about an equitable settlement between the two countries, about Kashmir and other matters, and I visited Rawalpindi for those discussions, when I reached there, when on the next day the discussions were to start, on the previous evening, Pakistan and China had announced that an agreement had been arrived at between China and Pakistan about the settlement of the boundary between the Sinkiang Province of China and the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It was very striking that they were discussing the question of Jammu and Kashmir with India and when the discussions were to start and these discussions were initiated as a result of the Chinese aggression upon India and when the talks were to start on the next day, on the day before that they announced an agreement in principle between Pakistan and China about a part of Kashmir which was the subject matter of discussion. Over these years this thing which was exhibited at that time developed and it appears it became very thick. When the two forces—the armed forces of India and Pakistan—were interlocked and fierce battles were going on and the Pakistani forces were retreating at several of these fronts, in the month of September, China came to Pakistan's rescue, and gave India an ultimatum on the 16th of September completely toeing the Pakistani line on the issue of Jammu and Kashmir, and also hurling accusations against India, which were so trivial, and the language was highly offensive and highly provocative. There could not be a clearer proof of collusion and working together between Pakistan and China than the timing of that ultimatum to India and also, if we look at the content of that ultimatum, then no doubt is left about this sinister collusion.

Mr. Chairman, we have to face both these dangers, from China as well as

from Pakistan, and in that respect I am sure that the great unity shown by the people in India, the valour of our armed forces, the vigilance of our police and the very hard and sustained work put in by all people who were entrusted with this task of defending the honour and integrity of India at that crucial time will always be there to meet any challenge that India may have to face again. We have to be in this state of preparedness and we cannot relax our efforts in this connection.

During this period, Mr. Chairman, we have had experiences of many kinds. We had, on the one hand, the support and understanding and objective appreciation of our position in this India-Pakistan conflict from several countries, and we were also surprised and pained to find that certain countries did not bring in the requisite objectivity in understanding our viewpoint, and took attitudes which were not based on facts, which were partial to Pakistan and loaded against us. It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, at any rate in my opening remarks to go into any great deal about all that, but there are some countries which I would like to mention even at this stage, and I would reserve my remarks for reply with regard to others. Amongst the non-aligned countries we had great understanding of our position by Yugoslavia and also by the United Arab Republic. Yugoslavia is an important non-aligned country and we have always had the best of relations and co-operation with Yugoslavia. Our Prime Minister visited Yugoslavia a few months back, and our President visited Yugoslavia after the present conflict. On both these occasions our Prime Minister and our President were received with great warmth by the people and the Government of Yugoslavia, and there was a complete understanding of our position in this conflict and our position in Kashmir. We greatly value this friendship, and this shows that, amongst the non-aligned countries, those countries, which have kept

themselves informed appreciate our position, and they know that India's stand in relation to Kashmir and also in this conflict is a just one and a correct one. All this is reflected in the communique also, which was issued at the end of our President's visit to Yugoslavia. We have also other very close relations, economic and the like, with Yugoslavia—trade, commerce, technological association and collaboration. U. A. R. President Nasser has always shown a great deal of understanding about all matters concerning this part, and he knows fully well the relationship between India and Pakistan, and India's position in Kashmir, and it is no secret if I were to say that it was the efforts of President Nasser and some of his other colleagues at the time of the meeting of the Arab summit leaders at Casablanca that the resolution that was adopted at Casablanca was a resolution in general terms, and notwithstanding the efforts of several other countries which were represented in that conference, Pakistan's viewpoint either about the plebiscite or about the earlier resolutions of the U.N. Security Council of 1948 and 1949 were not mentioned in that resolution. Otherwise also the attitude of the U.A.R. President has been one of understanding. There are several Arab countries which have been appealed to by Pakistan in the name of religion, but they have consistently turned down that appeal, and they are conscious of the fact that the problem of Kashmir in relation to India is not a religious question. And even on the basis of the number of Muslims in Jammu and Kashmir, it is only five per cent of the total number of Muslims in India, and therefore to treat this as a religious issue in the name of any religion is something which is not accepted by a large number of Arab countries. And we have, therefore, to continue our efforts to explain our viewpoint and to cultivate our friendship with non-aligned countries.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: What was the date of the Casablanca conference?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: About the countries in South-East Asia I would venture to mention Malaysia and Singapore. Singapore, as you know, Mr. Chairman, became a separate State only a few months back. We wish Singapore all success in stabilising their position and in their development programmes. We had the honour of welcoming the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore, and also the Foreign Minister and the Education Minister there, and there is full understanding between us and Singapore, and we will continue to take a friendly interest in their welfare and development.

With Malaysia we have had very friendly relations, and I am happy that Malaysia, on an objective assessment of the situation, has understood our viewpoint completely, and in relation to the conflict as also on the question of Kashmir Malaysia has lent the Indian viewpoint full support in the United Nations and also in the Security Council, and this is based on their understanding of the situation and of our friendship with them. We ourselves are very much interested in their development and progress. Malaysia and Singapore are countries where democratic institutions, like ours, are flourishing, where they have got multi-racial and multi-religious societies just as we have multi-religious and multi-lingual societies here in India, and therefore their success and our success are more or less on the same lines with the same objective, and this binds us still further in bonds of friendship and in bonds of understanding.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, with regard to the attitude of major powers, I am purposely not making any statement at the present stage. May be that the Prime Minister himself may like to intervene in the debate and so I would like that aspect to be dealt with by him and, if necessary, I will revert to this matter and several other matters in the course of my reply if the Prime Minister somehow does not find it possible himself to

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

participate in the debate.
 1 P.M. There is one thing, however, which I would like to say before I conclude. It is true that we have been very gravely concerned with our own affairs, because we were involved in a very major conflict with Pakistan. Our first thoughts, our first attention, naturally got all the time concentrated on dealing with this problem. But let us not forget that we have to function in a wide world, a world in which we have always played a significant role in combating the forces of reaction, in combating the forces of medieval colonialism, and our fight on that front continues unabated. The happenings in Rhodesia about which I made a statement in this House some days ago have created a situation which has caused the gravest concern to us. Here is a racist minority government which has usurped illegally the power of government and has unilaterally declared independence. We have always taken the view that there must be a government elected on the basis of one man one vote, before any transfer of power can take place and it is the responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom to ensure that this illegal declaration of independence is thwarted. Otherwise the situation may take a highly explosive turn. This is a very, very vital issue and we must fully understand the implications of this. Any racist conflict taking a violent shape in Rhodesia is bound to have repercussions and ramifications which will be much wider and these will be very very far-flung, and this might really involve a major part of the world in this conflict. Therefore, the strongest terms that we can think of in condemning what has happened in Rhodesia are not strong enough. We will have to continue our efforts in consultation with the African countries and we will lend all possible support to any action which may be initiated by the Organisation of African Unity, to deal with the situation. There have already been some con-

sultations which we are anxiously awaiting the outcome of those consultations. In the meantime, the conscience of the whole world has been roused about this. The enforcement of sanctions, I hope, will have some effect and the situation may be capable of being retrieved, although the situation would not have taken an ugly turn if the British Government had taken timely steps and taken strong and determined action much earlier.

The situation in Aden is another situation which causes all of us much concern. Whatever little Constitution they had there, has been abrogated and a reign of terror obtains there. We have always had our sympathies and support for the freedom fighters who are struggling there to establish their independence and we lend full support to them in the establishment of their freedom and their independence. The areas still under colonial domination and racist regimes are the areas where the peoples of the world, particularly those of Africa, Asia and Latin America, have to concentrate their efforts to liberate themselves. Angola, Mozambique and South Africa are the regions where there is the greatest need for concentrated effort and action to end the racist and colonial regimes there. We will continue to take the maximum of interest in their early liberation and freedom and we will lend full and solid support to all efforts that are directed for bringing the peoples of those countries nearer the cherished goal of their freedom and independence.

Mr. Chairman, I would not like to say more on this occasion. I will deal with several other matters in the course of my reply because I want to give more time to hon. Members to put across their viewpoints. But before concluding I would like to say that suggestions have been made in the course of several weeks that we should change our basic policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. I want to make this position categorically clear, that our adherence to the policy of non-alignment and

peaceful co-existence is not only a policy which enables us to have independence of action in any given situation—it is a necessary symbol of our freedom and independence—but even in the interest of our enlightened self-interest, this is the correct policy and we should continue to adhere to this in a steadfast and firm manner. Let us not forget that it was the call of a large number of non-aligned countries, the call by the two super powers, the two big powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, that was raised when we were threatened by the Chinese ultimatum during this conflict with Pakistan. If we had not been pursuing the independent policy that we had pursued all these years, we would not have got this support in this complicated situation when we faced two dangers one from Pakistan and the other from China. If we had not been pursuing the policy of non-alignment we would not have got support in facing both these dangers that we had to face, namely, from China and from Pakistan. Some times, when we isolate one from the other, or when our minds are obsessed by our difficulties, when we feel harassed, we think of easy solutions and we think of some bright ideas that we could line up with this group or that group. But that would be a short-sighted step. We will have to stand on our own legs, get strength from whatever source we can and continue to adhere strongly and steadily to the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, for that is the only policy which gives us honour and which gives us freedom of action. Thank you very much.

The question was proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two amendments, one in the name of Shri Chordia and the other in the name of Shri Sadiq Ali.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the Government is yet reluctant to orient its postures in foreign affairs more realistically in the light of our recent confrontation with Pakistan and China, and specifically suggests that—

(a) in view of Pakistan's naked aggression on our territory both the Indus Canal Waters Agreement and the Kutch Agreement be deemed annulled and India declare itself absolved from all obligations and commitments under the Agreements;

(b) Government must take rational note of China's entry into the nuclear club, abjure all notions of pseudo-pacifism and resolve to build up an independent nuclear deterrent;

(c) Government should withdraw its support of China's entry into the United Nations;

(d) full support be extended to the case of Tibet's freedom;

(e) the lopsidedness in our Middle-East policy be removed by establishment of full-fledged relations with Israel;

(f) an all-Party committee be formed to reappraise the worth of our membership of the Commonwealth against the background of recent experiences and particularly in the context of the British Government's hostile role in the recent war with Pakistan; and

(g) the recent naval bases set up by the British Government in the Indian Ocean should be taken advantage of by us to make friends with Afro-Asian countries'."

SHRI SADIQ ALI (Rajasthan): Sir, I move:

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

[Shri Sadiq Ali.]

'and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy'."

The questions were proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. The House will continue till 1.30 P.M.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened patiently to the speech of the hon. Minister of External Affairs. I am wholeheartedly with him when he referred to the sense of unity that was shown by the people in the face of the Pakistani aggression and when he was praising the valour of our defence forces and also of our police on the border who had a very difficult time and it is gratifying that they stood at their post of duty and against heavy odds I am also glad that they have been able to wipe off the ignominy that came to them, not because of their own doing, but because of some muddling in policies which resulted in their suffering that ignominy a few years ago. I am afraid I cannot go further in agreeing with him. Our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence came to an end when the Chinese hordes rushed at our borders. The Bandung Conference at which we boasted so much and gave offence to Pakistan unnecessarily resulted in Pakistan's resentment and wanting to retaliate in some form or the other. This policy of peaceful co-existence and non-alignment paid us dividends to a certain extent and perhaps if we had not wasted so much time and so much of the country's money in trying to boost that policy, in trying to show the advantages of that policy to the world but had concentrated more on building up our own internal defences and our own internal strength, we would have been in a very much better position then and even now.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: May I ask him one question?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Please, after I finish. My time is limited.

We were in difficulties primarily because we had a predecessor to the Minister who was entirely mistaken on these matters and particularly the Defence Minister who misled us, who misled the Prime Minister, who misled the country and hence we are now in this mess. (*Interruption*) He misled us into making appointment of officers in the Defence Forces as a sort of clique and intrigue. He misled us into making one part of a tank in Calcutta, the second part in Jabalpur and the third part in the South. He misled us into making coffee percolators, bath-tubs and photographic enlargers in the best ammunition factory that we have at Calcutta.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: (Andhra Pradesh): He had the Gnats also.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: We could have done much better with the amount of money that we have spent on all these items in these days. I am, Sir, reminded constantly of the Gnats. Is it the Gnats or the bravery of the Armed Forces, the bravery of the persons driving them, sitting in them that has resulted in this success? I say that it is not the Gnats but the exemplary sense of duty and devotion, the exemplary and self-sacrificing nature of the pilots who were sitting in them that secured this success. It is good that in the last three years the training in the Armed Forces has been streamlined and all the chaos and confusion that was brought about in the Krishna Menon regime has been set right. The foreign policy, let me say very frankly, has been a failure, failure, failure. Our failure was in letting down Tibet, to my mind a very high moral failure. India has been taking a high moral stand always and has been trying to show this to the world. With what face can we dare to do so today when we have let Tibet down, when we allowed a treacherous nation to come and concentrate there? We did not

even help or facilitate the Dalai Lama to go to the United Nations and put his case there. We have made some friends cold because of our attitude in this respect. We have been looking for friends. The Minister has told us of certain friends but I have not been able to understand why there was no positive reaction or positive friendship shown to our case which was based on such high moral plane. There was a clear case of aggression on our country but no country named the aggressor. If there is aggression and if there is an aggressor, there is a procedure set down by the United Nations to deal with the aggression and the aggressor. It is because of the utter failure of our External Affairs Ministry that they have not been able to persuade the world to accept that there had been aggression and that the necessary steps should be taken against the aggressor. Only two days ago we had a long-drawn out debate on the failure of our external publicity. It is not external publicity alone that has failed, it is a failure all along the line. It is failure to distinguish between a real friend and a foe. Who are your real friends?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi): Who is the real friend?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: People who let you down, people who are afraid of naming the aggressor. If that is what you call . . .

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: According to you?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The United States has named the aggressor.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): The United States of America.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Let him say that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I will allow the interruptors to calm down for a minute; it helps.

I do not know whether people in this country have heard recently about Taiwan and Madam Chiang Kai-shek's open condemnation of Pakistani aggression in New York. Yet, our country will not recognise their friendship. Today, in the course of questions on food, in the course of questions on the Tonnage Club, etc., there was mention made about tai-chung rice, the rice that is used by these people but our country will not have anything to do with them. We will not have diplomatic relations and so the Rice Research Station for which crores and crores of rupees come through the United Nations, through the Rockefeller Foundation, come to us indirectly through the Philippines where the Rice Research Station has gone instead of coming here where it was offered first and where it was refused. We are getting that seed from Manila instead of getting here directly. See the number of precious years that have been lost in this case because of these policies. Therefore, it is that I commenced by saying that it is a case of failure of the policy. We refuse to call a friend a friend. We have two small countries on both sides who have made a success of agriculture but our misguided foreign policy prevents us from looking to them, prevents us from copying their example and, therefore, we lack self-sufficiency in food and, therefore, the people of this country must tighten their belts more and more; they must tighten their belts because of the war. Where will our economy go? While it is being recognised in certain quarters, I do not think the Government of India has recognised sufficiently that the real threat to our security and the real danger to us is not Pakistan but it is Red China. It is true that Pakistan has committed aggression on us. We are sufficiently strong enough to meet it. If we had been better prepared perhaps an aggression of this type would not have been thought of even but what happened to us at the time of the massive Chinese invasion a few years ago was perhaps the reason why Pakistan could even think of

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

such a naked aggression against us. It is, therefore, the failure of our Government that has resulted in this situation. Our Government failed to protect our borders at Rajasthan. We are told it is a very long and large border but the border has been there for years and the Government also has been in that position for a long time. The Government should have been at least sufficiently informed of the designs of Pakistan. Then why did they not take measures to protect the border? We have been told that a large number of infiltrators were going into Kashmir in the last year and a half. The number of Pakistani infiltrators arrested, as admitted by our Government, surely did not cross into Kashmir overnight. Surely they did not cross the distance, the long distance, right up to the other side of Kashmir overnight. Then what was our Government doing? Have we a Government there or not? Have we a police force there? Have we got a Military Intelligence there? If we have, why did they not give us this information and why was Pakistan able to come so far, stealthily if you please, and consolidate its position partly at least at the time of the aggression? Therefore, I call it our failure.

I must also say that our propaganda has failed. All India Radio's dealing with the situation is far from satisfactory. There was failure to keep the world informed. Of course, there also the policy of the Government comes in. It was a silly thing to cancel the VOA deal. That is why whenever you try to listen to the All India Radio you first get Pakistan. Pakistan has got a more powerful instrument for broadcasting and it is easily caught on the radio while you try to tune in. That is also because of our folly. A deal that was offered to us, to which the Prime Minister himself set his signature, there was no reason to back out. I think it was again failure on our part.

There are no signs of trying to correct the earlier mistakes. Perhaps

that is going to land us into more and more trouble. I would like the Government to revise its policy in many of these matters. It is only by doing so that we will be able to build up our position correctly. Why do we mistrust the friends who always come to our aid. There is a lobby in this country which seems to be allergic to American aid and that is the aid on which we have always subsisted. I would like the Members of the House to take a little more interest and see the amount of aid that comes to us from different countries. We have been reduced to a position, because again of the failure of this Government, that we take aid from wherever it is possible. Look at the large amount of aid that we have received; look at the terms on which we have received and then perhaps we will be able to judge things better.

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): Every country is doing it. Britain is doing it; U.S.S.R. is doing it.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Whether you like it or not we got 69 per cent of aid for the First Five Year Plan from the United States. At that time there was no aid from Russia. For the Second Five Year Plan we received 54 per cent.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh): Going down.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes; if you think that is going down. Perhaps you are unable to absorb more. We got five per cent. from the Soviet Union. For the Third Five Year Plan we got 59 per cent from the United States and 8 per cent. from the Soviet Union. Of course for the first year of the Fourth Plan it was 89 per cent from the United States. So we receive the largest amount of aid from the United States. We received only 6 per cent. from the Soviet Union.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: Give some break-up of this.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am in a position to give all the figures but I know my time is limited. It is, therefore, that I would like our Government to reconsider its policy. After all the quantum of help that we get has some relation though all the aid that we get we are told is without strings.

