

## RAJYA SABHA

*Saturday, the 23rd June, 1962/the 2nd  
Asadha, 1884 (Saka)*

The House met at eleven of the clock,  
MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRI M. MISRA

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform  
Members that the following letter has  
been received from Shri M. Misra:

"I have been laid down with pox and  
am unable to attend the current session  
of the Rajya Sabha. I will be obliged  
to have leave of the House for the  
entire period of the current session."

Is it the pleasure of the House that  
permission be granted to Shri M. Misra  
for remaining absent from all meetings of  
the House during the current session?

*No Hon. Member dissented.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to re-  
main absent is granted.

### RESULTS OF ELECTIONS TO VARIOUS COMMITTEES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The following  
Members being the only candidates  
nominated for election to the bodies  
respectively shown against each, I hereby  
declare them duly elected to be Members  
of the said bodies:

1. Shri B. C. Nanjundaiya—Indian  
Central Coconut Committee.

2. Dr. A. Subba Rao—Indian Cen-  
tral Arecanut Committee.

3. Shri P. A. Solomon—Indian Cen-  
tral Spices and Cashewnut Committee.

•377 RS—1.

## MOTIONRE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE PRIME MINISTER AND  
MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
(SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Sir, I beg to  
move:

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

It is not my intention at this stage to  
take up much time of the House. I shall  
briefly refer to some matter\* and then  
perhaps, with your permission, I shall  
deal with the comments in the House at  
the end of the debate.

Recently, an event took place in India  
which has certain importance from the  
international point of view. That was the  
Anti-nuclear Arms Convention held in  
Delhi. I think that this was an important  
Convention and it dealt with a vital  
matter. Indeed if one looks at the world  
today and the arms that have been  
accumulated and that go on being  
accumulated and the danger of war almost  
every other question, national or  
international, sinks into the background  
compared to this ever-present danger of a  
war and a war which will be so terribly  
destructive that it might put an end to  
civilisation and humanity as we know  
them. I hope that what was done at this  
Anti-nuclear Arms Convention will attract  
enough attention elsewhere in the world—  
I believe it has attracted a good deal of  
attention. It was essentially an Indian  
Convention but we had the advantage of  
the presence of some eminent people from  
outside, from the U.S.A., from the Soviet  
Union, from England and from some other  
countries. At the present moment I was  
wondering if some symbol could be found  
for the modern world. Every age might be  
designated by a symbol, just as a country  
might also be. The present age probably  
would be designated best by the symbol of  
mushroom cloud which comes out of an  
atom bomb. It has become the recognised  
symbol of the atom bomb and of nuclear  
warfare and to live under the shadow of  
this cloud—the possibility

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

of such a cloud arising—is to live a life which is not civilised. This leads me to the question of these nuclear tests because ultimately it is not merely the avoidance of nuclear tests that will put an end to this danger because there are vast numbers of nuclear bombs accumulated in various countries, notably in the U.S.A. and in the Soviet Union, but ultimately there has to be an assurance of a world without war. Some people may say that it is an idealistic concept. The world has never been without war but the world has also never lived with nuclear bombs as its bed-fellow almost. You have to meet this situation and there is no way out. There is no doubt that a war will lead to the use of nuclear weapons and the nuclear weapons will largely destroy the world, as we know it. It is true that even if we stop the tests, the war may occur. Even if we stop the manufacture of nuclear weapons and destroy those that we have got, there is a chance, if war occurs, of those weapons being manufactured again by industrialised communities. Ultimately we have to aim at a world without war. There is no choice left—either survival or extinction. But to aim at that as a far-off thing is logical but to aim at that as the first step is difficult. So we work for disarmament. Even in the matter of disarmament, although some progress has been made at Geneva, it is still rather far-off. The immediate change that we have to face is this question of nuclear tests. Nuclear tests make disarmament more difficult, make it more dangerous and the possibility of a conflict increases because a conflict depends more on fear and distrust as well as preparation for war than on anything else. I do not know how many hon. Members present here saw the two films which were exhibited to the members of the Anti-nuclear Arms Convention. One was a Japanese film and the other I am not sure whether it was American or British. Both dealt with nuclear war and they were horrible films—not horrible in the sense of horrible things that were shown there, that is true—,

but the whole possibility that it might occur was a horrible idea and all our arguments and ideologies' srik into insignificance b

efore this possibility. So far as nuclear tests are concerned, we are arriving probably, I imagine, at the end of the present series of American tests. I do not know if the Soviet Union, as it is said, will have a series of tests now. It is difficult for me to say. But even if they have those tests, I imagine and experts tell me that this series of tests by the U.S. and by the Soviet Union will probably end for a long time to come this testing business because they have achieved their purposes. They have got such scientific and technical knowledge as was possible by these tests. But either very soon or after some tests have been undertaken by the Soviets, there will be a stoppage of them. Thus, virtue will come out of necessity but it is a very painful truth that we have arrived at a stage in the world when Powers, Great Powers, can play about with these weapons and simply because they are afraid of the other Power, they take the risk of annihilation of mankind. Now, Sir, during these past months two pleasant developments have taken place. One is the agreement about Algeria between President de Gaulle and the Algerian Nationalist Movement. No country that I can think of even in history has suffered quite so much, offered so much sacrifice for its freedom as Algeria. It is said that one million of them had died in this struggle apart from the millions who have been injured or who have suffered by being driven out of their country. In a country with a population of ten millions, this is a tremendous average and all our heart goes out to these brave people who have suffered so much. I hope that within a few days, possibly early in July, the referendum, or plebiscite will take place in Algeria, and there can be no doubt about the result of that, and that it will be followed by the establishment of the independent State of Algeria. The great problem in Algeria now is *haw* to meet the terrorism of the O.A.S. the secret army there. I do not know

how far it is true but it is said that some kind of agreement has been reached between the Algerian Nationalists and this secret army of Frenchmen. Now, there have been fewer outrages by the Secret Army Organisation in the last few days. It is obvious that by these terroristic tactics they are not going to frighten the Algerians or the French authorities. Having gone thus far, no government in France, and certainly no government presided over by President de Gaulle, is going to surrender to some terrorists. We must realise this. Well, we have criticised many of the French activities in Algeria. This gives us a picture of the reality and the difficulties President de Gaulle had to face among his own people, not amongst the Algerians, in coming to an agreement with the Algerian Nationalists and I think we must extend to him our congratulations that he adhered to his decision and ultimately came to an agreement with the Algerians. This is the first thing we welcome.

The second is the settlement in Laos between the three Princes. Now, I speak without full assurance because we have had settlements before and they have broken down when somebody objected to them but I hope that this settlement will lead to a national government in Laos in the next few days and that will at least end the conflict in Laos and this will no doubt have some effect over the whole Indo-China area including Viet Nam which is in a state of high tension. Recently, the Commission there, the International Commission of which India is the Chairman, presented a Report. I cannot say much on the Report because it has not yet been published—it has been sent to the two Co-Chairman in the United Kingdom and Russia—but this I shall mention that they have pointed out infringements of the Geneva Agreement by both sides and the result is that both sides are annoyed at this Report.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) :  
The Prime Minister has said that

violations by both sides have been alleged in the Report. Would he please give us some details or some idea of those violations?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot because, as I said, it is a confidential document. I gave you this idea but I cannot read out portions of the document. On the one side, it is well known that American troops have landed there which is patent, nothing to hide and, on the other side, things there are not so patent but have been held to be violations of the Agreement.

The development in Laos resulted in the American authorities sending troops to Thailand. The SEATO suddenly came into action. All this time, the SEATO has been in existence for some years, it has not functioned at all. Suddenly it functioned. It chose a moment for functioning when it was least necessary to function. However, various countries sent their armies or air forces to Thailand to protect their border with Laos. As far as I know, there was no danger to that border and now that the people in Laos have arrived at a settlement among themselves, there can be no danger to the border and I hope that these forces in Thailand from other countries will be removed.

