

[Shri O. V. Alagesan.]
ration and production to interested parties. A number of Companies and organisations from different countries registered themselves as bidders for rights in this area. India did not originally register itself for bidding, but subsequently in May 1964 decided to do so in cooperation with E.N.I. of Italy and Phillips Petroleum Company of U.S.A. The National Iranian Oil Company, acting on behalf of the Government of Iran, declared October 31, 1964 as the last date for receiving the bids and allowed O.N.G.C. to make a bid jointly with AGIP, which is a subsidiary unit of E.N.I., and Phillips, although O.N.G.C. had not registered itself for the purpose within the due date.

A joint bid of O.N.G.C., AGIP and Phillips was submitted on October 28, 1964. According to available information there were several other bidders who had offered much better terms than ONGC-AGIP-Phillips. The NIOC however reopened the bids and gave all bidders a chance of submitting fresh offers. Accordingly, ONGC-AGIP-Phillips made a revised bid for a larger number of structures and I am happy to say that our revised bid has been accepted by NIOC.

Under the terms of the agreement with AGIP and Phillips O.N.G.C. will be an equal partner with them and share equally in the cost of exploration and development. It will also obtain in equal share of the oil produced and have an equal voice in the management of operations. The entire seismic data of the off-shore area was obtained from NIOC at a cost of \$704 000 of which O.N.G.C. has paid one-third as its share. The total risk for the revised bid we have made involves an outlay estimated at a maximum of \$ 58 million of which our share will be one third.

All oil exploration even in the most prolific oil-bearing regions in the world carries a certain amount of risk. but our partners, who have both long

and varied experience in the field of oil exploration and production, are of the view that the structures for which we have bid are likely to contain large reserves of oil. I may add that we have arranged with another party to cover our entire risk money in case the area does not produce oil. O.N.G.C. will therefore incur hardly any expenditure if the structures prove barren. If on the other hand we strike oil, as we have every hope we shall we will pay to our insurer with interest the monies he is advancing and a small commission for covering the risk.

Sometime ago we have decided to collaborate with NIOC and AIOC in the establishment of a Refinery at Madras which is scheduled to come into operation in the latter half of 1967. This decision along with the acceptance by the Iranian authorities of our bid for exploration and production of oil in the off-shore areas of the Persian Gulf opens out a new chapter in the oil industry of India. Simultaneously it begins a new chapter of close economic collaboration with Iran with which country we have had friendly relations from pre-historic times. I would like to pay a special tribute to the interest that His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran and His Excellency. Dr. Mohd. Eghbal, Chairman of NIOC and a former Prime Minister of Iran, have taken in these negotiations. I am sure the House will join with me in wishing every success to this new chapter of collaboration between Iran and India and share my hope that this will lead to a much closer co-operation between our two countries in many fields.

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the Motion regarding the International Situation. Sardar Swaran Singh.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH):

Sir, I beg to move:

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

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Sir, I want to rise on a point of procedure. It has been the tradition here that the Prime Minister is always present. In fact, he has always led the debate on foreign affairs because he has been handling the portfolio. Since Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri has taken over, perhaps to relieve him of some of the burden, Sardar Swaran Singh has been handling the foreign portfolio. Yet, on a matter like this, we would like the Prime Minister to be present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is anything in that. The Prime Minister used to be present because he was also the Foreign Minister.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: As you have rightly pointed out, there is no point of order and if he . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I never said 'order'. I only talked of procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of procedure which is in addition to our normal points of order.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, the House might recall that on the 17th November, I made a statement on the floor of this House giving a resume of the important international events that had taken place during the six weeks' interval between the earlier October session when the international situation was discussed and the 17th of November. In that statement, I made reference to important events like the Cairo Conference relationship with Pakistan and the situation that

had developed as a result of the explosion of a nuclear device by China and also to the agreement with Ceylon about the future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon. It is not my intention, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to refer to these points and in the opening remarks I will confine myself mainly to bringing the information before the House upto date so that I might be able to devote greater time in the course of my reply after hon. Members have an opportunity to offer their comments about the international situation. The statement that I made earlier in a sense may be considered to be part of my opening remarks and it is not my intention to go over the same ground again.

Sir, after I made that statement, I visited the Soviet Union and was there for two days, on my way to New York for attending the Session of the United Nations General Assembly. During my stay there I had the opportunity of exchanging views and of having discussions with Mr. Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, and also with Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers. These discussions were very useful and in the course of these discussions not only matters of mutual interest between India and the Soviet Union were discussed but the international situation in its broad aspects—important aspects like world peace, disarmament and other important aspects—was also discussed. As a result of these discussions I found that there was a large volume of identity of views on major international questions. The Soviet Union's views about disarmament, about the desirability of lowering international tensions, about support for the concept of non-alignment, about the policy of peaceful co-existence were identical with our views. These are the important items in which there is identity of views between the views of the Soviet Government and of the Government of India. On matters of mutual interest between our two countries the Soviet Union con-

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

tinues to follow the policy of friendship and co-operation with India and their desire to increase the economic relationship both in the matter of trade and in the matter of association, co-operation and collaboration in the various industrial projects continues to be at the same level if not at a somewhat higher level.

Thereafter I went to the United Nations General Assembly where I spent about two weeks. Mr. Chairman, you would no doubt be aware that the United Nations General Assembly this year started under very peculiar circumstances. In fact, fears were entertained that the tensions that had arisen between the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, about the question of financing the peace-keeping operations were of such a nature that even the future of the organisation was threatened. On this issue there was a sharp cleavage of opinion. The United States view in this respect was that the expenditure that had been incurred by the United Nations for peace-keeping operations in Congo, Gaza and elsewhere was such to which contributions should be made by all countries irrespective of the stand that had taken at the time when these peace-keeping operations were undertaken. Whether a country was in favour of these peace-keeping operations or not, whether a country had supported or opposed the initiation of these peace-keeping operations, it was the contention of the United States that all countries should contribute to finance these operations. On the other hand the view of the Soviet Union was that such operations which had been undertaken not under the authority of the Security Council of the United Nations but by Resolutions of the General Assembly were in a sense unauthorised and as a consequence of that it was contended that no country could be compelled to contribute to the expenditure that was incurred for such

peace-keeping operations. This was the basic difference of opinion on the substance of the question.

Then again what was the effect of non-payment within the period of two years? According to the United States, non-payment would automatically result in forfeiture of the right of vote to the defaulters; on the other hand the Soviet Union's contention was that the whole operation being unauthorised there was no responsibility to pay and therefore non-payment did not affect the status of a country that had refused to pay. To refresh the memory, the House may kindly recall that the main question was examined by the World Court and the World Court had come to the conclusion and had given the opinion that the countries should contribute to this expenditure incurred for peace-keeping operations. The important question, however, at this stage was the effect of non-payment of dues by the Soviet Union. France also is a defaulter but they would have completed their two years' period of default in another two months or so. We had given a great deal of thought to this matter and we had come to this conclusion that, we ourselves having always contributed our share of these peace-keeping operations, countries should pay and it is desirable that they should pay. At the same time on the constitutional and juridical question after a great deal of examination we came to the conclusion that non-payment does not automatically deprive the country that has failed to pay of the right of vote in the United Nations and we had made our position clear in the working group where our permanent representative made a clear statement that mere non-payment does not result in automatic forfeiture of the right of vote. That is a matter which comes up again for consideration. I have clarified this position as there was some comment that our own position in this respect was not quite clear.

In this atmosphere the United Nations General Assembly met and

the delegates attended the session in an atmosphere of great tension and it was feared that if this matter was brought to a head and votes taken, irrespective of the results of the voting, the United Nations faced a real crisis and the future of the United Nations was itself in grave danger and doubt. I am happy, however, that the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, showed a spirit of accommodation and mutual understanding and neither of them appeared to be too keen to bring matters to a head and added to this was the effort made by the group of Afro-Asian countries and also the Secretary-General. It was the combined results of all these efforts as also the great spirit of mutual understanding which was shown by both the United States of America and the Soviet Union that the immediate crisis was averted. An important, and if I may add, ingenious device was thought of that the work could start and the United Nations General Assembly could undertake the transaction of such business which did not call for the exercise of the right of vote. And it was by acclamation that the President of the General Assembly was elected and in this respect the House will no doubt join with me in expressing our joy and happiness that a distinguished African has been elected for the first time as the President of the General Assembly. Mr. Alec Quaison-Sackey, the distinguished Ambassador from Ghana, has been elected as the President of the United Nations General Assembly, by a unanimous vote, by acclamation. By a unanimous vote another very significant event took place, that is, the admission of three new countries that have emerged into full Statehood, namely, Zambia, Malawi and Malta. All the three countries were admitted as full-fledged members of the United Nations. We have had very good relations with all these three countries and we have watched with great sympathy and with all possible support their movements for freedom from colonialism, and now

that these three countries have emerged as independent nations and as full-fledged members of the United Nations, our felicitations go to the people and Governments of these countries. We are looking forward to our close and friendly collaboration with these countries and we wish that they will play an important role in the world organisation. We will work in close cooperation and collaboration with these countries.

Work in the General Assembly has not really started in a business-like manner yet. Only the general statements have been made by the representatives or permanent delegates of various countries and the general debate is likely to continue even for some days more when the General Assembly reassembles sometime in January. Even the next date when the General Assembly meets after the Christmas recess has not yet been finalised. It may be either on the 4th or 11th, more likely the 11th, but no date has yet been finalised.

I took the opportunity of my presence there to have talk with the Foreign Ministers who had come there for the General Assembly session. Many of the Foreign Ministers had not attended the session, particularly those from the West European countries on account of their other commitments, but most of the African and Asian Foreign Ministers were there. I had a very useful discussion with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Dean Rusk, when matters of mutual interest to both countries were discussed and the international situation, particularly in relation to sensitive points in Asia and Africa was considered. As a result of this I had the satisfaction to learn that the United States also is anxious to create a situation whereby tension in these various sensitive areas is reduced. They are also keen that in areas where peace not only of those areas is uncertain, but international peace is also in jeopardy, steps should be taken in consonance with their general approach to

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

various intricate problems and steps should be taken to reduce the tension in those areas.

It was a healthy thing that came to my notice there and this was noticed by representatives of all countries. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union and the Secretary State, Mr. Dean Rusk, of the United States, had several meetings between themselves, between the two of them. They discussed very complicated and difficult questions about which there is a sharp difference of opinion between the two countries. There was willingness to meet and to talk and to find a solution not only to the immediate problem that faces the United Nations, namely, the question of contributions to the United Nations' peace-keeping operations, but also it is known that they talked about other important questions. The situation in Africa, in the particular context of the Congo situation, South-East Asia, disarmament, these were the points about which opinions were exchanged and there were press reports also, which were not speculative, in which the two leaders of the two great countries did give some inkling of the nature of the talks that were going on. This is a good development and this shows that there is willingness on the part of these two countries to have direct contacts and to make efforts to understand each other's viewpoint and to narrow down their differences as far as possible. This does not mean that the differences between the two countries have in any way been narrowed down or that every difficulty has been resolved. I am not suggesting that. But the fact that they met and talked and discussed these matters does show that the process of *detente* is likely to receive greater fillip as a result of these talks and it is hoped that this process will continue with good results.

I myself had an opportunity of exchanging views with the distinguished Foreign Ministers of many

countries of Asia and Africa, I think that on this occasion I met as many as—24 or 25 Foreign Ministers and we discussed matters which were of great importance for the areas concerned, for the parts of the world to which these distinguished leaders belonged, also to our bilateral relations between our two countries. In this respect although this was not a very easy work from the point of view of both time and energy, I am happy that it did give an occasion for me to have important discussions and thus enabled me to understand their way of thinking on various important matters.

I would like, while talking about the United Nations, to clarify one matter about which there has been a lot of speculation in the press. This came to my notice when I was away to New York. This is about India's attitude or India's stand on the question of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. I would like to say very clearly that our original stand remains, according to which we had supported the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. In fact, it is not a question of admission. It is a question of representation, as to which Government represents the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Whether it is the Taiwan regime or the Formosa regime or the Government, that is, the People's Republic of China our stand has been that the People's Republic of China is entitled to have its representative in the United Nations. Our stand in this respect continues and I am not happy that there should have been an unnecessary controversy and doubts raised on this question, which unnecessarily have embarrassed us in various respects. It is true that the attitude of China what it is. Not only on account of our conflict, but also in several other respects, their general posture is not that of peace or of co-operation, but it is that of war and belligerence. That unfortunately continues. But its admission

to the United Nations should be considered not always on this view, as to whether we like a particular country or whether we like or dislike their policies, but on the principle of universality which we have always advocated and also to ensure that the country of the size of China, with their population, should be in the United Nations, so that they are amenable to international discipline, they influence others and they also, in turn, are influenced by the atmosphere that prevails. That is the view that we have always taken and we continue to take this view, and therefore there need not be any controversy on that score.

Sir, the most important question before the world today is that of war and peace, whether the world is progressing towards peace and what should be done to generate that atmosphere and climate of peace. This is the most important issue that faces the world today. In this respect we have always attached the highest importance to disarmament. Our representatives in the United Nations year after year have taken a very clear stand on this all-important issue. In the General Assembly, in the various Committees, in the Disarmament Committee, we have taken steps very patiently but very consistently to ensure that the world moves towards disarmament. The alternative to disarmament, the alternative to peace, is disaster and conflagration, which certainly is not in the interests of the world. It certainly is not in our interest either. On this question of disarmament we have taken a very clear stand, and this time again it is our intention to pursue this line which we have persistently pursued for several years. We however feel that disarmament has to be approached from an overall angle. It is a difficult and complicated problem which cannot be oversimplified, and to pick up one aspect in one sphere might lead to results which may not be quite appropriate and may not be quite desirable either. For instance, if we talk only

of, say, nuclear disarmament, the countries who have got large conventional armies or conventional armaments may get an edge over others, if there is a success in the nuclear field. I do not suggest that we should not continue our efforts on nuclear disarmament. We should continue those efforts, but let this be a co-ordinated approach and let no country by just putting across a propagandist posture get away with this impression that they have put really peaceful proposals before the world. We attach importance to this problem from an overall angle and might not be misled by merely propagandist suggestions that are made from time to time with a view to stealing advantage over others by stressing the importance of disarmament in one or the other sphere. It is important therefore to keep that aspect always in front of us. In this connection there is the lead given by the Cairo Conference where they—the non-aligned nations—made a call to all countries who have not subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty to subscribe to it, calling upon all countries who have the nuclear weapons or devices not to give them to others, not to give possession or control to others; also a determination by those countries who have not got the nuclear devices not to have them or not to possess them—these are the three important aspects of the Cairo declaration. There are, I am fully conscious of the fact, grave difficulties and very real difficulties in the way of persuading all countries to adopt this code, to subscribe fully and completely to this, but the objective is desirable and we should continue to direct all our efforts to achieve this. Several countries who have not subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty should subscribe to the Test Ban Treaty, and the scope of the Moscow Test Ban Treaty should be amplified to cover the underground tests also. The importance of these things should not be underrated. On the one hand we are hoping that the world would move towards disarmament. If on the other hand the

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

countries continued to replenish their arsenals by adding to this stock of deadly weapons and also go on exploding the devices, both in the open and underground, then surely this is not consistent with the avowed intention put across by these countries that they are thinking in terms of disarmament. It is therefore necessary that as a first step all those countries who have not yet subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty should subscribe to it. As I said in my statement on the 17th, it is unfortunate that notwithstanding this overwhelming opinion China in flagrant defiance of this opinion exploded a nuclear device—to which I made a reference in the statement that I made on the 17th of November—and in that respect it is a definite setback to the forces of peace, forces of disarmament and the steps that the world was patiently taking for lowering tension, and to that extent the reaction even in other countries is also similar, namely, that this is a step which is definitely a step in the wrong direction and has increased the danger of proliferation and danger of conflict, and therefore this is a very serious matter of which the world should take note.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): What about France?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: About France our attitude is quite clear. We have always said that the attitude of France in not having subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty is absolutely incorrect and wrong, and when they exploded their device in the Sahara, in the United Nations we supported the resolution that expressed strong disapproval of the explosion by France of their nuclear device.

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): Is it a device or a bomb?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Bomb is also a device

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Let us not minimise it.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not at all minimise this, and if this expression nuclear device is something which is always used, it is an accepted expression and it is not minimising or maximising. This is the normal expression that is used for this type. When nuclear energy is used for non-peaceful purposes, then it is called a nuclear device. A bomb is something less dangerous than a nuclear device, if I may use that expression. I know that his English is much stronger than mine, but probably in these technical expressions I have an edge over him, and particularly these matters are scientific and not just literary. I was mentioning that this matter is a very serious matter and we take very serious note of this, and this is a question which has been engaging the attention of the Government of India, and our Prime Minister during his last visit to London did pose this problem before the nuclear powers of the world. His poser is of great importance and significance. Here is a situation where the world is anxious for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, nuclear devices. Peaceful uses of nuclear energy is the direction in which the world should move. It is, therefore, a matter of grave concern for the world and also it is a matter of importance that the principal nuclear powers—the Soviet Union and the United States of America—should take note of this situation and they should find some answer to the situation that has been developed by new countries coming into possession of nuclear devices. Therefore, the non-nuclear world should have the assurance, should have the satisfaction, should have the sense of security and safety that by their adherence to the policy of non-proliferation they do not expose themselves to the danger that is inherent in the proliferation of nuclear weapons either by their development, or by nuclear powers passing control to other countries. This matter has already started being looked into seriously by the powers of the world.

Although it is too early yet to say if any concrete result out of this is likely to come out, we have to see this in relation to the general approach of disarmament and non-proliferation. This posture is in keeping with our general approach to disarmament and non-proliferation and we should view it in that context. We should not regard this as a nuclear shield as has been wrongly described in a press conference. We are not asking for any nuclear shield from any particular country. We are posing a problem before the main nuclear powers if they want non-proliferation, if they want that other countries should not develop their own weapons. It is for them to devise some method of reassuring the countries who do not possess the nuclear weapons, that they should not feel insecure and unsafe in this situation.

Sir, I said something in my statement on the 17th November about our relations with Pakistan. It is unfortunate that the Pakistan Government asked for the postponement of the Home Ministers' Conference. We were hoping that the two Home Ministers would meet and would be able to settle some of the important matters which had exercised the minds of all of us here in this country and which were resulting in this unfortunate situation with which we are faced, of a large number of Hindus coming out from East Pakistan, and even now their flow into India continues unabated.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh): Are there only Hindus who are coming out?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Pathak is quite right, "Non-Muslims" would be a better expression because Christians also have been pushed out from there. Buddhists have been pushed out. Tribals, who probably do not know any religion but who do not happen to be Muslims of the type that perhaps are welcomed in Pakistan all these people are being pushed out. It is really a very sad situation.

two Home Ministers would meet and would try to find some solution of this vexed problem so that there may be an abatement of migration of non-Muslims from East Pakistan.

Sir, there was also a meeting at official level to work out some agreement so that the tense situation at the cease-fire line, where a large number of incidents had taken place, resulting in the loss of innocent lives, could ease. We were hoping that these meetings between the Home Ministers and also at official level to discuss or to eliminate the incidents at the cease-fire line, that would result in some satisfactory solution of these vexed problems and this would improve the atmosphere so that all differences might be discussed in a better atmosphere. But unfortunately all these hopes have been falsified. And not only this, but unfortunately the general tone and general trend of propaganda in Pakistan is of a very virulent type. All types of allegations, incorrect allegations,—unfounded allegations, have been levelled; such as, we are siding with one or the other parties who are in the field in their election. This unfortunately is the state of affairs. But we should continue to hope that this may be an unfortunate or completely unjustified posture which has been adopted during the election, and once the elections are over they would settle down so that we can again resume the talks with them. After all, we are neighbours, and our efforts should continue to improve relations with our neighbours to the best of our capacity. But it is to be remembered that there cannot be any satisfactory solution unless there is a reciprocity of approach on the Pakistan side. Whatever our good intentions or howsoever well-intentioned we may be, they may not yield any result unless there is reciprocal response from the Pakistan Government.

Sir, there are only one or two things more which I would like to mention in my opening speech. The situation in Africa particularly in the Congo, is there. As you know, there is a very that has been going on in

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]
the Security Council over the Congo. The situation there is really bad and the general feelings amongst the majority of the African countries is very strong on this issue. We ourselves have always taken the view that this is a quarrel between the Congolese and the Congolese where the Congolese unfortunately are fighting the Congolese, and there should be no interference from outside in any form. We are strongly in favour of the elimination of all outside interference and withdrawal of all foreign troops so that the solution of the vexed problem of the Congo, of this strife-torn Congo is found in the African way. Sir, the Organisation of African Unity have been devoting a great deal of energy for solving this vexed problem. They have constituted a Conciliation Commission under the distinguished presidency of President Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya and we have always supported their efforts to find a satisfactory solution. But this is possible only if the outside interference from all sides is eliminated and there is a national reconciliation, the objective that the Organisation of African Unity have put before them. There cannot be a military solution. Any military intervention really accentuates the situation, exasperates it and does not lead towards a solution. We have always been of that view, namely, that there should be no interference from outside and the Organisation of African Unity should work out a satisfactory solution.

Sir, South-East Asia is another very difficult and sensitive area. The situation in South Vietnam, where there is this political instability, has added to their difficulties of an international character. There also there is this allegation on either side that there is interference on the side of South Vietnam. There is this allegation that North Vietnam and the Chinese continue to support the forces of subversion and, therefore, this constant trouble continues in South Vietnam. On behalf of North Vietnam there is this allegation that there is American interference and the Americans

are there in a big way. For the solution of the Vietnam situation, the sooner it is realised that a military solution of this vexed problem and of this difficult problem is not possible the better it will be for Vietnam and for South East Asia. A military solution is not possible and it only mounts tension, increases the tension. Therefore we have always advocated the convening of a Conference of the Geneva type, a Geneva-type Conference which could pick up from the point at which the last Conference ended their labours so that we could find out where the parties have slipped back. It is interesting that the basic principles that there evolved as a result of that Conference are not contradicted by the parties concerned. The allegations are that the spirit of that Agreement was not implemented. The difference is on implementation, not on the basic approach that was evolved as a result of that Conference. Therefore there is hope that if the Conference is reconvened and the matter is examined dispassionately and if all the parties concerned are there, it is possible to find a solution on political lines and ultimately in South East Asia the solution lies in eliminating these outside influences, these extraneous influences and of neutralising these various countries in South East Asia.

In Laos the situation continues to be uneasy, though it is not that disquieting as it in Vietnam. The two Princes held some talks in Paris but the results of those talks were not very fruitful. There also there is general agreement that a Geneva-type Conference might pave the way for solving this difficult position in Laos.

As for Cambodia, as you know, the U.S.A. and Cambodia were conducting bilateral talks in Delhi. Unfortunately progress has not been made and they have said that they are not making much progress. Let us hope that after reporting to their respective Governments these talks are resumed either here or elsewhere because it is easy to snap the relationship, it is

easy to break the relationship, but whatever may be the differences, our effort has always been to persuade the two sides not to break diplomatic relations but to continue their efforts for resolving whatever may be their differences.