Then how do we tackle our food problem? Very foolishly we are living a very hand to mouth existence in the matter of food. If we do not get one ship tomorrow we are in difficulties. That is also linked to our foreign policy as I said earlier because we do not learn to grow more food when we can. If as was said this morning Mr. Pandeya from Gujarat and other people who are in this Tonnage Club can grow more food, more wheat, more rice, in this country what is the Government doing all these years? Why did they not find better people? Why did they not find people in the Ministry of Agriculture to publicise this fact all over India and advise people. Wherever countries have made a success of agriculture it has been not merely the enterprise of the people but a considerable amount of knowledge, help and guidance comes to them from the officers of the State. Are we doing it here? We have failed to do it. Therefore, we are in this situation and this is also because of our foreign policy.

Sir, after the hostilities broke out—I have pointed this out a month ago—there was a cable to our External Affairs Ministry from a journalist who wanted to come and observe the situation I personally made representations to so many people in the External Affairs Ministry. He had come half way right upto Bangkok and wanted to come to India to see things but he is still waiting. It is more than a month. This is how we give our case to the world. If we do not have diplomatic relations with a country is it a reason that we do not allow even journalists from that country to come

and understand our case? I thought this was a very poor way of selling our case to the world when already we are misunderstood. You are misunderstood because of your wrong policies, because of your trying to stand on a very high pedestal and preaching to everybody without the strength that is necessary in yourself to be able to do that. Sir, if our foreign policy is to succeed it has to be completely reorientated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I would only emphasize all the criticisms that I made in this House two years ago when an effort was made to try to prevent me from going to Taiwan. I pointed out to the Minister for External Affairs and to the Prime Minister also that one of the Resolutions passed at the Conference was condemnation of the Peking-Pakistan axis. This was nearly two years ago. Well, our Government still persists in its pig-headed attitude of putting a blanket ban on all literature, whether it is literature concerning food or whether it is literature concerning improved methods of agriculture, coming from that country. It is no use the Minister telling me that the ban has been removed. Even till today the literature that comes in my name and in the name of another ex-Member of this House, Raja Mahendra Pratap—he is from the other House; I mean of Parliament—has been stopped by the Customs at Calcutta and they say, 'If you want it come and explain; otherwise in a short time we will destroy it.' This is a very wrong way of doing things. Therefore I say that the whole policy of our External Affairs Ministry is completely misguided and needs to be reorientated if we are to succeed and if we are to let the world know the correctness of our case. I would, therefore, appeal to the Prime Minister—unfortunately he is not here—Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, who has shown imagination, who has shown realisation that some of these wrong policies have landed us

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

into difficulties that a change of policy has to be made. Whether he will be able to rise above the intrigues and the forces in his own party that prevent him from doing so, that is how he will be judged in this country and by history whether he is a success or a failure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 2-30 in the afternoon.

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

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

SHRI SADIQ ALI: Madam Deputy Chairman, it is good that we are having a fresh look at the world after this tragic Indo-Pakistan conflict, a conflict which has transformed our country. The world—the 120 countries are also looking at us in a new perspective and coming to their own conclusions. The field of foreign affairs is vast. I, therefore, propose to restrict myself to a few specific matters relating to our foreign policy, but before I do so, may I, with your permission, say a word, a rather lengthy word, about the Afro-Asian Conference which I was privileged to attend as a delegate?

The Afro-Asian Conference has tended to be discussed in our country in terms of whether India has lost or gained or whether China has lost or gained, as though it is only these two countries which matter and others do not. I do not think this is the correct approach. Even looking at the Conference from India's point of view, let us be clear in our minds as to what our objectives were when we decided to join the Afro-Asian Conference, because it is these objectives which furnish the test of success or failure. Was it one of our objectives that the Afro-Asian Conference should be held anyhow, under all circumstances? It

has been argued in India that China was set on its postponement and India was bent upon having the Conference. This feeling, I am afraid, is wrong. It may be right so far as China is concerned. We did want to attend the Conference. We had made a commitment in July last, not only we, but also Pakistan, China and many other countries in Asia and Africa. We wanted to remain true to that commitment. Therefore, when an invitation came to us from Algeria to attend the Conference, we accepted it. China then raised objections. China wanted the Conference to be postponed for some special reasons. Forty-five nations, in defiance of the wishes of China, in defiance of its advice or warning, did attend the Conference in Algiers. The Conference was held. The Chairman was elected. He made his inaugural speech. Other office-bearers were elected. But when the Conference was about to enter upon real business certain new factors emerged. The host country, Algeria, itself began to have doubts about the advisability of holding the Conference. Mind you, the invitation had come from Algeria. They were very anxious that the Conference should be held. Forty-five countries were present, but the host country itself began to have doubts and their main argument was that very few Heads of States were coming to Algeria to attend the Conference. Their stand was that the Afro-Asian Conference was essentially a Conference of the Heads of States. The Conference of Foreign Ministers was just a preparatory meeting to draw up an agenda. It is the Conference of the Heads of States which would consider the agenda and arrive at decisions on the various items of the agenda. Therefore, when this difficulty was pointed out to us, we were helpless. It is true that only about twenty or twenty-two Heads of States were coming. The twenty or twenty-two Heads of States were not competent to take decisions on behalf of the whole Afro-Asian family and

Algeria thought it inconsistent with its own prestige if a truncated Conference was held. Now, the real thing to understand is the reluctance on the part of the Heads of States to come. They said 'Yes' to the invitation and yet they were reluctant to come. What are the reasons for this reluctance. The reason is that there is no proper atmosphere for the Conference to be held, an atmosphere in which real business could be transacted. There was the Bandung Conference. Recall the circumstances in which the Bandung Conference was held. About twenty-nine countries had been freed by then. They all met in a spirit of comradeship. There was great unity and they had many important tasks to face. There were many countries in Asia and Africa which were still in subjection and, therefore, there was work for the Afro-Asian Conference to do, to free these countries, which were still in subjection. And then there were other problems facing Asia and Africa and facing the world and the Bandung Conference considered those problems and arrived at very sound decisions. The decisions they arrived at had a great impact and they did affect the course of events in the next five or ten years, but what is the mood now? There is still a job to do, because even though many countries had been freed, there are very difficult problems connected with their social and economic development. All these problems had to be considered. There are still some fifty or sixty territories, small and large, which have to be freed. All these are constructive jobs, but the atmosphere does not exist. The spirit of division and discord is abroad and to this our friend, China, has made a powerful contribution. So, till this atmosphere improves, I do not think there is any prospect of the Afro-Asian Heads gathering at any particular place.

Now, this brings me to another important point. I find that the African nations have two important preoccupations. One is their own social and

economic development and the other is to safeguard their freedom and bring freedom to countries which are still in subjection. India is in entire agreement with the basic aspirations of the people and Governments of Africa and I was happy to find that the African nations do not distrust India. They would welcome help from our country, because they know that no political strings are attached to it. They know our policy, our settled policy, not to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. They know that, although we are a democracy, wedded to democracy, it is also our firm and fixed belief that other countries are free to choose their own ways of life and their own system of Government. Therefore, there is plenty of scope for co-operation and collaboration with African countries in the social and economic fields. Whenever there is a debate on foreign affairs, some issues are invariably raised. One is the issue of non-alignment. It is extra-ordinary to me that there should be debate about non-alignment in our country when there are dozens and scores of countries in Africa and Asia which have taken the inspiration from us and are following the path of non-alignment. Non-alignment is not discussed there, is not debated there. It is as natural for them as the food they eat and the air they breathe. But there is criticism about non-alignment in certain quarters in India. What is the reason? I think the main reason is that whenever there is any failure anywhere, the blame is put on non-alignment. After all non-alignment is not the whole foreign policy of India. It is only a fragment, a portion of our foreign policy. It does not cover all situations. If our country is attacked and we need immediate help, non-alignment will not come and should not come in the way of our asking help from any quarter. After all the essence of non-alignment, apart from the two power blocs, whether they exist or do not exist, is freedom and independence of judgment, freedom and independence of

[Shri Sadiq Ali.]

action. I do not think any sensible person will disagree with this basic approach.

Another pet theme of our critics here is that India is friendless and, therefore, its foreign policy is a failure. Now let us look at the world. Is the foreign policy of Pakistan or China or Indonesia an outstanding success? Is Great Britain a great success? Do Japan or the U.A.R.,—I can indiscriminately name many countries—do they claim many successes and no failures in the sphere of foreign policy? We must remember that we are living in a new and complex world. There are 120 nations and most of these nations have been newly freed. They are proud and sensitive nations, and each nation has to make its appropriate adjustments with all the 120 nations. Each country—specially the newly freed ones—is faced with a multiplicity of problems and challenges. Each country has to make its adjustments. It is not easy to make the right adjustments with all the 120 nations. An element of trial and error is bound to creep in. But all this requires great alertness on our part, a constant vigilance and sensitive awareness of all that is happening in various parts of the world. We have to have special studies of the various regions. We should have these studies in our Foreign Office, in universities and in many voluntary organisations. I do not know whether the special studies exist. It is for our Foreign Minister to tell us whether we have made satisfactory arrangements for proper studies to be made. If we want to know about China, we go to France, to Great Britain, or to America, because in these countries there are excellent arrangements for the proper study of China. Do we have similar arrangements here? It is not only China. There is Africa. We have to study this continent, its urges, its aspirations, its problems. Therefore, this is a task to which we must address ourselves without any further loss of time.

May I say, Madam, a word about Kashmir? Our Foreign Minister has dealt exhaustively with all aspects of the Kashmir question, but I have had opportunities of meeting representatives of foreign countries during my foreign tour. They say, even those countries which are affectionately disposed towards us say, that India's case is strong and sound but still ours is a big country and we should be generous. Another argument advanced is that India has a very important role to play in world affairs, and this important role is injured and damaged if we have this vicious conflicts with Pakistan on our hands. For these two reasons they want us to be generous. Now India has not been wanting in generosity. We all know that millions of refugees have poured into India from across Pakistan, and perhaps they are pouring still. We could have created many uncomfortable situations in regard to these refugees because it is not easy for a country to find a home, a habitat, for millions of refugees, but we have created no uncomfortable situations. We are carrying the heavy burden. Then there was the Indus Waters. Dispute. We showed generosity. These instances of generosity can be multiplied. But where Kashmir is concerned it is not a question of concession in details. It is a question of concession in vital principles, and these vital principles we cannot surrender, because they are bound up with the integrity of our country and with the foundations of our multi-racial, multi-religious and multi-lingual society. It is good, however, that the countries are beginning to understand more and more our basic stand in regard to Kashmir.

Now we want to project an image of India abroad. If we are really anxious to project a particular image, build up a particular image of India in the world mind, then we should be clear in our own minds what that image should be, and then that image should be projected gently, patiently and imaginatively. I deliberately use the word "gently" because that alone

is consistent with our peaceful intentions and the constructive purposes we have in view.

I would like to offer a few remarks on the explosive question of Rhodesia. This question has to be studied against a particular world background. Since 1945, some 745 million people in 50 lands have achieved freedom. But there are still 50 or 60 territories, small and big, which have yet to achieve their freedom. We believe in the policy of peaceful co-existence but not in the policy of co-existence with slavery. Slavery has to go. On Rhodesia we have even gone to the length of saying that the countries struggling for freedom can resort to arms. It was not an easy position for us to take. Those of us who practised non-violence in our struggle for freedom, even we have gone to the length of saying that the countries struggling for freedom can resort to the use of arms. Now it is the direct responsibility of Great Britain to see that power passes into the hands of 4 million Africans and not 2 lakh Europeans. They have to take the necessary measures—political, economical and military—in order to suppress and liquidate the illegal regime of Mr. Smith. We find that Great Britain today is in an acutely divided state of mind. I am afraid it will have to face grave consequences if it persists in this vacillation and indecision. So far as India is concerned, we have taken many steps to make known our relentless opposition to the Smith regime and we are prepared to take other steps to strengthen the hands of the UNO or the Organisation for African Unity.

Before I conclude, I would like to say a word about the atom bomb. My friend, Shri Chordia, has also moved an amendment in regard to this matter. The Government of India has taken up a particular position on this vital matter. I entirely agree with the stand which the Government of India has taken. When we say that we

would not have the atom bomb, it does not mean that we want our country to be left militarily weak; nothing of the kind. Even if we have the atom bomb, we will have to build up our strength on the conventional pattern. We will have to have an efficient army, an efficient air force and an efficient navy and these will absorb all the resources that we possess, all the energies that we possess. The Government has taken a particular stand in regard to the atom bomb. Why?—because we realise, looking at the world, that a new type of thinking is necessary in the entirely novel and unprecedented situation created by these ABC weapons. Humanity today has in its hands a weapon with which it can commit collective suicide. When we say that we do not want an atom bomb, what does this mean? We do not stop there. It is not just enough for us to say that we do not want an atom bomb, we want to destroy the atomic weapons which exist in other countries. There is talk of non-proliferation. We subscribe to it. But the countries which are armed to the teeth with atomic weapons do not have the right to tell us that we should not have atomic bombs. If we have ourselves arrived at the deliberate decision that we should not have the atomic bomb, it is not on account of the advice given by these super powers, it is not on account of any pressure that they have brought to bear upon us; it is our own deliberate decision. But the super powers which possess these atomic weapons, they must understand that it is not enough for them to say that there should be non-proliferation; they will also have to disarm themselves, and that is why we attach the greatest importance to this Disarmament Conference. And in the Disarmament Conference, the foremost emphasis is on atomic disarmament and so long as atomic disarmament does not take place, there is bound to be confusion and uncertainty in the world's mind. We have to start a crusade after declaring our stand. It does not mean that we have to go to sleep; we have to start a

[Shri Sadiq Ali.]

crusade for the effective outlawry of atomic weapons. That is the task. I am afraid our people do not understand this and if our crusade does not produce quick results, well, we will have to think afresh. People ask me whether our stand is for all time, whether it is for eternity. Well, I cannot speak in that language, none of us can. Ordinary, normal human beings like us cannot talk the language of Christ or Gandhiji. But we have taken a stand keeping in view the necessities of the situation and we hope that the super powers will respond to the call for disarmament which has gone out not only from India but from all the newly freed countries and from all sensible people in all parts of the world.

With these words, Madam, I support the motion moved by the hon. Minister of External Affairs together with my amendment.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :

उपभक्ति भद्रा, हमारे विदेश नीति का प्रारम्भ स्वातंत्र्य के प्राप्ति के पश्चात् से होता है। उसके कुछ समय पश्चात् सारे संसार में जो हमारे मित्रों का संख्या था, हमारे हिनेच्छ थे, हमसे घनिष्ठ सम्बन्ध रखने वाले थे, उनको देखा जाये और आज की संख्या देखा जाये तो हम मालूम पड़ेगा कि अगर ज्यादा ज़ोर लगाया जाये तो हमारे घनिष्ठ कहने वालों में मलेशिया के अलावा और कोई दिवना नहीं और हिनेच्छुओं को संख्या भी कम हो चुकी है और हमारे मित्रों की संख्या में भी कमी हो चुकी है इससे हम अन्दाज़ा लगा सकते हैं कि हम चहे जितने उच्चतम सिद्धान्तों पर चलते रहे, हमारा वास्तविक स्थिति क्या है, इसको हम अच्छी तरह तोल सकते हैं।

अगर स्थिति का अध्ययन किया जाय तो पता चलेगा कि सब राष्ट्र अपना नीति अपने राष्ट्र के हित में निश्चित करते हैं, न कि किसी नारेबाज़ी के आधार पर। सिद्धान्तों

की अपेक्षा, उनका लगाव इससे होता है कि उनके राष्ट्र का हित किस में अधिक है। आज भारत का अगर पाकिस्तान से झगड़ा होता है, तो संसार का एक गुट हमारी मदद करने के लिए अग्रसर होता है। अगर भारत का चाइना से झगड़ा होता है तो संसार का दूसरा गुट हमारी मदद करने के लिए अग्रसर होता है। यह कहना कि हमारे लिए अमुक बिल्कुल मित्र है और अमुक हमारे दुश्मन है, बिल्कुल उचित नहीं है। सारे संसार के राष्ट्र अपना नीति का अपने राष्ट्र के हित में, अपने हित में निर्धारण करते हैं, इस सिद्धान्त पर नहीं कि चूंकि भारत से हमारी मित्रता है और उसका अमुक से झगड़ा हो गया है इसलिए हम उसकी मदद करें। इसी प्रकाश में हमें सोचना है और अपनी नीति का पूरी तरह से निर्धारण करना है। पाकिस्तान के साथ झगड़े में रक्षा ने हमारी मदद की, इसलिए वह हमारा घनिष्ठ मित्र हो गया या चीन के साथ हमारा लड़ाई में उस समय अमराका और ब्रिटेन ने हमारी मदद की, इसलिए वह हमारे स्थायी मित्र हो गए—अगर इस भ्रम में पड़ गए तो हमारी जो मूलभूत रक्षा का प्रश्न है, विदेश नीति का प्रश्न है, उसका हम ठीक तरह से निर्धारण नहीं कर सकेंगे।