In the Congo, the position is one of stalemate. In December last a settlement was arrived at between Prime Minister Adoula and Mr. Tshombe at Kitona. During this settlement a declaration was made by Mr. Tshombe. It was a good declaration but very soon after he followed his own practice of going back on his declaration and there the matter stands now in stalemate. Mr. Tshombe only believes in adequate pressure with some sanctions behind them. He made that declaration because there was great pressure on him. The moment the pressure was lessened he withdrew from it. It is obvious that the United Nations can only succeed in making Mr. Tshombe act up to his declarations by making it clear to him that they will take action against him, including the use of force, if

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] necessary. Unfortunately, he has got into the habit of getting some support from various quarters outside the Congo, I mean in other countries, who piously declare that there must be no force used against him and thereby they allow him to carry on in his peculiar ways.

Now, in regard to the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, there has been an adjournment for a month. Their only positive achievement has been an agreement of a draft preamble to the Treaty, an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is a good preamble but other difficulties remain. It is difficult to say what the result of this Conference on Disarmament will be but it is making some progress however slowly.

Indo-Nepalese relations are more or less satisfactory. I would not say that they are cent per cent as we would like them to be but the visit of the King of Nepal here on the whole improved those relations. Recently we had a request from the Nepalese Government that in accordance with what we decided in our Joint Statement we should have a joint enquiry into some events in the border. We have agreed to that.

Then, there is a matter which must be in the minds of many Members here and that is the discussion going on on Kashmir in the Security Council. Hon. Members will remember that this matter was brought up a little while ago before the Security Council as an urgent and immediate issue because according to Pakistan India was thinking of an armed attack on Pakistan. It was a fantastic notion. Yet that was made the reason for going there because there is no other apparent reason why they should hurry this. For five years the matter has not been there and suddenly it has come because of this alleged reason and this alleged reason has of course no basis. Then that discussion took place there for a few days. Nothing happened; now it has again been revived there and I do not know what the result will be today or tomorrow but I must

say that the course of events there thus far has been unsatisfactory, rather unpleasing. It is very difficult for all of us, I believe, and certainly for me, to realise how any country, any representative of any country can fail to understand the basic issues involved in Kashmir; not only the legal issues, not only the constitutional issues which are quite clear and admitted that the Pakistanis or those who came under their shelter, the tribals, invaded Kashmir and committed loot and raping there after Kashmir had acceded to India—that is the legal and constitutional issue—but the practical issue which is raised in Kashmir, which is of vital consequence to us and I believe indirectly to Pakistan also is whether we should adhere to our policy of secular State or we should not. Pakistan of course is not a secular State. It is a conflict between those two ideologies and I do not pretend to say that all of us are secular-minded or that all the Pakistanis are anti-secular-minded. Both are incorrect but there is such a thing as policy. We have followed a policy for a long time and gradually it is becoming a part of the texture of Indian life in spite of the difficulties; in spite of breaches of that occasionally, it is the basic fundamental policy of India and I do submit that there can be no other policy for India constituted as India is. Even in theory in the modern age there can be no other policy because any other policy would mean the reversion to some medieval concept but apart from that, India being constituted as it is, any reversion to that would mean India remaining backward and instead of devoting her energies to progress, spending her time in internal conflict. Indirectly—not directly but indirectly—this question comes up when we consider Kashmir because the whole argument for Kashmir on behalf of Pakistan is that Kashmir being a Muslim majority area must necessarily go to Pakistan. We have never accepted that argument even for the partition of India—although it was raised, we never accepted it. We accepted a certain geographical argu-

ment and therefore practically speaking anything that we do which hurts that argument hurts the whole concept of India we have had and brings about enormous trouble in India and Pakistan. That is why we have strongly said that we cannot possibly agree to any such thing. I greatly regret that other countries, not perhaps realising the ultimate issues involved, are taking up lines which I think are quite wrong.

On our border with China the position is broadly speaking more or less the same as it has been except that, as I have said previously in answer to questions in this House, we have made some considerable improvement in our position. That improvement does not justify any complacency but whether any action is contemplated or whether even apart from any action any operations, they can only come from an improved position. The building of roads has gone on apace in those mountain areas and we have opened a number of new check-posts which give us a certain advantage. But whether it is China or whether it is Pakistan, or any other country, we do not wish to have war unless it is forced down upon us. In regard to Pakistan we have repeatedly stated that we are prepared to have a no-war declaration; that is to say, that every question between Pakistan and India must be settled or even remain unsettled but we will not go to war. It is Pakistan that has not accepted this. The India-China frontier raises far more difficult problems for us. However we may solve them ultimately—and I have still not given up hope of being able to solve them in a peaceful way—we have to be ready for all emergencies and that is what we have been doing all these years.

For myself, Sir, I shall confine myself to these remarks and I shall endeavour to reply to such comments or criticisms, as hon. Members might make, at the close of the debate.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI PATIL PUTTAPPA (Mysore): 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 A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets—

(i) That Government's attitude towards China continues to be ludicrously unrealistic and consequently its China policy, in effect and ineffective;

(ii) that nothing has been done to educate world opinion in general, and opinion in our neighbouring States in particular, about the expansionist designs of China;

(iii) that as a result of this lapse, Government has failed to checkmate effectively China's bid to drive a wedge between India and Nepal;

(iv) that our Nepal policy has not yet succeeded in lessening strains between India and this neighbour of ours;

(v) that Government has failed to realise that the recent outbursts against Hindus in Dacca, Rajshahi, and other parts of East Pakistan are not just sporadic outbursts of communal frenzy but are clear indications that it has become impossible for non-Muslims to live in the Islamic State of Pakistan with peace and honour, and so the situation there warrants a more radical and realistic approach on India's part than the lodging of mere protest notes; and

*IShn A. U. Vajpayee.*J

(vi) that in their representation of India's case for Kashmir at the U.N., our delegates have failed to reaffirm India's rights over the Pak-occupied portions of Kashmir and her determination to recover them.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House recommends—

(i) that as a first step towards a realistic reorientation of our China policy, diplomatic ties with China be severed;

(ii) that the primary objective of all diplomatic and defence policies and postures *vis-a-vis* China should be clearly accepted as the early recovery of lost territory;

(iii) that a conscious and concerted effort should be made at international forums and in our neighbouring States, to expose China's perfidious conduct towards India and its imperialist designs in general;

(iv) that efforts towards lessening of Indo-Nepalese strains should be intensified;

(v) that in view of the fact that Pakistan has failed to assure to the Hindu minorities in Pakistan a secure and honourable living, Pakistan must be called upon to cede territory to India to rehabilitate the heavy influx of displaced persons coming over from Pakistan; and

(vi) that Government should make it clear to the United Nations that the only function it has to perform in respect of Kashmir is to help in securing vacation of Pakistan's aggression and that if, instead, members of the Security Council suffered Pakistan to exploit this international forum for a con-

tinued slander against inoia, India would be constrained to dis-associate from all U.N. discussions on Kashmir'."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is firmly of the opinion that to deliver mankind from the threat of a nuclear-missile war and ensure peaceful co-existence of countries with differing social systems and thus bring about durable peace in the world today is the most sacred and urgent task facing every peace-loving Government and all humanity'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House notes with confidence and inspiration that the forces of war and imperialism, despite all their aggressive moves, are getting weakened and isolated day by day while the forces of peace and national independence are growing from strength to strength and that these world developments have brought into existence the real possibilities of averting another war and for safeguarding world peace'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that in order to promote the cause of world peace and banish war from the life of the society, it is necessary to further develop the combined initiative and efforts of all peace forces, including the efforts of India and our people'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the complete and general disarmament under the strictest international control is one of the principal ways of achieving the object of eliminating the threat of a nuclear war and of achieving universal world peace'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that as an important step towards halting the arms race and of complete and general disarmament, it is imperative for the nuclear powers to arrive at an immediate agreement for banning all nuclear weapon tests'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that now that it is possible to detect nuclear explosions in a country from another country, the question of so-called inspection should not be an insurmountable obstacle for a nuclear test ban agreement'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House notes with regret that defying the protests from peoples of the world including the American people and a large number of U.S. Scientists, the United States should have planned to carry out a series of high altitude nuclear tests in the Christmas Islands which will cause great danger to the living generations as also the generation unborn'."

11. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that by its high altitude tests, the U.S.A.

is in fact extending the nuclear arms race to Outer Space for which the responsibility must squarely rest with the U.S.A alone'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House joins with the peoples of the world in condemning these nuclear tests in the Christmas Islands and would urge upon the U.S.A. to show regard for mankind and stop such preparations for a nuclear war'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the U.S.A. should have started a series of nuclear tests in the Christmas Islands at a time when the 18-Nation U.N. Disarmament Committee at Geneva was engaged in discussion on the problems of complete and general disarmament and of nuclear test ban agreement'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House records its appreciation of the efforts made by the Indian Delegation at the Geneva Disarmament talks for arriving at a treaty on complete and general disarmament and in particular, as an immediate step, for an agreement on nuclear test ban'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House assures the Government its full and unstinted support in all its constructive efforts for advancing the cause of complete and general disarmament and for the preservation of world peace'."

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

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

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] in the international arena, nothing heightens the prestige and glory of India today more than her initiative and efforts for the preservation of world peace and for wiping out colonialism from the face of the earth'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House notes with concern the latest moves of the U.S.A. and Ireland to revive the Kashmir issue in the Security Council in total disregard of the fact that the Security Council has completely failed to ensure the implementation of its past resolution on the Kashmir question which Pakistan with the support of the U.S.A. and backed by the U.S. Military aid has systematically violated'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that any refusal on the part of the U.S.A. to ignore the changed conditions in Jammu and Kashmir and harp on certain aspects of the Security Council resolutions which have now lost their validity can only further complicate the situation'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the State of Jammu and Kashmir is now legally, constitutionally, politically and in every way a part of the Republic of India and that any attempt to ignore this position in the Security Council would be an unfriendly act towards India as well as an interference with her domestic affairs'."

20. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, \*bi» House cannot but note that at

every crucial moment the U.S. directly or indirectly agitates the Kashmir issue in the Security Council, the object of which appears to be to put India in the wrong light in the eyes of the world and create pressures on the Government of India'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the present move of the U.S.A. in the Security Council constitutes only a link in the chain of a series of U.S. activities directed against the interests of our country'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House records its appreciation that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Rumania have solidly stood by the just cause of India in the Security Council in regard to the Kashmir question and are making every effort to frustrate the line of the Western Powers, especially the U.S.A.'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the time has come for India to plainly state before the Security Council that the Council has no longer any jurisdiction over the Kashmir question and that this matter should not be allowed to be any more raised by the U.S.A., Pakistan or any other Western Power directly or indirectly, in the Security Council'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is firmly of the opinion that having regard to the changes that have taken place since the Security Council passed its resolutions on Kashmir and also having



regard to the fact that Pakistan has failed to carry out the commitments under the Security Council's resolutions the matter should be treated as closed so far as the Security Council is concerned'."

25. 'That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that in view of the repeated efforts by Pakistan, U.S.A. and other Western Powers to use the Kashmir issue against India, the Government take proper steps to acquaint all the members of the U.N.O. with the real facts about Kashmir in order that India's case is fully understood by every newly—liberated Afro-Asian nation'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House takes serious note of the reports that a number of training Centres are being set up by the Pakistan Army in the occupied part of Kashmir for provocative and sabotage activities directed against India and that at least some of these military forces in these centres are being trained by Senior U.S. Army Officers'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the German Democratic Republic is still not given recognition by India and is further of the opinion, that such' discriminatory action on the part of the Government of India is neither helpful to the cause of the solution of the German problem nor is it consistent with India's basic policy of peace and non-alignment'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that certain steps on the part of the Government of India, especially its agreement with the German Federal Republic for carrying out of joint advisory activities for the development of agriculture in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh, gives the impression that the Government of India is treating West Berlin as if it is a part of German Federal Republic whereas West Berlin under the international agreement does not at all constitute a part of West Germany'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that India should have joined hands with Canada in the International Commission and Supervision in Viet-Nam and accepted some of the South Viet-Nam accusations of infiltration and subversive activities against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam while the truth is that the U.S.A. is ceaselessly carrying on aggressive military and other activities in South Viet-Nam in clear contravention of the Geneva Agreement of 1954'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that under the Geneva Agreement, the patriotic forces of South Viet-Nam have every right to participate in political activities and that the present South Viet-Nam Administration has no right to suppress these patriotic forces'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House apprehends that India's joining with Canada in the International Commission in Viet-Nam

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

is fraught with grave consequences inasmuch as it will give encouragement for further U.S. intervention in Viet-Nam and make implementation of the terms of the Geneva Agreement even more difficult'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that neither India's broad national interests nor the implications of her policy of peace and non-alignment have been duly taken into account in formulating the Government of India's approach to the situation which has arisen as a result of Britain's move to join the European Economic Community'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House notes with regret that the Government of India's memorandum to the European Economic Community should have on the one hand ignored the fact that the European Common Market is an international combine of "Western Monopoly Capital and an appendage of the aggressive NATO Powers and, on the other acclaimed the European Economic Community as the historic movement towards a close economic integration for strengthening the economies of member states and fostering their capacity to contribute to the economic expansion and social progress both at home and abroad'."

34. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that apart from showering the above praise on the European Economic Community, the Government of India, in its Memorandum to the ECM should have said that the proposed enlargement of the Community.....

hold out significant prospect not only for the prosperity of its own people but also for the expansion of international trade and for acceleration of economic growth and social progress of the developing economies'."

85. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House notes with astonishment that the broad assessment of the ECM or the Common Market given in the Memorandum of the Government of India runs counter to the various statements of the Prime Minister on the subject, including his statement in Parliament on May 14, 1962, in which the Prime Minister far from giving any certificate to the Economic Community made certain critical observations'."

36. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the appreciative and laudatory words uttered about the general character of the European Economic Community in the memorandum of the Government of India are likely to cause misunderstanding about India's position with regard to the ECM'."

37. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that India's policy of peace and non-alignment has not been correctly interpreted and projected in the context of the Government's approach towards the European Economic Community'."

38. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House takes a serious view of the stand the Governments of

the U. S. A. and the United Kingdom have taken in regard to the reported negotiation and or discussions between India and the U.S.S.R. for the purchase of Soviet MIG Aircrafts and the House is further of the opinion that such conduct on the part of these two Governments constitutes a clear interference in the internal affairs of India and with her sovereign rights'."

39. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the Government of India should not entertain any complaints or representations made by the Governments of the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom over such questions as the purchase of Soviet MIG Aircrafts by India'."

40. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the Government of India have not made it sufficiently clear to the Governments of the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom that any interference, whatever the form, on the part of these Governments in regard to the negotiations and/or consultations for the purchase of MIG, would be construed as highly improper international behaviour on the part of these Governments'."

41. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House takes serious note of the statements and speeches that were made in the U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee against India and its Government over the question of the so-called U.S. economic aid to India'."

42. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House takes particular note of the fact that the attitude of the U.S. Senate in regard to the question of economic assistance to India has clearly demonstrated the real political designs behind the U.S. economic aid and has furnished a clear proof that such U.S. economic aid is neither disinterested nor without political strings'."

43. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that in assessing the possibilities and otherwise of getting economic assistance from the Western Countries, Government has failed to take appropriate account of the political factors underlying the attitude and policies of the U.S.A., Britain and other Western powers towards India'."

44. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that there is no proper co-ordination between the Ministry of External Affairs and the Ministry of Finance in dealing with the Western Powers in economic matters'."

45. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the Prime Minister's talks with the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations of the U.K., Mr. Duncan Sandys\* should have given the latter the impression that he could state with impunity that mutual consultations between India and the United Kingdom over certain questions relating to India's defence are a regular practice'."