The year 1965, Mr. Chairman, is the International Co-operation Year for the United Nations. Our late Prime Minister when he attended the United National General Assembly, had made an appeal that the world which appears to be torn by strife and conflict is still continuing and that there are large areas of co-operation and understanding and if we pick up the areas of understanding and co-operation and not be too much overwhelmed by the conflict that prevails in the world, then that might be a constructive way of lowering tensions in the world. There is a unanimous Resolution of the U.N. General Assembly that the 20th year of the U.N. should be celebrated as the International Co-operation Year and we in India owe a special responsibility, we have special interest in this and I hope that the world, as a result of the spirit of International Co-operation Year, would move from the present tenseness and present conflict to one of Co-operation.

On Ceylon the statement that I made on 17th November gives the basic information about the Agreement. To bring this matter up to date, I would say that our Commonwealth Secretary visited Colombo and there were further talks and a joint statement was issued at the end of those talks about the establishment of procedures for implementing the agreements that had been arrived at.

Mr. Chairman, in these remarks, I have ventured to bring up to date the various events and am looking forward to the view-points of the Members. The international situation is at the moment very complicated and there are large areas of tensions. There is great conflict in the world but at the same time we have

to patiently work for peace, for disarmament, for ending colonialism and we have to bend our effort through a co-operative effort so that these may become a passing phase and the world may emerge as a result of the patient efforts of the world towards peace and towards amity rather than conflict and confrontation. Thank you.

The question was proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are eleven amendments. They may be moved at this stage. No speeches need be made but when they take part in the debate, they can speak about the amendments.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move:

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

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should inform the Government of the United Kingdom of the feelings of deep concern of the Indian public at the attempted enforcement of a constitutional solution in British Guiana which would lead to the break-up of the multi-racial society in the Colony and isolate the community of Indian origin from other communists and force it to demand the partition of British Guiana."

I also moved:

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

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that while the participation of India in the conferences of non-aligned nations is useful, Government should take steps to impress upon the conferences the need for recognising the threat of China to the independent nations of Asia and also to conform to the recognised international procedure of accepting without challenge the credentials of representatives duly authorised by their Government,

[Shri A. D. Mani]

for participation in the work of the conferences.' "

I also move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that while the decision of Government not to start the manufacture of nuclear weapons is welcome for the present, Government should at the same time negotiate with nuclear powers like the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union treaties of assistance, which will ensure that these powers would give military assistance to India in the event of her being threatened by a nuclear attack or subjected to a nuclear attack by an unfriendly power.' "

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

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

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

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should have taken a more positive attitude in condemning the armed intervention by white mercenaries of Belgium and asked for a guarantee by the United Nations Organisation that no foreign troops shall be allowed in the Congo.' "

I also move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should have proposed to all the anti-colonial Governments of African countries to convene a Conference to discuss ways and means of preventing new colonialism from taking roots in African countries.' "

I also move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should have ascertained the views of Indians in Ceylon before concluding a pact with the Government of Ceylon to transfer them, as such transfer involves human rights.' "

I also move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should have taken more effective steps to establish better friendly relations with countries of South East Asia.' "

I also move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should have taken more rigorous steps to counteract the cloak and dagger policy of the Pakistan Government.' "

I also move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the proposal to form the multilateral nuclear force by the United Kingdom Government only

adds to increase the tension in the world and hence the Government of India should impress upon all the Governments that the only way to peace is total and complete disarmament.' "

The questions were proposed.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Sir, may I suggest that the debate may be carried over till tomorrow? The Foreign Minister has taken about an hour and we would also like to take some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Each one of you would like to take one hour?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We do not want one hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the suggestion. We shall sit through lunch hour to-day. The Minister will reply first thing tomorrow when we begin the discussions.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We can sit till seven this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can sit till eight.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA (Bihar): Can we not stay the other business tomorrow by one hour?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact I am going out of my way in this extension. Five hours were allotted and I am giving you six hours and I will give you another time tomorrow. I cannot go on extending. People should either make up their minds not to speak on certain things and speak on others or speak in brief. There is a list of thirty or thirty-five Members on my list and others are coming in.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): We can adjourn for lunch for one hour and instead of adjourning at five, we can adjourn at six.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should sit through lunch and then I will see what I have to do. Mr. Patel.

1 P.M.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened patiently to the speech of the hon. Minister. I am afraid the impression that I have gathered in my mind that he is confused has not been cleared by his speech. He began the confusion by making a point of procedure that I raised into a point of order. I was pointing out to a tradition in this House followed for so many years, namely, that the Prime Minister always piloted the Motion on Foreign Affairs. It is true that because of the Prime Minister's health he has thought it fit to ask Sardar Swaran Singh to take over the portfolio of foreign affairs. But I do believe that this is a very important portfolio, and the role that India is playing in the affairs of the world is also important, particularly after we saw the report of the first speech that the Prime Minister made abroad, at Cairo. Sir, the hon. the Speaker was taking a delegation of Parliament Members to Europe and he had been kind enough to invite me. We passed through Cairo that night, after the first speech of the Prime Minister. It made such a good effect everywhere. I thought we were to see very good times. It is unfortunate that he has not been able to continue to have good health, but his first speech certainly made a good impression. I had the opportunity of going to Europe with the hon. the Speaker and see some of the "sensitive spots"—the words the hon. Minister used. I think he is quite right. I was hesitating to use "hot spots"; we are trying to cool them off, but they are sensitive spots. I had the opportunity of going right up to the Berlin Wall to sense the feelings of the people of Germany, as to how they feel about it. Then it was that important events that shook the world took place, just when we were in Germany. On the third day of our visit

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

we got the news of the British election result. That was a surprise to many. To many it was welcome news. People like me welcome the Labour Party in England coming back to power, because we still remember with gratitude the quality which is again on the opposition side. We remember with gratitude that it was the Labour Government in England that took the initiative and cut the Gordian knot and resolved to grant independence to India, and therefore we were more happy to go to London at that time. I will not go into what happened in London. Perhaps I will get an opportunity. If this House does not sit too late, the Indian Parliamentary Group has asked me to speak in the Hall, when I will relate some of my experiences. But I do not know how far that will succeed. The visit to Europe, and the delegation's work being over, on my own, Sir, I visited Israel for two days. That is also a trouble spot. I do not know why our Government is so chary about Israel. The Minister for External Affairs just enunciated the principle of universality. What about the principle of universality in the case of Israel, Mr. Minister? And what about the same principle in the case of Taiwan? I was saying that the first news we got in Germany was of the British election. The second news we got was of the dismissal of Mr. Khrushchev, and you can understand how the people of Germany felt when we were there. As I said, we went right up to the Berlin Wall in a temperature of minus three degrees. Even then we saw people moving about freely, and the very obvious difference, when you stood up to look over on the other side, whether it was a fence or whether it was an open road or whether it was through a building, was that in that cold weather people were bustling busily going about in West Berlin. On the other side of the Wall it was completely deserted and dreary. That is the difference between the two worlds

that we saw there. I do not know whether this principle of universality could not be applied in the case of Israel also where, as I said, I went, because there also it was something similar. By bringing water through a pipe-line of 150 miles Israel has turned deserts into blooming fields. Their production has risen high. We have many things to learn from them. I do not know whether our fears of displeasing the Arab nations are completely justified in this respect, because there are other countries, smaller countries, even like Ceylon, or many others, who have recognised Israel, and they have good relations with Russia. Why should we not? Many of the Arab countries have recognised them. Many of the African countries have recognised them, and recognising a country or having diplomatic relations with it, I do not think, necessarily means that we are antagonistic to the aspirations of the Arab nations.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: We have also recognised Israel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: No.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON): We have recognised Israel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: We do not have their ambassador in Delhi.

SHRI ABID ALI (Maharashtra): There is the Consul.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: That Consul you have because there are a large number of Indian citizens who go to Israel and come back. Then there are a large number of Indian citizens who go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and they are required to get visas; it is for their convenience. But you are denying diplomatic relations between these two countries. This, I think, is not a

right policy; it is not a right line to take particularly after I listened to the principles enunciated by the Foreign Minister. After returning from the visit to Europe I was wanting to go to the meeting of the anti-Communist League at Taiwan. I had gone to Taiwan a few months earlier. It was only Peking that had protested, and even in Europe, when I was introduced to some people, to some friends, by the Speaker, they said, "Oh, this is Mr. Patel who had gone to Taiwan a few months ago." They had heard of the loud protests from Peking about the visit of some Members of the Indian Parliament there. We have always made it clear, let me say so, that during our visit, all of us, that we were non-official Members, that we did not belong to the official party but were certainly Members of Parliament and that we would urge our point of view on our Government. We had never said anything that was derogatory either to our Government or to our country. In a democracy it is open to Members to criticise a Government, to say that we do not agree with a certain type of policy of the Government. When I was in Taiwan there was a delegate from France, who made a vigorous speech, if you please it was a lady, denouncing the policy that was being followed by General de Gaulle. And this happens in all countries, and we should not get so shy and touchy about it.

SRI T. V. ANANDAN (Madras):
Not outside the boundaries of our country.

SRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
Certainly; if other people in other democratic countries can do it, let us get out of these small narrow insular boundaries; if you believe in humanity, if you believe in the principle of one world, you have to get out of the narrow principle of the boundary of a country and of the communist idea of trying to regiment even the thinking of everybody, which is where

we have gone wrong. Sir, I want to say that this Government has gone wrong since it was influenced by Mr. Krishna Menon, who tried to regiment the whole thinking of the Government, took it the wrong way including the defence of the country, the production of the country, and the political policy and the foreign policy of the Government. Therefore we are in this soup today. Had it not been for him we would have taken a more reasonable attitude. After all, why do we not recognise Taiwan? We do not recognise it because it will offend Chou and Mao. But what have they done? They are the aggressors. When Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek was fighting for freedom along with the other allies for the freedom of the world, he was our ally too. The Communists bade their time till he was completely exhausted after the war and then they raised their head and drove him out. But look at the difference between these two people. Sir, we have been generous to people whom we considered our enemies. I am very glad, because that befits a people who have the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi. When the question of reparation from Japan came up, we said we would not take any. But I would like to point out how great and generous was this great General. Look at the greatness of his heart. He went even further. When he received the sword of surrender from Japan, he was asked, "What is your wish?" He said, "We do not want to humiliate any one of your Generals." "Then what about the Emperor?" "That is a thing," he said, "for the people of Japan to decide. We do not want to dictate to the people of Japan." And he went even further, Sir. He allowed every retreating soldier, when he was leaving China, leaving the mainland and Taiwan, to take with him 30 kilograms of rice, because there was nothing to eat in Japan. That is how he treated a surrendering army, that is the generosity that he showed. He did not say, "Put them to death or take them as slaves or put them all

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

in concentration camps so that we can build our factories on their labour, on their sweat and their blood." That is the difference between freedom and communism. It is unfortunate that under fifteen years of the Nehru-dominated regime and with Mr. Krishna Menon, we have ceased to recognise this. We have forgotten this and in this hour when we are still debating and talking about freedom, we do not recognise this very great generosity of this act of this General. We do not recognise it even after China had invaded our land and when we were caught napping and when the flower of our Army has been lost without even proper equipment, without snow-boots, without ammunition, and all for one reason, for the friendship of the Communists. We asked the Prime Minister several times on the floor of this House, and I had asked the questions, "Are you aware that they are building roads in China on our borders? Do you know that they are building roads to the north of the Himalayas?" But the Nelson eye, if I may use that expression, was turned to this. I do not know if there was any Nelson here, but the Prime Minister refused to hear the warnings from this side of the House and from many friends. He was warned that a very dangerous situation was there and now we pay for it. Now, is the same policy to continue? I was hoping that under Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri things would improve and his speech the other day, a few days back in the Lok Sabha during the foreign affairs' debate there gave me some hope. But it is reported that in his speech to the Congress Party he was saying that what he said was of course, something that would come about if it had the approval of Russia also. Sir, I do not understand it. I do not know whether that report is true or not. But is our policy something that has always to be with the approval of Russia? Is not the interest of our country going to stand first and above all others? Is not the

guiding principle of this country the one enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi? Is not that going to be our guiding principle? Is pleasing the Communists only going to be our guiding principle? Certainly, Sir, Mr. Khrushchev did great service to the world by agreeing to the atomic test ban treaty. But are we going to be tied down to a thing just for one reason, namely to have his assent to everything?

Sir, I am, I was, I may say, and still I am, unhappy that the Foreign Affairs Minister tried to prevent me from going to Taiwan. Why did he do that? What were the resolutions passed at the conference there? I would like to say that they are very similar, to the resolutions passed by the United Nations. I will not bother the House with all the resolutions passed at that conference. I think here is a resolution which will please many and you can see whether it is fair or not. This is the resolution urging the repatriation of the Arab refugees in Palestine. This certainly will hearten the hearts of the Arab countries. It reads as follows:

"Recognizing that Communist infiltration and propaganda is a serious problem among Arab refugees in Palestine;

Noting that the United Nations has urged the repatriation of refugees to their homeland;

Suggesting that such repatriation will serve the ends of justice, world peace, stability, and human rights;
Resolves:

(1) To request the United Nations to seek the implementation of resolutions concerning the repatriation of Arab refugees in Palestine."

Does Sardar Swaran Singh object to this resolution?

Then there is the resolution supporting India in resisting the Chinese Communist aggression. It says:

Noting that the Chinese Communist regime, after its earlier military occupation of Tibet and invasions of India in 1961 and 1962, has replenished its military supplies and concentrated its armed forces to step up aggression and that, following the recent explosion of a nuclear device, has posed a greater threat to India.

Considering that the Indian Communists with the support of their Chinese counterparts exploited the unrest of the Indian people at a time of food shortage to start a large-scale anti-government demonstration with a view to subverting the Indian Government;

Resolves:

(1) to give its sympathetic support to the Indian Government and people for their courage in fighting against the Chinese Communists and suppressing the Indian Communists;

(2) To urge the free nations to extend moral and material support to India in fighting Chinese Communist aggression and subversion;

(3) To urge the free nations, especially the non-Communist nations of Asia, to watch closely the massive concentration of military forces on the Indian border and to take effective action to repulse this renewed threat of invasion;

(4) To urge the Indian Government to sever diplomatic relations with the Peking regime."

This is something which any Government, any self-respecting Government, would have done when faced with aggression. This should have been the line of the Government of India, especially when there was this Chinese aggression.

Then there is the resolution condemning the Chinese atomic explosion. It says:

"(1) To urge freedom and peace-loving countries and peoples to condemn the Chinese Communist atomic explosion and to oppose further tests in conformity with the international test ban treaty;

(2) To support the clear-cut stand taken by the United States and other countries that have refused to be blackmailed into accepting the Chinese Communist call for convening of a nuclear summit conference;

(3) To urge the United States to help the free Asian nations set up a mutual security organisation in Asia and the Pacific region without delay to cope with the threat of atomic war that has been stirred up by the Chinese Communists;

(4) To urge all freedom-loving nations to give positive support to the Republic of China in launching counter-attack against the Chinese mainland so as to destroy the Chinese Communist regime and eliminate the threat of nuclear weapon and the peril to free peoples".

Perhaps Sardar Swaran Singh would not like the last part of it. But you see the kind of resolutions passed there. Here is one more. It says:

"Viewing with great regret the closer relationship that has recently developed between Pakistan and the Chinese Communist regime;

Suggesting that as a loyal member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, Pakistan should be an advocate and an ally of free Asia, and therefore should have no ties with the enemy;

To call upon the Government of Pakistan to break off relations with the Chinese Communists and....".

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa): You are reading from file after file. What did the Taiwan Government say when 14,000 square miles of our territory was occupied by China?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: May I request the hon. Member to behave, Sir. I am only pointing out the nature of the resolutions that were passed (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The hon. Member is not yielding. You proceed.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I was urging Sardar Swaran Singh to see if this is not something that is reasonable, something supporting our own stand? Then why try to interfere with the freedom of the people, with the freedom of Members, the freedom of movement of Members, without even understanding things? I think, Sardar Swaran Singh suffered from confusion of thought. He had a confused mind. He should have known clearly and he is the Foreign Minister of the country and he should have been sufficiently well informed about this conference and what was going to happen there. Sardar Swaran Singh, I think, has shown sufficient confusion of thought that the Government should reconsider its position. Government have got many able people in the Party. There is Mrs. Pandit whose experience in dealing with the international situation, in international conferences . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): On a point of order, Sir. This is very unfair and unkind that he should name people and . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You need not lecture to me, Mr. Akbar Ali. You can sit down. I am not yielding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot ask him to sit down.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: What kind of thing is this Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him proceed.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am entitled to say that so and so would make a much better Foreign Minister particularly when it is in the interests of India.

Sir, I would also like to point out that during my visit and tour of Korea, I had occasion to go right up to Pan Mun Jan where I saw the Conference as usual meeting at 10-30 in the morning and shouting at each other. Each side had its own loud speaker, the American loud speaker or what is made in the free world and the Russian loud speaker and each side read its script in its own language and the only point of agreement was, "We meet tomorrow at 10-30". I had occasion to observe that; I mentioned this as part of my observation. I reached there just in time for the opening of a Freedom Centre in Korea. After the liberation of South Korea, in memory of the nations that had supported Korea, they opened a Freedom Centre to which Governments of several countries contributed, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Commonwealth of Belgium, Dominion of Canada, Republic of Columbia, Ethiopian Empire, the French Republic, the Kingdom of the Hellenes, the Great Duchy of Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Phillipines, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, etc., but I am sorry to say that there is no mention of India. I know that our Government did send medical supplies for which grateful references were made but I am not satisfied. When such an international event is taking place in memory of such an international event surely our Government which has been spending so much of money on so many other things could very well have spent something in support of a cause of this type. One more thing emerges in this connection in which, to my mind, the Government has failed. When I was in Taiwan I

was shown the spot where the plane carrying Subhas Chandra Bose is supposed to have crashed. There is no memorial there because the Government of India will not ask Taiwan. We have no diplomatic relations. No proper enquiry has been made as to where this spot is, whether that is the real spot or not. What a serious situation this is? Even in honouring a national hero like Subhas Chandra Bose we are allowing this sort of untouchability to come into our foreign policy. Sir, I think our foreign policy is not clear. We are suffering from what I might call, if you permit me, Sir, the hangover of the Nehru regime. It is time that we got over it, we cleared our mind and started tackling our foreign policy independent of various pressures that might come. The suggestion that I made, I made in all seriousness thinking that such a person would be the only person who would be able to circumvent the pressures inside and outside the Party that we see. This would lead to better relations not only with the countries that we do not recognise but really with the world. If we put ourselves right with every country, big or small, we will rise, the reputation of India will rise all over the world. It is not by pleasing large countries, it is not by pleasing strong countries that we can build up our reputation. Therefore, Sir, I would urge the Government to reconsider some of its failings in the light of past experience, learn from the experiences of the past and correct its policies.

Sir, one word more and I have done. Indians had acquired respect all over the world, particularly in the colonised world, in the dominions of England, France, etc. The Indians were respected and people used to say, "You come from the land of Gandhiji." Sir, ten years ago I had occasion to go to Zanzibar, East Africa, Kenya. The Sultan sent word, even though he was virtually a British prisoner, that he would be glad to meet me. I went to him, had a nice talk with him. He called all his friends and said, "We

are in the same boat and we want to get rid of this". What is the situation today? Because of our defeat in the Himalayas, very largely due to our wrong foreign policy, nobody looks at us. We are being kicked out ignominiously from the African countries, from Burma which was part of our country till yesterday, from Ceylon which was part of our country till yesterday. Let me here say that I heartily disapprove of the talks that have been going on with Ceylon and the terms of the agreement that had been arrived at. How is it that we will take back so many people from Ceylon? What will they do? We already complain of overpopulation, we already complain of unemployment. To that also I have got something to say but at present I am on the position of Indians who are in these overseas countries. I do not name them. What is their situation? What happened in Zanzibar a few months ago? Even though the Minister denied it, people have come back as refugees very nearly in the same condition as the refugees coming back from East Pakistan, with hardly anything. Perhaps they were able to save their clothes or a few personal belongings. Why are they able to do this to the Indians? Whatever we may say, our prestige is at a very low ebb in all those countries. It is good that a person like Jomo Kenyatta has been influenced by the writings of Gandhiji that he has not acquired bitterness which would normally have come, and just as our Government and our people have shed bitterness towards the British, he has also shed his bitterness and has asked his people to restrain themselves and, therefore, Indians in Kenya are a little better off. If the holocaust comes about, what will happen to our people? It is only for this reason, I am sorry to say that our foreign policy is completely wrong. See what is happening to Indians all over the world. In Fiji, in Zanzibar, in Africa, in Ceylon and in Burma, worst of all. People are coming back as paupers, people who

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]
 had contributed their wealth, their sweat and their labour for the development of those countries. It is a very very sad commentary. While we were in England with the Speaker we saw an acute shortage of labour there. I know that many years ago an enterprising businessman of Surat took three plane loads of fitters to England. They are doing well there, earning ten, eleven or fifteen pounds sterling a week and sending five pounds home but somehow, somebody saw them. They were unable to talk English or perhaps they had not learnt to dress in the English way. Somebody saw them and said, "Are the Indians like this?" And so, the Prime Minister or somebody whispered a word to Mr. Morarji Desai, whether it was the Prime Minister or somebody from the High Commissioner's office, I do not know, and all migration from India was stopped. When we stopped this, being short of labour, they got a large number of people from Jamaica, ten thousand Negroes were taken. England is short of labour and so they are taking labour today from all over the world. The same is the case with Germany. Why is our Government following this policy? When we have got a surplus population, when we have got intelligent people who are welcome to work all over the world why should we follow this policy? By going to countries like England and Germany, these people are able to provide for themselves. They are able to relieve our population problem. They acquire better education, their children learn to be better, they get the technical knowledge that we lack so much. Why is our Government following this policy? Our foreign missions have been completely following a misdirected policy. Their only policy was the personal prize of the Late Prime Minister; they were not concerned with anything that happened to Indians, whether they were students, whether they were businessmen. I would like the Government to reorient its foreign policy in the light of these events and

act in such a way that the respect that this country had because of Mahatma Gandhi may be restored, that the Indians may go about the world with their head erect and not be insulted and kicked about as they are at present. I would appeal to the Government to reconsider all these. If Sardar Swaran Singh is able to do it, I have no quarrel with him. What I have said is not personal. I hope he understands. In my remarks, nowhere have I tried to be personal but I do feel that his undersanding of the situation was very wrong when he tried to prevent me from going to Taiwan. I hope he will not do it to anybody else, much less to any Member of Parliament.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I believe in the basic policy of non-alignment and co-existence which this country has pursued ever since independence under the guidance of a great man who gave us faith and courage. Whenever we discuss foreign affairs in this House, Sir, we miss the warmth of that man's presence. We have not got quite accustomed yet to the idea that he is no longer with us. We remember with gratitude and pride the work that he did over a number of years for the cause of making it more and more possible for the communist and non-communists of this world to live together in comparative peace instead of destroying each other. But when I say that I believe in the policy of non-alignment it becomes necessary for me to explain, in the light of the grim realities that face our country today, what that faith really amounts to.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that our Prime Minister only a short time ago in the course of a very important pronouncement said that while he was going to follow in the footsteps of Jawaharlal Nehru and to follow the basic policies of our departed leader he would not follow a beaten track and he would not hesitate to rethink and reshape policies if the best interest of the country and the changing cir-

cumstances demanding such rethinking and reshaping of policies. It will not be a bad idea therefore if in the course of our debate today we were to provoke some serious thinking on our foreign policy and also to examine the suggestion which was thrown out the other day by our Prime Minister in London that the two super-powers of the world, the United States and the Soviet Russia, together with Great Britain might consider the possibility of giving the non-nuclear powers of the world a guarantee against possible nuclear aggression.