हमारी सबसे बड़ा बुराई यह है कि हम शक्ति न होते हुए भी दुनिया भर के झगड़ों में अपना राय जाहिर करने के लिए सब से आगे हो जाते हैं। वे लोग जिनके सम्बन्ध में हम राय जाहिर करते हैं, हमारे मित्र बनना तो दूर आपस में मित्र हो जाते हैं और हमारी दुश्मनी या हमारा मित्रता वही का वही रह जाती है। उदाहरण के लिए 1956 में जब स्वेज नहर का झगड़ा हुआ तो हमने ब्रिटेन और फ्रांस को बहुत कोसा, किन्तु आज वही यू० ए० आर० वाले, ब्रिटेन और फ्रांस के मित्र होते जा रहे हैं और हम थोड़े दूर होते जा रहे हैं। इसके बाद हम इजरायल का झगड़ा देखे। इजरायल ने जब यू० ए० आर०

मिस्र, पर आक्रमण किया उस समय हम लोगों ने बहुत बुरा-भला कहा और यह कहा कि सारा कुछ दूसरे राष्ट्रों के इशारे से हो रहा है, लेकिन आज जिनके इशारे से इज्रायल ने मिस्र पर आक्रमण किया था वे मित्र बन रहे हैं, मिस्र के और हम वही पर स्थित है। हम यह भी सोचते हैं कि अगर हम इजरायल से सम्बन्ध स्थापित करते हैं तो अरब के 12-13 देश हमारे खिलाफ वोट दे देंगे, मगर अगर सारी स्थिति का अध्ययन किया जाये तो ऐसा लगता है कि अरब देशों में भी जोर्डन, ईराक और सऊदी अरब वगैरह हैं उनका हमारे प्रति क्या रुख है। यह स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि हमें जो भ्रम बना हुआ है वह बिल्कुल अवास्तविक है। दूसरे पक्ष का और भी हम देखें। जिन राष्ट्रों को इजरायल से भी मित्रता है, जिन राष्ट्रों ने इजरायल से दौत्य सम्बन्ध कायम कर रखे हैं, अरब देशों से भी उनके दौत्य सम्बन्ध हैं, लेकिन उनकी आपस में लड़ाई नहीं होती। हम में इतना कमजोरी आ गई है कि हम सोचते हैं कि अगर इजरायल से सम्बन्ध रखे तो अरब कण्ट्राज नाराज हो जायेंगे। फ्रांस के दौत्य सम्बन्ध दोनों से है, अमरीका के दोनों से है, उनका आपस में कहीं लड़ाई नहीं होती। यह भ्रम हमारे यहां के शासन चलाने वालों को क्यों पैदा हो गया कि अगर हम इजरायल से सम्बन्ध स्थापित करते हैं तो अरब कण्ट्रीज हमसे हट हो जायेंगे, संयुक्त राष्ट्र सब में उनका जो समर्थन प्राप्त होता है वह नहीं मिल पाएगा। इस पर हमारी सरकार को जरूर विचार करना चाहिए। एक तरफ तो इजरायल से, जो अपना दौत्य सम्बन्ध कायम करना चाहता है, दौत्य सम्बन्ध कायम करना नहीं चाहते और दूसरी तरफ अरब राष्ट्रों के दबाव में, अप्रत्यक्ष दबाव में, हम इतना आते जा रहे हैं कि अरब ल.ग. को भी हमें मान्यता देना पड़ी। हमें उसका मान्यता कायम रखनी चाहिये या नहीं। स.प. पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये। एक राज्य से दौत्य सम्बन्ध कायम नहीं करते और दूसरी आर

अरब लाग है—उनका आपस में कहा तक एकमत है उसका विश्वास नहीं उसके बावजूद भी हम उसको मान्यता देने के लिए आगे बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। इस तरह से अरब राष्ट्रों का ध्यान रख कर और उनके दबाव में आकर हमने अन्य मित्रों को नहीं बनाया, केवल यह सोच कर के कि ये मित्र नागज हो जायेंगे, इसलिये यह करना कुछ ठीक नहीं।

माननीय मन्त्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में फ्रांसाब्लांका के प्रस्ताव की भी चर्चा की। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या कारण है कि जिसमें राष्ट्रपति नासर भी थे, वहां के सब थे, वहां पर एग्रेसर को एग्रेसर घोषित नहीं किया गया जबकि पाकिस्तान ने हम पर आक्रमण किया था, यह बिल्कुल सर्वविदित है, उसके लिये किसी प्रकार के प्रकाश की आवश्यकता नहीं, इसके बावजूद भी वहां पर एग्रेसर को एग्रेसर घोषित नहीं किया गया। फिर कैसे यह हमारे लिये बहुत अच्छा है, यह कुछ मानने सरीखी बात नहीं है। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हम इस दृष्टि से पुनर्विचार करके जो जो राष्ट्र हम से मित्रता करना चाहें उनसे मित्रता करने में किसी तरह की आपत्ति नहीं करनी चाहिये।

जहां तक प्रधान मन्त्री जी का ताशकन्द में पाकिस्तान और रूस वालों से मिलने का सम्बन्ध है, उसके सम्बन्ध में निवेदन है कि जो सिद्धान्त उन्होंने काश्मीर के बारे में प्रकट किया उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूं और आशा करता हूं कि माननीय प्रधान मन्त्री जी उसे पूरा करेंगे और जिस वचन को उन्होंने देश को दिया है उस पर उस समय वह कायम रहेंगे, उसको तोड़ेंगे नहीं।

जहां तक पाकिस्तान के साथ दौत्य सम्बन्ध रखने का सवाल है, मुझे बड़ा अप्रसोस होता है कि एक राष्ट्र मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाता है और उदारता के साथ दौत्य सम्बन्ध कायम करना चाहता है उसको हम करते नहीं और एक देश ने जिसने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया, हमारे यहां के दूतावास के कर्मचारियों का

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया:]
वहां रहना मुश्किल कर दिया और हमें मजबूर हो कर वहां से लोगों को बुलाना पड़ रहा है, वहां हमारा दूतावास कुछ काम नहीं कर सकता, फिर भी हम उससे सम्बन्ध बनाये रखना चाहते हैं। समझ में नहीं आता कि एक तरफ तो उन्होंने लड़ाई छेड़ दी है, हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया है, हमारी चौकियां आये दिन लेते हैं, हमारे यहां गोलियां चलाते हैं, हम पर बम्ब बरसाते हैं और दूसरी तरफ हम उनसे दौत्य सम्बन्ध बनाये रखते हैं, ये दोनों चीजें साथ साथ चले कुछ न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होता और यह कुछ उचित हो, ऐसा लगता नहीं।

पख्तूनिस्तान के बारे में हमारी सरकार ने जो निर्णय किया वह बहुत अच्छा किया, उसे हमें समर्थन देना चाहिये, सहायता करनी चाहिये और उनको प्रचार का मौका देना चाहिये। पख्तूनिस्तान एक अलग स्वतन्त्र राष्ट्र बने इसमें हम उसकी पूरी मदद करें, इसमें हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं मालूम होती लेकिन जो सिद्धान्त पख्तूनिस्तान के बारे में रखते हैं तो क्या कारण है कि तिब्बत के बारे में वही नहीं रखते और हम चुप रह जाते हैं, क्यों नहीं हम दलाई लामा की सरकार को मान्यता देकर उसे सारे सांसार में अपना प्रकरण प्रसारित करने का अधिकार देते। क्या कारण है कि हम आगे बढ़ कर क्यों नहीं संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में इस बात की पहल करें कि तिब्बत को स्वतन्त्र राष्ट्र घोषित किया जाये और उसकी स्वतन्त्रता के हम हामी बनें। लेकिन एक तरफ हम कुछ सिद्धान्त लेने हैं और दूसरी तरफ कुछ सिद्धान्त लेने हैं और फिर कहते हैं कि हमारी तो ऐसी पालिसी है जिसमें कि सब को एक निगाह से देखते हैं, किसी में कोई मतभेद करना नहीं चाहते, किन्तु हम अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से मतभेद करने जा रहे हैं और हमारे मित्रों की संख्या घटती जा रही है और हमारे दुश्मनों की संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है।

चाइना का संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में अभी तक हम समर्थन करते जा रहे हैं और कहते हैं कि उसका वहां प्रवेश हो। जिस समय हमने यह सिद्धान्त लिया था कि चाइना संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में शामिल हो उस समय उसमें जो पंचशील के बहुत उच्चतम सिद्धान्त थे उनको स्वीकार किया था, उस समय उसके हाथ खून से रंगे हुये नहीं थे, उसके अपने ही इलाके में रहने वाले तिब्बती लोगों के खून से उसका हाथ रंगा हुआ नहीं था, उम्रे समय हमने समर्थन किया था और इस आशा से समर्थन किया था कि राष्ट्र अपनी सीमा में सुरक्षित रहेगा, वह कभी भी किसी पर आक्रमण नहीं करेगा, एक अच्छे सिद्धान्त पर किया था। परन्तु अब हम उसकी प्रक्रिया देख रहे हैं, उसकी कार्यवाही इतने वर्षों से देख रहे हैं कि कितनी खतरनाक है, तिब्बत को हड़प जाने के बाद भारत पर आक्रमण करके भारत पर कब्जा करना चाहता है, आये दिन सीमा पर गोली चलाता है, हमारे सिपाहियों को मार कर ले जाता है। तो भी हम इतने भोले आदमी बन कर काम करते हैं और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उसके प्रवेश के लिये दलील दी जाती है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में प्रवेश होने के बाद उसे तमीज आ जायेगी।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh)
Whether you like it or not, China is a fact to be reckoned with in the politics of the world.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
तो जो यह दलील दी जाती है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र में प्रवेश होने के बाद उसको तमीज आ जायेगी यह बात कोई अकाल से काम लेने वाली मानी जायेगी इसके तो मैं विपरीत सोचता हूं। जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उसका प्रवेश हो जायेगा तो वह अपना एक संघ, अपना एक ग्रुप बना कर काम चलायेगा और जहां अभी हमें सही बात के लिये भी मन प्राप्त करने में कठिनाई होती है वहां तो उसके प्रवेश के बाद फिर हम कुछ भी नहीं कर पायेंगे, स्थिति और भी खराब हो जायेगी। इसलिये यह अत्यन्त

आवश्यक है कि सरकार जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उसके प्रवेश करने में उसकी मदद कर रही है उसको हमें नहीं करना चाहिये और इतना ही नहीं बल्कि उसका विरोध करना चाहिये। इसके दूसरी तरफ जब हम को नेशनलिस्ट चाइना की तरफ से मदद मिलती है तो...

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू : वाह वाह।

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: I will request Mr. Sapru to keep silent.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you address the Chair, then you will not have any trouble.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : तो इस दृष्टि से हमारे का विचार करना चाहिये कि जो हमारे मित्र बनना चाहते हैं उस को हम मदद नहीं करें और जो मित्र नहीं बनना चाहते उसको हम मदद करें, तो यह कोई भी सिद्धान्त की बात नहीं कही जा सकती, राजनीति में इसे बिल्कुल थोथी सिद्धान्तवादिता कहा जायेगा, इसका कोई भी मूल्य आका नहीं जायेगा।

नान-एलाइनमेंट की बात की जाती है। जब दो राष्ट्रों में झगडा हो तब क्या हम नान-एलाइंड रह सकते हैं, जब हम पर आक्रमण हुआ हो तो यह समझ में नहीं आता कि नान-एलाइंड रह कर हम केवल अकेले ही रहना चाहते हैं और दूसरे राष्ट्र उसको छूट दे दें कि वह किसी से भी एलाइंड हो कर लड़ाई करता रहे। यह समझ में आने सरीखी बात नहीं है। चाइना का आक्रमण होता है तो हमें अपने मित्रों की संख्या बढ़ानी पड़ेगी, एलाइनमेंट करना पड़ेगा, पाकिस्तान का आक्रमण होता है तो हमें अपने मित्रों की संख्या बढ़ानी पड़ेगी, मित्र बनाने पड़ेंगे, लेकिन हम कहते हैं कि हम नान-एलाइंड हैं, हम किसी की मदद नहीं चाहते, किसी से एलाइनमेंट नहीं चाहते। इस झूठे सिद्धान्त पर राष्ट्र को चलाया जाये तो हम राष्ट्र को गर्त में डुबो देंगे और राष्ट्र की रक्षा नहीं कर पायेंगे इसलिये

यह नारा लगाना, नान-एलाइनमेंट का नारा लगाना, एक स्वप्न लोक में विचरण करना है और जब तक इस इमेजिनेशन में रहेंगे तब तक कुछ नहीं कर पायेंगे और तब तक स्वप्न लोक में ही उस संसार में ही, विचरण करते रहेंगे। उसके परिणामस्वरूप चाइना का आक्रमण हो चुका है और हमारी सीमा में वह काफी हद तक घुस आया है। इमेजिनेशन और रीजनल दोनों मिलना चाहिये।

जहां तक कामनवैलथ का सवाल है उसके बारे में विचार करना चाहिये। मैं यह भी नहीं कहना चाहता कि बिल्कुल उससे निकल जाइये। एक अहम प्रश्न है और इसके बारे में मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करके निर्णय ले। अगर हो सके तो जिनकी वजह से कामनवैलथ कंट्रीज में गड़बड़ पैदा होती है उनको ही निकाला जाये, या तो उन को निकाल दिया जाये या फिर हम उसके बारे में कुछ विचार करें।

जहां तक विदेशी दूतावासों का सवाल है इसके सम्बन्ध में फारेन पब्लिसिटी के बारे में जब चर्चा हुई थी तो काफी कहा गया। मगर अफसोस इस बात का है कि हम सही सिद्धान्त ले कर के संसार के सामने खड़े होते हैं मगर फिर भी हम विदेशों में अपना प्रभाव कायम नहीं कर सकते और इसका कारण यह है कि विदेशी दूतावासों में हमारे जो माध्यम हैं वे ठीक तरह से काम नहीं करते। जापान का उदाहरण ले लीजिये। जापान में राजदूत कहते हैं कि हम किस तरह से इस बात को डिफेंड कर सकते हैं कि हमारी सरकार ने लाहौर पर आक्रमण नहीं किया है, जापान में राजदूत कहते हैं कि जब हमारी सरकार ने प्लेबिसाइट कराने की हामी भर ली तो मैं कैसे इस बात को डिफेंड कर सकता हूं। इस तरह की बात कहने से हमारा मनोबल कमजोर होता है, विदेशों में हमारी साख कम दृती है और विदेशों में जो हमारी सही बात का प्रतिपादन होना चाहिये वह हो नहीं पाता। इसलिये मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस तरह के जो

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया]

डिसग्रंटिड लोग हैं उनको मेहरबानी करके भारत में बुला लीजिये । और अपने नवयुवको परभरोसा रखिये उनसे काम लीजिये जों कि भारत में, सरकार में निष्ठा रखते हैं, यहां की संस्कृति को समझते हैं, यहां के सिद्धान्त पर विश्वास करते हैं और ऐसे लोगों को वहां बैठा कर फिर प्रचार करेंगे, कार्य करेंगे, तो लाभ हो सकेगा ।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जापान में किस राजदूत ने यह कह दिया कि कहां से हम डिफेंड करेंगे ।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : यह वही बात है, आप को चाहिये तो मैं आपको बता दूंगा ।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : यह बड़ी गम्भीर बात है ।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : अभी जापान से एक मित्र लट कर आये हैं उन्होंने इस बात को प्रकट किया । जब ऐसी चर्चा वहां की गई तो उन्होंने कहा :

"How can I defend my country when it has already spoken about plebiscite? How can I defend 'hat my country has not gone to Lahore"

This thing has happened.

जहां तक अणु बम बनाने का सवाल है . . .

श्री सैयद अहमद (म.प्र. प्रदेश) : वह कौन साहब है जिन्होंने बताया कि राजदूत ने ऐसा कहा ।

श्री विमल कुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : किसी साहब ने बताया है

I will give you the information.

SHRI SYED AHMAD: You are creating a very great misunderstanding.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: It is a fact.

श्री अकबर अली खान : इस का बेसिस क्या है ?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :

जहां तक अणु बम का सवाल है हम आज तक इस सिद्धान्त को मान कर चलते हैं कि अणु बम बनाना खतरनाक है, यह वायलेस है, इससे राष्ट्रों की हत्या हो जायेगी । इस में दो मत नहीं कि यह बड़ी खतरनाक स्थिति है, परन्तु जब हमारे ऊपर कोई आक्रमण करता है और आक्रमण करने वाले के पास शक्ति है, आक्रमण करने वाले के पास अणु बम है, तो ऐसी स्थिति में हम चुप रहें और अपनी शक्ति से उसका सामना न करें ऐसा कोई भी बुद्धिमान आदमी नहीं करेगा । हम नहीं चाहते हम अणु बम बना कर किसी पर आक्रमण करे, किसी पर फेंके । मगर किसी के हाथ में लकड़ी रहने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि बाजार में वह किसी को पीटता जायेगा । लकड़ी होने का मतलब यह है कि अगर कोई कुत्ता भीकेगा तो ठीक ठिकाने लगा देगा और उसके भय से कोई कुत्ता भीकेगा नहीं और आक्रमण नहीं करेगा । हमारा लक्ष्य नहीं हम किसी के ऊपर आक्रमण करें, मगर अगर हमारे ऊपर कोई आक्रमण करता है और खतरनाक अस्त्र शस्त्र का उपयोग करता है तो हम उस का मुकाबला कर सकें । इसके लिये अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि हम अणु बम बनाएं । आज छ टा सा इंग्लैंड जों कि हमारे एक प्रान्त के बराबर भी नहीं है, क्या कारण है बड़े राष्ट्रों में उसकी गिनती है । इस का कारण उसकी जनसंख्या है . . .