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

46. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government has not yet fully taken the country into confidence about what has passed between it on the one hand and the U.S.A. and the British Governments on the other over the question of purchase of Soviet MIGs'."

47. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that Government should make a comprehensive statement giving all material information and facts about what the Governments of the U.S.A. and the U.K. have told the Government of India in connection with India's intention to consider the purchase of Soviet MIG Aircrafts'."

48. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House deplors the television interview given by the Indian Ambassador in the U.S.A. on May 23rd, in disregard of all rules of propriety and of standards of national self-respect'."

49. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House disapproves of the approach of some Heads of the Indian Missions abroad, Ambassadors and others who sometimes try to play on the anti-communist prejudices and feelings of the U.S.A. and other Western Powers, in order to get economic assistance from them'."

50. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House deplors the manner in which the Indian Ambassador in the U.S.A. dragged in India-China border dispute on June 16, in Columbus by saying "the MIGs would be actually more significant in relation to India's border dispute with the Communist China specially in view of the fact that Russia has not provided Communist China with similar planes'."

51. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that in view of the fact that India has supplied troops to serve under the U.N. in the Congo, it becomes all the more the duty of the Government of India to do everything in their power to save the life of Anotine Gizenga and secure his immediate release from illegal detention'."

52. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that provisional Algerian Government should be given immediate and full recognition by the Government of India'."

53. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that Government should take note of the fact that the name of the Prime Minister is being exploited by interested parties in Singapore, Malaya, Buenos, Sarawak and North Borneo for canvassing support for the so-called Malaysia Plan while the progressive and patriotic sections in all those countries are strongly opposing the Plan which has the

open support of British Imperialism and is indeed inspired by it."

54. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same this House is firmly of the opinion that adequate funds and other forms of relief must be made immediately available to the new migrants to India from East Pakistan'."

55. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House expresses its concern about the condition of Indian students and trainees in West Germany, many of whom, according to the newspaper reports, are denied proper training and at the same time are subjected to all kinds of harassment'."

56. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that adequate steps are not being taken to provide relief and other assistance to those who are now migrating into Malda and other parts of India from East Pakistan on account of a bad turn in the communal situation in East Pakistan'."

57. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the view that Indian Missions abroad must be properly educated in the spirit of India's foreign policy of peace and non-alignment so that they can discharge their function efficiently and well'."

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, very rightly the Prime Minister started the debate or introduced this motion with some remarks on the question of peace and complete and general disarmament. We also are of the view that this is the crucial question facing mankind today and we are glad that men of all shades of public opinion are by and large coming together to find a common voice for the solution of this burning question and in that context, naturally the convention that was held here under the aegis of the Gandhi Foundation had its significance. I only wish that in some respects the approach of the convention was not sectarian. For example, I do not see why the organisers of the peace movement in the country as represented in the Peace Council should have been left out. Similarly, there are mass organisations like the All India Trade Union Congress and the I.N.T.U.C. and various other important all-India organisations. I think it is necessary, since there is a broad agreement in the country, to get them together, for in the final analysis as far as we are concerned we have to wage the struggle not only at the State level through the foreign policy of the Government of India but also in our public life by getting together in ever-increasing numbers all peace-minded people irrespective of their party affiliations. It is of such importance not merely this aspect of calling a convention, but also how it is called.

Now, it will be agreed on all hands that general and complete disarmament is the principal way of ensuring peace in the world today, or shall we say enforcing the policy of peaceful co-existence. I wish, perhaps we all wish, that the Geneva talks should have progressed further. If it did not go very far, it is mainly because of the intransigence of the U.S. and other Western Powers who seem to have taken the line that they should continue this arms race, they should perpetuate the nuclear weapons; and

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] in the name of having a kind of strict international control, without having made a commitment on the question of complete and general disarmament even by stages, they would like to delay matters. It is not insignificant, therefore, that when these talks were going on at Geneva, at the same time, the U.S. decided to carry out a series of tests in the atmosphere, in the Christmas Island region, despite the fact that many people even within the United States of America opposed such a move just at that time and otherwise generally also. Now, here it has been revealed how things went on at the Geneva talks. As you know, we have been pleading always that India should participate in such a conference and it is a good thing that India went. We are happy that our delegation there played an important part in its own way in bringing the various parties that mattered together, but they did not succeed very much. I say they did not succeed very much but they had their impact on it, but nothing very much beyond that. That is why I say this. Here I must mention that the proposal that was made by India and the other seven non-aligned members of the U.N. Disarmament Committee was accepted as a basis for agreement by the Soviet Union, but the Americans and the Western Powers brushed it aside soon. They did not pay any attention to it. They must have read it only to speak in the Disarmament Committee. They did not even accept it as a basis for agreement. That shows where they stood in this matter. Now, let us recognise it. The Prime Minister has dealt with one aspect of the matter, and rightly so, the tremendous destructive power of nuclear weapons today. And it has been pointed out by more than one scientist of repute in the U.S. and the United Kingdom that in the course of sixty to seventy days of the outbreak of a nuclear war, about 600 to 700 million people will have been destroyed. It has been pointed out that one 5-megaton bomb would destroy whole cities and so on

in a matter of no time. Within twenty-four hours of the outbreak of a nuclear war—this was pointed out by an American scientist—nearly sixty to seventy million Americans will be destroyed outright and many more otherwise also. Such is the destructive power. But fortunately for mankind, people are not afraid of it that way. Today their feelings have been roused against the horrors of a nuclear war and those feelings have now urged people to greater activities in the struggle for peace, for disarmament and for a ban on nuclear tests. That is the positive side of it. And, therefore, I say that the arms race, bad as it is, has brought about one of the mightiest world mobilisations today as we see.

Now, in this context, naturally our mind goes to the Congress that will be soon held in Moscow, the Congress of Peace and Disarmament, to be attended by over 2,000 people drawn from all parts of the world. Ninety nations will be represented and this will be the greatest congregation of peace forces in the world today. We wish well of this conference and we hope they will find a common voice for a solution or offer a solution to the outstanding problems of our time. The arms race is something which has been imposed on the world by the imperialist powers and today the world is spending 1,20,000 million dollar\* every year or Rs. 60,000 crores in terms of our currency, that is to say, five times our entire outlay on the Third Plan or almost five times India's national income. Sixty per cent of the U.S. national income has been spent on military purposes and they have produced this year the biggest ever war budget in peace time. That shows where the U.S. stands. Today there are fifty million people employed in the armed forces. Add another fifty million people who are employed in war industries. You get 100 million people and so money and resources are spent and employed for the creation of weapons of destruction for destructive purposes. What

else could be a greater tragedy for mankind, when almost the entire humanity live in poverty, sorrow, hunger, unemployment and destitution in every part of the world? Everybody knows that if disarmament was possible as indeed it should be possible, by the combined efforts of the peace forces, much of this sum wasted and spent on destructive purposes, would be released for constructive work for the well-being of the people. Therefore, it has a great, humanitarian aspect from every angle. That is why today men—whether they are unilateralists, whether they are pacifists, whether they are Congressmen or Communists and I am glad to find even our P.S.P. friends—have come to realise that the struggle for peace is a worthy cause to which every decent man must be dedicated.