Mr. Chairman, about a couple of years ago, Mr. Khrushchev, former Soviet Prime Minister and a warm friend of India, said in the course of a long interview with Mr. Walter Lippman that there was no such thing in this world as a non-aligned man. How can any honest man say that he is non-aligned as between communism on one side and parliamentary democracy on the other? Each one of us, if he is worth his salt, is aligned either with parliamentary democracy or with communism. But Mr. Khrushchev added on that occasion that there can of course be such a thing as a non-aligned country. A country may adopt non-alignment as a matter of State policy; and a State policy is after all a matter of expediency. I believe in non-alignment as a State policy and I believe in it so long as it serves the purpose of the survival of my own country. I am not one of those Indians who talk about non-alignment as if it is as immutable as the second law of Thermodynamics.

It is my firm belief Mr. Chairman, that a country's influence in international affairs is directly proportional to the number of cabbages it can grow at home. We are a country that has to go to the United States tomorrow to ask for about six million tons of foodgrains every year for the next five or six years. We are not in a position to pay for it. We have already taken Rs. 1200 crores worth of foodgrains from the Americans. It

was called a loan but it had to be turned into a virtual gift. Even after this period of five or six years there is no knowing when we shall be able to produce enough food to feed our children, because the population of this country is increasing at the fantastic rate of 12 million every year. Our Third Five Year Plan was by and large a failure; our economy is on the downgrade; and our financial position and the balance of payments position is rather precarious, as our own Finance Minister stated in the other House recently. Externally, we are nowhere near a solution of the problem of India-Pakistan tension and the phenomenon of Chinese military power hangs on our head like the Sword of Damocles. It can fall on our head at a point of their own choosing and at a time of their own choosing. And let us face it—the much talked of military assistance we have received from the Americans, from the Russians, from the British, all these bits and pieces put together are not enough to hold the Chinese who have massed on our borders 16 or 17 divisions of their crack troops trained in Korea and North China. When I say these things, I am not revealing any very great secret which is not known to the Chinese or to the rest of the world. The policy of non-alignment has to be examined in the background of these grim realities.

Neither the communists nor the non-communists of the world today, Mr. Chairman, object to our policy of non-alignment. The Russians say we can go to the Americans and take whatever military assistance we like from them. They do not object to it. The Americans say that we can go to the Russians and take whatever military gadgets they are prepared to give us. They approve of it. Even as regards co-existence, who does not believe in co-existence in the world? Even Mao Tse-tung says that he believes in co-existence. There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when we used to believe that if we were a friend to all the countries and enemy of none—

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.]

and that is the central meaning of non-alignment—then we would be left alone in peace. But the invasion of India by Chinese in October 1962 knocked all that out of our heads. Our non-alignment did not prevent the Chinese from invading India. We recently went to the Conference of the non-aligned countries in Cairo and there we threw out a suggestion that the non-aligned might like to send a delegation to Peking to dissuade the leaders of communist China from exploding their atomic bomb and thus polluting the earth's atmosphere with poison that will endanger not only the health of the present generation of human beings but also the unborn generations that are yet to come to this earth. But our non-aligned friends did not seem to take any notice of our suggestion. The Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference in London held a few months back could not be persuaded to say one word in sympathy or support of India in our China predicament because of the opposition of the African Prime Ministers. Mr. Nkrumah of Ghana has recently welcomed the development of a nuclear weapon by one of our Asian brothers; this diabolic means of destroying mankind is no longer the monopoly of the white race and that I suppose is a matter for congratulation for those of us who are black. I often wonder what is so common and what is this bond of brotherhood between a country like India and a country like Mr. Nkrumah's Ghana or Mr. Soekarno's Indonesia, apart from the fact that they talk non-alignment. The explosion of the Chinese atomic bomb seems to have completed the process of intimidating all the South East Asian countries. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to do some serious stock-taking and heart-searching about this question of how we are going to survive in this world as a free and independent nation. The people of India have every right to demand an answer to that question from this Parliament and from this Government.

Now, there is a lot of excited talk these days in our country about manufacturing an atom bomb. Does it really require a lot of argument, a lot of discussion, to decide whether a country which cannot produce enough food for its children should or should not make an atomic bomb? Does it not appear immoral to a country that talks about Gandhi in season and out of season to poison the earth's atmosphere not only for the present generation of human beings but even those who are yet to be born? Were we now the people who delivered moral lectures from a high pedestal to Khrushchev and Kennedy when they decided to test their nuclear weapons? In any case is there any such thing as defence against a nuclear weapon? Can the United States defend itself if the Russians are so mad as to use nuclear weapons against the United States? The Americans can, of course, retaliate; they have the power to destroy large parts of Russia but they cannot defend themselves against another power's nuclear weapons.

It is not defence; there is no such thing as defence against nuclear weapons. It is only one terror balancing another terror. And no nuclear power in the world today dares to use its nuclear weapon against another power without inviting its own destruction. I find it hard to believe that even the Chinese communists would dream of using their nuclear weapons against India. The possession of a nuclear bomb has, of course, proved to be a very great political asset. Look at the excited talk it has caused amongst ourselves about making our very own Indian national Swadeshi atomic bombs wrapped up in our own National Tri-colour. But the actual use of the Chinese nuclear weapon is a very, very remote contingency. It should be obvious to all of us that the danger of Chinese invasion of India by conventional military power, by their 17 divisions of crack troops sitting on our borders, is much more real than nuclear aggression.

Now, how do we deal with that military situation. The answer is that we have to raise our own military strength, to a level which is sufficient to hold the Chinese on our frontiers. This requires co-operation of other powers, mainly the United States of America and Soviet Russia to give us military equipment for our Air Force and our Army. During the last two years we have examined the possibility of acquiring military equipment from these two great powers in very great detail. I too have done informally and unofficially my share of work in this extensive explorations in Moscow and Washington, not once but three times in one year. These two great powers are both willing to give us bits and pieces of military gadgets, but he is a diplomatic infant who believes that either Soviet Russia or the United States has any intention of raising India's own military strength to such a level that we can be independent of them and can deal with the Communist Chinese on our own. That is out of the question and the sooner we put it out of our heads the better. We are devoid of any sense of realism if we believe that we can expect Soviet Russia to give us military assistance to an extent which is more than a token and a gesture of friendship. They still have the Sino-Soviet military alliance, in spite of grave differences between the two of them. Their differences are not likely to be patched up in the very near future, but it is inevitable that the new leadership in Soviet Russia, after the overthrow of Mr. Khrushchev, will make very serious attempts to come to terms with the Chinese. The Americans are willing to give India a little more of these military equipment than the Russians. But they too have no intention of raising India's own military power to the level necessary to offer effective resistance to Communist China, mainly for the reason that they do not know where they stand with us. They feel that there is no real understanding between the United States and India.

We go to Moscow and declare that India's basic policy is that we are anti-Capitalist inside India and an i-Imperialist outside India. Next day we urge the Americans to bring into India as much American private capital as possible, because we are urgently in need of more and more investment capital and we are short of foreign exchange. When we go to Washington we tell them we are anti-Communist crusaders on white horses. It is entirely possible, Mr. Chairman, for this country to say with complete honesty to the Russians that we want the warmest kind of friendship between India and Soviet Russia but we have every determination to stop the spread of communism in this country because we reject communism either as a way of life or as a political system. It is entirely possible to tell the Americans: To you private enterprise is a religion, but not to us. In our situation it is necessary for our Government to own and manage large industries and that is why we have a policy of mixed economy. We are going to have more and more State-owned public enterprises, but we have no intention of being unfair to private enterprise or abolishing private enterprise. If we did that, I think, we would be respected by both, whether they like it or not. But we have got into the bad habit of telling the Russians what is calculated to please them and of telling the Americans what is calculated to please them. The result is that neither of them, deep down, really trust us.

we have heard much before and also this morning from my friend, the Foreign Minister, about the controversy regarding the dues to be paid by the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations for their peace-keeping forces in the Congo and elsewhere. We know that the International Court has said that the payment of these dues is obligatory. We could have talked privately to the Americans as friends and tried to persuade them to see that it

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.]

would be most unwise to have a show-down the Russians and create a crisis. We could have spoken privately to the Russians to try and persuade them to see that the dues should be really paid. But what did we do? We first take a position publicly and formally by sending an official communication to the United Nations. Then, the Americans come and lodge an official protest against the position taken by us. As soon as we do that we immediately destroy our position as peacemakers. I thought the role of a peacemaker was expected of a country that believe in non-alignment.

As regards military equipment, the Americans are, of course, in a better position to give us the military equipment we need for our Army and our Air Force, but they do not see why they should do it. For one thing, it would cost them something like 4,000 million dollars. The American taxpayer is not very happy about it. Their Pakistani allies do not approve of it and there are various other people in the world who do not like it. The Americans know in their minds that if India is really and dangerously invaded at any time in future, then, alliance or no alliance, they will have to be called in by India anyhow. And the nature of military power in the world today is such, and the military might of the United States is so fantastic that the Americans know in their minds that they can defend India even without occupying an inch of Indian territory.

One word more and I have done. May I make it very clear that my purpose in saying what I have said this morning is not to question the validity of the policy of non-alignment. I do want non-alignment, but I also want my country to survive; my purpose is to provoke some serious thinking and some heart-searching by my friends in the Government. It seems clear to me that there are two roads open to us to day and we have got to take one or the other. I

am firmly convinced, Mr. Chairman, that there is no such thing as a military solution of the problem of India-China conflict. The solution of the India-China problem has got to be non-military, diplomatic, political. This conflict started as a border dispute. There can be such a thing as a genuine and honest misunderstanding between two neighbours about a border which was never properly demarcated. Both sides to the dispute have based their claims on pieces of paper that were signed more than 50 years ago by a British Government in India, and by an Imperial Government of China, long before the Chiang-Kai Shek days, when this border was of no importance either to India or to China. It is not beyond the wisdom and ingenuity of the world leaders of today to find means of getting together a group of impartial men, who have nothing to do with China or India, perhaps with the imprimatur of the United Nations, to examine this border dispute purely on merits and to work out a scientifically re-delineated India-China border which may be acceptable to both parties on the basis of give-and-take. On the strength of whatever first-hand knowledge I have of international politics, I am convinced that it is entirely possible to bring about such a political settlement between India and China even now, although things have gone very far. But this requires diplomatic initiative, diplomatic talent of a very high order on the part of our country. Whether the instrument we call our Foreign Ministry possesses that talent or not I do not know. The gentlemen who function there certainly have developed a great talent for writing protest notes, but the writing of protest notes in King's English or Queen's English by these gentlemen is not going to get us anywhere nearer to a solution of the India-China problem. The Chinese can afford to keep the 17 divisions of mechanised crack troops which they have got on our border for an indefinite number of years without ruining their own economy—without invading India; just by sitting on our

head, poised to strike, but not actually striking, they can make a devastating contribution to a gradual disintegration—political disintegration and economic disintegration—of this great country.

If we find that we do not possess the diplomatic talent and resourcefulness that is necessary to bring about a non-military political settlement with China, then the other alternative open to us is to pursue the suggestion which was made the other day in London by our own Prime Minister.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Are you sure that they are ready for a settlement?

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: It is our business to bring it about. Anyhow the other alternative that is open to us is to pursue the suggestion which was made by our own Prime Minister the other day about a joint U.S.—Soviet guarantee for the non-nuclear countries against possible Chinese nuclear aggression. But let us be clear about it. Do the South American or African countries fear that they are in danger of a nuclear attack from China? Do the Asian countries say or are they prepared to say that they stand in danger of a nuclear attack from China? Clearly not. India is the only country that stands in real danger. And that danger is more from an attack by conventional military power than nuclear power. Let us ask our Russian friends and our American friends if they are prepared jointly to give us the kind of guarantee which has been suggested. I believe in such U.S.-Soviet joint action for peace in this world. My heart is in it. I have worked for it. For the last two or three years I have done little else. But we cannot get such a joint U.S.-Soviet guarantee merely by wishing for it or by indicating that we shall be graciously pleased to accept it if it is offered. We have got to show that we have the imagination and the talent to bring it about. If I were in the shoes

of my friend, the Foreign Minister, I would not expect Civil Servants to bring it about for me. I would accept the challenge myself. I would undertake to bring about either a non-military political settlement with China or a joint U.S.-Soviet guarantee against possible Chinese aggression, whether it is nuclear or non-nuclear. I would undertake to bring about one or the other, and thus make it possible for India to put a stop to this ruinous drain on our resources at the rate of Rs. 1,000 crores a year on armaments.

Therefore, my conclusion is that I support the policy of non-alignment, but we owe it to the people of India to prove to them, how, in what manner, non-alignment is going to save India from going under.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्री जब अपना भाषण कर रहे थे तब कुछ समय के लिए मुझे ऐसा लगा कि शायद मैं युनाइटेड जेनरल असेम्बली के रिपोर्टर की रिपोर्ट सुन रहा हूँ क्योंकि उन्होंने अपने भाषण के ज्यादा हिस्से में तो युनाइटेड जेनरल असेम्बली के बारे में कुछ डिटेल्स बताए लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश-नीति की आज क्या परिस्थिति है और हिन्दुस्तान की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति में आज क्या कठिनाइयाँ हैं और क्या समस्याएँ हैं उनके बारे में बहुत कम बताया ।

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

एक और चीज मैं यह भी कहना चाहूँगा, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि जब विदेश नीति के बारे में बहस हो रही है तब प्रधान मंत्री को रहना चाहिए, क्योंकि कैरो के सम्मेलन में वह गए और उसके बाद इंग्लैंड भी गए और विलसन साहब से भी भेंट किया और ये सारी चीजें जो हैं वे विदेश नीति के साथ सम्बन्ध रखती हैं और जब विदेश नीति के मामले पर इस सदन में बहस होती है तो यह जरूरी है कि प्रधान मंत्री भी यहां रहते और इसको

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]
सुनते । लेकिन अफसोस की बात है कि प्रधान मंत्री साहब पार्लियामेंट जब सेशन में है तब ज्यादातर वह दिल्ली के बाहर हो रहे हैं ।

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी : वह शान्तिनिकेतन में हैं ।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : मेरा तो यह कहना है कि सरकार का जो विदेश नीति चल रही है उसकी न कोई दिशा न कोई नीति है, सिर्फ एक पालिसी ग्राफ डिप्ट चला रहे हैं । उनको कुछ पता नहीं है कि किस दिशा में जाना है । उनके पास कोई नीति भी नहीं है क्योंकि छः सात महीने में जो कुछ नीतियां चली हैं उनका बेमालूम सा नतीजा निकल रहा है, कभी कुछ करते हैं और उससे वापस आते हैं और फिर उसके बाद दबाव में आ कर कुछ और कर डालते हैं ।

मैं इनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर चीन का जो आक्रमण हुआ उस वक्त इस सदन ने और इस पार्लियामेंट ने यह तय किया था कि हिन्दुस्तान की एक इंच भूमि भी जब तक चीन के कब्जे में है हम चुप नहीं रहेंगे, लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री साहब बार बार यह घोषणा करते आए हैं कि अगर कोई न कोई सेटिलमेंट करना है कुछ लेनदेन भी हो सकता है और कुछ एडजस्टमेंट भी हो सकता है । अक्सार्डिचन के बारे में कुछ किसी ने एक बयान दे दिया तो उसके बारे में भी प्रधान मंत्री साहब ने जब कभी भाषण दिया तो यही कहा कि कुछ एडजस्टमेंट भी हो सकता है और हम पीस चाहते हैं । पीस चाहते हैं लेकिन जिस ढंग से चाहते हैं इस बारे में भी साफ रहना चाहिए । जब हिन्दुस्तान का भूमि चीन के कब्जे में है तब यह कहना कि हम एडजस्टमेंट करेंगे उसका कुछ मालूम नहीं आता है । तिब्बत और हिन्दुस्तान की कोई बातचीत होती तब एडजस्टमेंट की बातचीत हो सकती थी,

यह हो सकता था, लेकिन आज चीन ने न सिर्फ तिब्बत को हड़प लिया है बल्कि अब हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ हिस्से को हड़प कर के बातचीत करना चाहता है । बातचीत उसके साथ यह हो सकती थी कि उसके साथ हमारी मैकमोहन लाइन की जो बाउंडरी थी, मेरा यह कहना है कि तिब्बत के साथ में तो बातचीत हो सकती थी कि तिब्बत में कौन हिस्सा रहेगा, यों मानसरोवर और कैलाश का इलाका तिब्बत में रहा है, लेकिन जब कोई देश दूसरे देश को हड़प कर लेता है और उस देश की बाउंडरी तीसरे देश पर है, तब उसके बारे में बातचीत करने लगे तो फिर यह एडजस्टमेंट की बात कहां से आती है यह परे समझ में नहीं आती । चीन के बारे में हमारे सारी नीति गलत रही है । अभी तक डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशंस हम कायम किए हुए हैं एक तरफ तो उनके साथ जंग भी हो चुकी है, वह हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण भी कर चुका है, हम कहते हैं कि उसने एग्रेशन किया है और दूसरी तरफ साथ ही साथ उनके साथ डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशंस भी चला रहे हैं । हम इस चीज को भी सफ नहीं करते कि आज दुनिया में दी चीन है, एक तो पीपुल्स चइना है और दूसरा फार्मोसा का चीन है । हमें यह साफ करना चाहिए था कि दोनों चीन के साथ हम रिश्ता रखेंगे ।

हम जब प्रिसिपिल आफ युनिवर्सैलिटी की बात करते हैं तब कोई प्रिसिपिल इस गवर्नमेंट के साथ नहीं रहा है, इन्होंने कभी भी इस प्रिसिपिल को इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है । जर्मनी की मिसाल ले लीजिए, ईस्ट जर्मनी और वेस्ट जर्मनी है, वहां भी युनिवर्सैलिटी का प्रिसिपिल इन्होंने इस्तेमाल नहीं किया, और साथ ही साथ इजरायल को मिसाल है । यह चीन का मसला लीजिए । कहीं पर इन लोगों ने इस तरह का प्रिसिपिल इस्तेमाल नहीं किया । मौका आ जाता है तो कहते हैं कि युनिवर्सैलिटी के प्रिसिपिल पर चल रहे हैं और यह काम किया, जहां सूट

करता है वहां युनिवर्सलिटी आ जाता है और जहां सूट नहीं करता है वह प्रिंसिपल खत्म हो जाता है। हम तो पोलिटिकल डिंसीशंस लेते रहे हैं। तो जहां तक इस तरह के पोलिटिकल डिंसीशंस हमारे पक्ष में हैं वहां तक तो हमको करना चाहिए था।

मैं कैरो कांफेंस के बारे में भी कुछ ब्रिक् करना चाहूंगा। युनिवर्सलिटी की बात की जाती है। तो फिर वहां शोम्बे के बारे में जो रवैया हम लोगों ने पहले अख्तियार किया वह बिल्कुल गलत था, वहां युनिवर्सलिटी या उसका प्रिंसिपल नहीं आया। यह साफ कह देना चाहिए था कि कांगो के साथ हम लोग किसी तरह की बातचीत नहीं कर सकते या बैठ सकते। क्योंकि सारे कांगो 2 P. M. का इतिहास ऐसा रहा है कि वहां पर जो सरकार आज ठीक है उसके साथ अगर हम बातचीत करेंगे तो सारे अफ्रीका में हमारी जो प्रतिष्ठा है उसको धक्का लाता है। अफ्रीका के बारे में हमारी नीति गलत रही है। क्योंकि शुरू से हमारा रवैया गलत रहा है।

आज सुबह जब मैं ने एक प्रश्न के बारे में पूछा और अलजीरिया की मिसाल दी तो उन्होंने कहा वहां अपना बस नहीं है। यह इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि अलजीरिया के बारे में जब ३६ देशों ने अलजीरिया प्रेजिडेंट गवर्नमेंट को मान्यता दे दी थी तब फिर भी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने मान्यता नहीं दी, बैठे रह गए—पहले फ्रांस मान्यता दे तब हम मान्यता देंगे। अगर इस तरह की नीति अपनाएंगे तो फिर अफ्रीका वाले देश और अरब देश जिन्होंने आपके साथ सहानुभूति दिखायी और आपके साथ रहे उनके लिए आगे ऐसा करना नामुमकिन हो जाता है क्योंकि आपका सारा दृष्टिकोण गलत है। जब आपका दृष्टिकोण अफ्रीकी और अरब देशों के बारे में गलत रहा है तो फिर जब वे देखेंगे कि हमारी दोस्ती में कमी आ रही है तो लाजमी बात है कि वे हमसे

दूर हटने लगेंगे। मैं बहुत अफ़ोस के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस नीति को बदलने की कोई कोशिश नहीं हुई और अभी तक जो नीति चल आ रही है उसमें कोई इनिशियेटिव लेकर काम किया गया हो ऐसी बात नहीं है। हमारे विदेश मंत्री तो जहां कहीं बाहर के देशों से निमंत्रण आता है वहां चने जाते हैं, कुछ किसी से बात कर लेते हैं लेकिन उससे नतीज क्या निकलता है? कुछ नहीं। सबसे बात की, अच्छी बातचीत हुई, कार्डियल टाक्स हुई और वापिस आ गए। लेकिन पिछले छः महीनों के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान की ओर से कोई इनिशियेटिव लिया गया हो और जो पहले गलतियाँ की गई हैं उनको ठीक किया गया हो या अपनी नीति में बदलाव किया गया हो, या मैं यह समझूँ कि पहली भी जो नीति चलती रही उसे भी दृढ़ता से आगे लाए होते, तो भी कुछ समझ में आता, लेकिन वह भी नहीं हुआ। एक डिफिटिंग नीति, नीति विहीन नीति पर हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय चला आ रहा है।

मैं इसके बारे में भी यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अफ्रीका के जितने भी देश हैं उनमें से कितने देश ऐसे हैं जो हमारे साथ कूटनीतिक रिश्ता कायम किये हैं? बहुत कम। यह क्यों ऐसा होता है? जब हम इतनी बात कहते हैं कि अफ्रीका के और एशिया के देश हमारे साथ हैं और एफ़्रो एशियन नेशन्स हमारे साथ होने चाहियें तो हमारी कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि हमारे देश के कम से कम अफ्रीकी देशों के साथ कूटनीतिक संबंध हों या हमारी नीतियों में कोई कमियाँ हों उनको हमारी किसी बात से धक्का पहुंचता है तो बातचीत कर के उन को रो करने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये। मैं चाहूंगा, हमारे विदेश मंत्री मास्को, लंदन और दूसरे देशों में जाने को बजाय अफ्रीका और एशिया के देशों में ज्यादा धूमें। इस बारे में हमारा सारा दृष्टिकोण ही गलत रहा है। पहले, से हम समझे बैठे हैं कि बड़े बड़े देश जो हैं अमेरिका, रशिया और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन, बस इन्हीं को ठीक करना है, कोई भी विदेश मंत्री