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : कितना बड़ा राष्ट्र ?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : ब्रिटेन का ।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : कब से ?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : आपको पता नहीं होगा मगर उसकी खुशामद करने जरूर जाते होंगे । तो उसकी गिनती क्यों होती है, इसलिए कि उसने अपनी शक्ति का निर्माण कर रखा है,

उसके पास शक्ति है और जब तक शक्ति नहीं होती, तब तक कोई भी आपकी पूजा करने वाला नहीं है, जब तक आपके पास शक्ति नहीं तब तक आपके प्रति कोई भक्ति रखने वाला नहीं। अगर राष्ट्र को मजबूत बनाना है तो शक्ति संगठित करनी होगी। आज छोटे-छोटे देश अपने को ताकतवर महसूस करते हैं मगर इतना बड़ा भारतवर्ष होने के बावजूद सारे भारत में एकता होने के बावजूद हम दूसरों का मुंह ताकते फिरते हैं, जरा, जरा सी बात पर। तो मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति को राष्ट्र की दृष्टि से सोचें न कि सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर और नारेबाजी के आधार पर चलें।

जहां तक वैज्ञानिक पहलू है, जो यह लड़ाई हुई इसमें लड़ाई के मैदान में हमारे बहादुर सिपाहियों ने जिस शौर्य का प्रदर्शन किया उसकी हम प्रशंसा करेंगे ही मगर उनके साथ साथ काम करने वाले वैज्ञानिक लोग हैं, जिन्होंने बैठ कर निर्देश किया कि किस तरह से किस शस्त्र को नष्ट करेंगे, किस तरह से दुश्मनों की गतिविधियों का निरीक्षण करेंगे, उसके लिये वे भी वधाई के पात्र हैं। उनका उपयोग हमारे देश में ठीक तरह से होना चाहिये। हमारे यहां के बड़े बड़े वैज्ञानिक आज विदेशों में ब्रिटेन में अमेरिका में काम कर रहे हैं और उसका कारण यह है कि हम अपने उन साइंटिस्ट्स का ठीक तरह से उपयोग नहीं करते और विदेशी लोग उनको विशेष आकर्षण दिखा कर ले जाते हैं। यही कारण है कि हमारे बड़े बड़े साइंटिस्ट्स विदेशों में काम कर रहे हैं। हमें उन साइंटिस्ट्स का आदर करके उपयोग में लाना चाहिये। एक ओर हमारे यहां ऐसे पी० एच० डी० डिग्री लिये हुए साइंटिस्ट्स हैं जो इस बात पर शोध करके ही अमुक फूल में क्या विशेषता है अपनी डिग्री प्राप्त कर लेते हैं। मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा हमारी सरकार को ऐसा नियम बनना चाहिये कि अगर वे साइन्स की पी० एच० डी० की डिग्री लेते हैं तो वे सुरक्षा अथवा उद्योग के दृष्टिकोण से

शोध करके हमारे देश के सामने प्रस्तुत कर जिससे हमारे देश के इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट में मदद मिल सके हमारी सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से मदद मिल सके। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि हम विदेश नीति में सिद्धान्तों पर जाने की बजाय राष्ट्र हित को ध्यान में रखते हुए चलें। इस तरह की नीति बननी चाहिये। केवल सिद्धान्त के आधार पर रहने से हम अपने देश की भलाई के लिये काम नहीं कर सकेंगे।

SHRI SYED AHMAD: Madam, I would like the position to be cleared and that is about the ambassador posted in Japan. It is very upsetting to be told that this Ambassador has been carrying on propaganda against all the policies of the Government, if my hon. friend is correct.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Did Mr. Chordia say so?

SHRI SYED AHMAD: Yes.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would strongly repudiate any such suggestion and I am very sorry that the hon. Member should have made such a statement. If he had any information received from any individual, then he should have passed on that information to me. It is totally incorrect that our Ambassador in Japan, who is a very senior Ambassador, has said that he cannot defend India's position when India has gone to Sialkot or Lahore. It is absolutely incorrect to make any such insinuation. It is a great pity that on the floor of this House the hon. Member should make statements without any verification. I strongly repudiate any such suggestion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Chordia, you must pass on all the information to the Minister...

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: Yes, I will.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN... and after it has been confirmed, you could say things. You cannot make insinuations.

(Interruptions)

[The Deputy Chairman.]

Mr. Gujral, you will have fifteen minutes only

SHRI I K GUJRAL: I have sat here and I heard with great expectations the speeches of the two leaders of the Opposition, particularly Mr. Patel. It is very unfortunate that whatever an objective situation develops in this country, Shri Patel's faith in the old myths continues and he always continues to divorce himself from the reality but it is a very strange thing that even when he tells that he is a great realist, the myths that he talks of have nothing to do with the reality itself. I was expecting from him that after at least this experience of war or fight against Pakistan's aggression, he would have realised that it is self-reliance and the industry of his own country which had paid dividends. I would have expected that at least at this late stage he would have got up and paid compliments to those who have led this nation for quite some time, that they have laid foundations for such a base which made us effective to fight Pakistan but his faith in his old friends still continues, who, unfortunately for him and for India, do not have the same reciprocity. Up till now we have been seeing, since 5th August, the attitude of the USA and the U.K. about the various things that India has done. From the very beginning, from 5th August to early September they preferred to keep quiet when India was fighting against aggression and once India decided to defend itself, all of them started speaking. To that point I will come later but I would only like to say this that the British Press not only not stopped at condemning us for defending ourselves but it has now started interfering in matters purely our own. I would like to quote or give a small quotation from "The Times" of 8th November, which was commenting on the arrest of Miss Sarabhai and it says:

"The Indian Government extended its efforts to suppress all opposition in Kashmir to Delhi . . ."

It continues to say—and this is about Miss Sarabhai—

"Over past 10 years or more she has been working with equal dedication for the cause of the Kashmiris . . ."

SHRI P N SAPRU: What is wrong with that?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Please let me finish. After I have finished, you comment.

It says:

"and from her house in Delhi had continued to put out . . ."

This is what "The Times" itself says and this will perhaps satisfy Mr Sapru

"information about events in that State which was usually available from no other source"

If, keeping this in view, the Government has taken some action, it is "The Times" which is very very worried about it. Whether our action is right or wrong—and Mr. Sapru may have a comment to offer—I do not abrogate this right nor do I give this right to foreign Press of any foreign country to tell us what we should do to preserve our security intact. Mr. Sapru might say that the Press is very free in that country and also might say that the British Press can do whatever it likes, and none can tell it what it should or should not do. That is what we have been told again and again when the Parliamentary Delegation of the British Parliament has been here also. I do not like to say anything from myself but would only like to say that the British Press in our crisis has only toed the line of the Foreign Office there. To support my contention, I would only like to quote three lines from "The New Statesman" which is a paper supporting the Government. In another context—that is in the context of Rhodesia—the paper says:

"The Prime Minister's handling of the Rhodesian settler rebellion has so far . . ."

and please note this, Mr. Sapru:

"... thanks to his astute manipulation of the mass-communications media, evoked wide support and even war praise."

This manipulation is not something which is considered beyond the Government. We have also seen how the B.B.C. has behaved with us and we have been told that the films that were shown by the B.B.C. about the devastations in Delhi and about the bombing of Delhi had nothing to do with the Government because the B.B.C. is an independent media. Again I am referring to the same newspaper and I quote again how free the B.B.C. is and I quote from the 'New Statesman' of 19th November. The British Government had decided to get a film made for the TV and when the film was made, the paper said:

"The script was vetted and approved at the highest level, including Lord Normanbrook. The film was made and is, I believe, of quite exceptional quality. On 2 September it was seen by Lord Normanbrook and others, who thereupon pronounced that it must be seen by government representatives before transmission. On 24 September government people (quite who is not disclosed, but they included somebody from the Home Office) saw the film. Since then silence..."

This shows that every film that is shown by the B.B.C. should have the clearance from the Home Office and I would like to know whether all the films that were shown on the B.B.C. about India-Pakistan conflict had clearance from the Foreign Office or not. If they had, how to-day the British Government can deny itself the responsibility for all the propaganda that was unleashed to misrepresent this country. And today we are also being told—and I understand from a

very responsible Member of this House—that Mr. Noble, while discussing with some Members of Parliament yesterday, said that the British Government was willing to be convinced of Pakistan's role if India could only convince it that Pakistan had collusion with China. It is very strange that even at this stage there are some responsible Members of the House of Commons, who like to be convinced that Pakistan and China have been having collusion. When two thousand square miles of Indian territory have already been handed over to China by Pakistan, when an ultimatum has also been given to us that they would attack us within twenty-four hours, even at this stage we are told that the British Government is open to conviction, and this conviction, to my mind, is going too long and too far. We are told that the aid, of which Mr. Dahyabhai Patel is so much enamoured, and which has been stopped, had no political strings and has no political strings. I quite concede this point that perhaps it has no more strings but now perhaps its strings are converting themselves into ropes, and here I only like to quote from 'The Economist', and this is what 'The Economist' says, and it is for Mr. Dahyabhai Patel to decide what it means. I put what it says in plain words. In plain language it means that the freeze will continue until the Indian Prime Minister Mr. Shastri, and President Ayub of Pakistan give satisfaction to President Johnson, when they meet him some time in December. It says that the freeze will be felt most acutely in case of India's 'maintenance' imports, for which the United States has been providing over \$200 million a year—half of the total coming in under this head, namely "U.S. Economic Aid to Indian Sub-continent", from all other countries. And all these other countries means that not only the U.K. is stopping giving us aid, it is also using its influence on other countries too. I again quote from a paper entitled "The Washington Daily News", which again speaks of the strings which

[Shri I K Gujral]

Mr Dahyabhai Patel prefers to deny It reads and I quote:

"As a benefactor of both countries—having supplied nine billion dollars in aid to them—the United States is merely being reasonable in showing its disgust by withholding new arms and new economic aid until they come to their senses"

Now what those senses are, I do not know If to defend this nation is senselessness, if to rise and protest against aggression is senselessness, then only the USA and the UK may for all times understand that we have no intention of coming to our senses as they understand them

I also like to quote to you for a second, Madam, from the Japanese Press which, I very much regret to say, under pressure from the British diplomacy, has also stopped all the trade agreements and the aids that we are having from them Now it says and I quote.

'Another cause of the foreign exchange difficulty is that there is no prospect of getting foreign aid The loan from the World Bank is being withheld because of the loan which was expected to be made from the United States in this connection has not been made yet'

Therefore, Madam, you will agree with me that these people, of Great Britain and USA, have both conspired to see to it that we are unable to emerge as a self-respecting nation But I must thank the Government and this nation that, in spite of all that they might say or do, this nation is going to stand on its own, and is not going to be bothered by what these nations are doing, by their efforts, to strangle us.

My friend, Mr Chordia, has made a great mention about the Commonwealth and whether we should leave or should not leave the Commonwealth I would not like to men-

tion whether we should or should not leave it, but I would only like to say that there is no Commonwealth left, which can be left any more If there was a Commonwealth it would have exerted its conscience, united conscience, at the time of our conflict, it also would have exerted itself at the time of the Rhodesian crisis Now I do not like to make many detailed quotations, but I am trying to read out to you from the newspaper which supports Great Britain's Government, and it gives the caption "Wilson's Tragedy of Errors", and says—I am paraphrasing it—that if Mr. Wilson had spent half the time in arriving at an understanding with the African members of the Commonwealth, the tragedy could have been averted But much before the tragedy of Rhodesia came, Mr Wilson had made it known to them that he was not going to use arms, and having made it so known, perhaps in the name of conscience, which conscience did not prick Mr Wilson when the Aden crisis was there very much and where armies were landed immediately, and having told Rhodesia that arms were not going to be used and the Commonwealth members were not going to be consulted, he went further and started talking of, what he says, sanctions Now those sanctions are ineffective and useless and are not going to give any results, as is recognised by his own party and by his own members If I had longer time at my disposal, Madam, I would have given you detailed quotations to prove that all the sanctions that Mr Wilson is thinking of are going to be useless and ineffective, and one of the sanctions, most interestingly, he has called Exchange Control sanction, and that Exchange Control sanction, according to 'The New Statesman' in practice means that Rhodesia can buy whatever it wants to, from UK but not from any other country This is the type of sanctions that Mr Wilson is thinking of But if it comes to India, the sanctions amount to strangulation, but if it comes to Rhodesia, those sanctions are nothing but a joke and they are only en-

couraging to build up a ring around the neck of African independence so that African independence cannot, tomorrow also, emerge on a self-respecting basis.

The other thing that I like to remind Mr. Chordia about the Commonwealth is that the high priest of the Commonwealth, Mr. Wilson, has delivered a final blow in the form of military bases, and a couple of days ago I think the Deputy Minister mentioned it here and said that all the bases in the Indian Ocean were an unfriendly act to us. Did Mr. Wilson choose to consult any member of the Commonwealth when he decided to set up the Chagos base? What is that base meant for? Is it a base against China? Is it a base against the Soviet Union? No. It is a base in the Indian Ocean which is definitely meant for all the Commonwealth members in Asia. It is a base against India. It is a base against Ceylon. It is a base against Pakistan, whether Pakistan knows it or not, and it is a base against all the East African independent countries, and these bases in the Indian Ocean, as I said earlier, have a strange habit of changing their character and, generally, it has been seen in the past history that these bases are always not only bases of aggression, they are also bases of subjugation, as it happened in the last four hundred years, and whenever the British wanted to use a base to subjugate any nation, they did not hesitate to do so, and if the Commonwealth had any respect in the mind of Mr. Wilson, he would have called a meeting of the Commonwealth nations and discussed with them as to what he was wanting to do. I like to understand, Madam, whether it is Aden, Madagascar, Chagos, Scotia or Maldives, whether all these bases there are not a ring around the Indian neck. All the bases in the Indian Ocean today threaten our freedom, threaten the freedom of Asia and threaten the freedom of African nations. This third nail, the establishment of bases,

has finished the Commonwealth for all times to come, and it will only remain a club, and therefore the question whether to leave it or not should not bother us seriously. The Commonwealth, to my mind, has ceased to exist. The British attitude in the India-Pakistan conflict, the British attitude on the Rhodesian crisis and the British attitude about the bases has finished the Commonwealth for all times and I am certain that it is never going to revive. Yet it is going to revive; it is going to revive in a different form, and that form can be that all these members of the Commonwealth, who are from Africa and Asia, should get together and form themselves into a strong base for freedom, and that base should not only confine itself to those members only who are today in the Commonwealth; let us further strengthen it by adding more members, so that our Indian Ocean policy must be strongly looked after.

I will say a word and sit down, Madam, that India's defence is not only in the Himalayas; India's defence—history tells us—has also been in the Indian Ocean, and if in the Indian Ocean we do not have any effective and strong policy, the future may not be very bright for us. Therefore, I feel that all those nations which are concerned with the defence of the Indian Ocean, and all those nations which are concerned with the defence of the Himalayas against Chinese expansionism must form themselves into a strong friendship, and that friendship, whether Mr. Chordia likes it or not, does exist. It does exist in the form of Malaysia, it does exist in the form of the Arab countries, and even if a couple of Arab countries have chosen to disagree with us on this present conflict of ours, we cannot forget that, whenever we have given an effective fight in the Indian Ocean, it has always been because the Arab countries bordering on the Indian Ocean have been friendly to us. If today we forget the lessons of history we would be making a mistake. Much has been

[Shri I. K. Gujral.] talked about Tol Aviv. Much has been talked about Nationalist China. But let us not forget that Tol Aviv is the creation of the West and it shall always remain a stooge. Let us not forget that in the position of today it would be a short-sighted policy if to pinch one nation or the other we change our foreign policy and if ever we do that I am sure we would be heading to a fall. See what they have been doing. What has Israel done? What has Israel done in connection with our conflict with Pakistan? What has Israel done about South Rhodesia Israel in all its existence, has it ever supported any progressive cause? I would like to say that the Arab countries have done that very often. Madam, the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We have to be vigilant, not alone but we have to be vigilant in conjunction with all the other countries that have always stood in the past for freedom and which shall always stand for freedom.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR (Punjab): Madam, Deputy Chairman, there has been a great deal of criticism of our policy of non-alignment. A great deal of that criticism came from the leader of the Swatantra Party. He accused the Government of flogging a dead horse and he accused the Government of pursuing a negative policy. What is negative about that policy I am afraid I do not understand. It is a positive policy. I would submit. It only means that we reserve to ourselves the right of independent thinking and of independent action. Is the hon. Member advocating and advising us that we should sell that right of independent thinking and the right of independent action? If that is the case, I am sorry, for if we were to take that advice, it would be suicidal for this country. This policy of non-alignment, has gained us friendship and sympathy of people belonging to different ideologies. I would like to give the example of the Soviet Union, the glowing example of the Soviet

Union's friendship. The Soviet Union has been consistently with us for the past seventeen years and their stand on Kashmir has never wavered. During the critical time of the Indo-Pakistan conflict also, they never stopped their vital aid to us, their economic aid to this country. They have always been of help to us, and they have helped us out at many a critical time, Madam, in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. In fact, I should say that we in this country should be very grateful to the Soviet Union for this consistent friendship.