Now, the Americans have decided to start nuclear tests in outer space. They are extending the nuclear arms race to the outer space, although the U.N. Secretary-General has pointed out very clearly that outer space does not belong to any particular country. It belongs to all countries. These tests in outer space, as the scientists have pointed out, would affect every single nation in the world one way or another. Therefore, it has to be treated as a crime against humanity. But the U.S. imperialists seem to be undeterred by the protestations of the whole world, including 700 scientists in their own country. Now, radiation belts will be created which will affect this planet and the human beings living on it. Therefore, the time has come for us to speak very strongly against these nuclear tests, whether in the atmosphere or in outer space. Now, in this context, the suggestion was made at the Gandhi Peace Foundation's Convention that there should be unilateral disarmament. Noble sentiments may underlie such pronouncements—but impractical—and would seem to be an international Utopia. Today, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, they have stated in the programme of the Communist Party of

the Soviet Union that for their internal purposes they do not need any armed forces. They have also stated that if the Western Powers would accept complete and general disarmament by three stages, as they have stated in their proposal, the Soviet Union, on its part, is prepared to accept any form of international control. Therefore, the problem is what you want. Do you want the business of international control to be utilised for carrying on the arms race, or do you want it to be an instrument for enforcing an agreement or treaty for disarmament complete and general? As you know, the U.S.S.R. had earlier accepted unilaterally the banning of nuclear weapon tests and it also reduced its armed forces by unilateral cuts. The only answer it got from the United States of America was to instigate France to carry out atomic tests in the Sahara. This is one. Another was that the military spending was stepped up by the United States and West Germany was being equipped for a nuclear war and promised nuclear weapons in the hands of the former Hitler's Generals and military personnel. It is such a situation that in order to keep the defensive forces of the Soviet Union in combat readiness, the Soviet side say that they had to take recourse to certain tests last time. But they are prepared for a nuclear test ban. They have pointed out, supported by others, that as far as the test ban is concerned it should be arrived at because the present developments in science and technology make it possible to detect such tests from another country and that the question of inspection should not offer an insurmountable difficulty. Now this disarmament has a special significance for newly liberated nations or nations who are fighting for their independence. In the first place they limit the military possibilities of the imperialist powers and thereby strengthen the forces of independence in their struggle for liberation. Secondly, they create a better atmosphere for the reconstruction of the under-developed countries and better

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] Economic relations in the world today. That is why we saw how our Five Year Plans came to be affected when there was aggression in Suez, when tension developed as a result of Anglo-French aggression in Suez against Egypt, the U.A.R., in 1958. This aspect should be borne in mind also in our country.

The Prime Minister referred to the Kashmir issue. That is very important. Here it is quite clear. The United States want the Kashmir issue to be agitated in order to bring pressure on India, to wage cold war against India, to get us to toe their line or at least to yield to them in certain matters. Only today the *Times of India* carries a news item in which the *New York Times* is quoted. According to the *New York Times* report: "The real issue as we see it in Washington is not Kashmir but whether the United States resolution would result in India's acquiring MIG jet fighters from the Soviet Union." It is *Times of India* leading news today. Sometimes our External Affairs Ministry does not tell us. But Americans are blunt people. They have an American way of talking, and they talk like that. It is good that we know from the *New York Times* as to why all of a sudden this Kashmir question is being agitated—in order to bring pressure upon the Prime Minister so that he does not go in for any kind of discussions or negotiations, whatever they are, with a view to purchasing certain jet planes which possibly the Government of India need. I am not a military expert, Mr. Vajpayee certainly is, you will hear him but I am not. Now this is quite clear, this is how they treat such matters. Here again it is the cold war. We are glad that the Soviet Union and Rumania have stood by India in the just cause of India, by what is a fact and politically accomplished truth, internationally admitted truth, and they are trying to frustrate the American move. But America, pretending friendship here, pretending friendship in New York

and Washington, telling so many things to us in very sweet tones, takes up this issue and tries to bring pressure on India. It is a rod in their hand in order to pressurise India. That must be understood. All I can say in this connection is that I urge upon the Government of India to declare publicly and from the forum of the United Nations that we consider, as far as the Security Council is concerned, the Kashmir question to be a closed question. It should be frozen. I do not know whether we can take

it out technically and legally. But we can today with the support of other good nations in the United Nations Organisation and in the Security Council take the stand that in view of the changes that have taken place since 1948 and 1949, in view of the continued violations, with American backing, of the U.N. Commission's resolutions on India and Pakistan by Pakistan, the matter has lapsed. There are certain things in international law also by which certain things can be described as lapsed. Why cannot we take this stand? Has the ingenuity of the Government in international law or affairs come to such a point that it cannot find the legitimate and requisite arguments to freeze the Kashmir issue in the Security Council and make it impossible for the Western Powers to be agitated every time we want to take a firm stand on this or that international issue? This is what I would like the Prime Minister to consider. Well, I cannot offer him consultations, but he has great legal luminaries around him with very great talents, and I think it should not be difficult to find a solution of the problem. The Security Council has failed to implement its obligations also so far as certain clauses of the resolutions are concerned. It does not lie in the mouth of the Security Council today to say that it is again seized of this matter and allow the Western Powers to take it as a vantage point and make political debating points against India and, what is more, to bring pressure to



bear upon India's foreign and economic policies. This is what I would like to say.

Here the Government should take a firm stand. I know that the Prime Minister is a very polite man and he would not have liked my language, and I am not so great as to understand sometimes his language. But I think that in such matters the Americans understand blunt speaking. If the Prime Minister does not like to speak like that, he can get some Minister of the External Affairs Ministry or somebody else to speak. It should be done. I think we should speak out firmly. I think Mr. Vajpayee is getting agitated. It is too early for him.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, Senator Fulbright's attitude should be considered a little. In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when the question of aid for India was discussed, we saw how the Senator spoke. They forgot that we are an independent nation, a nation many times bigger in population than the United States of America and many Western nations put together. They talked as if we were charity buyers waiting at the doorstep of American millionaires for a few dollars, and one of them said patronisingly that India should not be punished because—note the words—of the folly of the Prime Minister and the crime of the Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon. Well, I am glad that a discrimination was made, but it is meaningless discrimination. Folly of the Prime Minister and, crime of the Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon—therefore, you must not get it. Is it not political interference? Is it not poking their nose into our internal affairs? Some day we shall see the Americans telling us who should be and who should not be our Deputy Ministers in Parliament, in the Government. Well, that is how things begin. It has begun. Here it is very interesting, Mr. Chairman. Some American wrote—I think he is Max Lerner—"Senator Fulbright

.377 RS—2.

attributes the cuts primarily to the baleful impact of the Indian Defence Minister. Some day a graduate student in world politics may write a study on the economic consequences of Krishna Menon." This is what the Americans write. I think we should also understand and our politicians here, not some day but today, should properly understand the political consequences of the economic aid that we are getting now, and we should do it before it is too late. Now I can give you many other quotations from the *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, and so on, to show how they treat this matter. For example, the *New York Times* said: —

"The most serious blemish in the Aid India Bill is the specific limitations of aid to India to the last year level. Not because of the limitation itself but because it singles out India for punitive action in retaliation for its unco-operative policy. This action is a manifestation of strong feelings aroused in this country by Indian seizure of Goa and the double standard India sometimes employs judging its own and Communist action with those of the West."

The only thing they did not say, following the Indian Finance Minister, was that the Prime Minister was a fellow-traveller of Mr. Khrushchev. *The Washington Post* dated the 17th May says: —

"The Senators voting for an aid-cut last Friday criticized Indian take-over of Goa in December, her repeated refusal to negotiate a settlement of the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan and Defence Minister Krishna Menon's repeated anti-West attacks, particularly in equating U.S. underground nuclear tests with Soviet atmospheric tests.

The Senators also indicated that they were in agreement with the Pakistan argument that any eco-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] nomic aid to India is same as military aid since it frees the Indian resources to concentrate on arms against Pakistan".

It is clear. Well, I ask the Prime Minister: Are these not indications of strings? Political strings are not always written into agreements. Political strings are sometimes created in the objective situations, in economic relations, with the expectation that they will give them a handle to put pressure on the Government. Now, whatever our intentions are—we may mean well—but they do not mean well. It is clearly demonstrated by the Aid India Club. They do not give us money. I know that they gave us money. That was an attempt to blackmail us. Money may be coming. In the meanwhile, they have chosen to blackmail us and *The Washington Post* before the Aid India Club meeting told the world that the Aid India Club would not take any decision or rather take a decision not to fulfil the commitment. That happened. But our External Affairs Ministry kept quiet, may be out of politeness, may be out of ignorance or may be out of both, or may be out of understandable prudence. I do not know what that was. We would like to know it.