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

हो जाता है तो वहां दौड़ जाता है, कहीं लंदन, कहीं वाशिंगटन, कहीं मास्को। दूसरे देशों के बारे में कुछ सोचते ही नहीं जैसे हैं ही नहीं। जब तक यह दृष्टिकोण नहीं बदलता है तब तक कुछ होने वाला नहीं। आप अपनी नीति बनाएंगे या दूसरों की नीति के पीछे दौड़ेंगे। आज यही हो रहा है कि जो बड़े बड़े देश हैं जो आजकल दुनिया में अपनी हुकूमत कायम किये हुए हैं उनके पीछे दौड़ते हैं, वे कुछ नीति बनाते हैं तो हम रिएक्ट करते हैं, उनके पीछे दौड़ें और उनकी नीतियों के बारे में कुछ न कुछ कहें या उनको समझाएं कि हम तुम्हारी नीति के साथ हैं या नहीं हैं, तुम्हारा समर्थन करते हैं या नहीं। कुछ अपनी नीति तो बनाओ। तो मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि यह लन्दन, मास्को और वाशिंगटन दौड़ने की बजाय आप अपनी नीति बनाइये—कुछ आस पास के देशों में घूमा करें, अगल बगल के देशों के साथ अपने मामलों को ठीक ठाक करें।

अब चीन के बारे में बहुत कहा गया कि वहां पर एटम बम का विस्फोट किया गया। हमारे देश में कुछ लोग हैं जो समझते हैं हमको भी एटम बम बनाना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं समझता हूं यह सारा देश तभी उठ सकता है जब खुद अपना कुछ आर्थिक, औद्योगिक और वैज्ञानिक "बेस" हो। उसको ठीक करें और वह इस काबिल हो जाय कि हम एटम बम बना सकें क्योंकि मैं यह नहीं मानता हूं कि सिर्फ एटम बनाने से ही हमारी हिफाजत हो सकती है। हो सकता है आगे चलकर हिन्दुस्तान को भी बम बनाना पड़े लेकिन आज की परिस्थिति में यह बहस मेरे खयाल में नावाजिब बहस होगी क्योंकि जिस चीज की हमें पहले जरूरत है उसकी बहस हमको पहले करनी चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तान की आर्थिक परिस्थिति ठीक होनी चाहिये। जब तक परिस्थिति ठीक नहीं होगी, हिन्दुस्तान का विज्ञान भी उन्नत स्थिति में नहीं आ

जायेगा तब तक हम इन चीजों के बारे में नहीं सोच सकते हैं। इस बारे में मेरा यह कहना है कि हिन्दुस्तान बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ है और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को चाहिये पहले घर की परिस्थिति को ठीक ठाक करें फिर बाद में और चीजों के बारे में हम सोच सकेंगे।

एक और चीज और इसके बारे में कही जाती है कि हिन्दुस्तान गांधी जी का देश है, अहिंसावादी देश है इसलिये बम नहीं बनायेंगे। इससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूं क्योंकि जब आप सेना भी रखते हैं, हथियार भी रखते हैं तो फिर इस ढंग की बात करना फजूल है लेकिन और चीजों के बारे में जरूर ध्यान देना चाहिये और उस बहस में अभी नहीं पड़ना चाहिये। यह मेरा मत है।

साथ साथ मैं विदेश मंत्री साहब से यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जो जब लंदन गये तो उन्होंने विलसन साहब से क्या बातचीत की और उसका क्या नतीजा हुआ, क्योंकि वे घण्टा भर बोले लेकिन उसमें मुझे ऐसा लगा कि लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री, लन्दन गये तो वहां उनकी बात हुई ही नहीं। जो विदेश मंत्रालय को हमारे सामने बातें रखनी थीं उसके बारे में तो बहुत ही कम हमको सुनने को मिला। सारे भाषण में, यूनाइटेड नेशन्स एसेम्बली में क्या हुआ, वहां किस से मिले, क्या मिले यह सब बताते रहे लेकिन हमारी समस्याओं के बारे में क्या बातचीत उन्होंने की और विलसन साहब के साथ शास्त्री जी की क्या बातचीत हुई, किस लिये हुए, क्यों इतनी जल्दी गए इन चीजों के बारे में यहां कुछ नहीं बताया गया। कुछ अखबारों में मैंने देखा कि न्यूता तो था ब्रिटिश सरकार से कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री वहां जायें लेकिन उसके लिये कोई तरीका वहां पर निश्चित नहीं हुई और यह भी लिखा था कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने अपनी ओर से वहां जाना तय किया और जल्दबाजी में तय करके गये। फिर अगर

ऐसा हुआ तो हमको यह पता लगाना चाहिये कि क्यों इतनी जल्दी थी और क्यों वे गए, इसके बारे में भी अगर कुछ रोशनी डालें तो अच्छा होगा ।

इसके साथ साथ यह न्यूक्लियर अम्बरेला की भी बात की जाती है और यह भी कहना है कि शायद प्रधान मंत्री साहब उसी के बारे में बातचीत करने गये । तो मैं यह साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि किसी की भी गारन्टी लेकर, अमेरिका हो या रूस हो या इंग्लैण्ड हो, किसी की गारन्टी पर हम अपना डिफेन्स करें यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता, क्योंकि हम देख चुके हैं कि जब चीन ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया तब किसी ने हमको मदद नहीं दी । वह भी साफ है और कौन हमको कितनी मदद दे सकता है वह भी साफ है । जब तक हम खुद अपने डिफेन्स को ठीकठाक न कर लें तब तक डिफेन्स हो नहीं सकता । इसलिये इस न्यूक्लियर अम्ब्रेला की बात करना बेमतलब है और मेरे ख्याल में समय की बर्बादी है ।

इसके बाद मैं हमारे अगल बगल के जो देश हैं उनके साथ जो सावालत पैदा हो गये हैं उसके बारे में भी कहना चाहूंगा । विदेश मंत्री साहब ने बहुत लम्बा चौड़ा भाषण किया लेकिन उसमें कहीं यह जिक्र नहीं था कि भूटान में जो बात पिछले महीने हो गई वह कैसे हुई । उसके बारे में कुछ कहना चाहिये था यह सही है भूटान कोई विदेश नहीं है लेकिन भूटान की विदेश नीति हमारे अधीन है । जो भी भूटान में हुआ है उसके बारे में कुछ रोशनी डाली जाती तो कुछ मामला साफ होता क्योंकि तरह तरह के बयानात काठमांडू से या कहीं और से आते रहते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर चार्ज लगाते हैं और यह सही है कि हिन्दुस्तान इस मामले में किसी तरह से इन्वाल्ड नहीं था । तो इसको साफ कर देना चाहिये था विदेश मंत्रालय को । विदेश मंत्री इसके बारे में कुछ कहते क्योंकि सारा जो कुछ भूटान में हुआ, उसमें ऐसा लगता है कि शायद वहां के जो राजा हैं या

उनका जो परिवार है उसके अन्दर में जो कुछ भी मतभेद रहा हो उसकी वजह से यह सारी चीज हुई, लेकिन कुछ लोग जो वहां से बाहर निकल गए हैं वे ऐसे बयानात कर रहे हैं कि मानों भूटान में हिन्दुस्तान का हस्तक्षेप था इसलिये यह सब हुआ । तो इस चीज को भी साफ कर देना चाहिये था । और साथ ही साथ हमारी सरकार को एक नीति बनानी चाहिये जिसके आधार पर हम भूटान के साथ अपने संबंध कायम कर सकें । केवल राजाओं से ही हमें ताल्लुक नहीं रखना चाहिये क्योंकि इससे आगे चलकर समस्या और भी गम्भीर हो सकती है । इसलिए हमारी यह कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि अगर हम भूटान में जनतंत्र की हिफाजत करना चाहते हैं तो वहां पर जो स्टेट कांग्रेस है उसके बारे में भी सोचना चाहिये, वहां पर जो जनतंत्र पार्टी है उसका भी ख्याल रखना चाहिये क्योंकि हमारी जो सरकार है वह सिर्फ चार, पांच राजा या जो दूसरे लोग वहां पर हैं उन्हीं से बात करती है । मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार के लिए ऐसा करना मुश्किल होगा क्योंकि किसी पार्टी के साथ रिश्ता रखना किसी सरकार के लिए एक कठिन काम है, लेकिन जहां तक सरकारी पार्टी का संबंध है, सरकार के लोगों का संबंध है, उन्हें तो कम से कम इस तरह का रिश्ता रखना ही चाहिये और वहां पर जो जनतंत्र पार्टी है उसको बढ़ावा देने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये ।

मैं यहां पर सिर्फ भूटान के ही बारे में नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ बल्कि हिमालय के आसपास जो भी हमारे पड़ोसी हैं उनके बारे में एक नीति बनाई जानी चाहिये सोशलिस्ट आन्दोलन के नेताओं ने कई बार इस चीज के बारे में सरकार का ध्यान खींचा है और कहा है कि हिमालय देशों के बारे में एक "हिमालियन पालिसी" बनाई जानी चाहिये । लेकिन मुझ दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी सरकार इस तरह की बात को नहीं

[श्री गोड़े मुखर्जी]

सोचती है और जब उसके ऊपर कोई मुसीबत आती है तब वह उसका सल्यूशन निकालने की कोशिश करती है। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि हिमालयन के जो देश हैं उनको अगर आप अच्छी स्थिति में रखना चाहते हैं तो उनके संबंध में एक हिमालयन पालिसी बनाई जानी चाहिये। जिसके अन्तर्गत आप इन देशों की आर्थिक स्थिति को सुधार सकें, वहां के लोगों को शिक्षा दे सकें, वहां पर कुछ औद्योगिक स्थिति में सुधार कर सकें, इन सब चीजों को सुधारने के बारे में आप की पालिसी होनी चाहिये। हमारी पालिसी इस तरह की नहीं होनी चाहिये कि वहां पर कुछ लोगों के ही साथ रिश्ता रखा जाय और यह समझ लें कि हमारे सारे मामले हल हो जायेंगे। इस तरह की बात मैं उचित नहीं समझता हूं।

अब मैं कुछ शब्द सीलोन के बारे में भी कहना चाहूंगा क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान और सीलोन के बीच में अभी हाल में एक एग्रीमेंट हो चुका है। वह एग्रीमेंट हम को ऐसा लगता है जैसे बाजार में किसी सब्जी के बारे में सौदा हुआ हो। सीलोन में कई लाख हिन्दुस्तानी, हिन्दुस्तान से गये हुए लोग हैं, उनके वहां पर परिवार हैं, इन लोगों के बारे में जिनकी तादाद करीब ५ लाख के है, दो आदमी बैठ कर फैसला करते हैं। इस तरह से इतनी बड़ी समस्या के बारे में दो आदमी बैठ कर कुछ बार्टर करें, कुछ बारगेन करें, और कोई सल्यूशन निकालें, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। वहां जो मसला है वह कई लाख लोगों से ताल्लुक रखता है। उनमें इंडियन सिटीजन्स भी हैं, कितने लोग इंडियन ओरिजन के हैं, कितने लोग हिन्दुस्तान आना चाहते हैं, कितने नहीं आना चाहते हैं, इन सब बातों का जब पहले पता लगा लिया जाता तब ही इन लोगों के बारे में कोई फैसला किया जाना। इस समय इन लोगों के बारे में जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ है वह ऐसा मालूम पड़ता

है कि एक सब्जी वाले के दुकान में कोई सब्जी खरीदने गया है और वहां पर दो आना, तीन आना का मोल करके सब्जी खरीद लाता है। इस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान और सीलोन के बीच में एग्रीमेंट हुआ है। इस तरह का एग्रीमेंट करना एक गलत बात है और इस एग्रीमेंट के बाद जो कुछ वहां पर हुआ है उससे यह पता चलता है कि इस एग्रीमेंट का कोई मतलब नहीं निकला है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि यह एग्रीमेंट खत्म कर दिया जाये और नये तौर पर सारे मामले को सीलोन की सरकार के साथ एक बार फिर बैठकर दूसरा हल निकाला जाना चाहिये।

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I support the amendment moved by Mr. Sudhir Ghosh but I own that I was a little surprised when Mr. Ghosh talked of an honest misunderstanding with reference to China. Probably it was not realised—I cannot say about him that he did not realise it—that in spite of the Treaty of 1954 about which we all know, in spite of the statement made in Delhi, inspite of the subsequent conduct, they have stabbed us in the back and they have spurned the Colombo proposals of the Six Powers by not accepting the suggestions made by those Powers and yet one could hear in Parliament the voice of Mr. Ghosh saying that there might be an honest misunderstanding. Is it not a fact that on account of the fear, the terror caused by the Chinese atomic bomb or device, whatever you may call it, many countries in the world, particularly countries in the South East Asia, are not prepared to condemn that act or have not been prepared to condemn the aggression? Therefore I would submit that we must have contact with realities and we must not forget that what China has done is the result of a definite aggressive expansionist policy and could never be the result of any misunderstanding.

I support the policy of the Government so far as the representation of

the Chinese Government in the U.N. is concerned and that is in spite of the fact that the Chinese Government has presented new terrors and have posed new problems for us. I support that policy because China is unpredictable and that is so because it is not controlled by the humanising influence of the U.N. The Chinese bomb test has caused re-thinking throughout the world. The shape of the problem of disarmament has been completely changed because those who are participating in the Disarmament Committee or in the Disarmament Proposals in the U.N. are members of the U.N. and when the two Super Powers—Mr. Vice Chairman you may permit me to use this expression in respect of the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia—who have got weapons which can destroy the world, awakened to the grim reality that if one of them wanted it or to attack the other with nuclear weapons, it would itself be destroyed—at least that was the serious risk; when they awakened to this reality, we had the lessening of the tensions. We had the Hot line. Since the Cuban affairs this realisation came to them and they wanted to recede and they did recede from the positions they had occupied. We had the Test Ban Treaty as a result of that. At that moment when the Test Ban Treaty had been signed by more than 100 nations, comes this Chinese bomb test. When the rest of the world is coming closer together, when tensions are lessening and when they are moving towards disarmament and when, from their conduct, one can infer that they realise that these tests must be banned, that it is impossible to have a nuclear war in this world, at that time China made this test. Now there is, on the one hand, the struggle of the international community, the civilised community, against the proliferation of this bomb against the dissemination of this nuclear power, for the purpose of war. On the other hand, we have got a country which believes in the inevitability of war, arming itself with nuclear weapons. Kindly consider what is the strength of these weapons. At the core of an atomic bomb, the tem-

perature at the time of explosion is one million degrees, and we know the devastating effects; the effects spread over thousands and thousands of miles.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Now this is the situation, and there is the cruel dilemma in which we are placed. China has placed us in that dilemma. Shall we meet this threat of nuclear bomb by ourselves making the bomb, or shall we look on unconcerned and see the preparation of the weapon which is intended for our destruction? This is the dilemma in which we are placed. Now, when such a dilemma has to be faced, the decisions that have to be made have to be made after great deliberation, and I do think that the decision that has been made by the Government is a great decision. As we are situated today, that is the only decision that could be made and I submit, Madam, that in this connection we must take into account the responsibilities of the United Nations, and the responsibilities more particularly of the nuclear powers that brought this weapon of destruction into this world. Now, Premier Khrushchev once said in one of his speeches that the responsibility of the nuclear powers was great. I am sure the United States also realises that there is the burden of responsibility on them as they have created this nuclear weapon, and if I may be permitted to say what the position in international law is, it is a crime against humanity to destroy or to make a preparation for the destruction, of the right to live, of the people in this world. Right to live means the right to live a healthy life, a peaceful life, not a right to live when all the cells of your body are changed, when there are genetic effects, when future generations are affected. Now therefore there arises this question of a crime against humanity which is threatened; with the tests that crime is committed, and the question of what is the responsibility of the United Nations or of these nuclear powers arises. Now I submit,

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]

Madam, that there is a burden of responsibility resting on the big nuclear powers in this matter, to protect the unprotected individuals and nations, and when they take any action in respect of this matter, to accord protection to others, they do so in discharge of that responsibility. It is not a question of our begging them to do it. It is a question of their discharging a responsibility which rests on them by reason of the fact that they are nuclear powers and the future of this world lies in their hands, because they are the people to decide whether there should be world nuclear war or not. Now, Madam, while under the present circumstances we have got to support this decision and we have got to intensify our efforts to quicken the pace of disarmament through the United Nations or otherwise, we have also to intensify our efforts in the way of having a United Nations police force, which can protect the countries which do not want to fight and which cannot fight, and the suggestion can also be considered whether this police force should be armed with nuclear weapons or not. That is a matter for serious consideration, because today it is acknowledged on all hands that nuclear weapons are not weapons of offence; they are weapons of deterrence. If there is the nuclear weapon which might be used by way of retaliation, the other party stays its hands and stops there and also begins to feel that they themselves might be destroyed. Therefore, Madam, while this policy is the only correct policy, and this great decision was the only decision which could be taken today, yet if we find later that the United Nations fail—there is no question of the United Nations failing today, because even now there was evidence as was pointed out by the External Affairs Minister, the United States and Russia are avoiding a show-down and they have pulled back from a show-down, but if these efforts fail, then it will be time to consider the matter,

आपत्त काले मर्यादा नास्ति

There are some values which we place above our lives. Therefore, if those who have the responsibility do not discharge the responsibility and do not discharge it in time, and if the United Nations also fail,—we support the United Nations and we have supported the United Nations throughout—then alone will the question arise of revising our policy. It is not a rule of political life that you may stop future thinking or you may decide today against a future line of action. But I am sure and I am absolutely confident, that such a situation will not arise.

Next, Madam, about South-east Asia I have got to say a few words. That is the scene of hot war and that is the only scene of hot war in the world today. There are forces working in South-east Asia which threaten the peace of the world and this small war may escalate into a big war or even into a nuclear war. We must also not forget that Indonesia treats Malaysia as a non-existing State. They say they do not recognise that State. Indonesia has sent its guerillas. It is a disturbance and it is a continuous threat to the very existence of Malaysia. Malaysia has only eleven million people. And we must also remember in this connection what has been decided at the Cairo Conference. It was decided there that the frontiers of every State must be respected, frontiers as they existed on the date when independence was achieved by that State. That was the principle that was endorsed by the various powers which formed that Cairo Conference. That also brings to my mind the declaration or what appeared in the Press as the declaration of President Soekarno, that Indonesia also wanted to have its nuclear bomb. It is not beyond the range of possibility that China may help various States which may align themselves with China, with the necessary technique in this respect. Therefore, we are surrounded, I mean the people behaving in non-violence have been surrounded on the west, north and east and everywhere,

by talks of violence. The air is thick with talk of violence. This alignment between Pakistan and China is also a threat to the peace of the world. Now, situated as we are, we have got to be very careful. We must express our sympathies to the Malaysian people. There is nothing but aggression against Malaysia and we cannot ignore the fact that there is threat of aggression against that country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I would suggest that the Minister of External Affairs should himself visit these various countries in South-east Asia. I know that they are not very attractive places. I heard that some diplomats in service do not want to go that side.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not want to go.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I am sure he will go, he is not afraid. I would, therefore, request the Government to treat this as a matter of urgent importance, I mean what is happening in South-east Asia and our government should negotiate with the various governments and make a contribution towards the achievement of peace in this region.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Just one minute more, if you would permit me, Madam. There is just one point that I would like to touch on. So far as Pakistan is concerned, it is the religious, apartheid practised there which is responsible for so many of the refugees coming to our country, to whom we are giving refuge on humanitarian considerations. This is a human problem. Their souls are tormented. They have suffered cruelties. They have suffered from man-made cruelties. We must therefore, think of having friendly relations with Pakistan. Of course, we

have always tried for that. But we must make it clear that we have got to preserve our own integrity. There is no question of ambivalence on the part of the Government. But we must make it absolutely clear that our relations with Pakistan can be friendly only if justice, law and rights are respected. Thank you, Madam.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : महोदया, अच्छा होता अगर इस विवाद में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी उपस्थित रहते। कुछ दिनों से यह आलोचना सुनी जाने लगी है कि विदेश नीति के निर्धारण में विदेश-मंत्रालय के अफसरों का ज्यादा हाथ रहने लगा है। संसद् की बैठक चल रही है और इस समय शान्तिनिकेतन जाने का कोई औचित्य नहीं है। लंदन की यात्रा में समझ सकता था लेकिन शान्तिनिकेतन की तिथियाँ ऐसी निर्धारित की जा सकती थीं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इस विवाद में उपस्थित रहते और संसद् सदस्यों को विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ कहना है उसे सुनते। यह ठीक है कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी हमारे विदेश मंत्री हैं लेकिन शासन के भुखिया होने के नाते प्रधान मंत्रीजी अंततोगत्वा विदेश नीति के लिए उत्तरदायी हैं और देश के सभी विचारों से अवगत होना उनके लिए सहायक होता।

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति और विदेश नीति पर चर्चा हम अने देश के संदर्भ में ही कर सकते हैं। विदेश नीति का उद्देश्य राष्ट्रीय हितों का रक्षण और संवर्धन करना होता है, और, इस बात से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि हमारे हितों पर आज आंच आ रहा है। कम्युनिस्ट चीन से हमें पहले ही बड़ा खतरा था, वह हमारे विशाल भूभाग पर कब्जा जमा कर बैठा है। अब अणु-बम का विस्फोट कर के उसने हमारे लिए चिंताजनक परिस्थिति पदा कर दी है। हम अणु-बम बनाएं या न उनाएं इस प्रश्न पर देश में चर्चा हो रही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस पर खुले दिमाग से

[श्री ए० व० वाजपेयी]