Let me now give an example of an aligned country, the example of Pakistan. Pakistan is a country which has allied itself to certain pacts. Actually, in the initial stages, it looked as if Pakistan had an advantage over us in this conflict. But soon it turned out to be quite the contrary. I happened to be in London at that time when the trouble started. If I remember correctly it was on the 10th September that Mr. Bhutto was proclaiming to the world that he was going to prolong this war for a thousand years to come, and on the 10th September, the Pakistan High Commissioner called a press conference and he took a more rational view of the case than his Foreign Minister. At this press conference he said—and I am quoting the Pakistan High Commissioner in London—"Pakistan would take it as an unfriendly act if military aid were to be stopped." He had to make that statement because at that time there were some sort of talk that sanctions might be applied on both the countries if they did not take or heed the advice of the Security Council. And at his Press Conference, the Pakistan High Commissioner said that Pakistan would take it as an unfriendly act if military aid were stopped, because Pakistan was dependent to the extent of 80 per cent on such Military aid, while India—and this is the version of Mr. Aga Hilaly—was manufacturing 80 per cent of her military equipment in the country itself. And further he said that if military aid was

stopped, Pakistan would not last a week. I think he was right there. After all that high and mighty talk it was for this very reason that Pakistan agreed to the cease-fire. So this shows that Pakistan with all its alignments and its pacts did not score an advantage over us. If we came out victorious in this conflict with Pakistan it was on the basis of our planned development. The hon. Member, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, has been very critical of our non-alignment. He has been very critical of our planned development also. I don't know why. I have the greatest regard and respect for him, but I suppose he has to toe the party line and his party is opposed to everything progressive, it is opposed to non-alignment and it is opposed to progressive planned development. At the same time he pleaded that we should build up the defence potential of the country. I do not know on what basis he would do it if he is opposed to planned development. If we came out victorious in this conflict it was on the basis of our planned development. If we have come out victorious in this conflict, it was due to the vision of Jawaharlal Nehru who knew that if we wanted to preserve the sovereignty and the integrity of the country, ultimately we would have to rely on our own strength and on our own resources. I want to pay my tribute to the Armed Forces of our country. At the same time, I would like to bring it to the notice of this House that our forces, our soldiers did not have a hand-to-hand fight, Madam. They fought with the material produced in a chain of ordinance factories in the country and that is what I mean when I say that if we have won this conflict it was on the basis of our planned development. And we have to carry on this planned development.

I want to mention another thing. There is a tendency at this stage on the part of some people who are trying to whip up a war hysteria in this country. There is a certain section—which I do not wish to

to name—which is making an all-out effort to whip up a war hysteria in this country. This is a dangerous tendency and it is a tendency which we must resist with all our might because this trend defeats the very purpose of all that we stand for. After all, what is the ultimate objective before us? Our ultimate objective is peace and this war hysteria if we allow it to be carried on like this, is going to defeat the very purpose of all that we stand for. So we must resist it. After all, this is only sowing the seed of hatred. We do hope that at least one day in future generations, the two countries, Pakistan and India, will learn to forget what divides them and learn to live in peace and harmony. So let us not leave behind a legacy of hatred.

Now, I want to say something about the atom bomb. Some people are saying that we should manufacture atom bombs in this country. Apart from the moral aspect of making an atom bomb, just think what it would imply to make an atom bomb. It would divert large sums of money just to make a mere weapon of mass destruction. Let us resist this temptation, because this is going to retard all our planned development. It is going to retard the progress of the country. Let us look to the progress of the country, let us build up the economy of the country. We want to build up the defence potential of the country. So let us resist this temptation to make the atom bomb. Also I would like to say if we go in for manufacturing atom bomb in this country, we will be looked down upon by the international community for being untrue to our basic principles for which we have stood all these years, our fundamental principles.

Next I want to say something about the British attitude. The British attitude is absolutely shocking in this context. As I mentioned earlier, when this conflict started I happened to be

[Shri Mohinder Kaur.]

in London and at that time the attitude of the British press, the attitude of BBC was absolutely one-sided. The attitude of the British Government was definitely partisan. It was, if I may say so, almost that of an indulgent mother to a child of love. This is something that we did not expect of the British Government. However, Mr. Harold Wilson, the Prime Minister, tried to make amends for this attitude in a subsequent speech of his when he said that he put India and Pakistan in the same category because at that time he did not have all the correct facts before him. It is surprising, Madam, that the British Prime Minister did not have the facts before him. I want to mention one thing. I saw this morning in the papers that the leader of the British Parliamentary delegation that was here in India a few days ago, at a press conference has said that perhaps the Prime Minister's speech could be attributed, that Mr. Harold Wilson's speech could be attributed to the fact that we did not give him correct information soon, that our press relations in London were not good. It is surprising that the British Prime Minister, the Prime Minister of a country like Great Britain should depend on his being supplied information by our Press Information Officer for him to know the facts. The line of communication between India and U.K. had not broken down and there was no chaotic condition at that time prevailing in the country, his own High Commissioner here could have informed him about the correct situation. Anyway, let us take that statement at its face value. We may have plenty of opportunity in the near future to put that statement to test and see Great Britain's attitude because we have not seen the last of the Indo-Pakistan conflict. It is going to continue for some time and we will see what Great Britain's attitude is.

Some people are in a huff about our relationship with the Commonwealth and they have been saying

that we should break off our relationship with the Commonwealth. I personally am not at all enamoured of Great Britain and she is not the only member of the Commonwealth. There are very many friendly nations there and I think we should not turn our back on those friends. If in future, an occasion arises, then we can certainly sever our relations if we want it. We should be cautious and we should not be in a hurry.

I would like to come back to the question of non-alignment this is a policy which has sustained us in the past. I know of very many people who have been trying to push us into an bloc or the other. As I said, it will be suicidal and it will be a great tragedy for the world if the world were to be divided into two power blocs. There would be no meeting ground at all. We must resist this temptation to fall in line with one group or the other. This policy of non-alignment has paid us in the past and in fact it has stood the severe test of the present time. I feel that now the time has come when we should re-affirm our faith in the fundamental principles or the fundamental policies that we have pursued so far that is, planned development, non-alignment and the five principles of peaceful co-existence. We should re-affirm our faith in these three fundamental principles and work sincerely to make them a success. I know that there are very many people with whom our fundamental policies are not merely a conviction but an article of faith and we should not give up these policies under any pressure from wherever it may come. I know that there is great deal of string pulling going on behind the scenes but we must resist this temptation because this policy has sustained us in the past and has stood the test of time. We must persevere and carry on against all criticism.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE (Nominated): Thank you, Madam. I did not expect to be

called by you so soon but I am quite willing to say what I want to say on this subject. In fact, this is the first opportunity I get of talking about foreign affairs. When I talk about foreign affairs, Madam, I would like to mention that foreign affairs cannot be divorced entirely on home affairs. If our ambassadors abroad have got to support our country and make a good case of it, it is very necessary that we at home also show a splendid face to the world. It is not possible for our ambassadors or our High Commissioners to plead the case of India only as regards the foreign policy. They have got to show to the world how India behaves at home. A lot has been said today about the expenditure that would have to be incurred if we were to go in for nuclear weapons. I grant that it would mean greater expenditure but, Madam, have we considered the extravagance and the amount of money that we are spending for our Plans? I think we can cut our expenditure very much short in those departments and save some amount for the production of nuclear weapons. This is a thing we can do. I do not profess to be an economist and I do not know how much extra money is being spent and how much of extravagance is going on in these Plans but I do know about one subject and on that subject the money that is being allotted in the Fourth Plan is really exorbitant and unnecessary. If the same thing is happening in other cases, I am afraid we are spending much, too much on the Plans. We can easily save that. We must concentrate on efforts at home to fight corruption, extravagance, etc. before we can have a good face to show to the world. Having said this much, I would like you to consider this fact as to why it is that we have lost face in the world. I remember that in the earlier days India commanded respect for her views. Why is it now that we are being looked upon as something not worth paying attention to? I feel Madam, that it is because we have talked too much and too often unnecessarily. We

have tried to pose as mentors of the entire world and we have told others what they should do. We have really not always minded our own business and I think it is high time that we minded our own business and refrained from too much talking. In the past, no matter what trouble rose in what part of the world, we had to express our opinion whether it was asked or not. I think that process has really cost us a great deal of the respect that we had in the world, and which now is gone. This is, I think, worth while thinking about. The other thing that my friend, Mr. Chordia, pointed out and which I think is worth while considering is a re-orientation of our foreign policy. We have many friends and we are prone to fall in love with some. Excuse my using that expression, Madam, but that is what we have been doing. We are very keen on supporting the policies of some nations whether or not they support us in return. I am referring to the Arab countries. Mr. Chordia said, and I do not want to repeat that again, that at the Algiers Conference nobody condemned Pakistan as an aggressor although that was the fact and that was a thing which was hitting everybody in the eye. It was an established fact as large as life. We ought to reconsider our attitude to countries which do not, or which refuse to, support us. I have just heard Mr. Gujral making his point about Israel, that Israel also did not condemn Pakistan as an aggressor. That may be true but it is necessary that they should side with us. We should see who our friends are and who are our enemies. I think we were about the first people in the world to support China's entry into the United Nations. Many Members—at least those whom I have heard since coming to the House—think that we ought to re-think about this. At that time China had sworn to follow the principles of Panchsheel, China had committed herself to a certain policy but China now has withdrawn all those professions of hers and China has gone contrary to what she had promised and what she said she would

[Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye.]
do. In those circumstances should we support the entry of China into the United Nations? I think here again there is a thing which lies in between supporting and opposing. We do not seem to know that there is such a thing as keeping quiet.

मौनः कलहोऽनास्ति ।

मौनं सर्वार्थं साधनम् ।

This is in favour of silence. It is also said in the English language 'Silence is golden'. I think we can learn this lesson of being silent at times. Why must we always have opinions and express them loudly all over the world whether we are asked to express our opinion or not? That is what has cost us a lot of goodwill and I think that is a thing which we ought to remember. In this conflict with Pakistan we have certainly done well and we should continue to do well. We are watching some of the Western countries and some of the Eastern countries and seeing what help we are going to get. We are afraid some help might be withdrawn or might be stopped. Are we going to look about for help always? Are we never going to want to stand on our own feet, be self-dependent, to live on our own efforts? I think it is high time that we thought about it. There was a talk for some time and everybody said that the aid from the United States would be stopped or there would be strings attached to the aid. I do not know. I have been away from Delhi and I could not always get the papers regularly but I have seen in the papers that the aid that is now given by the United States is on a monthly basis. I have also read recently that the aid is likely to be resumed to be given on a long-term basis. Sometimes, I feel sorry that people help us because it makes us weak; it makes us feeble; it makes us dependent; it makes us indulge in this weak policy of accepting help from others. I sometimes wish that the help should be stopped; I often say that to my friends when I talk to them. I know

many of us—I have said it before on the floor of the House—maybe thousands and lakhs might die and that will solve the population problem but it will certainly make us stronger; it will make us want to stand on our own feet. Sometimes I wish and pray that the aid was stopped. Whether or not the aid is stopped we must chalk out a programme which will make us strong, which will show us the way to be dependent on ourselves, which will show us how to utilise all our resources, how to make our country strong and how to maintain the place we had on the map of the world.

Thank you.

شری جی - ایم - میر (جموں)

اور کشمیر) : میڈم ڈپٹی چیرمین-
آج صبح سے اس معزز ایوان میں
جو ایکسٹرنل افیئرس پر بحث ہو
رہی ہے اس میں مجھے بھر بولنے
کا موقع ملا اس کے لئے میں دل
کی گہرائی سے آپ کا شکریہ ادا
کرتا ہوں۔ اس لئے کہ یہ فارن
افئرس کی جو ڈبیت آج ہو رہی
ہے اس ڈبیت میں سب سے زیادہ
چرچا کشمیر کے متعلق ہوا اور کشمیر
ہندوستان کا ایسا ہی حصہ ہے جیسا
کہ دلی، بمبئی اور مدراس؛ اور
پاکستان اور ہندوستان کے درمیان
جو کٹھنلیکٹ ہوا اس کی اس تمام
ڈبیت میں چرچا ہوتی رہی۔ میں
نہایت خاموشی کے ساتھ ان تمام
تقریروں کو جو صبح سے لے کر اس
وقت تک ہوتی آئی ہیں سنا رہا

میڈم ڈپٹی چھرمین — بدقسمتی سے کشمیر کے مسئلہ میں ہم نے شروع سے ہی کچھ غلطیاں کیں۔ ہماری سب سے پہلی غلطی یہ تھی کہ ہم سیکورٹی کونسل میں کمپلیمنٹ کی حیثیت سے ایذا کیس لے کر گئے کہ پاکستان نے ہم پر حملہ کیا ہے ۱۹۴۷ میں نہتے کشمیریوں پر حملہ کیا گیا۔ ہمارے گھروں کو لوٹا گیا، ہمیں تباہ و برباد کیا گیا۔ اس چیز کو لے کر ہم سیکورٹی کونسل میں گئے اور وہیں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ ہماری سب سے پہلی غلطی تھی۔ دوسری جو غلطی کی وہ یہ کہ ۱۹۴۷ میں سہز فائر کو قبول کیا اور اس کے بعد ہم نے جو غلطی کی وہ یہ کہ رائے شماری کے متعلق کچھ آفر کی، کچھ کمیٹینٹ کی۔ تو اس قسم کی باتیں ہونیں۔

بہر حال کشمیر کا مسئلہ شروع سے لیکر ایک نرم پالیسی کی وجہ سے، ایک ایسی خطرناک پالیسی کی وجہ سے لٹکتا رہا۔ فیریقہ کی حالات پیدا ہوئے اور کشمیر کے لوگ جس طریقہ سے ترقی کے راستہ پر گامزن ہونا چاہتے تھے نہیں ہو سکے۔ ۱۹۴۷ سے لیکر آج تک ۱۹۶۵ تک، کشمیر کے لوگ متواتر پاکستان کی

سازشوں کے پاکستان کی طرف سے کو، کئی سیوریسہ اگٹیویٹیز کے اور پاکستان کی طرف سے کی گئی توڑ پھوڑ کی کارروائیوں کے شکار ہوتے رہے لیکن ہماری حکومت نے کبھی اس طرف توجہ نہیں دی اور اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ پاکستان کو ایک شہہ ملی۔ پاکستان نے سمجھا کہ ہندوستان کمزور ہے اور جیسے میں چاہوں گا۔ میں کشمیر کو روپ کر لوں گا۔ پاکستان نے دوسری دفعہ ۱۹۶۵ میں ہمارے ملک پر پھر حملہ کیا۔ اسے دوسری دفعہ نہیں کہنا چاہئے بلکہ متواتر ۱۹۴۷ سے ۱۹۶۵ تک حملہ جاری رہا ہے۔ یہ لکی چھپی بات نہیں ہے۔

اب میں پچھلی باتوں کی طرف نہیں جانا چاہتا لیکن ۱۹۶۵ میں ۵ اگست کو پاکستان کی طرف سے جو حملہ ہوا وہ ایک بالکل واضح چیز ہے۔ تمام دنیا کے سامنے یہ واضح ہے۔ جنرل نیمو کی رپورٹ آپ دیکھیں۔ تمام دنیا کے پریس کو دیکھیں۔ تمام دنیا کی رائے عامہ کو دیکھیں۔ تو یہ صحیح معنوں میں پتہ چلے گا کہ پاکستان نے ہمارے ملک پر حملہ کیا۔ میں آپ کے سامنے اس معزز ایوان میں دنیا کی جو تمام پریسز کی رائے ہے وہ کوٹ کرنا چاہتا ہوں:

[شری جی ایم - میٹر]

The Cork Examiner (September 7) says:

"In this latest and most dangerous turn in the issue over Kashmir there is no doubt that Pakistan is the aggressor."

The Guardian (September 7) says:

"Pakistanis by sending or allowing infiltrators across the cease-fire line in past few weeks were responsible for the original flaring up of the present trouble."

The Weekly Tribune, Ceylon (September 11) says:

"To the impartial observer India cannot be regarded as aggressor when it was Pakistan which first organised aggressive infiltration across the cease-fire line on August 5."

The Daily Telegraph, Nigeria (September 14) says:

"Pakistan has committed what in public international law is aggression and India has every legitimate right to fight back."

Al Jamhouria, Lebanon (September 15) says:

"In this problem which has arisen in Indian sub-continent we stand without reservations considering Pakistan the first infiltrator and first aggressor."

The Guardian, Manchester and London (6th September) says:

"The series of violations that began on August 5 were to a considerable extent.....in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the cease-fire line from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side."