Now, let me come to the European Common Market. I am concerned with the political and international aspects of it. The Prime Minister says one thing and the Memorandum of the Government of India says another thing. And when we ask them to tell us what is what, then everything is mixed together. We are living in a mixed economy. Therefore, what Mr. Morarji Desai says and what the Prime Minister says make a common mixture and we are to swallow it. But we are not prepared to do it. What did the Prime Minister say? In one of the Press conferences he said and rightly so that the European Common Market was something like a means for controlling the

under-developed countries. The Prime Minister is a statesman and a politician. His is the voice of the nation. It is good that he said it. Then in the Lok Sabha talking about the growing political solidarity between them, he said—I am quoting his exact word—as follows:—

"But I fear it will not lead to anything good. I am talking about political solidarity".

This is the assessment of the Prime Minister about the European Common Market. And what our great Finance Ministry in its Memorandum says is very interesting. In paragraph 2 of the Memorandum, certificate is given to the European Common Market that it will mean social progress and economic expansion, that it will be good for everybody, good for the member countries and good for others. This is clearly stated and indicated in my amendments. Now, I would like to know from the Prime Minister: Is it a correct interpretation of his understanding or his policy of peace and non-alignment in the context of the European Common Market? I cannot understand it. I cannot square this statement with the other one. We], I would not like to accuse the Government of double talk because I am very sober in such matters. But then it sounds like double talk, Mr. Chairman, and I agree with the Prime Minister's general assessment. The European Economic Community is a projection of NATO into the economic field with a view to maintaining the East-West trade barrier, with a view to bringing about a greater combination of international finance and capital to exploit the working people of the European Common Market countries and exploit the associated countries—for example, the Asian and African possessions of France—and keeping the under-developed countries down, and above all directed against the Socialist camp. This is E.C.M. and the E.C.M. politicians have left no doubt about it. Today Britain is joining the E.C.M. urged and prodded by the U.S.A. because in the first place\*

Britain wants to break the rise of West Germany and the combination of France with West Germany, and secondly, the United States also wants to secure through Britain some measure of control over the European Common Market. That is the matter. Now, do not give certificate to it. Is it not a perversion of our foreign policy, of our understanding of the good sentiments and thoughts of the Prime Minister by the Ministry of Finance when they put such kind of things? They could have easily given the economic consequences of the European Common Market in terms of trade and so on. But why did they suddenly go out of the way to indulge in high politics and come out with a certificate when the Labour Party in England is divided on it, when prominent British M. Ps are fighting the E.C.M., when every section of the working class movement of E.C.M. countries and progressive-minded people are stoutly opposing the dangerous move in the field of the economics, politics and military? This is a device to strengthen the NATO alliance and the imperialist alliance. I do not understand why such things happen. The Commonwealth Prime Ministers sometimes talk about the Commonwealth as if we shall not live if the Commonwealth disintegrates and goes out of existence. Neither shall I ask the Prime Minister to shed his tears; there are better causes for which, Mr. Chairman, we shall all join with him in shedding our tears. But the Commonwealth is a shoddy facade of British Imperialism, discredited every day in life. Why should he try to make out as if the Commonwealth is going out? That is not the main thing. The point is, it is directed against us. The British Government has taken advantage of the fact that 40 per cent. of our trade is with Britain and the European Common Market countries. This is what they are doing. This is an attempt to pressurise India into a position where, willy-nilly, we have to accept what they say. And it seems to me that the Government of India

want settlement in the interests of a small section of monopolists rather than the larger interests of the country. I think the solution is to expand our trade with other countries, develop the economic relations with the Socialist and other non-aligned nations. Fortunately, we live in a world today which is not dominated or 'controlled by the imperialists; we are living in a changed world today. Therefore, we should act accordingly. All I would say is that the Prime Minister's foreign policy should be interpreted properly in the matter of economic development and there should be better co-ordination in such matters at least between the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of External Affairs. Now, coming to Viet Nam, I do not understand why India should sign a joint report with Canada and accuse the North Viet Nam Republic of infiltration into South Viet Nam. In fact, if I may say so, this International Commission has failed to ensure the Geneva Agreement. For example, there should have been general elections by 1956. Those elections could not take place because of the intransigence of the South Viet Nam administration or regime and the Americans are behind that. Then, patriotic people are fighting against the tyrannical regime in South Viet Nam. Under the Geneva Agreement, they are entitled to do so. The Geneva Agreement lays down that partisans or resistance fighters must not be persecuted but then they are hanged and so on. Military build-up by the Americans is going on. What business have the Americans got to go from thousands of miles away and sit in Laos and in other parts in the vicinity or neighbourhood of Viet Nam? Therefore, I think that the Government of India should not have accepted these false allegations and fabrications which have been springing up time and again with a view to cover up the persecution of the patriotic forces in South Viet Nam, with a view to undermining the Geneva Agreement and with a view to covering up the military

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] build-up by the Americans. That must be borne in mind. Now, everybody knows that Canada is an attorney of the U.S.A. in the International Commission. We should have done better than finding company with such people.

Now, again, here I must say that in Thailand there are 700 Marines; they have gone there. In Laos there are 7,000 troops. There are 8,000 American troops in South Viet-Nam and the whole purpose is to keep that region under their control, under their sphere of influence, and their fleet is also there. As you know, movements of that fleet have taken place there recently. Therefore, that should be taken in the context of the bid by the Americans against the Asian countries and against the peace of the world.

Therefore, as far as Laos is concerned, I do not wish to say very much. The coalition government has come into existence but then the Right-wing elements are trying to frustrate this Agreement, to wreck it by bringing in extraneous issues and in that connection, we find that the gentlemen of the American State Department or the Americans are encouraging them. That everybody sees. India's stand on the question of Viet-Nam has disappointed many people, and I would ask the Prime Minister to personally look into this matter.

12. NOON

As far as Algeria is concerned, that Government should be recognised. Also German Democratic Republic should be recognised and I do not see why discrimination should be followed against German Democratic Republic. An Agreement was signed with the West German Government and article 12 of this agreement says: "This Agreement shall apply to land Berlin." Berlin is not part of West German Republic and so why in that Agreement is Berlin recognised? Who gave authority to the German Federal Government to come to Agreements with

other powers with regard to Berlin, which neither in geography, nor in political fact nor in international law constitutes a part of West German Republic—as we understand it today. Therefore it creates misgivings, and there was no need in that Agreement that was signed for the development of agriculture in Mandi in Himachal Pradesh, for you to go and sign that particular Article which, in effect, gives an indirect recognition to the claim that Berlin is part of German Federal Republic.

Now I would refer to another point, an important point, the MIG affair. The Prime Minister the other day said that there was no negotiation. Technically perhaps he was right—there was no negotiation, but what I fail to understand is this and I hope he will clarify here. The first time he spoke on this subject was in the Lok Sabha last year when he said that the possibility of buying MIGs was not ruled out. That is what he said. Later on he could have repudiated this statement but then he continued to say a similar things. Suddenly he said here, after talks with Mr. Sandys somewhat differently '—it was a later thing, later to his Press Conference. I would refer the Prime Minister to his press conference in June this year, where he said so many things about the discussions, negotiations and so on on this particular question. Here, in that Press Conference, he said: "Then we go on to MIG. We had felt for some considerable time that our Air Force was relatively weak, that is, the machines, etc., more especially after some much later type of aircraft was given as aid to Pakistan." Then, Mr. Chairman, he said: "We are considering all aspects, and even in the Soviet Union we have to consider many aspects and talk to them about it." Then he said: "But we did gather that they would be willing to come to some agreement with us about it"—supply of MIGs. Now what he said amounts to an admission that negotiations were on. Now the Prime Minister can say: "It

was not on a Government-to-Government level", "but I cannot understand it. Surely the Prime Minister had not sent his engineers to the Soviet Union to talk on behalf of Mr. G. D. Birla or, if you like, for Bhupesh Gupta. They go and talk on behalf of the Government. Surely the engineers and the other authorities concerned going to the Soviet Union do not enter into a discussion over such vital matters relating to defence with the authorities of the Soviet Government on behalf of others. Therefore let us frankly say that negotiations are there. They may not formulate it in terms of tender and offer but the desire to buy and the readiness to sell is there and discussion goes on, and I do not know why the Prime Minister said this thing. But he will kindly explain it here, I hope. But my fear is that after Mr. Sandys' talk with him he said this thing. Probably he meant it as a gesture of politeness, but others will take it in other light, and I shall not be one of them—I tell you that much. And the Prime Minister in his Press Conference has said about the question as to why they were going to buy the MIG, and it was because... "more especially after some much later type of aircraft was given as aid to Pakistan." In this connection I find that Mr. B. K. Nehru in his statement in Columbus on June 17, 1962, has spoken on the MIG deal and said:

"Twelve aircraft hardly represent a decisive margin or superiority for Pakistan forces against India's".