चर्चा हो लेकिन अणु-बम न बनाने के लिए कुछ कारण ऐसे दिए जा रहे हैं जो बड़े हास्यास्पद हैं। कहा जाता है कि हम अहिंसा के पुजारी हैं, गांधी जी के उत्तराधिकारी हैं, हम भला अणु-बम कैसे बना सकते हैं? जो देश बड़ी सेना रख सकता है और उस सेना पर प्रतिवर्ष ८०० करोड़ रुपये खर्च कर सकता है, जो उस सेना को शस्त्रों से सज्ज करने के लिए दुनिया के सभी देशों से सैनिक सहायता मांग सकता है, जो गोवा की मुक्ति के लिए उस सेना को उपयोग में ला सकता है, और जो चीन के चुंगल में चली गई भूमि को वापिस लेने के लिए सेना का प्रयोग करने के लिए वचनबद्ध है वह देश अहिंसा का, गांधी का, नारा लगा कर एटम बम बने या न बने इस सवाल पर अपनी राय तय नहीं कर सकता। गांधी जी सभी अस्त्रों के खिलाफ थे। लेकिन जिस संसार में हम रहते हैं, जिन पड़ोसियों से हम घिरे हैं उनके इरादों को हम दृष्टि से ओझल कर के नहीं चल सकते। चीन ने एटम बम बनाया है प्रदर्शनी में रखने के लिए नहीं। चीन के नेता उस अणु-बम का उपयोग करने का इरादा रखते हैं। फ्रच पॉलिसी मेंट का एक डेलिगेशन अभी चाउ-एन-लाई से मिलने गया था और लौट कर उसने जो रिपोर्ट दी है उसे सरकार को पढ़ना चाहिए। चाउ-एन-लाई ने कहा, हम एटम बम बना रहे हैं काम में लाने के लिए, उससे करोड़ों लोग मरेंगे यह हम जानते हैं। और फिर चाउ-एन-लाई ने इतिहास का एक सुराणा उदाहरण दिया कि चीन में एक बादशाह था, एक राजा था, जिसके काल में लड़ाई चली और उस लड़ाई में ४ करोड़ चीनी मारे गये मगर, चाउ-एन-लाई ने कहा, हम अन्त में लड़ाई में विजयी हो कर निकले, ४ करोड़ चीनी मारे गए, तो क्या हुआ अभी हम ६५ करोड़ हैं। स्पष्ट है वे एटम बम बना रहे हैं उपयोग में लाने के लिए। अमेरिका के विरुद्ध वे एटम बम का उपयोग नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि अमेरिका के पास

एटम बम हैं। वे एटम बम हमारे लिए बना रहे हैं।

एटम बम का जवाब क्या है? एटम बम का जवाब एटम बम है और जवाब नहीं। आज रूस और अमेरिका दोनों के पास एटम बम हैं इसलिए एटम बम की लड़ाई नहीं होगी। यह सम्भावना है, लेकिन केवल अमेरिका के पास एटम बम था और जापान के पास नहीं था, तो जापान के विरुद्ध उस का प्रयोग हुआ। यदि उस समय जापान के पास भी अणु बम होता तो शायद अमेरिका को उसे गिराने की हिम्मत नहीं होती। मित्त देशों के पास और जर्मनी के पास जहरीली गैसें थी और क्योंकि दोनों के पास जहरीली गैसें थी, इसलिए उनका उपयोग नहीं हुआ।

② चीन के पास एटम बम रहे, उससे एशिया का सैनिक संतुलन बिगड़ जाय, उस एटम बम के कारण चीन प्रतिष्ठा प्राप्त करे, दक्षिणी पूर्वी एशिया के छोटे देशों को डराए धमकाए, यह स्थिति हमारे लिए अच्छी नहीं है। इस प्रश्न को हमें व्यवहार की कसौटी पर कस कर देखना होगा। यदि सरकार यह कहे कि एटम बम बनाने में कठिनाइयाँ हैं, हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है, देश का हमें पुनर्निर्माण करना है और हम अपने साधन स्रोत अणु बम बनाने में नहीं लगा सकते, तो मैं उन पर विचार करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। लेकिन, नैतिकता का, अहिंसा की गांधी जी की बातें मत करिये। देश का रक्षा होनी चाहिये। जिस हथियार से देश की रक्षा हो सकती है उस हथियार को देश को, सरकार को अनाता होगा। छोटा हथियार अच्छा और बड़ा हथियार बुरा है यह मानने के लिए मैं तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं तो चाहता हूँ सरकार एटम बम बनाने के संबंध में गंभीरता से विचार करे, यद्यपि कहा जाता है हम चाहें तो १८ महीनों में एटम बम बना सकते हैं। यह सरकार अट्ठारह सालों में बहुत से काम नहीं कर सकी, अट्ठारह

महीनों में इतना बड़ा काम कर सकेगी इस बारे में मुझे संदेह है। मुझे संदेह इसलिये भी है कि चीन ने जो एटम बम फोड़ा है उसको हमारे अणु संस्थानों ने पहले रिकार्ड नहीं किया। हमें विदेशों से पता लगा कि चीन ने एटम बम फोड़ लिया है। प्रधान मंत्री ने वादा किया था कि वे पता लगाएंगे कि हमारा अणु संस्थान चीन के विस्फोट को रिकार्ड करने में क्यों विफल रहा। मगर वे शांति-निकेतन गये हैं और हमें यहाँ युद्ध और शांति की चर्चा करने के लिये झोड़ गए हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ विदेश मंत्री इस परिस्थिति पर प्रकाश डालें। अगर हम चीन का अणु विस्फोट कब हुआ, इसका भी पता नहीं लगा सकते, तो मुझे सरकार ने इस दावे में शक है कि हम चाहें तो अट्टारह महीनों में एटम बम बना सकते हैं।

मेरे मित्र श्री सप्रू यहां नहीं हैं। जब चीन के एटम बम का सवाल होता है, तो वे फ़्रान्स का नाम लेते हैं। मैं उनसे कहना चाहूँगा कि फ़्रान्स के नेता चीनी नेताओं की तरह से युद्ध की अनिवार्यता में विश्वास नहीं करते, फ़्रान्स के नेता चीनी नेताओं की तरह से विश्व पर प्रभुत्व के सपने नहीं देखते। फ़्रान्स ने पड़ोसी देशों पर आक्रमण नहीं किया है। मगर हम फ़्रान्स द्वारा एटम बम बनाने के भी खिलाफ थे। लेकिन चीन के एटम बम की विभीषिका को, भयंकरता को, छिपाने के लिए अगर कुछ साम्यवादी और साम्यवादियों के समर्थक फ़्रांस का नाम लेते हैं तो देश का हित नहीं करते, वे प्रश्न को स्पष्ट नहीं करते, वे ऐसा भ्रम पैदा करते हैं जो हमें धोका देने के काम में आ सकता है जो भ्रम सत्य का समर्थन नहीं कर सकता।

महोदया, कम्यूनिस्ट चीन संयुक्त राष्ट्रसंघ में जाय या न जाय यह सवाल फिर खड़ा हो गया है। आज विदेश मंत्री ने कहा, हम पुराने रवैये पर कायम हैं। मैं जानना चाहूँगा : कितने दिनों तक वे कायम रहेंगे? सरकार के

बदले हुए रवैये को बारे में ये जो खबरें छपी हैं ये कोई आसमान से नहीं उतरी हैं—ये विदेश मंत्रालय से निकली हैं, और क्या विदेश मंत्री इस बात से इनकार कर सकते हैं कि एक समय आया था जहाँ यह विचार हो रहा था कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में चीन के प्रवेश के प्रश्न पर कौन सा रवैया अपनाएं। दो तिहाई मत से निश्चय हो या साधारण बहुमत से—क्या यह प्रश्न विदेश मंत्रालय में नहीं उठाया गया? क्या जो खबरें दी गई उनके पीछे कोई आधार नहीं था? फिर निर्णय बदले क्यों गए? मैं इसमें विश्वास नहीं करता कि सरकार प्रोसीजर की ओट ले, मैं इस मत का हूँ कि आज की स्थिति में हमें कम्यूनिस्ट चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में लाने के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन नहीं करना चाहिए। कम्यूनिस्ट चीन ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया है, कम्यूनिस्ट चीन विश्व शांति के लिए खतरा है, अणुबम बनाकर उसने मानवता को चुनौती दी है। क्या हम इतने भोले हैं जो समझते हैं कि कम्यूनिस्ट चीन संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में आए, तो उसका कार्याकल्प हो जायेगा? अभी हमारे विदेश मंत्री जो ने कहा, हम उसको डिसिप्लिन में रखना चाहते हैं।

श्री सी० डी० पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : बांध देंगे, रस्से से बांध देंगे।

श्री ए० बी० वज्जोरी : पहले संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के पुर्तगाल और दक्षिण अफ्रीका को तो डिसिप्लिन में रखना चाहिए। पुर्तगाल संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य है मगर उसने उपनिवेशवादी नीति नहीं छोड़ी। दक्षिण अफ्रीका संयुक्त राष्ट्र का सदस्य है, उसके विरुद्ध प्रस्ताव भी पास किये जा रहे हैं, उस पर बहिष्कार किया जाय यह मांग हो रही है मगर उसने रंगभेद की नीति नहीं छोड़ी। अगर छोटा सा पुर्तगाल और दक्षिण अफ्रीका संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जाकर बदला नहीं, तो क्या

[श्रे. ए० ब्र० वाजपेयी]

क्या कम्यूनिस्ट चीन बदल सकता है ? हमें आत्म बंचना से काम नहीं लेना चाहिए । कम्यूनिस्ट चीन संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जायेगा, सुरक्षा परिषद का सदस्य बनेगा, उसको वीटो का अधिकार मिलेगा, वह दुनिया में हमारे खिलाफ प्रचार करने के लिए विश्व का मंच पायेगा—यह भारत के हित में नहीं है । शायद हम उसका वहां जाना रोक नहीं सकते । मगर, हममें इतनी शर्म तो होनी चाहिये कि जिस देश में हमारे ऊपर हमला किया है हम उसकी वकालत वहां न करें । हमें उसका विरोध करना चाहिये और यह सवाल प्रोसीजर का सवाल है, अथवा सब्स्टेन्टिव्ह इशू है इसकी ओट नहीं लेनी चाहिये ।

मुझे इस सरकार से यही शिकायत है कि यह सरकार सही कदम उठाना तो चाहती है मगर कुछ शर्माती है, झिझकती है । अगर शास्त्री जी होते, तो मैं कहता कि दृढ़ता से काम लीजिए, पद चिन्हों पर चलना हरदम आवश्यक नहीं हुआ करता है (२) परिस्थिति बदलती है और बदली हुई परिस्थिति बदली हुई नीतियों की मांग करती है । शास्त्री जी एक क्षण के लिये यह न सोचें कि उनका कद छोटा है, वह कमजोर आदमी हैं—वह पैतालीस करोड़ भारतीयों के प्रतिनिधि हैं । खद कोई लम्बाई से नहीं होता, आत्मविश्वास के साथ बोलें और प्रश्नों पर दो ठूक फैसला करें, जो यह सरकार नहीं कर रही है । मुझे ताज्जुब है, कहीं तिब्बत के बारे में फैसला बदल तो नहीं गया । सरकार ने ऐलान किया है कि वह मानवाधिकारों के प्रश्न पर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जो अन्य देश सवाल उठा रहे हैं उसका समर्थन करेगी । मुझे विश्वास है, सरकार उस पर कायम रहेगी । नयी सरकार ने एक यही सही फैसला किया है (३) मैं इसके लिए उसे बधाई देना चाहता हूं । बधाई पूरी हो जाती अगर कम्यूनिस्ट चीन के संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में प्रवेश के सवाल पर भी हम ऐसा

फैसला करते जो हमारे स्वाभिमान के अनुकूल होता ।

महोदया, हमारे नेता भी कहते हैं और रूस के नेता भी दोहराते हैं कि भारत के प्रति सोवियत संघ की नीति बदली नहीं है । नई दिल्ली को यह स्थिति कुछ संतोष दे सकती है । मगर हवा में कुछ तिनके ऐसे उड़ रहे हैं जो हमें दूसरी दिशा में सोचने के लिए मजबूर करते हैं । मुझे आपत्ति है इस बात पर कि जब हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी रूस गए उनके साथ श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन भी थीं, तो उनके सम्मान में ग्रैंड क्रेमलिन पैलेस में जो एक सार्वजनिक समारोह हुआ और उसमें रूस के राष्ट्रपति ने जो भाषण दिया उसमें ऐसे देशों की आलोचना की जिन के साथ हमारे मित्रतापूर्ण संबंध हैं । क्या यह कूटनीति शिष्टाचार का उल्लंघन नहीं है ? हमारे राष्ट्रपति रूस के अतिथि थे । रूस से हमारी मित्रता है, हम उस मित्रता के संबंधों को दृढ़ करना चाहते हैं । लेकिन हमारे राष्ट्रपति की उपस्थिति में अगर कोई विदेशी नेता उन देशों की आलोचना करें जिन देशों के साथ हमारे मित्रतापूर्ण संबंध हैं, तो इस का समर्थन नहीं किया जा सकता । उन्होंने मलेशिया की आलोचना की है, उन्होंने और भी आपत्तिजनक बातें कहीं । हमारी ओर से उत्तर नहीं दिया गया है । अगर हमारे राष्ट्रपति कहते कि कम्यूनिस्ट चीन ने भारत पर हमला किया है, कम्यूनिस्ट चीन ने मानवता के प्रति अपराध करने का दोषी है तो शायद इसके खिलाफ आवाज उठाई जाती और रूस के नेता भी उसे पसन्द नहीं करते । हमें रूस का ध्यान कूटनीतिक शिष्टाचार के इस उल्लंघन की ओर खींचना चाहिये ।

एक दूसरा उल्लंघन भी किया गया है । कामरेड खूश्चेव चले गए, यह रूस का घरेलू मामला है—वह किस को लाएं किसको गायब कर दें यह उन का प्रश्न है, हम कहीं तसदीर में नहीं आते । लेकिन हमारे राष्ट्रपति

ने जब वहां यात्रा की तो उनकी और रूस के राष्ट्रपति की एक संयुक्त विज्ञप्ति प्रकाशित हुई थी। उस में कामरेड खुश्चेव का भी हवाला था। भारत स्थित सोवियत दूतावास ने उस यात्रा के बारे में पहले/जो पुस्तिका निकाली थी उसमें तो वह संयुक्त विज्ञप्ति पूरी दी गई थी लेकिन अभी कुछ दिन हुए हैं यह एक नयी पुस्तिका निकाली गई है। मुझे नयी पुस्तिका के प्रकाशन पर आपत्ति नहीं है मगर मुझे इस बात पर जरूर आपत्ति है कि अंत में जहां सोवियत इन्डियन कम्यूनिके दिया गया है वह कम्यूनिके नहीं है जिस पर डाक्टर राधाकृष्णन के दस्तखत थे। वे अगर चाहते तो विज्ञप्ति को संक्षिप्त कर सकते थे लेकिन वे विज्ञप्ति के ऊपर ऐसा शीर्षक नहीं दे सकते जिससे भ्रम पैदा हो कि जो विज्ञप्ति दूसरी पुस्तिका में है वह मास्को में जारी की गई थी। क्या वह भारत सरकार से पूछ कर किया गया है और यदि नहीं, तो क्या इस बात की योग्य रूस का ध्यान दिलाया जायेगा ⑦

एक तीसरी चीज भी है। हमारे विदेश मंत्री मास्को गये थे और उन्होंने अपने भाषण में इस बात का उल्लेख भी किया। वहां उन्होंने एक प्रेस सम्मेलन किया और हमें बतलाया गया कि उन्होंने इस प्रेस सम्मेलन में कुछ बातें कहीं, मगर सोवियत पत्रिकाओं ने जो उनकी पसन्द की चीज थी उसको तो छपा और हमारे विदेश मंत्री उन्हें जो बताना चाहते थे, वह नहीं छपी। रूस में भारत की तरह पत्र स्वतंत्र नहीं हैं और रूस सरकार यह कह कर बच नहीं सकती कि हमारे यहां के समाचार पत्र स्वाधीन हैं और वे जो छाप सकते हैं और जो न चाहें नहीं छाप सकते हैं। हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने अपने प्रेस सम्मेलन में जो कुछ कहा उसमें से जितना वहां के अखबारों को छापना चाहिये था, उतना नहीं छपा, क्या इसका एक अर्थ नहीं निकाला जा सकता ?

एक बात और हाल में ही प्रावदा में हिन्दुस्तान के एक कम्युनिस्ट नेता का एक लेख छपा है और उस लेख में भारत सरकार की आलोचना की गई है। हमारे विरोधी दल सरकार की आलोचना करने के लिए स्वतंत्र हैं। किन्तु सोवियत रूस का सरकारी पत्र हमारी सरकार की आलोचना करने वाला एक भारतीय का लेख छापे यह आपत्तिजनक है। हम रूस से मित्रता रखना चाहते हैं, लेकिन रूस की मित्रता का अर्थ यह नहीं है कि रूस के इशारे पर भारत में चलने वाले जो दल या व्यक्ति हैं वे हमारे देश में काम करें और उनके साथ हम नर्मी का व्यवहार करें। मैं चाहता हूं कि दोनों प्रश्नों को अलग करके देखा जाना चाहिये। कम्युनिस्ट देशों से हमारी मित्रता है वह अलग बात है और देश के भीतर दलों के प्रति हमारा रवैया क्या हो यह घरेलू प्रश्न है। अगर कोई ऐसा दल है जो पेंकिंग में संचालित हो, मास्को से संचालित हो और हम यह जानते हुए भी कि उनकी निष्ठा देश के बाहर है, वे उनके इशारे पर चलते हैं, इसलिए उन के खिलाफ कार्यवाही न करें कि मास्को क्या कहेगा, पेंकिंग क्या कहेगा, यह ठीक नहीं है और यह राष्ट्र की स्वतंत्रता को, सुरक्षा को, खतरे में डालेगा।

युनाइटेड अरब रिपब्लिक के रूस के साथ मित्रता के संबंध हैं मगर उन्होंने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को गैर कानूनी करार दे दिया है। अलजीरिया के भी सोवियत रूस के साथ संबंध हैं, लेकिन इस कारण से भी अलजीरिया के नेताओं ने कम्युनिस्टों को खुलकर खेलने की छूट नहीं दी है। मैं ऐसा नहीं कहता कि आप कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा दीजिये, लेकिन मैं ऐसा जरूर कहता हूं कि कम्युनिस्ट देशों से हमारे संबंध और देश के भीतर कम्युनिस्टों के प्रति हमारा रवैया इन दोनों को अलग अलग करके देखा जाना चाहिये और रूस के नेताओं का ध्यान खींचा जाना चाहिये कि प्रावदा में कम्युनिस्ट नेता

[श्री ए० व० वाजपेयी]

का लेख क्यों छपा तब? इसमें भारत सरकार की आलोचना क्यों छापी गई? वह यह कहकर नहीं बच सकते हैं कि वह सर-सरकारी अत्रबार है। अत्रबार सरकारी है, इसलिए मैं प्रश्न उठाता हूँ अन्यथा मैं यह प्रश्न नहीं उठाता।

पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे संबंधों का प्रश्न भी सामने है, किन्तु इतना ही कहना काफी नहीं है कि हमने "नो वार पैक्" का आफर दिया था और पाकिस्तान ने नहीं माना। इसके आगे भी क्या पाकिस्तान ने हमारे लिए समस्या पैदा नहीं की? पाकिस्तान चीन के साथ सांठगांठ कर रहा है और दिल्ली स्थित पाकिस्तानी, कम्युनिस्ट चीन और इन्डोनेशिया के राजदूतावास मिलकर काम कर रहे हैं और हमारे विरोध में एक वातावरण बनाने में सहयोग दे रहे हैं। अभी पाकिस्तान के कुछ जासूसों को पकड़ा गया, पाकिस्तान हाई कमिशन के दूसरे सचिव को भारत छोड़कर जाने को कहा गया। उस दिन जवाब नहीं मिला। विदेश मंत्रालय के मंत्री मौजूद नहीं थे, आज तीनों मूर्तियां विराजमान हैं। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहूंगा कि हमारे विदेश सचिव ने इस बात को क्यों माना कि पाकिस्तान हाई कमिशन के सेक्रेटरी को भारत से निकल जाने का जो आदेश दिया गया था, उस आदेश को २४ घंटे तक प्रकाशित नहीं किया जायगा और क्या इस तरह का आश्वासन जो करांची में हमारे हाई कमिशनर हैं उन्होंने पाकिस्तान सरकार से लिया। यह पहला ही मौका नहीं है जब हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय को पाकिस्तान के जाल में फांसा गया। एयर अटैची के शवाल पर भी भारत सरकार ने इसी प्रकार की अर्बुद्धिमता का प्रदर्शन किया था। दुनिया को इस बात का क्यों मौका दिया कि वह हमें और पाकिस्तान को एक ही स्तर पर रखकर देखे। हम प्रचार

में भी पीछे रह गये हैं। विशाल हृदय का यह अर्थ नहीं है कि हम देश के हितों की रक्षा न करें और उसका अर्थ यह भी नहीं है कि हम विश्व में भारत की तसवीर को ठीक तरह से पेश होने से रोकें। पाकिस्तानी जासूसों के खिलाफ कड़ी कार्यवाही होनी चाहिये। साथ ही पाकिस्तान, चीन और इन्डोनेशिया के राजदूतावास के जो कर्मचारी हैं, उन पर भी कड़ी नज़र रखने की आवश्यकता है। वे हमारी मित्रता का नाजायज फायदा उठाकर यदि हमारे हितों के खिलाफ काम करते हैं, तो उनके खिलाफ आवश्यक कार्यवाही होनी चाहिये।

⑤ विदेशों में हमारा प्रचार कैसा हो, इसकी काफी चर्चा चली है लेकिन विदेश मंत्रालय में हमारे आफिसर किस तरह से काम करते हैं, उसका एक उदाहरण मैं रखना चाहता हूँ। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी मास्को गये थे और उनके साथ पत्रकार भी गये थे। राष्ट्रपति जी के सम्मान में एक भोज दिया गया। उस पर राष्ट्रपति बोले और श्री मिर्कोयान भी बोले। जो भारतीय पत्रकार थे उन्होंने हमारे राजदूतावास के जो प्रेस अटैची थे उनसे कहा कि हमें भारत के राष्ट्रपति जी का भाषण चाहिये। वह कहने लग कि आज तो नहीं मिल सकता है, कल मिलेगा। जब दूसरे दिन मांगा गया तो कहा गया कि हम प्रेजिडेंट मिर्कोयान के भाषण की समरी आपको दे सकते हैं और जहां तक हमारे राष्ट्रपति के भाषण का सवाल है वह प्रावदा मैं छपा है, आप उसमें से ले सकते हैं। पर भारतीय पत्रकार रूसी भाषा से परिचित नहीं थे और न उन्हें प्रेजिडेंट मिर्कोयान का ही भाषण चाहिये था। उन्हें तो हिन्दुस्तान के राष्ट्रपति का भाषण चाहिये था लेकिन प्रेस अटैची ने इस बात की तकलीफ गवारा नहीं की कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति का भाषण हमारे पत्रों में प्रकाशित करने के लिए अनुवाद कर देते वे पत्रकारों से मिलने भी नहीं आये में नहीं जानता कि वहां पर कौन से प्रेस अटैची

थे मगर हमारे विदेश मंत्री महोदय को इस बात की जांच करनी चाहिये। अगर ऐसे ही प्रेस अटैची मास्को, लंदन और वाशिंगटन में बैठ हुए हैं, तो वे हमारे मामले को दुनिया के सामने ठीक तरह से कैसे रख सकते हैं ?