اسی طرح اور دنیا کے تمام اخباروں کی رائے ہے لیکن ان سب کو اس معزز ایوان میں پڑھوں تو میرے لئے کافی وقت کی ضرورت ہے -

تر جب اس بار پھر 5 اگست کو ہمارے ملک پر حملہ ہوا تو تمام دنیا کے پریس نے اس کو واضح طور پر کہا کہ ہندوستان پر پاکستان نے حملہ کیا - پاکستان نے اپنی فوجوں کو سول لباس میں بھیج کر ہمارے اندر انفیلٹریشن کیا اور تمام جائیدادوں کو تباہ کیا - ہمارے مکانوں کو نذر آتش کیا - اس کے باوجود بی سیکورٹی کونسل میں یہ مسئلہ جھسا ہے اس کو دیکھ کر مجھے افسوس ہوتا ہے - سیکورٹی کونسل کے ان ممبران پر جو دنیا میں امن و امان قائم کرنے کے علمبردار ہیں اور جنکا کام ہے کہ دنیا میں صحیح طریقہ سے امن و امان کو بحال کریں - لیکن جب یہ مسئلہ سیکورٹی کونسل میں جاتا ہے تو ایک بھی ممبر پاکستان کو ایگریسر کہلے کے لئے تیار نہیں -

جناب فارین منسٹر صاحب اور جناب چھاگلا صاحب یہ مطالبہ کرتے ہیں کہ وقت آ گیا ہے کہ سیکورٹی کونسل ایک بار اس کا فیصلہ کرے کہ ہندوستان پر ایگریشن ہوا ہے - یا نہیں - لیکن مجھے افسوس ہے آج جب ہم فارین پالیسی پر بحث کر رہے ہیں، آج ایک طرف سے ایک بلاک کو سپورٹ کیا جا رہا ہے اور دوسرو طرف سے دوسری کلتری کو سپورٹ کیا جا رہا ہے - میں نہ

کسی کو سپورٹ کرنے کے لئے تیار ہوں نہ کسی کی مخالفت کرنے کے لئے تیار ہوں لیکن میں چاہتا ہوں ہندوستان ایک انڈیپنڈنٹ پالیسی زبان الاٹمنٹ کی پالیسی لے کر چلے۔ ہندوستان نے دنیا کو شانتی اور امن کا پیغام دیا اور اس پیغام کو ہم نے دنیا کے سامنے پہنچایا لیکن آج اٹھارہ سال کے بعد ہندوستان کی قوم ہندوستان کے لوگ یہ کہتے ہیں کہ ہمیں اپنی پالیسی کو ایک بار پھر سے دیکھنا ہے۔ آئیے۔ ہم حقیقت کو نہ بھلائیں۔ میں چاہتا ہوں۔ جیسا کہ میرے ایک مہربان دوست لیدی ممبر نے شاندار طریقہ سے کہا۔ ہم زیادہ باتیں کرتے ہیں ہم دوسروں کے معاملہ میں خواہ مخواہ مداخلت کرتے ہیں بجائے اس کے کہ ہم زیادہ باتیں کریں۔ بجائے اس کے کہ ہم دوسرے ملکوں کو سپورٹ دیں پہلے اپنے کام کو دیکھیں۔ جہاں تک ہندوستان کے انٹرسٹ کا تعلق ہے۔ ہندوستان کے بہترین مفاد کا تعلق ہے۔ چاہے ہمیں اپنی پالیسی میں نرمی برتنی پڑے۔ پالیسی کو بدلنا پڑے ہمیں اپنا رویہ بدلنا چاہئے۔ جس پالیسی کے لئے گاندھی جی نے قدم اٹھایا، جن پالیسیز کے لئے یلڈت جواہر لال نہرو نے دنیا میں نام پیدا کیا۔ ہندوستان کا نام اونچا

کیا۔ میں یہ کہنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہوں کہ اس کو بدلا جائے۔ میں نہیں چاہتا کہ نان الاٹمنٹ کی پالیسی کو بدلا جائے۔ میں نہیں چاہتا پنچ شیل اور بیس فل کو ایکزیسٹینس کی پالیسی کو بدلا جائے۔ لیکن دنیا کے بدلتے ہوئے حالات کو آپ دیکھئے۔ وہ چین جو ایک بار ہندوستان کا دوست بنا تھا، جس نے پنچ شیل کا اصول اپنایا تھا۔ اس پر اپنی مہر لگائی تھی، آج وہ پنچ شیل کی پالیسی کو بھلا کر پاکستان کے ساتھ مل گیا ہے حالانکہ آئیڈیولوجیکل ڈیفریمنسز ہیں۔ حالانکہ ایک ملک میں ایک طرح کی حکومت ہے دوسرے میں دوسری طرح کی حکومت ہے۔ لیکن پھر بھی وہ مل گئے ہیں کیونکہ ہر ایک ملک اپنے مفاد کی پالیسی پر چل رہا ہے۔ ہمیں ایمان داری سے اس بات کو ریلائز کرنا ہے۔ سیکورٹی کونسل میں میں ایمان داری سے کہتا ہوں ہمارا ساتھ کسی نے نہیں دیا۔ اگر دیا ہے تو کچھ حد تک یہ ٹھیک ہے روس نے ہمیں دیا ہے ہمیں اس کا شکر گزار ہونا چاہئے۔ مگر افسوس کی بات ہے کہ روس کی طرف سے بھی نہیں کہا گیا کہ پاکستان غلطی پر ہے۔ اس نے حملہ کیا ہے۔ اس کا مطلب یہ نہیں ہے کہ میں کسی کی مخالفت کو رہا ہوں۔ میرا کہنا یہ ہے کہ ہمیں

[شری جی - ایم - میسر]

ہندوستان کے بہترین مفاد کے لئے پالیسی بنا کر چلنا چاہئے۔ ذات ازلے بلیسیلنگ ان ڈسٹائنڈ جو پاکستان کی طرف سے یہ حملہ ہوا اور آپ نے ایک بار ایسے ہاؤں پر کھڑے ہو کر مقابلہ کیا۔

کشمیر کی انڈین سائز اسمبلی نے فیصلہ کر لیا ہے اپنی رائے عامہ کے ذریعہ ایک بار نہیں دو بار نہیں بلکہ اس سے بہت پہلے ۱۹۳۰ میں۔ جب ہندوستان میں وہ ہندوستان چھوڑ دوئے کے نعرے لگائے جا رہے تھے تب سے کشمیر میں وہ کونٹ کشمیر وہ وہ کشمیر چھوڑ دوئے کے نعرے لگائے جا رہے تھے اور اس تحریک میں جو رہنمائی ہمیں ملی وہ ہندوستان کے راہنماؤں سے۔ لیڈران سے ملی۔ وہ جواہر لال نہرو سے ملی۔ گاندھی سے ملی۔ بھٹو اور ایوب سے نہیں ملی۔ ۱۹۳۷ سے پہلے کے جذبات کا جہاں تک تعلق ہے۔ کشمیریوں کو اس معاملہ میں ذرا بھی غلط فہمی نہیں ہے۔ لیکن جہاں تک آپ کا تعلق ہے۔ آپ کی کمزور پالیسی کی وجہ سے۔ ایک طرف کہتے ہیں کشمیر کا مسئلہ حل ہو چکا ہے اور آپ کی بات سے میں خوش ہوں کشمیر کے لوگ خوش ہیں آپ نے اتھارہ سال بعد کہا ہے کشمیر کا معاملہ ختم ہو چکا ہے۔ کشمیر

ویسا ہی حصہ بن چکا ہے جس سے ہمیں ہے۔ مدراس ہے۔ لیکن اس سے پہلے کیا ہوتا تھا کبھی سورن سنگھ اور بھٹو ملاقات کرتے تھے۔ کبھی سیکورٹی کونسل میں کشمیر کے بارے میں بات چیت ہوتی تھی یعنی خود آپ کی طرف سے ایک غیر یقینی کی پالیسی اختیار کی جا رہی تھی میں خوش ہوں ہماری سرکار نے شاستری کی سرکار نے ایک بڑا شاندار قدم اٹھایا ہے ایک اسٹرانگ مضبوط پالیسی بنائی ہے۔ سردار سورن سنگھ جی نے سیکورٹی کونسل میں بیٹھے ہوئے جب بھٹو صاحب گالی دے رہے تھے۔ بہت اچھا کیا کہ میٹنگ کا بائیکاٹ کیا۔ دنیا کی وہ طاقتیں جو ہماری طرف دوستی کا ہاتھ بڑھاتی تھیں جو کہتی تھیں کہ ہم تمہارے دوست ہیں کیا انہوں نے اس کی حرکت کو کڈ دیا۔ ایک طرف ہندوستان کے ۳۵ کروڑ آدمیوں کو بھٹو صاحب گالی دے رہے تھے اور دوسری طرف سیکوریٹی کونسل کے تمام ممبران چپ بیٹھے تھے۔ کیا ان گالوں کا جواب کس نے دیا۔۔۔ نہیں۔ اسی طرح کا ساہانکا کی سمت کانفرنس میں اس کا کوئی ذکر نہیں آیا۔ تھیک ہے میں مانتا ہوں جہاں ک ناٹھڈ عرب ریپبلک کا تعلق ہے اس کا ایٹھوہوہ ریزن ایبل رہا ہے لیکن اس کانفرنس میں بھی کسی نے اس بات

کو کڈم نہیں کہا اور کسی نے پاکستان کو ایگزیٹسز نہیں کہا - کل یا پرسوں کا ذکر ہے ایک ممبر صاحب نے اس معزز ایوان میں بتلایا تھا کہ ایک آدمی جو ہندوستان آنا چاہتا تھا اس کو یہ بتلایا گیا کہ دلی میں بمبارقہ ملے ہو گیا ہے اور اشوکا ہوٹل پاکستان کا ہیڈ کوارٹر بن گیا ہے - میں جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمارے فارن مشنس کیا کام کر رہے ہیں - میں ایمانداری سے یہ کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمیں سوچنا ہے کہ کیا ہمارے سفیر ہندوستان کی صحیح معنوں میں باہر نمائندگی کر رہے ہیں - ہم اس طریقہ سے کام کریں جس طرح سے نیپال میں ہمارے امبیسڈر شریمن نرائن جی نے کہا ہے وہ جس طرح سے پیدل چل کر لوگوں سے ملتے ہیں اسی طرح ہمارے وڈیہوں میں امبیسڈر باہر جا کر عام لوگوں کے ساتھ - برطانیہ کے لوگوں کے ساتھ ملے - امریکہ کے لوگوں سے ملے - تو مجھے یقین ہے کہ جو غلط فہمیاں پیدا ہو گئی ہیں کشمیر کے سوال کے متعلق وہ غلط فہمیاں دور ہو سکتی ہیں - آپ دیکھیں گے ایران میں کیا ہوا، ترکی میں کیا ہوا - ان ممالک نے ہمارا ساتھ کبھی نہیں دیا اسی وجہ سے کہ پاکستان نے ایک زبردست پروپیگنڈا کیا تھا کہ یہ ایک ایسی جنگ ہے جو جنگ ہندو اور مسلم کے درمیان ہے - یہ جنگ اسلام

کو خطرہ میں ڈال سکتی ہے - ہندوستان کی یہ جنگ اسلام کے خلاف جنگ ہے - حالانکہ یہ جنگ اسلام اور ہندوازم میں نہیں تھی - یہ جنگ ایسی تھی جس میں سیکولرزم - نیشنلزم اور قیموکریسی ایک طرف تھی اور دوسری طرف فوجی ڈکٹیٹر - شپ - یہ دو آئڈیالوجیز کی جنگ ہو رہی تھی لیکن پاکستان کو میں کریڈٹ دیتا ہوں پاکستان کے پروپیگنڈا کرنے والوں کو کہ وہ پروپیگنڈا میں کامیاب ہوئے اور کسی طرح مسلم ممالک میں یہ پروپیگنڈا کام کر گیا -

مجھے ایک عرض یہ کرنی ہے کہ آپ نے تمام مسلم ممالک میں کشمیر کے حالات بتانے کے لئے قیلمگوشن بھیجے آپ نے انلے قیلمگوشن بھیجے مگر کشمیر کا ایک بھی قیلمگوشن نہیں بھیجا - کشمیر کے بارے میں کشمیر کے نمائندے ہی زیادہ اچھی طرح سے بتا سکتے ہیں - میں بتا سکتا ہوں کہ کشمیر کا ہندوستان کے ساتھ الحاق زور زبردستی کے ساتھ نہیں ہوا - حالانکہ پاکستان نے یہ کہا کہ ہم مسلمان وہاں اکثریت میں ہیں اس لئے کشمیریوں کی اکثریت کو پاکستان میں جانا چاہئے - لیکن ہم نے اس بنا پر پاکستان کا ساتھ نہیں دیا - ہم نیشنلزم میں سیکولرزم میں یقین رکھتے ہیں - ۱۹۴۷ میں جب چاروں طرف بھائی بھائی کے اوپر

[شری جی - ایم - میر]

گولی چل رہی تھی اس وقت گاندھی جی کو جو روشنی کی کرن نظر آئی اس کا تہجد یہ ہوا کہ سائنس کے کسی آدمی کا بال بانکا نہیں ہوا - واقعی ان کا بہت بڑا اثر ہمارے اوپر تھا - اس وقت آپ دیکھیں گے کشمیر میں سیکولرازم اور قہر و کرسی بالکل بحال ہوئی - یہ تمام چیزیں خاص طور پر مسلم ممالک کو کہتا ہوں - ہمیں افسوس ہے کہ ہمیں اپنے ریلیشن زیادہ سے زیادہ ان کے ساتھ مکمل کرنے کا موقعہ نہیں ملا - برطانیہ کی ہمیشہ سے یہ پالیسی رہی ہے - قیوانڈ / ایڈ رول - امریکہ کی پالیسی دیکھئے -

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. We are very strict today.

شری جی - ایم - میر : میں ختم

کر رہا ہوں - دو ملت میں کہہ دیتا ہوں - امریکہ نے بھی کہا تھا کہ تمام جو فوج سہائی تھی اور ایڈ تھی اس کو بند کر دیا - جس کی آڑے وقت میں ہمیں ضرورت تھی بتلائے اس دوستی کا ہمیں کیا فائدہ؟ اس کے مقابلہ میں دوس نے آج تک مدد دی - ہمیں ہتھیار دیئے ساساں دیا - اس لئے میں چاہتا ہوں کہ اٹھارہ سال کے بعد ایک وقت ایسا آگیا ہے کہ ہندوستان کے لوگوں کو اپنے پار پر کھڑے ہونے

کی کوشش کرنی چاہئے - ہم ہندوستان کے مفاد کو سب سے زیادہ سمجھیں ہم بولیں کم اور کام زیادہ کریں - اور دوسروں کے معاملے میں زیادہ آگے جانیکی کوشش نہ کریں - ایسا کر کے ہم اپنی نان الائنمنٹ کی پالیسی اور پیچ شیل کے اصولوں کو ٹیکر دنیا میں آگے جا سکتے ہیں - مگر اپنا مفاد پہلے ہونا چاہئے -

†[श्री जी० एम० मीर (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : मेडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन आज सुबह से इस मौजिज एवान में जो एक्सटनल अफेयर्स पर बहस हो रही है उसमें मुझे भी बोलने का मौका मिला उसके लिए मैं दिल की गहराई से आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ। इस लिए की यह फारन अफेयर्स की जो डिबेट आज हो रही है इस डिबेट में सब से ज्यादा चर्चा काश्मीर के मुताल्लिक हुआ और काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का ऐसा ही हिस्सा है जैसा कि दिल्ली, बम्बई और मद्रास; और पाकिस्तान, और हिन्दुस्तान के दरमियान जो कॉन्फ्लिक्ट हुआ उसकी इस तमाम डिबेट में चर्चा होती रही। मैं निहायत खामोशी के साथ उन तमाम तकरीरों को जो सुबह से लेकर इस वक्त तक होती आई हैं सुनता रहा हूँ।

मेडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, बदकिस्मती से काश्मीर के मामले में हमने शुरू से ही कुछ गलतियाँ कीं। हमारी सब से पहली गलती यह थी कि हम सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल में कम्प्लेन्ट की हैसियत से अपना केस लेकर गए कि पाकिस्तान ने हम पर हमला किया है। 1947 में निहत्थे कश्मीरियों पर हमला किया गया, हमारे घरों को लूटा गया, हमें तबाह व बरबाद किया गया। इस चीज को लेकर हम सिक्युरिटी

कौंसिल में गये और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह हमारी सब से पहली गलती थी। दूसरी जो गलती की वह यह कि 1947 में सीज फायर को कबूल किया और उसके बाद हमने जो गलती की वह यह कि रायशुमारी के मुताल्लिक कुछ आफर की, कुछ कमिटमेंट की। तो इस किस्म की बातें हुई।

बहरहाल काश्मीर का मसला शुरू से लेकर एक नरम पालिसी की वजह से, एक ऐसी खतरनाक पालिसी की वजह से सटकता रहा, गैर यकीनी हालत पदा हुआ और काश्मीर के लोग जिस तरीके से तरक्की के रास्ते पर गमगन होना चाहते थे नहीं हो सके। 1947 से लेकर आज तक 1965 तक काश्मीर के लोग मुतवातर पाकिस्तान की साजिशों के, पाकिस्तान की तरफ से की गई सबवासिब एक्टिविटीज के और पाकिस्तान की बरफ से की गई तोड़ फोड़ की कार्रवाइयों के शिकार होते रहे लेकिन हमारी हुकूमत ने कभी इस तरफ तवज्जो नहीं दी और उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि पाकिस्तान को एक शह मिली। पाकिस्तान ने समझा कि हिन्दुस्तान कमजोर है और जैसे मैं चाहूंगा मैं काश्मीर को हड़प कर लूंगा। पाकिस्तान ने दूसरी दफा 1965 में हमारे मुल्क पर फिर हमला किया। इसे दूसरी दफा नहीं कहना चाहिये बल्कि मुतवातर 1947 से 1965 तक हमला जारी रहा है। यह लुकी-छुपी बात नहीं है।

अब मैं पिछली बातों की तरफ नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन 1965 में 5 अगस्त को पाकिस्तान की तरफ से जो हमला हुआ वह एक बिल्कुल वाजह चीज है। तमाम दुनिया के सामने यह वाजह है। जनरल निम्मो की रिपोर्ट आप देखें, तमाम दुनिया के प्रेस को देखें, तमाम दुनिया की राय आप को देखें जो यह सही मायनों में पता चलेगा कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे मुल्क पर हमला किया। मैं आप के सामने इस मौजिज एवान में दुनिया

की जो तमाम प्रेसिज की राय है वह कोट करना चाहता हूँ :

The Cork Examiner (September 7) says:

"In this latest and most dangerous turn in the issue over Kashmir there is no doubt that Pakistan is the aggressor."

The Guardian (September 7) says:

"Pakistanis by sending or allowing infiltrators across the cease-fire line in past few weeks were responsible for the original flaring up of the present trouble."

The Weekly Tribune, Ceylon (September 11) says:

"To the impartial observer India cannot be regarded as aggressor when it was Pakistan which first organised aggressive infiltration across the cease-fire line on August 5."

The Daily Telegraph, Nigeria (September 14) says:

"Pakistan has committed what in public international law is aggression and India has every legitimate right to fight back."

Al Jamhouria, Lebanon (September 15) says:

"In this problem which has arisen in Indian sub-continent we stand without reservations considering Pakistan the first infiltrator and first aggressor."