And then he said:

"The MIGs would be in actuality more significant in relation to India's border dispute with Communist China, especially in view of the fact that Kussia has not provided Communist China with similar planes".

First of all, it is not proper to put it that way—the Prime Minister can well understand this thing. This is not the sort of statement that the Prime Minister made at his Press

Conference only a few weeks earlier. This was not the reason that he gave for going in for MIGs. I do not think that he should say any such thing or anybody should say any such thing. We are in for our defence equipment and we buy them from wherever we like. Should we say for what purpose we buy them? But here Mr. B. K. Nehru was trying to bring the China issue, evidently to be on the good side of Americans and to humour them by playing on their anti-communist prejudices, but I am glad to see that at least the Prime Minister had not used such a method. I would like the Prime Minister kindly to solve this contradiction also for me now.

Now I turn to the Congo. Mr. Gizenga should be released and our Prime Minister should help in it. He is not merely the Head of a Government; he is looked upon as one of the outstanding statesmen in the world today. Today we are participating in the Congo as part of the U. N. troops and Mr. Gizenga is held there in unlawful captivity and is about to be made over for assassination to the butcher. His fate will be that of Lumumba if we do not intervene and the world does not intervene, and we would ask the Prime Minister to do everything in his power to get him released and his amenities restored to him. It would be a humanitarian act; it would be a political act; it would be an act in the interests of anti-colonialism, and we will get the blessings and thanks of the entire freedom-loving mankind, and I would implore the Government to intervene in this matter. Gizenga must be saved at all costs, and if India would not come to his rescue and the rescue of the colonial people, to liberate the African people, who else on earth would come? Eyes are fixed on that man who sits there, the great man Jawaharlal Nehru. I know how the Africans deeply feel about him. They seek his intervention and I know the moral power and force that will be created. Once Jawaharlal Nehru, as the leader of a great nation and as the head of a great Government, once a statesman of his calibre gets up and says:

Shri Bhupesh Gupta.J "Set Gizenga at liberty; restore him to freedom; give him the amenities and save him from the hands of the butcher" I say something will follow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Malaysia is another thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid, Mr. Gupta, if you take a lot of time I will not be able to give even half as much time to the other speakers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing; just one word about Malaysia I shall say to draw his attention. I have tabled 57 amendments or 55 amendments. Now, in the creation of Malaysia our Prime Minister's name is being used by the rulers in Malay saying that he supports the Malaysia plan. I got in touch with the whomsoever various people there; I wrote to whomsoever I knew; I have got papers here, very many papers including the papers from those countries, the quotations and so on, to show that the people in those countries are opposing the Malaysia plan. This plan is inspired by the British. It is part and parcel of their plan to hold that region in the SEATO, and it is proposed by all, by the better progressive section that his name should not be there. He should stand squarely against it.

Now, before I sit down, I would appeal to him to render all assistance to the migrants who are coming from East Pakistan to Malda and other parts of India. I regret to say that the assistance which is being given is not adequate; the relief that is being given is not adequate. I agree with the Prime Minister that we must create a situation where such migration does not take place, and I think that for that Indo-Pakistan good^ relations should play an important part and we should play our part to improve that relation. Friendship between India and Pakistan is a vital question in the context of our own national existence, for us in India and for Pakistan as far as Pakistani people

are concerned, but as long as that situation does not arise and due to a bad turn in the communal situation the "migrants begin to come here. They come because of apprehension and fear and not just for fun, and I think we should receive them, show our kindness to them, render them every assistance, provide them with relief, provide them with adequate funds, accommodation, and so on, and here I must say that Rs. 5,000 is not enough, which the West Bengal Government has spent. It seems there is tardiness on the part of the West Bengal Government and also in the Central Government, and technical arguments are being advanced. Sir, this human matter should be viewed in the larger context of the relation between the two countries. It is something which we do not want and still it comes upon us. It is something which the Hindus in Pakistan do not want, but still it happens, and they have to trek into Indian territory on the border. I think, on this occasion, we must rise to the occasion and render them every assistance.

Finally, before I sit down, I generally support the Prime Minister's policy of peace and non-alignment. But I must say that it should be implemented at every level. What I would like to tell him is that the External Affairs Ministry officials should be educated in the spirit of the policy of peace and non-alignment. It is essential. We all need self-education and I do not think the Secretaries are without any need for such education. It is important for the political leadership of the country, under the Prime Minister, to see that the officers who go abroad or work here should implement in the day-to-day work the foreign policy of the Government, get the necessary outlook and orientation of the spirit of the foreign policy so that the nation marches according to his dictates and according to his guiding line and fundamental principles. We must play a still greater part for the preservation of world peace, for the

abolition of colonialism and for the well-being of mankind.

SHRI PATIL PUTTAPPA: Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to speak on the Foreign Affairs Debate. The nation is just like a clock. In every family, as the hon. Members know, everybody is not called upon to wind the clock. In the family there might be children and disabled persons, but only those who can catch up the clock and who know the art of winding are entrusted with the task. The nation is just like a clock. As everybody is not called upon to rewind it—only the person who is quite fit to undertake the task is entrusted with the business of rewinding it—so also it is singularly our good fortune that we today have got the leadership of an eminent world statesman of the stature of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Since the days of Asoka this country has not seen another great leader of his stature, and it is good that India, which shook off the bonds of her slavery, got at its helm a person of the stature of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru to guide her destinies.

For the first time the people of India got through him one-world view. Under his leadership they joined the world community and he brought a fresh outlook to the affairs of men, not particularly the men of India but to men all over the world. People began to think about world affairs in a different sense. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has been telling us that the world is a big neighbourhood and the world, so to say, has become one family. Man got the impression that he is not an islander by himself but he is part of a big continent. And, therefore, whatever happens to the whole continent happens to him wherever he is. He brought forth this outlook to men in India and the people in India began to view the affairs of men in this context.

Sir, I am very sorry that some people in this House and outside take

a very pessimistic view of things. I think this sort of pessimism amounts to a sort of irresponsibility. This government has done much in the furtherance of our foreign relationship. We are, after all, not a very big power. We may be an ancient country but we are a very young nation. Although we are very young we have done considerably well looking at our economic resources and the backwardness of our country.

Sir, some critics of our Foreign policy, here or abroad, are always trying to put a square peg in a round hole and then complain that it does not fit in. Of course, that is not the fault of our foreign policy it is the fault of their thinking. They have to attune themselves to look at things from a different angle.

Throughout the world people have been led to think in terms of power politics, conflict, wars and the like. But in India here is a man who has come with a message who, in the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "After me he will speak my language", is speaking his language, the language of peace, co-operation, friendship and goodwill. This has earned throughout the world a good number of friends for India. From Peru to Peking there has been a good deal of understanding about India. Although we have been functioning as a free nation only for the last fifteen years, we have been tremendously welcomed in the comity of nations.

Sir, there has been a lopsided thinking on the part of some hon. Members who want that India should do this and India should do that. But it is not the business of India to interfere in everybody's internal affairs. India cannot put her hand in every international pie. India, first of all, shall have to look to its own immediate good which is, of course, conditioned by the good of the world in general.