में एक और बात कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूंगा। श्री सुधीर घोष इस समय यहां पर नहीं हैं। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कुछ बातें अच्छी कहीं और कुछ बातों में वे पटरी से उतर गये और कहने लगे कि कम्युनिस्ट चीन के साथ लेनदेन के आधार पर समझौता हो सकता है। "गिव एन्ड टेक" के बारे में मैं उनसे जानना चाहूंगा कि चीन क्या देने वाला है ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : एटम बम ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : चीन एटम बम दे सकता है, चीनी हमारी प्रतिष्ठा को मिट्टी में मिला सकता है, चीन अपमान दे सकता है और चीन से क्या पाना है ? चीन से अब और हम क्या चाहते हैं, जो कुछ मिला है क्या वह काफी नहीं है ? इसमें समझौते का सवाल नहीं है। भारत की सार्वभौम सत्ता, भारत की अखंडता, यह कोई सौदे की चीज नहीं है। चीन आक्रमणकारी है। पहले वह भारत की भूमि खाली करके चला जाय। अगर हमारी सीमा के संबंध में उसके कुछ दावे हैं, तो हम उन पर विचार करने के लिए तैयार हैं, चर्चा करने के लिए तैयार हैं। लेकिन आक्रमणकारी ने वल प्रयोग करके हमारे झगड़े के स्वरूप को बदल दिया है, वह पहले हमारी सारी भूमि को खाली करके चला जाय। श्री सुधीर घोष कहते हैं कि यदि उनका अधिकार दे दिया जाय, तो वे नान मिलिटरी पोलिटिकल सल्युशन कर सकते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्रालय उनकी खवाहिश पर विचार करेगा। वे वाशिंगटन और मास्को के बीच में काफी घूमे हैं।

1152 RS—6.

ए० बी० वाजपेयी : पेकिंग जाना चाहते हैं।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : अगर वे पेकिंग जाना चाहते हैं तो उन्हें छूट होनी चाहिये ताकि वे कम्युनिस्ट चीन के नेताओं को समझा सकें। मगर ऐसा लगता है कि अभी इस संसद में कुछ ऐसे सदस्य हैं जो हवा में उड़ रहे हैं, जो वास्तविक धरती पर पाव रख कर चलने को तैयार नहीं हैं। हमने चीन से लड़ाई नहीं मांगी। युद्ध हमारे ऊपर थोपा गया है। चीन मित्रता चाहता है

3 P.M. इसका कोई भी प्रमाण नहीं है। इस समय अगर हम लेने और देने की बात करेंगे, तो उसका एक ही अर्थ हो सकता है कि हम भारत की भूमि को चीन को समर्पित करने के लिये तैयार हैं। अकमाई चिन दे कर जो चीन से समझौता करना चाहता है, वे चीन के इरादों को नहीं समझते। तिब्बत को चीन को दे कर हमने मित्रता करनी चाही और उसका दुष्परिणाम आज हमारे सामने है। मगर इतिहास को दोहराने नहीं दिया जायगा और भारत सरकार को चीन के सामने झुकने नहीं दिया जायगा। जितनी जल्दी हम इस तथ्य को समझ लें कि हमें चीन से टकराना होगा अपनी रक्षा के लिये, लोकतंत्र को सुरक्षित रखने के लिये, उतनी ही जल्दी आवश्यक है कि हम उसके अनुरूप अपनी सैनिक शक्ति का संग्रह करें औद्योगिक विकास करें और विदेशों ने अपने प्रचार को प्रभावी बनायें। नई दिल्ली की सरकार दृढ़ता के साथ विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करे और उतनी ही दृढ़ता के साथ उसको अमल में लाये। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कुछ डरते हुये, कुछ झिझकते हुये, कुछ टटोलते हुये आगे बढ़ते हैं। यह ठीक नहीं है। जितने आत्मविश्वास के साथ वे सदन में बोलते हैं, उतने ही आत्मविश्वास के साथ वे विदेश नीति बनायें और उसको अमल में लाये इसी बात की आज आवश्यकता है।

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, on an occasion like this, when we are considering our external affairs, it is gratifying to note that the correctness of our policy of non-alignment has been amply vindicated by the newly free nations of the world which have chosen to follow this policy. If more evidence is required the fulsome praise for our policy that has been expressed in the U.K., in the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., in there before us. The honour and the importance that was given to our Prime Minister during his visit to England and to our Foreign Affairs Minister in New York shows that India, which is the architect of this policy is still held in high esteem in the world's opinion.

I would like to say a word about one of the things which has been very controversial, namely, our Prime Minister's reference in England to the nuclear shield or nuclear umbrella. It is differently interpreted. It has been misconstrued. There have been misunderstandings about it. He has made it time and again perfectly clear that this reference was not made with reference to India. The reference was made to the non-aligned countries in general. One fact has to be realised. The question has often asked: Well, what is new about China exploding an atom bomb? France has been doing it. America has been doing it. Soviet Russia has been doing it. What is new in it? Why should India be shouting? China has been carrying on a propaganda like this. Her friends have been carrying on a propaganda like this and unfortunately some of our people also have been swallowing it. There is a difference. There have been nuclear powers. True. The USA is a nuclear power. The UK is a nuclear power. France is a nuclear power. It is true. But there is a difference between these being nuclear powers and China being a nuclear power. These nuclear powers are amenable to world discipline. Today, France cannot ignore

world opinion. The USA cannot ignore world opinion. Neither the U.K. can ignore world opinion and launch an atom bomb on any other country. But China observes no scruples. The whole world knows that. That brings in a new feature. Here is a country which observes no scruples. It is ruthless. It has followed a ruthless policy. It has violated all sacred pledges and it has betrayed its best friend, which was the first country to hold out its hand of friendship in the world, after it became the People's Republic. Now, what is the guarantee that this country, which is now in possession of this dangerous weapon, will not use it? That is not known. That is the new fact which our Prime Minister, with immense foresight—I must commend it—has certainly visualised, the dangers of the situation, and has referred to this fact. He has not sought protection for India alone. He says that there are non-aligned countries which have been pleading for complete disarmament and which have not followed this nuclear policy. Now, what about them? There is an unscrupulous man, a giant, a dragon, having the nuclear weapon. Are we going to be demoralised or are we going to be something or the other? So, this should not be mistaken to be the demand of a helpless country. This is facing facts and bringing to the notice of nuclear powers this new danger from an unscrupulous neighbour. That is one thing.

I have heard with great interest the impassioned plea of my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, for our being in possession of a nuclear bomb. The world knows that it is a very expensive thing. The first rocket that was exploded in America, it is estimated, cost two dollars per capita—only the rocket—to every American citizen. It may be that manufacturing a bomb may be less expensive now, but it is beyond our economic means. That is number one. Number two, the know-how we have to acquire. That takes some years, a year and a half or two years, not earlier. At least even if we try from now on we cannot overtake any

of these nuclear countries in this. We cannot master that. We cannot go nearer them. That is one thing. We may manufacture it, but what about the policy we have so far consistently followed. Till now we have been pleading for complete disarmament. As Mr. Vajpavee says it is quite possible that China may use this bomb against a country. It is quite possible. But it is not probable. China, whatever it is, is not a stupid country. The Chinese are not stupid people. They know that the first attempt they make in dropping a nuclear bomb on any other country will bring about a reaction not only from one country but from many other countries. If China should use the bomb against some country, well, the next moment China will be destroyed. China knows that full well. So, there is no fear that China will take this stupid step. Therefore, we need not go into this. It is selling our soul and going against the policy which we have consistently followed and the values we have stood for, which is in the interests of world peace and which many countries of the world, the majority of the countries in the world are pursuing. Against all these, what do we gain? In the economic field we have to build up our country. After 17 years of freedom we have still to give to our people economic betterment. We have to eradicate poverty and all that. We cannot . . .

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): What shall we build, if India is destroyed?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: There is no fear.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: There is fear.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: There is no fear of our being destroyed. (Interruption). China has to look twice, China has to think a hundred times before using its bomb. There are others also there. Well, anyway, let us take it . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: She is an unscrupulous power. So, there is nothing barred from China.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Of course. Therefore, I say there is a possibility. I do not deny the possibility, but it is not probable . . .

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: Do not demoralise our people by praising China in this August House.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Anyway, you hold your opinion and I hold my opinion.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: I hold my opinion.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: But the difference of opinion is clear.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Thank you. So, it is not wise to abandon all that we have stood for so far and to undo all that we have done in our external affairs, in our foreign policy, by following a different course now. There is my opinion. I commend that opinion to the House.

The other point to which I would like to refer and on which I would like to congratulate the Government is the Indo-Ceylon Agreement. I know that in many quarters this agreement has been considered to be unsatisfactory. Considering what the Indian nationals have done to build up the economy of Ceylon, considering the number of Indian nationals living in Ceylon, considering all this, this arrangement is not satisfactory. I do admit it. But considering the atmosphere that is prevailing in Ceylon, we have to take that into account. Considering the atmosphere that has been prevailing in Ceylon for over a decade, this arrangement is more than satisfactory. I have been in Ceylon four times. I have met different parties in Ceylon. I have talked to the Ceylonese leaders. I have been there when the ugly situation developed for the first time after 1945. When the anti-Indian feeling began to grow, I was there,

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

and I have also studied their restrictive anti-Indian measures and I know the situation. Therefore, I say that the arrangement that has been arrived at is the best that could be done under the circumstances. We could not have got a better arrangement under anybody else other than the Prime Minister Shrimovo Bandaranaike. This is the thing. However unsatisfactory from our point of view it is, under the existing circumstances, in the hostile atmosphere that is prevailing in Ceylon this is the best that could be done, and therefore I congratulate the Government and it has been skilfully handled.

Before my time runs up the other fact to which I would like to refer is the need for our Government to use the goodwill that is prevailing abroad for India. It is very shortsighted—I must be pardoned for using this word “shortsighted”—on the part of our Government not to have built up on the goodwill that exists abroad about India. Some of us have been meeting privately our heads of Government and discussing with them these things. We have not tried to build upon this goodwill. There was tremendous goodwill, there is still tremendous goodwill abroad for India. We have not done anything to build upon it. We depend entirely on the diplomatic personnel. Without disrespect to our diplomatic personnel and without in any way underrating them, I should say that they do not know—some of them are very excellent but many of them do not know—how to move with the people because they are brought up in a different atmosphere. It is nothing disparaging to them. We have to function under the new circumstances. It was all right when the British Government was ruling here because everything that was taking place was on government to government level. Now that is not the case. The Governments are all popular democratic Governments. They are all popular Governments. Now we have to move with the people. We

have to cultivate the friendship of the people. This need I do not think has been recognised or acted upon by our Government. Now I see a very commendable change in the recent years. Shri Shriman Narayan who was not a careerist has been appointed as our Ambassador to Nepal. I wish that this is followed up quickly and selected, screened non-officials of status and standing who can do honour to the country are sent to our diplomatic Missions abroad. There are many wrong impressions prevailing abroad, about which I have mentioned here before on the floor of the House, about our treatment of minorities in this country, our treatment of hill Tribes, taking Nagaland for instance, our treatment of Harijans, our religious bias, and so on. All this is exploited by two unscrupulous countries. One unfortunately is our neighbour and therefore is regarded as being authoritative. The other is our worst enemy. They make it a particular point to carry on a propaganda against us on these and several other points. There is a need, a very great need, an urgent need to remove these wrong impressions, but our Government is doing nothing about it. America is sending out people to speak about America in other countries. Eng'and is sending out people to speak about England, and of course the socialist countries are doing their very best, but we are not doing so. I do not know why. Let us spend Rs. 2 crores, Rs. 3 crores or even Rs. 10 crores on this. It will be a great asset to India. Let us select some prominent people irrespective of parties of the highest stature, who can present India in the best of colours who can go there and truly represent India and remove misunderstandings. Let us send them, if not to blow our own trumpet, at least to remove misunderstandings about India. This is a thing which I cannot overstress, which I commend to the Government to take note of and do the needful. Some time ago I had heard that some Members of Parliament would be selected to go abroad, but they did not follow it up. I am

very sorry to say that this is being neglected.

Thank you, Madam.

SRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN (Madras): Madam, I am very much beholden for the opportunity that you have been so pleased to grant me in participating in this debate. It is very customary indeed, Madam Deputy Chairman, that in a panoramic survey of the development of the international situation we always take note with particular interest of contemporary events. If that is the conventional mode, four great and mighty events have taken place which have not only a local significance but an international effect. One, Madam Deputy Chairman, is the election of President Johnson in the United States of America which, what ever might be its local political significance. I consider has a tremendous international effect so that what was threatened as Goldwaterism has not been consummated so that the world may have a breathing space for a certain amount of peaceful existence.

The second outstanding event of international importance, Madam Deputy Chairman, is the return of Labour to victory in the British polls, and that again augurs well for European diplomacy to be put on a proper setting.

The third, Madam Deputy Chairman, is the relief of Premier Khrushchev from his very onerous responsibilities, and again I value that as having a tremendous international effect which we have to take into account.

As if by a dramatic irony the explosion of a nuclear bomb by China is something that is engaging the most important strategic debate that is going on throughout the world. We have a particular interest in the development of the international situation in certain important sensitive spots like the worsening of the situation in the Congo, the deterioration of the situation in South East Asia and the rumblings of war in Laos, and a particular interest is developing with

reference to certain balance of terror that is going on in the world scene. I would visualise, Madam Deputy Chairman, in the development of the international situation three important changes. At one time we were told that the balance of power would be the accent on international relations. Slowly and steadily it developed into a balance of terror, and now we are having a balance of danger. Therefore, in the context of this deterioration and of the upsetting of the balance of peace throughout the world we have to consider certain developments of the international situation in that context. I will now very briefly and rapidly refer to the import of the nuclear explosion by China. I do not want to enter into a strategic debate on the necessity or otherwise of whether India should also run the race of manufacturing atomic bombs. Madam Deputy Chairman, one thing is certain. Some of us who have been brought up in a particular tradition cannot be untrue to that tradition. But I am not going to place my submissions on the necessity or otherwise of the manufacturing of atom bombs not so much on grounds of the philosophy of non-violence, not so much on grounds of a historic tradition, but I beg this of those friends and comrades who think that India must also join the race of manufacturing the atom bomb. My answer to that and my most respectful submission to that is first let us understand, as my esteemed comrade, Mr. Govinda Reddy, was pleased to state, why China exploded the nuclear bomb? It holds a definite portent to the Soviet Union and, I submit, it holds a definite plot so far as India is concerned.

India is now engaged in the most gigantic task of elevating the country to economic manhood and economic prosperity. If we could be diverted from that destination, and if we could deviate from that path, nobody is better satisfied and none will be happier than China itself.

One other point, Madam Deputy Chairman. I beg to those comrades

[Shri T. Chengalvarayan.]

to consider as to what should be our alignment with our neighbours. Already there is a fear going round some of the non-nuclear powers that they must also run the race and keep up the spirit. But if we, one of the bastion countries that stand against all such dangerous weapons, also fall a prey to that race, Madam Deputy Chairman, I think we are exposing all our neighbours to a great scare.

There are three factors that react in this world. One is the allegiance based either on ideological or militarist alliance, and another is the apprehension that is now created by the Chinese explosion. But India has to its credit a doctrine of affection which has developed throughout our neighbouring countries. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, in this strategic debate, whether India is to manufacture or not the atomic bomb, I beg of those friends who think on these lines that we are not going to run this race.

It has been stated, Madam, that our beloved Prime Minister during his London visit gave us some impression that we are seeking protection of partnership between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and England together. I should think nothing has been stated and nothing will be stated on these lines. India's safety does not lie in duckling under the Washington wings or under the British bosom. We stand on our own legs. But what our Prime Minister was pleased to state was that this explosion of a nuclear weapon by China is not only a threat to India but in a great measure a challenge to the entire world. In other words, our great Prime Minister has only awakened the conscience of the great nuclear powers and made them aware that the plural possession of this nuclear weapon in a vastly diversified area and strategic place will mean disaster and destruction to the entire world. Madam Deputy Chairman, international opinion is slowly turning to this important doctrine of what may be called collective security to face

this great danger. I am sure that India will not at all bend low to any of these threats. But at the same time we must remind ourselves generally of what have been our professions in the past.

A word, Madam Deputy Chairman, with your leave with regard to the Indo-Ceylon agreement which has been rather very much criticised and very often misunderstood. I share perhaps in a greater degree the poignancy of distrust and disappointment that circumstances have led us to conclude that agreement. None would have been happier perhaps if we could settle the question of the stateless nature of our Indian brethren of Indian origin completely. But may I ask my friends who doubt and who criticise the Indo-Ceylon Agreement; what is the alternative? Before we decide upon the alternative, may I most respectfully submit one aspect of international law that the law of domicile or the law of citizenship is a part and parcel of the municipal law of a particular country. It is an independent, sovereign country and it can, therefore, decide whatever may be the law of domicile or the law of citizenship and no nation, not even the international body, can question the validity and the sovereignty of such exercise. It has been said, Madam Deputy Chairman by no less an authority than Oppenheim, an eminent international jurist, in one of his greatest treatises, which has become a great work of classical value, that a municipal law governing citizenship is entirely a matter in the exercise of the sovereignty of that nation. We were faced with two alternatives, painful though they are. One was to allow the same thing to drift. And the consequence, Madam Deputy Chairman, is the state of draft to the people of Indian origin without any Statehood?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): What about the Indians in South Africa whose case was taken up to the United Nations before?

SHRI A. D. MANI: That was in the past.

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, the case of Indians in South Africa has a different aspect in so far as that is based on the racial discrimination. But in the case of Ceylon it is not conferring citizenship on the Indians of Indian origin there, they are rendered Stateless. And this Government, Madam Deputy Chairman, had to balance the advantage of having completely all Indians without any Statehood or to have a considerable fraction with Statehood. Now, I submit, it is the height of international diplomacy that we could achieve that, and I am sure, the implementation of this important agreement will be given complete sanction by the new Government of Ceylon.

One other thing, Madam Deputy Chairman, with reference to this agreement and that is that this agreement once again plays an important role that India in contemporary times has to play. We are having neighbours. Our problems with the neighbours are increasing. Now it will be a very bad day, Madam Deputy Chairman, if I may say so, with the greatest respect, if the problems with our neighbouring countries are continued to grow. That is not an act of diplomacy. That is not an act of foresight. Therefore, our action, Madam Deputy Chairman, has been in the context of resolving the difficulties and doubts regarding all problems with our very neighbourly countries which have been otherwise good neighbours. I am sure this conclusion of the Indo-Ceylon Agreement has got that charm, that importance and significance which goes a long way to solve some of the outstanding differences with our neighbouring countries. I value it.

One word more Madam Deputy Chairman, and I have done and that is the context of the international situation. We see the rapidly changing scenes one after the other. And whatever may change and whatever may occur, so far as India and the Indian Government today are con-

cerned, we stand on a solid, fundamental foundation. Non-alignment has been our banner and that banner will always be held aloft. If at all there has been any occasion, Madam Deputy Chairman, when we must hug non-alignment this is the time and this is the place. Abandonment of the non-alignment would not only spell disaster to our future, but it will totally upset the entire delicate structure of the world that is so labouriously built up.

Then, again, disarmament is our slogan. We hold it dear. And the answer to the Chinese nuclear explosion is not in manufacturing another atomic bomb, because that would be piling up atomic bomb one after the other, but the most convincing and crushing reply to the Chinese nuclear explosion is the tenacious and persistent propaganda for disarmament throughout the world, and I am sure India's voice and India's help will be greatly cherished by all those nations which desire peace. Though there may be rumblings in different places, though the situation is dark, may I only pray in the language of Cardinal Newman, "Lead Kindly Light Amid the Encircling Gloom". And that light is India.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam Deputy Chairman, before I deal with the subject of my amendment and the speech of the hon. Minister of External Affairs, may I refer briefly to the extra-ordinary speech made by the mover of the amendment approving of the Government's policy, Mr. Sudhir Ghosh. I have very great respect for Mr. Sudhir Ghosh. But the suggestion that he made that there ought to be negotiation between India and China on the border question is fraught with dangerous implications and is likely to be misconstrued in Peking, I am sure the hon. Minister for External Affairs will agree that the feelings on both sides of the House are unanimous that there should be no negotiations with China on the border question until China has accepted the Colombo Proposals and has vacated her aggression. I think that this should

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

be made clear beyond doubt by the Minister for External Affairs when he replies to the debate. The Minister referred to the question of Chinese admission to the United Nations. I would like to make a very brief remark on that and it is this that we are committed by our past record to support the Chinese admission to the U.N. and it is undeniable that there is re-thinking also on this subject at Washington. The British Government also wants China to be admitted to the U.N. and it is not possible for us to oppose the Chinese admission but we should not be vociferous or vocal in support of the admission. That is the first point I would like to make.

Secondly I would suggest to the Government of India to go back on the decision they have taken of regarding the admission of China to the U.N. as a procedural matter which requires only a majority vote. When an organisation like the U.N. admits a Member, it should be on the basis of the assent of two-third majority of membership. It is necessary for the proper functioning of this organisation because in the future it is likely that some other State, maybe a rebel State, may seek admission to the U.N. and be given the necessary majority support on the procedural basis.

The Minister also referred to the question of the present crisis facing the U.N. regarding the payment of dues by the Soviet Union for the peace-keeping operations. I know that the difficulties are very serious and on the successful solution of this dispute lies the future of the U.N. but I would respectfully request the Government to bear one point of view in mind and that is, the Soviet Union wants the maintenance of peace to be strictly within the purview of the Security Council. We should not at any time accept that position because it is the General Assembly—the United Nations—which should be charged finally with the responsibility for the maintenance of peace. I do

not mind any solution that is suggested and accepted by the Soviet Union. I would personally say that the Soviet Union must make a handsome contribution towards the peace-keeping operations which have stabilised the shattered prestige of the U.N. at the time the operations were undertaken.

I would like to go on to the question of the bomb, which is what is called the sixty-four dollar question, which is being asked everywhere, wherever India's foreign policy is being discussed. I have thought over the matter and I agree with the Government's decision not to make the atom bomb. You will be surprised that such a statement should come from a Member of the Opposition but I agree broadly with the point of view of the Government on this subject. I am not looking at it purely from the point of economy. It may be possible for us to produce a bomb which will not cost more than Rs. 17 lakhs as Dr. Bhabha seems to have said in a press interview, but the point that weighs with me is that we have supported the Test Ban Treaty and it looks very odd for us just because China has detonated a bomb for us to come forward and say that we too should manufacture the bomb. We should wait for some time in the matter but I am not prepared to say that the decision not to manufacture an atom bomb should be a decision valid for all times. This is a decision which I am prepared to accept in the present circumstances of the moment and I feel that he should not fritter our economic and financial resources in making a bomb in competition with China but I would like to say this. Having said that the bomb should not be manufactured, we should think in terms of assistance to India by Nuclear powers in the event of an emergency. The Minister fought shy of the word 'nuclear shield'. In politics we should not be frightened by phrases or slogans. Disarmament also is a nuclear shield. Test Ban

Treaty also is a nuclear shield. There is nothing dishonourable for a nation to come and say: 'In the event of a nuclear attack, A nation or B nation or C nation should come to our aid.' Asking for mutual assistance at the time of attack is not considered a derogation of the sovereignty of a nation and is not considered criminal at least in international affairs. I would refer the Minister to the Treaty of Assistance that existed between Greece and the U.K. prior to 1939. There were no bases of the U.K. in Greece but when Greece was attacked by the Nazis, the Greek Government invoked the Treaty of Assistance and Britain came to her aid and Mr. Winston Churchill gave it in a most magnificent manner. I feel that the idea which our Prime Minister, Mr. Shastri, mooted in a very brief press talk has found very encouraging response in Great Britain. I wonder how many have read the detailed report of the recent foreign affairs debate in the House of Commons. It was Mr. Donnelly who is a Member of the Labour Party, who said in the course of the debate: that "We must make our policy clear by which any attack on Calcutta or Rangoon or Singapore or Washington would be regarded as an attack on Great Britain". I would respectfully ask the Government to explore this idea and not be frightened by the storm of protests that the term 'Nuclear shield' has raised. It is nothing dishonourable at all to seek assistance of other nations and I will include the Soviet Union also among the nations whom we should approach for assistance in the event of a nuclear attack. The 'Economist' of London commenting on Mr. Shastri's reported remark said that China also should sign the guarantee to India. We should also approach China, France and all other nations. Those who have the nuclear power must give the guarantee to the non-nuclear nations. There is nothing dishonourable or disgraceful at all about asking for assistance and I hope the Government would not be frightened by the stormy reaction that it

has had from some Members of their own Party and give up this proposal.