The Guardian, Manchester and London (6th September) says:

"The series of violations that began on August 5 were to a considerable extent.....in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the cease-fire line from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side."

इसी तरह और दुनिया के तमाम अखबारों की राय है लेकिन उन सब को इस मौजिज एवान में पढ़ तो मेरे लिए काफी बख्त की जरूरत है।

[श्री जी० एम० मीर]

तो जब इस बार फिर 5 अगस्त को हमारे मुल्क पर हमला हुआ तो तमाम दुनिया के प्रेस ने उसको वाजह तौर पर कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान पर पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया। पाकिस्तान ने अपनी फौजों को सिविल लिबास में भेज कर हमारे अंदर इफिलट्रेशन किया और तमाम जायदादों को तबाह किया। हमारे मकानों को नजरे आतिश किया। इस के बावजूद भी सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल में यह मसला जैसा है उसको देखकर मुझे अफसोस होता है सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल के उन मेम्बरान पर जो दुनिया में अमनोअमान कायम करने के इलम-बरदार हैं और जिनका काम है कि दुनिया में सही तरीके से अमनोअमान को बहाल करे। लेकिन जब यह मसला सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल में जाता है तो एक भी मेम्बर पाकिस्तान को एग्सेस्स कर देने के लिए तैयार नहीं।

जनाब फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब और जनाब छागला साहब यह मुतालबा करते हैं कि वक्त आ गया है कि सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल एक बार उसका फैसला करे कि हिन्दुस्तान पर एगेशन हुआ है या नहीं। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है आज जब हम फारेन पालिसी पर बहस कर रहे हैं आज एक तरफ से एक ज्लाक को सपोर्ट किया जा रहा है और दूसरी तरफ से दूसरे कंट्री को सपोर्ट किया जा रहा है। मैं न किसी को सपोर्ट करने के लिए तैयार हूँ न किसी की मुखातिफ करने के लिए तैयार हूँ लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ हिन्दुस्तान एक इंडिपेंडेंट पालिसी नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी ले कर चले। हिन्दुस्तान ने दुनिया को शान्ति और अमन का पैगाम दिया और इस पैगाम को हमने दुनिया के सामने पहुंचाया लेकिन आज अठारह साल के बाद हिन्दुस्तान की कौम हिन्दुस्तान के लोग कहने पर मजबूर हैं कि हमें अपनी पालिसी को एक बार फिर से देखना है। आइये हम हकीकत को न भुलाएं। मैं चाहता हूँ जैसा कि मेरे एक मेहरबान दोस्त मेडी मेम्बर ने शानदार तरीके से कहा

हम ज्यादा बातें करते हैं, हम दूसरों के मामले में ख्वामख्वाह मदाखलत करने हैं बजाए इस के कि हम ज्यादा बात करे, बजाए इस के कि हम दूसरे मुल्कों को सपोर्ट दें पहले अपने काम को देखे। जहां तक हिन्दुस्तान के इन्ट्रेस्ट का ताल्लुक है, हिन्दुस्तान के बेहतरीन मुफाद का ताल्लुक है चाहे हमें अपनी पालिसी में नरमी बरतनी पड़े, पालिसी को बदलना पड़े, हमें अपना रवैया बदलना चाहिए। जिस पालिसी के लिए गांधी जी ने कदम उठाया, जिन पालिसीज के लिए पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने दुनिया में नाम पैदा किया, हिन्दुस्तान का नाम ऊचा किया, मैं यह कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि उसको बदला जाए। मैं नहीं चाहता कि नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी को बदला जाए। मैं नहीं चाहता पंचशील और पीसफुल को-एग्जिस्टेंस की पालिसी को बदला जाए। लेकिन दुनिया के बदलते हुए हालात को आप देखिए। वह चीन जो एक बार हिन्दुस्तान का दोस्त बना था जिसने पंचशील का उसूल अपनाया था, उस पर अपनी मोहर लगाई थी आज वह पंचशील की पालिसी को भुला कर पाकिस्तान के साथ मिल गया है हालांकि आइडियोलोजिकल डिफरेंसिस है, हालांकि एक मुल्क में एक तरह की हुक्मत है दूसरे में दूसरी तरह की हुक्मत है। लेकिन फिर भी वे मिल गये हैं क्योंकि हर एक मुल्क अपने मुफाद की पालिसी पर चल रहा है। हमें ईमानदारी से इस बात को रियलाइज करना है। सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल में मैं ईमानदारी से कहता हूँ हमारा साथ किसी ने नहीं दिया। अगर दिया है तो कुछ हद तक यह ठीक है रूस ने हमें दिया है। हमें उसका शुक्रगुजार होना चाहिए। मगर अफसोस की बात है कि रूस की तरफ से भी नहीं कहा गया कि पाकिस्तान गलती पर है, उसने हमला किया है। इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि मैं किसी की मुखातिफ कर रहा हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि हमें हिन्दुस्तान के बेहतरीन मुफाद के लिए पालिसी बना कर चलना चाहिए। "इट इज ए ब्लैसिंग इन

डिसगाइज" जो पाकिस्तान की तरफ से यह हमला हुआ और आप ने एक बार अपने पांव पर खड़े हो कर मुकाबला किया ।

काश्मीर की आइन साज्ज असेम्बली ने फैसला कर लिया है अपना राय ग्रामा के जगिण एक बार नहीं दो बार नहीं बल्कि इसमें भी बहुत पहले 1930 में, जब हिन्दुस्तान में "हिन्दुस्तान छोड़ दो" के नारे लगाए जा रहे थे तब से काश्मीर में "कुइट, कश्मीर, काश्मीर छोड़ दो" के नारे लगाए जा रहे थे और इस नहरीक में जो रहनुमाई हमें मिली वह हिन्दुस्तान के राहनुमाओं से, लीडरान से मिली। वह जवाहरलाल नेहरू से मिली, गांधी से मिली, भुट्टो और अयब से नहीं मिली । 1947 से पहले के जज्वात का जहां तक ताल्लुक है, काश्मीरियों को इस मामले में जरा भी गलतफहमी नहीं है, लेकिन जहां तक आप का ताल्लुक है, आप की कमजोर पालिसी की वजह से—एक तरफ आप कहते हैं काश्मीर का मसला हल हो चुका है और आपकी बात से मैं खुश हूँ, काश्मीर के लोग खुश हैं, आप ने अठारह साल बाद कहा है काश्मीर का मामला खत्म हो चुका है । काश्मीर वैसा ही हिस्सा बन चुका है जैसे बम्बई है, मद्रास है । लेकिन इस से पहले क्या होता था कभी स्वर्णसिंह और भुट्टो मुलाकात करते थे 'कभी, सिक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में काश्मीर के बारे में बातचीत होती थी, यानी खुद आप की तरफ से एक गैर यकीनी का पालिसी अख्तियार की जा रही था । मैं खुश हूँ हमारी सरकार ने, शास्त्री की सरकार ने, एक बड़ा शानदार कदम उठाया है, एक स्ट्रोंग मजबूत पालिसी बनाई है । सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी ने, सिक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में बैठे हुए जब भुट्टो साहब गाली दे रहे थे, बहुत अच्छा किया कि मीटिंग का बयकाट किया । दुनिया की वे ताकतें जो हमारी तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाती थी, जो कहती थीं कि हम तुम्हारे दोस्त हैं, क्या उन्होंने इसकी हरकत को कंडेम किया ? एक तरफ हिन्दुस्तान के 45 करोड़ आदमियों को भुट्टो

साहब गाली दे रहे थे और दूसरी तरफ सिक्यूरिटी कौंसिल के तमाम मेम्बरान चुप बैठे थे । क्या इन गालियों का जवाब किसी ने दिया । नहीं । इसी तरह से कासाव्लांका की सम्मिट कांफ्रेंस में उसका कोई जिक्र नहीं आया । ठीक है मैं मानता हूँ जहां तक युनाइटेड अरब रिपब्लिक का ताल्लुक है उसका एटिच्यूड रीजेनेबिल रहा है लेकिन उस कांफ्रेंस में भी विसा ने इस बात को कंडेम नहीं किया और किसी ने पाकिस्तान को एग््रेसर नहीं कहा । कल या परसों का जिक्र है एक मेम्बर साहब ने इस मीजिज एवान में बतलाया था कि एक आदमी जो हिन्दुस्तान आना चाहता था उसको यह बतलाया गया कि दिल्ली में बमबार्डमेंट हो गया है और अण्डाका होटल पाकिस्तान का हैड क्वार्टर बन गया है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे फारेन मिशनस क्या काम कर रहे हैं । मैं ईमानदारी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें सोचना है कि क्या हमारे सफर हिन्दुस्तान की सही मायनों में बाहर नुमाइन्दगी कर रहे हैं । हम इस तरीके से काम करें जिस तरह से नेपाल में हमारे एम्बेसेडर श्रीमन् नारायण जी ने किया है वह जिस तरह से पैदल चल कर लोगों से मिलते हैं उसी तरह हमारे विदेशों में एम्बेसेडर बाहर जाकर आम लोगों के साथ, बर्तानिया के लोगों के साथ मिलेंगे, अमरीका के लोगों से मिलेंगे, तो मुझे यकीन है कि जो गलतफहमिया पैदा हो गई है काश्मीर के सवाल के मुताल्लिक वे गलतफहमिया दूर हो सकती है । आप देखेंगे ईरान में क्या हुआ, टर्की में क्या हुआ । इन मुमालिक ने हमारा साथ क्यों नहीं दिया इस वजह से कि पाकिस्तान ने एक जबरदस्त प्रोपेगेंडा किया था कि यह एक ऐसी जंग है जो जग हिन्दू और मुस्लिम के दरमियान है । यह जंग इस्लाम को खतरे में डाल सकती है । हिन्दुस्तान की यह जंग इस्लाम के खिलाफ जंग है । हालांकि यह जंग इस्लाम और हिन्दुइज्म में नहीं थी । यह जंग ऐसी थी जिस में सेक्यूलरिज्म, नेशनेलिज्म और डेमोक्रेसी एक तरफ थी और दूसरी तरफ

[श्री जी० एम० मीर]

फौजी डिक्टेटरशिप। यह दो आइडियोलोजी की जगह हो रही थी। लेकिन पाकिस्तान को मैं क्रेडिट देता हूँ, पाकिस्तान के प्रोपेगंडा करने वालों को कि वह प्रोपेगंडा में कामयाब हुए और किसी तरह मुस्लिम मुमालिक में यह प्रोपेगंडा काम कर गया।

मुझे एक अर्थ यह करनी है कि आप ने तमाम मुस्लिम मुमालिक में काश्मीर के हालात बताने के लिए डेलीगेशन भेजे, आप ने इतने डेलीगेशन भेजे, मगर काश्मीर का एक भी डेलीगेशन नहीं भेजा। काश्मीर के बारे में काश्मीर के नुमाइन्दे ही ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से बना सकते हैं। मैं बता सकता हूँ कि काश्मीर का हिन्दुस्तान के साथ अलहाक जोर जबर-बस्ती के साथ नहीं हुआ। हालांकि पाकिस्तान ने यह कहा कि मुसलमान वहाँ अक्सरियत में हैं इसलिए काश्मीरियों की अक्सरियत को पाकिस्तान में जाना चाहिए। लेकिन हमने इस बिना पर पाकिस्तान का साथ नहीं दिया। हम नेशनलिज्म में, सेक्यूलरिज्म में यकीन रखते हैं। 1947 में जब चारों तरफ भाई भाई के ऊपर गोली चल रही थी उस वक्त गांधी जी को जो रोशनी की किरन नज़र आई उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि माइनोरिटी के किसी आदमी का बाल बाका नहीं हुआ। वाकई उनका बहुत बड़ा असर हमारे ऊपर था। उस वक्त आप देखेंगे काश्मीर में सैक्यूलरिज्म और डेमोक्रेसी बिल्कुल बहाल हुई। यह तमाम चीज़ें खास तौर पर मुस्लिम मुमालिक को रहता है। हमें अफसोस है कि हमें अपने रिलेशन ज्यादा से ज्यादा उनके साथ मुकम्मल करने का मौका नहीं मिला। बरतानिया की हमेशा से यह पालिसी रही है, डिवाइड एण्ड रूल। अमरीका की पालिसी देखिए।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. We are very strict today.

श्री जी० एम० मीर : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। दो मिनट में बंद देता हूँ। अमरीका ने भी क्या किया कि तमाम जो फूड सप्लाय थी और ऐड थी उसको बन्द कर दिया। जिस की आड़े वक्त में हमें जरूरत थी। बतलाइये, इस दोस्ती का हमें क्या फायदा? इस के मुकाबले में रूस ने आज तक मदद दी। हमें हथियार दिये, सामान दिया। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि अठारह साल के बाद एक वक्त ऐसा आ गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को अपने पांव पर खड़े होने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। हम हिन्दुस्तान के मफाद को सब से ज्यादा समझे। हम बोले कम और काम ज्यादा करें और दूसरों के मामले में ज्यादा आगे जाने की कोशिश न करें। ऐसा करके हम अपनी नॉन-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी और पंचशाल के उम्मीलों को लेकर दुनिया में आगे जा सकते हैं। मगर अपना मफाद पहले होना चाहिए।]

SHRI K K SHAH (Maharashtra): It is surprising that my friend, Mr. Chordia, and others have been complaining that we have no friends. I do not know what he means by saying that we have no friends. Probably he refers to England and America. So far as others are concerned, I will deal with them after I deal with England and America. Now what do they expect us to do? In 1947 England left the option for States to opt for India or Pakistan, and in pursuance of the option left by England, Kashmir opted for India, and in spite of that if Pakistan carries on aggression or invades Kashmir, was it not the duty of England to tell Pakistan that this is in pursuance of the arrangement left by England and what Pakistan is doing is not proper? On the contrary, in spite of the fact that Pakistan is an aggressor, we go to the United Nations where our friends are sitting and for 17 years they have not been able to tell that Pakistan was the aggressor, and they have been searching for proof as if occupation of Azad Kashmir is not

a proof of aggression What greater proof do they want than the fact that the so-called Azad Kashmir is in the possession of Pakistan today? Still they are not prepared to tell that Pakistan is the aggressor. I am very happy that you say that still we are trying

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :

मैने आज तब कभी नहा कहा और आपने मुझे मिसमंडरस्टैंड किया है।

श्री के० के० शाह : “यू०” एण्ड “अदर”, यह मैंने कहा।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :

मैंने कभी ऐसा नहीं कहा। मैं नेशनलिस्ट हूँ और इस मन का हूँ कि भारत के हित में जो है, वह हमें जहता चाहिये।
I am not concerned with America, I am not concerned with Russia, but I am concerned with India.

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

SHRI K K SHAH My friend twice repeated the statement that we have no friends or that we have been losing our friends. I will take them one by one, the major nations and minor nations, and will try to convince him that the policy followed by this Government is the right one, and I am very happy that the External Affairs Minister has restricted himself to the foreign policy followed by this country since the time the infiltration took place. In these last two months let us find out whether the Government of India has taken any step which has been wrong, misguided or unrealistic.

So far as the British Government is concerned, the British Government can afford to carry on trade with China, but as soon as Pakistan invades us and we defend ourselves the normal trade relationship is impeded on the pretext that licences take time to move, and still our Government

has taken such a sober attitude that these incidents, if possible, should not mar the entire future relationship of this country with England. We were talking to the British Parliamentary Delegation the other day and it was pointed out to them that in spite of the fact that the British Government took up this attitude at the time of aggression on Kashmir it was expected that at least our normal trade relationship would remain unaffected. We have trusted England and in times of crisis, when you have major trade relations, you do need some spare parts from that country. Which country does not do it? We pointed out that in times of crisis at least the normal trade relationship should be continued and that the normal trade relationship which we had established would not be utilised to bring undue pressure on us. As I pointed out, their trade with China will continue, but our normal trade relationship—I am not dealing with the question of aid—is disturbed, and in spite of that a very sober and wise attitude has been adopted by this Government. When we were discussing Pakistani aggression hotly in this country, some American friends also have been writing to friends in this country, and some of them advanced the argument, that we as a nation, which is a mature nation, should be prepared to accommodate or find out a solution for dealing with Pakistan in a way that our position in the comity of nations is maintained. I was at pains to ask them: “What do you want us to do?” The two alternatives that were suggested were: either hand over Kashmir to Pakistan or make Kashmir independent.

SHRI G S PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh): Will they be satisfied?

SHRI K K SHAH: Let us examine this argument of theirs. Some friends have gone to the extent of saying that Kashmir should be made independent, the independence being guaranteed by India, Pakistan and the United Nations. I pointed out to them: “Are you aware that a portion

[Shri K. K. Shah.]
of Azad Kashmir was handed over"—as was pointed out by our External Affairs Minister—"to China to facilitate Chinese intrusion into Ladakh? A portion of Kashmir which is in the illegal occupation of Pakistan was handed over to China." Then I asked a question: "Are you satisfied or do you envisage the possibility that China may be interested in occupying Kashmir so that it can control both India and Pakistan?" Luckily, the answer was "yes". Then I said: "In whose hands this Kashmir will be safe? In the hands of Pakistan and China or in the hands of India?" I must admit that they said: "It is worth giving thought." Then I said: "Take the alternative of Kashmir being made independent and its independence being guaranteed by so and so. Was not South Vietnam guaranteed by 14 nations, we were also one of them? What is happening in South Vietnam today? On the contrary an independent Kashmir will be an easier prey to the machinations of China." I am not such a presumptuous man as to believe that they do not understand; they do understand all this. In spite of the fact that they understand these things they take up an attitude which is to say the least unfair specially in times of crisis. Still they go on harping on the same theme. Is it not surprising that a dictatorship is supported by the bulwark of democracy, that dictatorship which is prepared to play into the hands of Communist dictatorship believing in expansionism? Still when we deal against the aggressive designs of such a type of dictatorship, the ultimate argument that is advanced is: "Would you not help us if we make a last attempt to persuade Pakistan from going Communist?" Even though they know that this argument is advanced only as a cover, even though they know that the moment Pakistan tries to go Communist—I am not afraid of Pakistan going Communist because East Pakistan is not going Communist with them, North West Frontier is not going Communist; Baluchistan is not going

Communist. If in spite of President Soekarno's machinations and manoeuvrings Indonesia could not go Communist though it is on the border of China, Pakistan can never go Communist. They are trotting out the argument that "we are doing this and asking you to undergo all trouble, humiliations and insult simply because we want to make a last attempt to prevent Pakistan from going Communist". I am rarely given to praise but I must admit that a very realistic search is going on so far as the Government of India is concerned, and very cautiously things are taken into consideration. The most important thing that we must remember is this. I shall quote the dictum of a well-known Englishman—England is neither a permanent friend nor a permanent enemy; England is only a permanent friend of English interests. And this dictum must help us to examine our relationship with everybody. Why does England take up this attitude? Would not England like to carry on trade relations for hundreds of years with five hundred millions of people rather than with one hundred millions of people? And then I got an answer which I was searching for. The answer was contained in a statement: 'Oh! India has become the fourth military power and it might become the third military power and you must be cautious.' Therefore, their eyes are on the old dictum of balance of power in Asia. Therefore, efforts at making friendship do not depend upon your gestures or your statements. Friendship depends upon the requirements of the policy that a particular country follows. And wisdom lies in the fact that we make an effort to peep into the recesses of their hearts which contain the reasons why they follow a particular policy. And if you examine the foreign policy that is followed by this country, I am sure everyone in this country will acclaim the policy that has been followed. Those days are gone when they forced us to come to an agreement on the question of Kutch. We cannot think of anybody asking us to do so now. What happened at that time? That

was not the place where it was to our advantage to offer a fight. We should be dependent on our own calculations in choosing the place where we should give the fight. And if, with a view to finding out the intentions of the party who intervenes, we give a long rope and are cautious, there is nothing wrong. Look at the achievements of this country. This country took a grave risk; when Pakistan framed a constitution on a religious basis, we accepted secularism. It was a grave risk and it required a great nation to see that this policy succeeded. What would have happened if this country had been built up on a religious basis as Pakistan has been built up on that basis. You know what happened there in Casablanca. There are some Mohammadan countries which during the last fifteen years have developed secularism and they did not fall a prey to all appeals of a religious nature. That is the success of it. Today the Hindus take pride in saying that this country is not only a country of Rana Pratap Singh and Sivaji but also a country of Maulana Azad and Abdul Hamid. That is the success of this country. Normally, we would not have got an opportunity of finding out or testing whether in fact, secularism has succeeded. It is only when we pass through a crisis, when the test is applied, that the success or failure of our secularism is known. In the same way, take the case of the Communist countries. One of my friends, the Maharani of Patiala, rightly said that the policy of non-alignment has succeeded. In concrete terms it amounts to this. Even when we have friends in Russia, Yugoslavia and other countries, friends of whom they are afraid, they behave in this way. But imagine, if we had no friends, how much lever they would have exercised upon us.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh):
Mr. Vice-Chancellor, Sir . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA): Banaras is very much in your mind.

PROF. M. B. LAL: I wish the Vice-Chairman one day to be the Vice-Chancellor . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Which university?

PROF. M. B. LAL: Sir, I do not know whether I will be in power when he will be put in the position of Vice-Chancellor. So, I am not in a position to say in which university he would be assigned that particular post.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the speech of the Minister of External Affairs is, no doubt, realistic in the sense that it was mainly concerned with the problem over which we are most exercised. But at the same time I feel that it is rather insipid because it is merely a resume of certain known facts and events. It is also incomplete because, while it deals with the question of Pakistan's aggression, it ignores, almost ignores, the other problem with which we are faced—I mean the problem of possible aggression by China. The entire House no doubt agrees with him that Pakistan's aggression deserves the condemnation of the entire humanity and all of us bemoan with him that certain nations failed to face the situation squarely, and even when the aggression was committed on us, an attempt was made by those nations to equate India and Pakistan as if both were responsible for the present situation. It was said by the Minister of External Affairs that the Arab nations maintained neutrality. We are happy to know about it but I am constrained to remark that we would have been happier if these nations had been more neutral than they had so far been. When we review the speeches delivered by the representatives of the Arab nations in the General Assembly of the United Nations, we feel that many of them failed to maintain even that balance of neutrality which they could have and should have maintained. We are sorry that the Security Council failed to call an aggressor an aggressor in spite of repeated requests by the representatives of India.

I have no doubt in my mind that no peace will be possible in this sub-con-

[Prof. M. B. Lal.]

continent so long as Pakistan continues to violate international law, indulges in subversive and other hostile activities and commits aggression and the world fails to forge effective sanctions against Pakistan's hostilities and aggression. It seems to me that Pakistan's old allies have not yet fully realised that Pakistan cannot be trusted to contain Chinese communism. They still feel that Pakistan can be won over through concessions on the Kashmir issue. They fail to realise that concessions that Pakistan manages to extract under the threat of collusion with China will not in any way be able to persuade Pakistan to leave China and side with those who are in favour of containing Chinese communism.

Sir, I do admit that Prime Minister Wilson's Guild Hall speech is a good speech. I do admit that Ambassador Chester Bowles statement deserves our careful attention. But I do submit to these statesmen that misunderstandings would not have arisen in India if Prime Minister Wilson had been prepared to make such a speech a few months earlier, if Chester Bowles had been good enough to make that statement a few months before. I beg to submit that if these statements mean something more than mere exhortations, they are to be implemented. The embargo on India must be lifted. So long as there is an embargo on India and so long as other nations, in pursuance of the policies pursued by the United States and the United Kingdom, impose an embargo on India, India has no option but to believe that India, the aggrieved nation, is equated with Pakistan, an aggressor. The mere reiteration that the British frontiers are on the Himalayas does not mean much.

Sir, to win over Pakistan, it is suggested to have joint administration over Kashmir. Those who make such suggestions forget that if Pakistani statesmen had ever been prepared to have joint administration with India in certain matters, this sub-continent

would not have been partitioned. It must be remembered that the system of joint administration all over the world has miserably failed. The idea of joint defence on Kashmir also is an impracticable proposition because Kashmir today is faced with the possible aggression of China. A large part of the territory which belongs to the State of Jammu and Kashmir has been forcibly occupied.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: May I ask one question? Who has suggested, what you call, joint administration, and what does it actually mean?

PROF. M. B. LAL: I think the learned Member must be knowing that the Chairman of this House chose me to be a delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, and I visited certain places in Canada and the United States of America. A very distinguished Professor, older than myself in age, with sufficient experience of Burma and India gave that idea to me, and I feel that idea is in the mind of many statesmen even when they do not say so plainly.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: What does this joint administration mean?

PROF. M. B. LAL: He did not explain it to me. If it means joint defence, I only wish to say that it is not a practical proposition because Kashmir today is faced with Chinese aggression, and it is hardly to be expected that Pakistan would be prepared to shoulder with India the responsibility of defending Kashmir against China. That is what I wish to say.

Sir, it is often said that Kashmir is a symbol of secularism. I have somehow a serious objection to this phrase. I feel the entire country is to be an embodiment of secularism if secularism is to prevail in this country.

I feel that we have wasted 18 years so far as this particular problem is concerned. Secularism is necessary in

India, not because a part of India is mostly inhabited by Mussalmans who are otherwise in a minority in the whole country, secularism is necessary in India because India is inhabited by persons professing different faiths. I would say that secularism is the development of a secular civic culture and that the development of secular civic culture is necessary for progress in this country. Even if India had been inhabited only by the Hindus, even then secularism was necessary for the progress of India. Therefore, all possible attempts should be made to promote secular. Civic culture and secular, democratic spirit in this country.

As I pointed out in the beginning, I am sorry that sufficient attention is not paid to the problem of conflict between India and China. I do maintain that China is our enemy number one. Pakistan dared to commit aggression in August because somehow or other Pakistan tended to believe that when the conflict would develop, China would come to its aid and India would not be able to face at least the combined might of Pakistan and China.

I would therefore beg of the Foreign Minister and the Government to take due note of this particular fact also and to project our diplomacy in such a way that the world might be able to know properly that China is a great menace not only to our freedom and integrity but to the peace of the entire South East Asia as well as that of the whole world. We may remain non-aligned but as Pandit Nehru said, there is no non-alignment against aggression and, therefore, it is our duty to mobilise the public opinion of the world in a manner that we might be able to secure the greatest support, moral and material, against that great aggression which we will have to face one day. I do not wish to condemn Indian diplomats who are discharging their duties to the best of their abilities. I do not think it is proper for this House to name a particular diplomat and say that he is good or he is bad. It is for the Government to see.

I, however, feel that while our diplomats have projected their diplomacy to the grave Indo-Pakistan conflict with which we are faced to-day, much greater projection is needed. A lot of our time was wasted in projecting the world policy of India rather than India's own policy and India's own interests. This is all that I wish to say. I do not wish to take more time of this House.

SHRI D. B. DESAI (Maharashtra): We are discussing the foreign policy matters when we have to face our hostile borders. As the Prime Minister said, the peace which we are having on the borders is quite an unstable thing. There is a menace from Pakistan. There is at the same time the menacing attitude of China also. So in this context, when we consider our policy in regard to international events, we have to take into consideration the various attitudes of all the Big powers in the world. There is much talk about re-orientation of our foreign policy but re-orientation is not explaining or giving specific instances. So when we consider our foreign policy, it is said that non-alignment is the corner-stone of our foreign policy. As some Members have put it, non-alignment is a frame. The Government of India or the nation has to put content in this frame. For instance, non-alignment may mean friendship with everybody. Non-alignment may mean enmity with none. So this is the gap, namely, friendship with all and enmity with none. We have to cover it and sometimes we may go this way or that way. So in the present context, when we were attacked by Pakistan and Pakistan was supported by China, it was a case whether we should take the help from any other nation in the world and we tried for that but we have seen that the so-called bulwark of democracy, namely, England and America, could not come to our aid. On the contrary they exerted every pressure on us that we should have a moderate attitude or we should have surrendered to Pakistan but because of the wave of nationalism we

[Shri D. B. Desai.]

could not do it. None of the foreign powers also could pressurise us to go that way but the intention of the Big Powers, specially Great Britain and U.S.A., was that we should moderate our relations or that we should have friendship with Pakistan. This is the attitude taken by the U.K. and the U.S.A. These countries, for the last 18 years, have never hidden their displeasure about our policy of non-alignment. They have always advocated that India should be or the Indian Government should be a sure ally of the British and American dollars but the Indian Government and the people did not like it and could not dare to do it because foreign policy is always a reflection of our internal policy. India is a free country politically but still economically it is dependent for various matters on Great Britain and America. This dependence is increasing day by day and therefore we are always prone to be influenced by these Great Powers and we have always to surrender to these countries. Therefore, when we say non-aligned or about having an independent foreign policy, we have always to surrender our independence in political matters in certain cases as in the case of, say, bases or in the Afro-Asian comity. Take, for instance, the joint defence plan put before us some time back. We were hesitant. Now the British Government, in alliance with the American Government, have come forward to establish a military base in the Indian Ocean. We have just opposed it and we are not in a position to resist it or to resist it in such a way that it may not take place. It is not in our power to resist. So that is our independent position in the foreign policy matters.

So, when we say that we must have an independent foreign policy, we must first establish our political independence, our economic independence, our independence in all types of policies. So when talk of re-orientation taking place, I would say that we should not fix our policy matters or

decide our policy matters looking to the faces of the Great Powers. We have to fix our policy or decide our policy so that it is suitable to our Indian conditions. I may say that our foreign policy should be Indianised. Then automatically it must be in the interest of the people. So if we have to be independent, economically we must have our own industrial development, we must have our own agricultural development, we must have our own social development. In every field we must be independent. That is the point.

The second point is that when we have to deal with certain policy matters or problems, or when we want to have some approach regarding international events, other countries should be in a position to seek our help but in this position we have to consider whether we should go this way or that way. We have to consider whether we should side with America or whether we should side with Russia. So this is not the position. And in some cases always we have to look at the face of, say, a Russian diplomat, or an American diplomat, and decide about the policy. This should not be the case especially after the India-Pakistan conflict, when we have experienced that the foreign Governments may not be able to help us, because they decide their foreign policy in the interests of their own countries. So we have to be more vigilant regarding the policy of, say, non-alignment, or independent foreign policy. In that case I may suggest this. Now if we go for aid, the Prime Minister has just announced in Madras that he may visit the United States very soon, and the press reports which are coming from America and other countries point out that unless our Prime Minister goes to America, we may not be able to get the necessary food aid, so if this is the position, then it is just asking us to beg. This year especially we are facing an acute food shortage and automatically we have to ask for food from one country or another, and America is the only country which can supply us

food. This is the position no doubt, but does the United States think that we should go begging? And in that case does our Government go with this attitude that we have no other way but to get our food requirements from America and so we should do anything? And automatically, the corollary or the result is that again we have to balance our attitude with the Soviet Union. So this type of attitude taking a zig-zag course, or this riding on the horns of a dilemma, is not helpful to our foreign policy, and it may not help us also in our independent economic development. So we must first establish in our own country that we will develop our economy, we will develop our agriculture and we will develop our industry standing on our own legs. We must ask our industrialists in India, we must ask our agriculturists in India that we have to develop on our own strength. But this advice or the Government's request is not heeded by the industrialists in this country. That is a fact. So first the Government, if at all they have to follow an independent policy abroad, must look to the industrialists in this country, whether they are heeding the advice or the suggestion or the request of the Government. Because it is a sort of request, the Government is not in a position to compel the industrialists, the Government is not in a position to compel the blackmarketeers and the Government is not in a position even now to compel the people who have hidden black money. They have been requesting and they have been simply requesting them in the last three months to give gold, to give the black money with them, giving any type of concessions to the industrialists and black-money-people. Still it is very difficult to get them and there has hardly been any result worth mentioning. Only a small quantity of gold has been invested in the Gold Bonds, and even the Defence Loans have evoked very little response from the Industrial community. So, if this is the attitude of the industrial community in this country, it means that

the industrial community in India is influencing the Government that India should have friendship, firm friendship, with the United States. So the industrialists in this country want that India should be aligned with the United States and Great Britain, and have friendship with Pakistan. On the contrary, the people of India want India to be free, India to be independent of foreign influences, India to be completely free from all types of foreign domination. So this is the clash between the two interests, interests of the people and interests of the industrialists in this country. So the Government of India has to choose between these two, whether they are going to help our industrialists in aligning themselves with the United States and Great Britain, or are going to choose the road the people have asked for and the Government has guaranteed up till now. Now, especially after the India-Pakistan conflict, Government has guaranteed that India will have a self-reliant economy, that India will have a self-reliant defensive arrangement, that India will have a self-reliant political sovereignty. This is the guarantee, this is the assurance given by the Government of India to the people. So this is a peculiar problem which the nation will have to consider, or the Parliament will have to consider, and the Government of India must give a concrete answer. Otherwise it is going to mislead the people. We are giving slogans of independent economy, independent political line, independent foreign policy, but at the same time we are asking American industrialists, we are asking Indian Industrialists to co-operate or collaborate with them and establish our industry here. We are asking our peasantry to give their blood and increase food production, but at the same time we are prepared to give any type of concession to those who are just giving us food, wheat or something of that sort. So this is the crux of the problem, and if the Government of India comes forward with a clear answer to all this, that will have served the real purpose of

[Shri D. B. Desai.]

this foreign affairs debate, and that will help us, that will help the country and that will create a clear confidence in the public. This is all I have had to say.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, as on a previous occasion. Sir, I am again a residuary legatee of the debate that has taken place today. I hope, tomorrow morning I would be able to dwell on some of the points which I want to bring to the notice of the House in a much fuller manner. But with your permission. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to make one point straightway even now.

The House, to my mind, has not addressed itself to the crucial question of the day, namely what modes of action—not a change in policy—are required to enable us to build a self-reliant and independent defence, and a self-reliant and independent economy. These constitute, to my mind, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the real, solid, concrete basis of any independent foreign policy, and unless the House addresses itself to this task seriously and makes some concrete suggestions, I do not know whether we can look forward to a very comfortable time in future.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it appears to me that during the course of this debate the hon. Members have again not taken cognisance of a very important fact, that is, that the old equilibrium, both in the international and domestic spheres, had been disturbed to an extent. I do not lament this fact. In fact, the very process of progress requires the disturbance

of an old equilibrium and the creation of a new one. There is no particular virtue in a standstill or stability, and we have to go on disturbing old equilibria and creating new ones. But I would also like to add that thereby I do not want to suggest that this disturbance has taken place for the first time now. In fact even in the year 1962, when a major confrontation with China took place, there was a major disturbance of the equilibrium. But the whole question, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is whether we are going to be able to create, as we did in the past in the year 1962, a higher equilibrium, or whether we are going to settle down at a lower equilibrium.

Now when I was saying that the equilibrium both in the international and national spheres had been disturbed, I wanted to explain it at some length, so that the House might fully realise its implications.

Take, for example, the domestic sphere to begin with. How is the equilibrium going to be disturbed? You know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the Prime Minister had said during the course of the debate in the last Session that the country might have to be prepared for less of development and more of military expenditure.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Mishra, you might further elucidate the point tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 23rd November, 1965.