I would go further and say that when such guarantee means the presence of the Soviet Union, the U. K. and the U.S.A. in the Indian Ocean area, we should welcome such assistance in the interests of peace.

I would like to go on to another point raised in one of my amendments, namely, the Non-aligned Conference which was held in Cairo. We had an opportunity of discussing the decisions of that Conference in the last international debate but then some of us did not have before us the full picture of what happened at the Conference. I am not against the Government's participation in the Non-aligned Conference but it seems to me that the Chinese propaganda is so effectively at work that if the Non-aligned Conference continues to function on the present lines, it may finally end up in anti-colonial rally with pro-Chinese segments fitted into that rally. We do not want to be made use of as a tool for Chinese ambitions in any international conference. It is very unfortunate that the Non-aligned Conference did not find it possible to protest against the Chinese decision to detonate the atom bomb. A protest of that character from the Non-aligned Nations would have had very great moral weight as far as China was concerned. The Non-aligned Conference let us down very much on that matter. Further I do not agree, however much I may disapprove of Mr. Tshombe, with the Non-aligned Conference treating Mr. Tshombe's presence as a matter of prestige of the Conference. For the first time I am asking the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs who represented India at the U.N., whether she has seen in any international gathering the questions of the credentials of a person to represent a State in a Conference being decided by a voice vote and a roll-call vote as was done at that time? It was left to the Delegate

[Shri A. D. Mani.]
from Libya to ask in that Conference: 'What would India say if somebody suggested that India should be represented not by Mr. Shastri but by Dr. Radhakrishnan, the President?'

Then I go on to the third subject of my amendment, namely, the question of persons of Indian origin in British Guiana. I had the good fortune of visiting British Guiana many years ago and I had the opportunity of long talks on their problems with Dr. Cheddi Jagan, who is the Leader of the People's Progressive Party and Mr. F. Burnham, who is the Prime Minister of British Guiana at the present time. The population of British Guiana is about 600,000 and the population is equally divided between persons of Indian origin, Africans and persons of Portuguese descent. At the time I visited, there was a multiracial society at work but now from all accounts that I have heard from British Guiana, there is a tremendous and a very terrific amount of anti-Indian feeling in British Guiana. If there would have been no proportional representation, Dr. Cheddi Jagan would have come to power. But apparently the U.K. Government did not want Dr. Cheddi Jagan to come to power because of his alleged communist sympathies.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Why alleged? He is a communist.

SHRI A. D. MANI: And on that account the constitution was altered . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Why did you say 'alleged'? It is a fact.

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . and proportional representation was introduced by the present Labour Government. The Labour Party, at that time, when this Constitution was introduced by Mr. Duncan Sandys, supported Dr. Cheddi Jagan, but when they came to office they caused an Order-in-Council to be passed dis-

missing Dr. Jagan from office. Madam, we should not be concerned too much in the internal affairs of British Guiana, but we have a certain sense of responsibility to persons of Indian origin wherever they are settled . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: There are more important things than Dr. Cheddi Jagan.

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . and I would request Government to make urgent representations to the British Government not to force a constitutional solution on British Guiana which will force the Indian community to demand partition of British Guiana. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Mr. Pande, what do you want to say?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: What I want to say is that I should also be allowed to participate in this debate. I do not give my name generally, but this is a debate where I must participate. I have not spoken on many things before.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You do not give your name generally but this time your name has been given.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Somehow or other it happened and I had been rather late in giving my name.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now Mr. Gurupada Swamy.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, some friends who preceded me have tried, may be unconsciously, to turn the whole debate between changers and non-changers, between *status quo* and change. May be from that point of view they would like to project their views in a sharp manner, so that Government may be moved in the direction in which they want them to move.

Madam, I agree with one statement of my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, that is, that the present situation is so fluid

and so critical, that the circumstances are so intimidating and exciting, both, and that it requires a constant review, a constant appraisal. I believe, no foreign policy of any country is settled once and for all. I do not also believe that a perpetual change is necessary. I do believe sincerely that the foreign policy of any country in the world, in the past, in the present or in the future, should be guided by two considerations, firstly, by the values which that country wishes to project, which she would like to translate, and secondly, the fundamental interests of that country in that particular situation. So from that point of view I say the present situation really calls for, what I might call, an agonising reappraisal of our foreign policy. While making this reappraisal, in my view four things are important, four things have got to be taken into consideration. Firstly, this is not a bipolar world; this is a multipolar world. There are many strong forces working in the world of today; there are pressures not only in the Western Bloc but also in the Eastern Bloc; there have been contradictory trends prevalent in both the Blocs. And there are more than two focuses of power in the world. Secondly, there is increasing proliferation of atomic weapons in the world and this has really introduced a very great element of danger. Thirdly, there are the emerginations coming more and more, new countries in Asia and Africa who have attained freedom. And fourthly, Madam, the very concept of non-alignment is being radically changed. Countries which have traditionally been non-aligned seem to be, in certain circumstances, aligned against one another. There are contrary trends, contrary alignments within the non-aligned countries themselves. So, while making a reassessment or reappraisal of our foreign policy, these four considerations, which are fundamental to me, should be borne in mind.

Madam, some of the Members suggested that India has no alternative

but to make the atom bomb. Before I deal with this question may I draw the attention of the House to the nature of the problem and to the history of the Chinese bomb explosion itself, so that it may hold out a lesson for us? In the light of it we can formulate our policy. Before I do so, I suggest that the debate that has been going on on this issue should be carried on, that there should not be any end to the debate, that the dialogue on this issue, on the bomb explosion, should be carried forward, and we should not be hasty, we should not hustle, we should not be just chauvanistic or emotional, but we should have a clear and a proper appraisal of the whole situation in the context of the Chinese explosion and formulate our foreign policy accordingly.

The Chinese bomb explosion, Madam, is a very interesting subject indeed. The Chinese explosion is far advanced than the explosions of some of the earlier countries which exploded the bomb. I am told that the Chinese explosion is far advanced in every respect. While other countries started the explosion with plutonium, China started off the explosion using uranium, which is a far more advanced method of making the bomb. Secondly, Madam, I find from information gathered through reports that China has been able to succeed even better than France in the matter of a gaseous diffusion plant. In France, even after six years of atomic development, the Government has not been able to set up a gaseous diffusion plant which requires tremendous sacrifices, tremendous effort. I am told that in the year 1945, when America did this, the Americans had to utilise nearly ten per cent of the entire production of electricity in that country for this purpose. In the same manner, China pressed into service most of its production of electricity for the purpose of creating this gaseous diffusion plant within record time. Thirdly, we have got to bear in mind that

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.]
in the year 1945 China had only ten nuclear physicists. and when there was a break between China and Russia, during those three years between 1959 and 1963, China had to sacrifice tremendously in all sectors for the purpose of pushing forward her atomic programme, and these three years, as you are aware, have been three years of bitter scarcities, acute scarcities, in China. But still, in spite of all this, they pushed forward this programme, and I am told that China today is in a position to set off a series of explosions, not one or two, but a series of explosions, and within the course of two years she might be able to manufacture a hydrogen bomb.

This is one aspect of the matter.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Already it was like a hydrogen bomb.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Dr. Sapru seems to be happy about it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I am giving one aspect of the matter. That is the situation that obtains in China with regard to their atomic programme.

May I draw the attention of the House now to the fact that today it is not merely China which has got the capability to manufacture atomic devices? I am told that nearly a dozen countries in the world, particularly the NATO powers, are in a position to manufacture atomic weapons. According to one of the reports submitted to the American Academy of Science and Arts, it is reliably learnt that all the countries in NATO, including Italy, West Germany and Belgium, are in a position to manufacture atomic weapons. They are not in any way inferior to China in respect of atomic science. Then take our own country. I think nobody can think here or elsewhere that we do not and cannot have the required

wherewithal, the knowledge and the know-how, to produce nuclear weapons. We have the capacity and we have the capability and the knowledge and the know-how to do this. So let us realise that the world consists of more than these five powers. There are nations which can really and successfully produce nuclear weapons, if they so desired. Then why did China, knowing all these factors and knowing full well the sacrifices which it would entail, take to this atomic programme? Why did she start on this programme of producing of atom bomb? That is a very important and decisive point that we have got to bear in mind. Maybe, as China has ostensibly said, the chief excuse for her to produce an independent atomic weapon of her own was the threat of America in the atomic field. That would be the chief and primary excuse that they would give. Maybe they wanted to bring about a break to their isolation in the world. May also be that they liked to establish for themselves a truly irrevocable status in the world. They want to emerge, perhaps, as one of the acknowledged big nations of the world. It may also be that in the context of Asia, they would like to play the role of the mighty mentor in all Asian affairs. All these may be true. But the fact remains that China even today is saying—and it is very strange and paradoxical—that the atom bomb is a paper tiger. This is no bluff. It is not a hoax. I take the the Chinese seriously because in the past without taking the Chinese seriously we have suffered. We should take every word of China seriously. In spite of their producing an atom bomb, they have said that they believe even today that the atom bomb is a paper tiger. They say that they believed it in the past and even now and in the future also, they say it is going to be a paper tiger. Still they produced the atom bomb. Why did they do it? There must be some reason.

(Time bell rings)

Madam, have I finished my time?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken eighteen minutes.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Please give me five more minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take another three minutes.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I think the overriding consideration seems to be that they should have the prestige and the status, and, if possible, to use it as a means of intimidation against various nations in the world, particularly the nations of Asia. Therefore, let us realise that even in the Chinese thinking today the bomb is largely a symbol of prestige and status. Suppose, as some friends say, China poses a real threat to India, can she utilise that bomb against us. Can China use it? That is an important question. Are they in a position to use the bomb against us if they want to do so? I am afraid, not. I say this because scientific opinion in the world and the judgment of the nuclear powers seems to be that atomic weapons are only weapons of deterrence and they are not weapons of defence. We must understand the difference between a deterrent and a defence. A deterrent is a peaceful device and it is only capable of being utilised effectively during peacetime. It can only deter and prevent an aggressor. But during wartime, when attack takes place, it is of no value. Suppose the atom bomb is used against a nation, then you must have counter retaliatory force, force enough to retaliate. Whether the country has got that retaliatory force is the question. It is the judgment of the world and I think it is the opinion of the great nuclear scientists today that against a surprise attack, a sudden attack by nuclear weapons, without warning, there cannot be any protection or safety. Suppose India makes an atom bomb we do not really intend to use it first. Unless you use it and strike against the

enemy in the first instance, the weapon is useless. China has got it now and even believing that China is a potential aggressor, and were to use the atom bomb against us, there is really no protection.

I know there is an argument advanced that it is possible to have 'limited nuclear operation'? I do not think that technically a nuclear warfare is possible in—the world. However, I concede, there are two views. One is that any use of atomic weapons escalates into an all-out war. It is inevitable. Another view is that it can be contained. Now, the question is this. Situated as we are, should we take to the course of manufacturing atomic bombs at the present time, whose value is extremely doubtful and whose manufacture involves tremendous sacrifice? (*Time Bell rings*). It would involve tremendous sacrifice to our economic development. Therefore, Madam I say that the best course in the existing situation is not to manufacture these bombs. The position could be reviewed. You can revise it later. But at the present time, I am afraid, it is a very dangerous course and it is very suicidal and we should not divert our resources in the making of atom bombs.

Lastly, I submit that the best defence for the country against any attack is not in mere military strength alone. The best defence lies in bringing about what I may call a renaissance of our political unity and strength, and to bring about the rapid economic development of the country. If these are there, if there is this renaissance and efflorescence of our will to dedicate all our efforts for building up our country and to build up the economic sinews of our country, it will be possible to defend our country against any potential aggressor. Secondly, I do not want to deprecate our efforts with regard to our defence. Our defence efforts should be made and every reasonable sacrifice has got to be made to build up our defence strength.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Minus the atom bomb.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Yes, minus the atom bomb. At the same time I would say that defence is different from deterrent. A deterrent has only limited value. It has value only in peacetime. But defence has got value during wartime. Therefore, I say we must increase our defence strength and step up our defence potential. At the same time we should have rapid economic transformation and social development. That is the only way in which we can achieve our goal and that is the only way we can protect our country.

4 P.M.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi): Madam, I have heard our friends, Mr. Patel, Mr. Sudhir Ghosh and Mr. Mani build up a case. They have talked about the various shortcomings and deficiencies in our policy and what they would like should be done particularly about the shield, the atom bomb or other things, even indirectly about alignment, excepting saying that we should not be aligned with one bloc or the other. I would have appreciated if they had, after carefully analysing the situation, said in so many words that we should be aligned with one bloc or the other, whatever their preference may be. I could well understand that because otherwise it is a very misleading thing to build up a case and ask us to follow a policy which for all practical purposes, and in every way, is alignment with one bloc or another. It is well-known where the alignment should be. I have thought over the situation, as Mr. Mani has done, and my conclusion is quite contrary to what he seems to think. I think that alignment with one bloc or the other will not work. At the same time, I do not understand how having a nuclear shield, or whatever you may call it, is going to help our defensive positions. I beg to submit that the country got a very big

stature due to the great Prime Minister we had in Pandit Nehru, because of his imagination and greatness and genius and his own personality and outlook and interest in people in general, not only of his own country. Because of this he was able to create a tremendous amount of goodwill for our country in spite of our handicaps in economy, our backwardness. Now, that situation has changed and shall have to face the world as it is and as we are and we will have to reckon with a lot of hard facts and probably get a few knocks also in the bargain. We have to realise where we stand. We are backward country, a developing country and we have a long way to go before we can go anywhere near the advanced countries economically and in various other fields like agriculture, industry and so on. Our status abroad will be judged by our position at home and, as Mr. Sudhir Ghosh said, in terms of the cobages that we grow. So, people will not be as generous towards us now as they were before, when Mr. Nehru was alive because of the great impact of his personality and the great impression that he created for our country. I personally feel that this idea of a nuclear shield will not work. It is not likely to work. If we get it from one bloc, that is, the Western bloc, then we shall for all practical purposes be hanging on to the aprons strings of the Western bloc and if we have this from Russia then for all practical purposes we will be tied on to the apron strings of the Russian bloc or the Communist bloc and in every case we shall be at their mercy without getting freedom. Being in a dependent position is not going to help our country very much. We shall have to be dependent upon one country or the other. We must have friendship with both or with none and dependence, sort of hitching ourselves to their bandwagon will not help us. The Western Powers are interested in seeing that Communist is contained. Previously it was known as stopping the sphere of influence but now it is

no more called that; that expression has become out of date and now the idea is to contain Communism. India is the stronghold of democracy and the last fort or so, and so they would not like it to fall into the Communist way. In the same way, I suppose, the Communist bloc would not like India to become just a hanger on of the Western bloc or to be in their camp and both these blocs are likely to look upon us, they probably do look upon us, in a peculiar way. If we get too much of Western help, China does not see why she should spare us and so attacks us or try to bring us within their influence; similarly, I think, the Western Powers would be concerned if we take to the Communist way and become Communist like other countries in Asia and the Far East. This is a sort of cold or hot war or psychological warfare that is going on. It is there whether we like it or not. They do not want India to be identified very much with one bloc or the other. If we turn to the Western countries, China is likely to come in and attack us, take it as an invitation to come in and attack us. If the Russian people come in too much then the Western countries are likely to take this as an invitation to make further inroads and interference in our country. We would not like our country to become one of their base from where they would like to fight or to take this as their battleground in the cold or hot war. Pandit Nehru had tried, in his own statesman-like manner, to keep that sort of warfare away from our country. I can assure our hon. friends who may have very high hopes about help from abroad of one thing. After the Chinese attack, though our weakness in the defence preparation was very badly ridiculed and criticised, even when we went with a begging bowl to various countries, though moral and material support came from all the countries of the East and the Western bloc—even with that help—we have not been able to face this Chinese threat. All this help has not enabled us to face the Chinese threat even today.

Secondly, even if we go to them for help, I don't think they would want to help. They have had very many bad experiences in Korea and elsewhere and they would not like that their sons should fight and give their lives in foreign countries. Their experience in Korea and elsewhere has been bitter. They may like to use our country as a battleground in their cold or hot war but they would not like their people to be fighting in far away countries because they would not brook a similar experience again. That is as far as help from the Western bloc or from others is concerned. Apart from that, if we try to take any shield from the East and the West together, both collaborating, helping those who do not have nuclear weapons, the question is how far they are likely to stand together. They seem to fall apart every now and then and they remain almost on the brink of a war. What surety there is that they will stand together? What surety there is that they would not throw this away as just a piece of paper, a scrap of paper? In the case of any test, any real situation arising, need arising, I do not think they will be able to stand together; this is very doubtful. I doubt very much whether they would stand together and fight our battles. In any case, those battles will have to be fought by our own people. It is doubtful whether the Western Powers would like to give us protection and shield against Pakistan or whether the Russian bloc would want to give us the shield against China. In this situation, I am very doubtful whether they would be willing to spend that much money which we ourselves and friends like Mr. Mani mentioned. Mr. Mani and friends have been advising us today about economy in this matter and for the sake of peace, they would not have it. I think we should have our own weapons for the sake of peace because even in the case of Russia and America having these weapons, it is only the fear of the enemy using this force that is making people very anxious for peace. It is making them

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]
really alive in an individual, personal way. Every citizen of America is very anxious that there should be peace because of the nuclear weapons or the atomic weapons which shows them the reality that is there if some trouble takes place. So I think in India also it is not only a deterrent weapon but I think it is also a weapon of offence. It would not say it must be an offensive weapon but it can be used for offensive purposes; if people drop atom bombs on other countries it is certainly a weapon of aggression. But it can be a deterrent weapon and people will see that they do not rub the wrong way because they will be afraid that India might hit them back. If we do not make ourselves strong enough people will have temptation to walk across and take over our territory and they will think that it is very easy to do so. All our non-violence, all our declarations of peace and our desire for peace did not prevent China from attacking our country with such serious consequences and again if we remain unprepared the same history will be repeated as it was in 1962. When the Chinese trouble came the Government was accused of unpreparedness not keeping the country prepared with defence preparations and so on. Today I do not know what hope we have for not preparing ourselves. For the last two years the Government has been preparing the country for defence and today we have no reason not to prepare ourselves. Today we cannot say that there will be no war; we cannot say that we will not be attacked by any neighbouring country or any foreign country. Therefore I think we should prepare ourselves. Why should we have even automatic weapons for which there was such a hue and cry two years back? We could have gone on with 333 or maybe even with *lathis* and *dandas* or something like that. But the fact is as people change the defence preparations change. It is a continuous process. When we could *no more depend on lathis and dandas* we had had to come to 303 and from there we are going to automatic wea-

pons. At that time there was tremendous pressure for these automatic weapons and there was a lot of criticism of the Government that they had not taken care to equip the country properly. Even the newspapers in foreign countries criticised us very much and very bitterly almost to the point of ridiculing our Government and our defence preparations. Our defence, great thought it was, was not sufficient to meet the situation. Therefore I think today we have no justification for repeating the same history of 1962, and I think it is necessary that we now go on to make atomic weapons. It is a great deterrent. We should have it not only as a deterrent; in case a situation arises we should be able to drop it but I would not like that possibility; I do not want it but if such a situation does arise we shall have to do it. And the situation is very fluid today. I may be wasting my arguments today but I will not be surprised if after six months probably the Minister of External Affairs himself comes forward along with the Defence Minister saying that we should make atom bombs because the situation has changed and there is a new threat now and therefore we should do it.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: And we will lose six months.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: So I think we should have these bombs. I remember some important people from the American Embassy at one time asked me why we do not bombard the supply lines of China when they attack us. And my reply was that if we had bombarded their supply lines they would have bombarded our cities and we were not in a position to face that situation. We could not have defended ourselves if we had bombarded their supply lines and got our own cities bombarded in retaliation. That would have been a very difficult and untenable situation which we could not face.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have only just two or three minutes.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: So I think we should have these bombs for our defence preparations. I think Rs. 17 lakhs or Rs. 37 lakhs is not such a big sum that the entire economy will collapse under its weight. I think it is worth spending that money for the preparation of these bombs because we cannot hang on to other countries hoping that they will look after us and supply us with all the things in times of need. They cannot supply and they will not supply them. So we should not be depending on anybody so far as the country's defence is concerned.

Madam, I would also like to say a word about Indians abroad. I also share the feeling of the Government that our people when they go abroad to other countries should look upon those countries as their home country, those people as their own people, and become the citizens of the respective countries. To go and settle down in those countries and at the same time always to be looking back to the home country for everything, looking upon India as your own country rather than the country where you have spent almost your entire life, is very unfair to that country and it is very unfair to India also that India should have so many of her own children and so many foster-children living in all those countries but always looking back to India. In such a case their loyalties are also likely to be doubted as to whether they are loyal to the countries in which they have settled or whether they are loyal to India. What happened in Burma? There are a large number of Chinese citizens there but those Chinese citizens have taken this nationalisation of shops and establishments and other measures as steps taken by their own Government and they continue to line there. They have not left the country. But our Indians want to marry their sons in their home country; they want to marry their daughters in the home country and they want to come back for these things. They also want to send back their entire earnings here into India. It is a shortsighted policy of theirs that they

should have this sort of double loyalty. It is not right that they should go on living there and look back to India for everything. If they do not feel happy there they should come back here and settle down here. They should not have their loyalties divided between those countries and India and this business of coming and going back and forth is very unfair both ways. And I think we sometimes become more touchy about Indians abroad. I do feel that they should settle down there and look upon those countries as their home and they should become the citizens of those countries. If they do not want to remain there they should come back to India and look upon India as their home for better or for worse.

Lastly, our whole propaganda is only done at the level of our diplomats but I feel that our propaganda should be among the people of the various countries. Madam, you may be knowing that a large number of young men and women come here from foreign countries and work in our slums, work with our student community, work in our backward areas. Thus quite a lot of goodwill is created. If you go and work among the people of foreign countries you build up good relationship and create goodwill. You come to know each other better. But we do not do that. We cannot hope to create goodwill on this tea party basis, through parties and dinners and other programmes. Without any contact with the people of those countries, without any concrete measures or steps taken to establish goodwill among the people of those countries it is no use. Our people abroad, our diplomats and their staff should work among the common people there. They should have the opportunity and experience of knowing you, moving with you and appreciating whether you have goodwill for them or whether you do not have goodwill for them. The visits of great leaders like Prime Minister, Ministers and other people do some good no doubt but it is only to some extent. It does create a certain amount of goodwill and is a

[Kamari Shanta Vasisht.]
source of propaganda. People begin to know each other and they get interested in what you say and what you do. But it is only as far as it goes; it does not really go deeper. Those people have no other opportunity or occasion to know anything more about us. There should be identification of our people in our Embassies abroad with the people of those countries and they should work with the people there. It is very important that we should contact them at personal level and not only have contacts in the diplomatic circle.

I do not think I have time to say more. Thank you.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam Deputy Chairman, the House will forgive me if I give expression to views which might seem somewhat unconventional. It has become the fashion for a certain set of people to denounce the policy of non-alignment with which the name of Jawaharlal Nehru is imperishably associated.

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

Sober papers of the standing of 'Guardian' and 'Observer' have paid tributes to the policy of non-alignment followed by this country. It may be said that things have made it difficult for us to follow that policy. China has developed the atom bomb; she has actually exploded an atom bomb and in a few years it will probably be a thermo-nuclear power. Now it is assumed by those who are apprehensive of what China is doing that China's principal aim is to attack this country or that China's principal effort is directed against this country.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: It is not an apprehension; it is a fact.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I will have to go into very great details if I were to reply to you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You have no time to go into details. Let him go on, Mr. Pande.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I would like to say that China has a real apprehension because of the fact that the U.S.A. is a thermo-nuclear power and that Taiwan is next door. She can attack China if she chooses to do so. Therefore, it may be that the quest for nuclear weapons so far as China is concerned is not directed so much against us as against the possibility of a nuclear attack by the USA. Also, China's relations with the Soviet Union have been deteriorating. I do not think that the Soviet Union has any intention to attack China. I do not think that China has any reason to apprehend any attack from the Soviet Union, but China wants to be independent of the Soviet Union so far as nuclear power is concerned, just as France wants to be independent of the U.S.A. so far as nuclear power is concerned.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: We also want to be independent, in atomic power.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Now, I do not think it is necessary for us to think in terms of nuclear power. On this question of nuclear power we have taken an ethical stand, a positive stand, which is based upon the philosophy of humanism, based upon certain human considerations. I would like those who are enamoured of these nuclear weapons to read the symposium which was conducted by Philip Toynbee, the son of the great Arnold Toynbee. The book is called, "The Fearful Choice". We have a fearful choice before us and the question that Dr. Arnold Toynbee has posed is whether the preservation of the human race is one in which the entire world is interested or not interested. We have to see that the human race or the civilisation which has been built up in the course of centuries is not destroyed by nuclear powers. Therefore, whatever may be for or against nuclear weapons as a deterrent I would say that the proliferation of nuclear weapons will pose a great threat to the future of the civilisation that man has built up in the course of centuries.

It will be against our spiritual heritage, if I may use that word, to go in for the manufacture of atom bomb. We should rather utilise our atomic power . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You address me, Dr. Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We should rather utilise our atomic power and atomic energy for peaceful purposes and our scientists should be able to do something spectacular in that direction. Let me also say that it is easy for us to talk of a struggle with China. That struggle may last for centuries and it is not wise for us to think in terms of a struggle in regard to a border dispute. We have supported in the main the Colombo proposals, but I confess that I am one of those who do not regard the Colombo proposals as something sacrosanct. What I am after is negotiation with China . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: May I know if Shri Sapru is for negotiating with China at any cost?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: . . . on terms honourable to this country and honourable to the people of China and it would be an evil day for this country if we were to think in military terms. It has not been the tradition of this country to think in military terms. I think we should stick to that tradition. I am not, therefore, enamoured of all this talk about defensive preparations. I would rather that we spend the money that we are spending on our defences, on banishing poverty and unemployment from this country. The question, therefore, of establishing good relationship with China is important. Perhaps one of the reasons for China's truculence is the ostracism which the People's Government of China has had to face. Ostracised by the community of nations, China is behaving like a bandit. Admit her into the United Nations and it may be possible for you to make the Chinese behave differently. (*Time bell rings.*) Just one or two minutes. The subject

is vast, it covers so many aspects, Asia Europe and all that. I could go on talking for a long time, but I am just going to refer to one subject on which I hold unconventional views.

I refer to the question of Indo-Pakistan amity. I know that the Foreign Minister has been heroically working for Indo-Pakistan amity. I know that Pakistan is a very difficult country to deal with. I know that progressive forces in that country are weak. I know that our brothers in East Pakistan have had to face a bad time, but there is a mystic unity underlying this country. It may be that Pakistanis will think that this is mischievous talk. They may think that it is dangerous talk. But I would say that it is necessary for us to think in terms of a confederation which would include Pakistan, India and Kashmir . . .

AN. HON. MEMBER: Kashmir as independent?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Well, we have to think along new lines. It may be that this solution will not be acceptable to Pakistan today, but we have to work for it gradually and persistently and it is by working for this ideal that we shall be able to establish Hindu-Muslim unity, to establish the foundations of a great secular State. For what happens in Pakistan is bound to have its reactions in our own country. The security of the whole minorities is bound up with our relationship with Pakistan. The future of our secular State is bound up with our relations with Pakistan. I would, therefore, like this question to be tackled from a new angle.

Lastly, I would say that there are many European problems. There are many problems in South East Asia, which have got to be tackled by us seriously. We have fortunately today a new Government in Britain and we have fortunately today President Johnson, who has got liberal ideas

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

It is unfortunate that the world has lost the services of Mr. Khrushchev. But there is no reason to apprehend that Mr. Kosygin, Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Suslov will depart from the essential policy of Mr. Khrushchev. Therefore, let us all work for a system of collective security by the liquidation of military blocs and all those things, for a collective security backed by international law, backed by the system of world codes.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I cannot in the short time at my disposal develop all these points, but I hope that at the United Nations the Foreign Minister will play a useful part and that he will not echo either the views of the Soviet Union or of the Anglo-American bloc. We have a definite point of view. Let us stick to that point of view, and it is no use our talking in terms of a nuclear shield to be provided by Russian, the U.S.A. and the U.K. If they all unite, the world unites. The only two countries are China and France. You cannot just eliminate them. Therefore, let us think in terms of collective security. Let us think in terms of a world order based upon a world federation and backed by international law. Thank you very much.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Minister of External Affairs has given us a fairly full picture of the present international situation and he has taken us along with him to the various problems that confronted him, and I have the fullest sympathy towards the Minister of External Affairs when he is called upon to solve problems bristling with difficulties and confounding the best brains of the present-day world. Though the field is very alluring, I do not propose, due to the embarrassing time factor, to enter into the very many alluring grounds covered by the Minister of External Affairs, but I propose to be nearer home and deal with only one problem, the so-called Indo-Ceylon Pact. In dealing with that problem I may request the Mi-

nister of External Affairs to take my speech to be conveying the feelings of remorse and agony felt by millions of people over this Indo-Ceylon Pact. The Minister has been telling us how politicians and statesmen all over the world are trying to enthrone justice and equity, are trying to find out how best human dignity can be safeguarded through various measures. I am going to measure the Indo-Ceylon Pact only through that rod of human dignity, international justice and even commonsense. Measuring with any such rod I find that this pact means a gross betrayal of millions of people whose one sin has been that they have been looking towards this country and this Government for solace.

The Indo-Ceylon Pact—the very name I would say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the very name is a misnomer. There is no problem at all between two sovereign countries like India and Ceylon. The main problem is between millions of people settled for generations together in Ceylon and the Ceylonese Government in the matter of the treatment meted out to them. The only part that we could have played and the legitimate part that we should have played is by giving a human aspect to the problem. All along it has been stated that we are not going to look at this problem as other than a problem of human interest, and the persistent, the consistent and the logical policy being followed by the previous Government—to be more correct, by the late lamented Prime Minister of this country—has been given a go-by even without an iota of remorse. He has been stressing all along that the problem of millions of people who have been unfortunately termed as stateless is a problem that has to be tackled mainly and solely by the Ceylonese Government. The Indian Government enters the picture only to guide the Ceylonese Government when it needs guidance. A point has been raised in this House whether the sovereignty of one country can be abridged by the actions for consultations of another country. Various views on sovereignty there have been.

and the present friend is that even sovereignty is to come under the aegis and under the guidance of the eternal principles of justice and fairplay. If this is merely the sovereign right of the Ceylon Government, Mr. Kotelawala, Mr. Dudley Senanayake, after that Mr. Bandaranaike, and now Sirimavo Bandaranaike need not have and would not have and could not have come to this country for consultations. The very fact that successive Prime Ministers of Ceylon have come to this country for consultations on this problem means that this is not purely a problem wherein the sovereignty of a country is at issue. This is a problem wherein the whole world has got an interest. The fact of the matter is that millions of people who are called people of Indian origin are settled in Ceylon not for a decade or two decades but for centuries together, and it has been stated that only the Indians there are people of Indian origin. I may ask the Minister of External Affairs to delve deeply into the annals of Ceylon and it may give him an insight to find out that the so-called Sinhalese are people of Indian origin who went to Ceylon during the reign of King Vijaya, and the millions of people who are now dubbed as people of Indian origin or even later, less people have gone there later. Therefore, to call the people of Indian origin as aliens to Ceylon is a travesty of fact, and this Government ought not to have countenanced such a barefaced injustice. The main burden ought to have been for the Ceylon Government to come to this country or before the bar of the world and they ought to have stated in what way they are treating, they have been treating and they are going to treat people who are settled there permanently.

Most of the people today who are called men of Indian origin have no connection, no hovels, no homes, no relations in that unfortunate part of our country, Tamilnad. The only affinity between those people and the people of Tamilnad is the affinity of language. If the Ceylon Government turns round and says that this is your

problem, what prompted the Government of India to accept that version of the Ceylon Government's proposal? What is it that they have surrendered to? Is it to temptation? Is it to pressure? Is it to various other extraneous circumstances? Why is it I want to know, that they have surrendered to the temptation of taking this problem as their problem? Even after having taken that false stand, did the Government of India or the present Ministry follow the best tenets of democratic principles? What did those Prime Ministers of Ceylon do? When Mr. Dudley Senanayake came here, when Mr. Kotelawala came here and when Mrs. Bandaranaike came here, before coming to this country, they took into their confidence, they consulted the important leaders of Opposition in their own country. I remember when Mr. Dudley Senanayake, as Prime Minister, came to this country, he brought along with him as one of the Members of the Delegation the late lamented Mr. Bandaranaike. Why is it that when a small country like Ceylon maintains and works along the best democratic tenets, you have not taken care to consult the opinion of any of the Opposition Parties? Why is it that the Ceylon Government, when it came here, it came fully armed with the unanimity of opinion of all political parties functioning in Ceylon and even the Communist Party which is called the Lanka Sama Samaj Party and why is it that you are presenting to this House and to this country a *fait accompli* and the Minister stated in the other House that he was constantly in consultation with the leaders of opinion in Tamilnad? May I ask the Minister for External Affairs to inform this House whether he has taken care to consult any one of the leaders of the major political parties in Tamilnad? No. He can turn round and say that the Chief Minister of Madras has given his blessings or consent and another Minister who was deputed by the Chief Minister here—hon. Mr. Ramaiah—had given the consent. What else can they do? Can they expose the Government of India? They cannot.

[Shri C. N. Annadurai.]

Their loyalty to the Party and to the Government stands in the way of their opening their hearts and say what they feel. Even after accepting the Indo-Ceylon Pact, speaking if I remember correctly, at Baroda, the Chief Minister of Madras stated that he would have been happier if a lesser number of people had been asked to come. What does that mean? It means there is a volcanic eruption though in a mild form in the mind of the Chief Minister of Madras. He is not happy over this Pact though he cannot, as a loyal Congressman, as a loyal State Chief Minister, question even the propriety of the Central Government. Therefore to cite the support given by the Chief Minister of Madras or his Deputy is merely burking the issue or escaping the question. How are you going to answer the agonies and remorse that are now being felt inside Ceylon and even outside? Why is it that you have deviated from the path followed by the late lamented Prime Minister? What did he say on the floor of this House, on the floor of the other House and on many occasions, whenever he had an opportunity to express an opinion? He had very correctly stated that he would take any number of people coming to this country if they come voluntarily and what is this Pact? This is not a voluntary repatriation. You have assured the Ceylonese that you would take 5 lakhs or more that will be coming and you have persuaded after much difficulty—I can understand the difficulties—Ceylon to retain 3 lakhs of people in Ceylon and you have left without taking into consideration, for the present I hope, 1,50,000 people. Well, when a similar problem confronted Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Kotelawala, what were the terms? What were the terms of the Indo-Ceylon Pact of 1953-54? The main term, the soul of the Pact, if I may put it in that way, was that the repatriation of the people ought to be voluntary. The people in Ceylon should be given the option, to opt for India or remain in Ceylon, and the

Ceylonese Government at that time went a step further and said that it was working upon a scheme of inducement, that they were going to induce the Indian residents there, as they called them, to go over to India by offering to them the temptation of a cash bonus or cash. Even that has been given up or given a go by in this Pact. After the 1954 Pact, did the Minister for External Affairs or even the Prime Minister look into the aspect of how that Pact has worked? It has been stated and it has not been repudiated by the Ceylonese Government that when more than 8 lakhs of people applied for registration of citizenship in Ceylon, merely 1,25,000 people were registered and it has been spoken by Senators and Members of the Representative House in Ceylon itself that the 1953-54 Pact was not implemented in a just manner. Even the present Cabinet Minister there, who has now resigned, Mr. Felix Bandaranaike, stated on the floor of the House of Parliament in Ceylon that the Pact has not been worked equitably and justly and when a Government after having come into a Pact with this Government, has not worked that Pact correctly and justly, why is it that you have walked into that parlour and signed on the dotted line? Therefore it is that millions of people today think that the so-called Indo-Ceylon Pact is a betrayal of the interests of millions of people. Very many hon. Members here have stated and particularly Mr. Chengalvaroyan said 'What alternative is there?', Well, what alternative is there when you sit tight over the fate of our country and these people and when you do not mete out justice what alternative is there? That alternative will be found out by the people at large. If you are going to solve every problem with this condition 'what alternative', we can solve the Chinese problem very easily. Already I find a trend from the speech of hon. Mr. Sapru and another hon. Member that they are thinking along the line of 'what alternative?' 'What alternative' should not or ought not to be the argument of a potent Government. 'What alter-

native has the Ceylon Government if we refuse to sign this Pact? If we refuse to take those 5 lakhs into this country, what is the alternative open to the Ceylon Government? Have they got the guts to keep these millions of people in a Belson camp? Have they the power to defy world opinion by shooting them down? No. Even the Ceylon Government cannot go so far. Therefore it is that when many hon. Members addressed the Minister for External Affairs as the Foreign Minister, I at first was irritated and then I thought he is really a Foreign Minister and that is why he has left to the discretion of a foreign Government to settle the fate of millions of people and even after the Citizenship Act was passed in 1953-54 when they have not implemented that Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam, who held the Ministry of Industry in the Ceylonese Government said when resigning from his post on the floor of the Representative House as follows:

"The Indian and Pakistani Citizenship Act has been so enforced and implemented as to render it utterly oppressive, with the deliberate object of denying to several hundreds of thousands of Tamils who call no country other than Ceylon their own and owe no allegiance to any other country, their inalienable right to be part of the permanent population of this country".

Therefore it is that, when the Ceylon Government has not taken it into consideration to implement the Indo-Ceylon Pact of 1953-54, how is it that we are going to believe that this Pact is going to solve the problem? And when a member of my party in the Lok Sabha put a very pertinent question to the Minister for External Affairs, he wanted a definite, a categorical answer from the External Affairs Minister. My friend there, Mr. Sezhiyan, wanted a clarification from the Minister whether this repatriation will be voluntary or compulsory, and the Minister for External Affairs—I have come to realise that he is adept

in the art of bypassing straight questions—he said, "Why should we take a hypothetical stand?" Two labour organisations in Ceylon, one led by Mr. Aziz, and another by Mr. Thondaman, both have declared their repudiation of this Pact. They have said that they are not going to opt for India. Therefore this is not a hypothetical proposition. When the people in Ceylon, when they refuse to opt for India, what are you going to do? Are you going to take them in shifts and get the five lakhs of people here—whether they are willing or not—and dump them on India? And therefore it is that my friend put a very pertinent question whether this repatriation is to be voluntarily or otherwise.

Another Member said that we have no jurisdiction. I find from reports that a professor of Delhi University—I do not remember his name at the moment—has stated, in one of the seminars conducted in Delhi by the Delhi University, that the Ceylon Government has got an obligation, according to the United Nations Charter on Human Rights, to give Statehood, to confer citizenship on those lakhs of people there. Instead of taking into consideration all those aspects, the External Affairs Minister—a good man that he is—has signed this Pact—or is it the Prime Minister? I do not know—or both of them have signed this Pact, which is a betrayal of human dignity of the lakhs of Stateless people there, and it is only to register my protest against this attitude that I have taken part in today's discussion.

Thank you.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am in large agreement with the views expressed on and the analysis made of my Mr. Gurupada Swamy, on the present international situation, and also with some of the views expressed by Dr. Sapru on the question of non-alignment. Non-alignment is not a negative doctrine, but it is a positive doctrine, which is

[Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy.]

not meant to be opportunism, but a doctrine which is meant to be followed for the purpose of world peace and national progress.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Congo is the centre of African tragedy rather the tragedy of the dark man who is trying to emerge out declaring his national independence and asserting his country's national position in the comity of nations. And Africa has been the centre of suffering over a long period of years, and as far as the Congo is concerned, the very next day after the declaration of independence, the Belgian mercenaries entered the Congo with the help of their puppets and started subverting the national independence and the economic life of Congo. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the rest of the story regarding Congo is well known, how Mr. Patrice Lumumba, the national leader of Congo was murdered and how Prime Minister Nehru declared on the floor of this House that the grave of Lumumba had become a place of pilgrimage, and how mercilessly the Congo Government refused even to indicate the place where he was buried. And that is the story of Congo and we have seen with what hatred the African peoples and Governments treated Mr. Tshombe when he visited Cairo to attend the Non-aligned Nations Conference. Our Foreign Minister and our present Prime Minister were witnesses to what happened in Cairo. If we could not take a firm stand on the question of the Congo, on the question of intervention by foreign armies in the Congo, like the Belgian white mercenaries supported by American aircraft—I quite appreciate the stand taken by the Government of India in condemning the intervention by these people but still—unless we invoke the forum of the United Nations for further stopping any intervention by any such outside forces, I am afraid, Mr. Vice-Chairman, India as a Government, India as a nation, would

be isolated in the opinion of African countries. Among the African countries there is the resurgence of not only nationalism but also aspiration for national progress on the economic front. If we do not understand their aspirations properly, if we do not understand how the people of Africa feel towards their own aspirations and treat the whites, then we will be getting ourselves isolated in their opinion, and India's national position among the African countries is likely to be jeopardised, and China is likely to play a very successful game in this direction if we fail so.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, regarding Ceylon . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think you can take another point. On Ceylon Mr. Annadurai has said enough.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: There is only one point which I would like to mention regarding Ceylon. The point has been raised that it is a question of international domicile. Those that are aware of the questions of international law, private international law, know that international domicile arises when a person goes out of this country having some place here to reside, and there he has temporary residence with, what we call, *animus revertendum*—that is, he must always have the intention to come back. But regarding the citizens of Ceylon who are called Indians, they had lived there for generations. Obviously they do not have any residence in India. Therefore the application of the doctrine of international domicile, which obviously postulates *animus revertendum*, does not apply in this case. Therefore, the Foreign Minister or the Prime Minister, in my humble opinion, Sir, should have taken into consideration the views expressed by the Indian leaders in Ceylon and ascertained from them whether they would like to go back. Without that we are trying to barter away their interests, we are trying to enter into

an agreement whereby we have to transfer the citizens from Ceylon without their consent or without their desire.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, as far as South-East Asia is concerned, it is a boiling cauldron, the fire is there and at any time it is likely to turn into a major warfare, and here the delicacy of the situation requires all the tact of the Foreign Minister. And it is a fact that India is not carrying the same old reputation and influence in South-East Asian countries, and I am in full sympathy with the Foreign Minister, because the whole question is full of tact and delicate situations, and I hope that the Foreign Minister and the Government of India would be able to succeed, to rally round the sympathy which we had in abundance during the time of Prime Minister Nehru. Prime Minister Nehru was considered not only as the leader of India but as one of the figures who symbolised aspirations of Asia and the people of Asia had all their love and affection for Pandit Nehru, and the same sympathy and affection, I hope, would be developed by the policies of our Foreign Ministry, to invoke the same love and affection which had hitherto been existing.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, one of the recent events which have taken place in the world is the victory of the Labour Party in England and their coming to power, though with a very small and insignificant majority. But as far as the victory of the Labour Party in the context of world politics is concerned, it is a very significant change that has taken place in England, and if the Labour Party is to succeed, if it is to continue in office, they must at least follow the policies laid down by Professor R. H. Tawney or Professor Lasky and bring about a radical change in the social values of English life. Otherwise, I am afraid, Sir, there is the danger that the next election may perhaps be held much earlier than most of us expect or wish.

(Time bell rings.)

Mr. Vice-Chairman I have got only one more point to touch upon. Talk of multi-lateral nuclear force has now come to be very much in 5 P.M. vogue in Britain, no doubt, as a result of the aspirations of the British Labour Party to emerge out as an independent power, independent of America and to enhance the national prestige of England. That is why they are talking of the multi-lateral nuclear force. That may be a justifiable desire. But I would like to submit that this is likely to increase world tension. The nuclear powers must remember that once a war is started by any power, then it only would mean the annihilation of the world and there is not going to be any victor or vanquished in that war. There has been some talk in this House about atom bomb and a nuclear shield for protection against atom bombs. To my mind all these propositions look very unreal. For one thing, there is our incapacity. And for another, to bring together the U.S.A. and Russia is a much more difficult task. Therefore probably the best alternative would be what Dr. Sapru suggested. Under a system of international law the U.N. Organisation must be persuaded to pass a resolution that in case of an attack by a nuclear power on another non-nuclear power, then under the auspices of the U.N. the other remaining nuclear powers should go to the aid of that State and steps should be taken for the protection of that non-nuclear power under the auspices of the United Nations. Probably, if we cannot succeed in this line of approach to this problem, we will not be able to succeed in any other type of approach. I do hope that Dr. Sapru's idea of security under international law, and under the auspices of the U.N. would be given due consideration not only here but also in the circles of the United Nations and I hope our Minister of External Affairs with all his wisdom, will be able to put forward this suggestion and persuade the powers with his arguments and

logic and capacity of persuasion.
Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): The Secretary
will read out a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE INDIAN TARIFF (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1964

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

"In accordance with the provi-
sions of Rule 96 of the Rules of
Procedure and Conduct of Business

in Lok Sabha, I am directed to
enclose herewith a copy of the
Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill,
1964, as passed by Lok Sabha at
its sitting held on the 21st Decem-
ber, 1964.

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

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): The House
stands adjourned till 11 A.M.
tomorrow.

The House then adjourned
at four minutes past five of
the clock till eleven of the
clock on Wednesday the 23rd
Decemebr, 1964.