Ever since the Prime Minister made a policy statement in 1946 before India became free, the Government has been adhering to that

[Shri Patil Puttappa.] policy of strict neutrality. It has not aligned itself with any power bloc but it has been the staunchest supporter of the United Nations because the Prime Minister believes, and with him India also, that ultimately the destiny of the world is veering round the one world of Nehru's dream. There are many things happening in this world and we cannot take exception to everything that is happening because everything is to be considered in the context of the world's well-being.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, although India is very young in the comity of nations, it has been able to give her guidance whenever it was sought. It has tried its best to avert a crisis in Indo-China, stopped a war in Palestine, negotiated a peace in Korea and helped the big nations at Geneva to come to an understanding, but India is not prepared to be dragooned into this camp or that camp. There might be nations wanting India to associate herself either with this bloc or that bloc. But India wants to pursue her own policy without aligning herself with this or that power bloc. India although very young in the comity of nations, is playing a very vital role. Many smaller nations look to India so that they could do something the way that India has been doing. Sir Bertrand Russell remarked that smaller nations hang on to these powerful blocs, just as prostitutes. India is not one. India is not hanging on to any one of these powers. I am only quoting Sir Bertrand Russell. India, although she is getting economic aid either from the American bloc or the Soviet bloc is pursuing her own foreign policy. As Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said as long back as 1947, no one can buy India. India wants to hold on to those principles and those values of life that she has been advocating since ages. She cannot be purchased by any one of these blocs. Members know pretty well that this is the real position. They agree with the position taken by the

Prime Minister, but many a time they say "No" to whatever he says. It is something like the case of the sailor's daughter in the story. A sailor went on a voyage after telling his daughter to say "No" to whichever suitor came to her. One suitor came and asked her to marry him and she just said: "No". Another came and said: "Spring has come and church bells are ringing. Will you remain single?" And she answered "No". She did not know what she was saying. In the same way some critics of our foreign policy say "no" to things, though at the same time, they agree to the contents of our foreign policy.

Some exception has been taken by some hon. Members to our association with the Commonwealth. Nobody forced us to join the Commonwealth. It is out of our own free will that we have joined the Commonwealth and we are free to get out of it also if we want. But we should think whether it would be worthwhile getting out of it. No one forced us to join it and we are not a party to any one of the military pacts that Britain has entered into. Therefore, there is no point in advocating that we should leave the Commonwealth. It is out of our own free will that we are there, and because we know that it is to the benefit of India to be there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much more time, do you think, you would take?

SHRI PATIL PUTTAPPA: Two minutes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, two minutes\* is two minutes.

SHRI PATIL PUTTAPPA: About our attitude to the proposed E.C.M. and the Malaysian Federation, there has been some opposition expressed. Actually these are not our problems. If the people of Malaya and other countries want to have a federation).



It is for them to have it. It is their business. Perhaps some of the European powers fear that if there is a federation they will not have sufficient strength as against the Soviet bloc. And the European powers might also be thinking in terms of a European Common Market. We have to see how far it is going to adversely affect us, and only to that extent we should bother ourselves about the E.C.M. If the nations of Europe want to have a common market, it is their business. I feel that geography is having a greater influence now on these matters than before. Some time back that famous British geographer, Sir Halfred Mackinder who is a great authority on geopolitics, divided the world into two groups. One group consisting of Asia, Europe, Africa he called the greater island of the world. The two Americas he called the lesser island. Areas right from the Rhine up to Siberia he called the heart line of the main island and he enunciated the theory that whoever is in possession of this heart line would rule all East Europe, and he who rules East Europe would command the greater island and he who rules the greater island would command the whole world. Perhaps some of these powers are working on the suggestion made or the apprehension expressed by Sir Halfred Mackinder.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please finish. That will do. Mr. G. S. Pathak.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to just one or two matters now. First of all I would refer to our disputes with China. I have studied the recent correspondence between ourselves and the Chinese Government and also the statements made by our Prime Minister both in the Lok Sabha and in this House. It is gratifying to learn that the Government has taken proper steps to defend our territory and to strengthen our borders. We have taken strong measures in defence of our independence and in defence of our territory. But I

feel, and I hope many of us in this House also feel, that after our sad experience with the Government of China, we should have no further faith in their word and we should not be very optimistic about their behaviour. At one time they had made a clear pronouncement about their attitude towards our differences with Pakistan with regard to Kashmir. On the 16th of March, 1956, a clear statement was made to our Ambassador in Peking by the Chinese Government that they held the view that the people in Kashmir had declared finally their views about the accession. But the Chinese Government have now exploited our difference with Pakistan and they have gone back upon what they had said and are negotiating with Pakistan with regard to our territory. They have violated the treaty and the principles of Panch-sheel. We now feel that we should not have placed any trust in their outward expressions of fraternal feelings towards us. Therefore, it is necessary to continue our efforts to strengthen the borders, our northern borders. There should be no slackening in those efforts and it is gratifying to learn that the Government of India is taking up that attitude. That attitude has been made very clear and explicit in the statements that the Prime Minister made in the Lok Sabha on the 14th of May. We have got our commitments also towards Sikkim and towards Bhutan and Government is right in being vigilant and in being in a state of preparedness for any emergency.

Now, Sir, I have got a word or two to say on this fuss over the M.I.G. planes and the American attitudes. Sir, the purchase of M.I.G. planes is entirely a commercial transaction. It is a matter with which no other country should be concerned. It is a matter relating to our defences, relating to the preservation of our independence and our freedom. How we defend ourselves, where we make our purchases, whether it is convenient to purchase from one place or from another—and'

[Shri G. S. Pathak.] we have been making purchases from various countries irrespective of political considerations—are all matters which are of a commercial nature. We have made purchases from the Soviet Union; we have made purchases from the United States itself and we have made purchases from United Kingdom and France. How is it that this purely commercial transaction with which we alone are concerned has been sought to be transmuted into a political issue? It has been attempted to be linked with economic aid which we have been receiving and we are going to receive from the United States and from the Aid-India Club. Why is that so? It is the declared policy of the United States that the economic aid shall be without strings. They know our declared policy that we cannot have any aid with strings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When did the United States say as a general policy?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: In various speeches. If you remember President Kennedy's message dated the 22nd March 1961, to the Congress, he had laid down the principles on which economic aid was being given.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But don't forget the Mutual Security Pact.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I am not forgetting anything. Those who are concerned and who have been concerned with the principles on which aid has been given have made it clear that there is no link between military assistance and the aid given to undeveloped countries. Now, it would be inconsistent with all these principles if aid is linked with conditions and I do not see any difference between saying 'We shall not give certain amounts unless you -accept our conditions' and saying 'We are giving aid with strings'. Now, if we do not accept aid if it is given with strings, then it appears to me that that should not be the real reason for an attempt

to reduce the aid particularly when we have got the consensus of opinion from those who visit the country from the United States, their dignitaries, their statesmen, their Senators that India is the country which has put to the best use the economic aid given throughout the world. It has been given to so many countries. Now, specious reasons are being given by some people for saying why there should be reduction in the aid. I will take just one reason. India might purchase M.I.G. planes from Russia. Those planes might be used against Pakistan. That is one reason. How will this question arise if the United States knows that India is not going to attack Pakistan unless Pakistan attacks India and Pakistan would not attack India according to the declarations given by the American Government. If that is so, how will this question arise *viz.* that India would attack Pakistan? India repeatedly has made clear declarations that she is not going to attack Pakistan even when disputes have got to be resolved. They forget that the weapons that we want to acquire might be used against China. Therefore, Sir, these are all specious reasons and the real reason is to be found elsewhere. Sir, the real reason is the military pacts. The real reason is that the military departments dominate political decisions. Recently, there was a press report which appeared in the American papers from an American correspondent in Karachi and it said:

"The United States enjoys certain facilities in Pakistan the precise character of which is a secret. U-2 espionage flights were cancelled by the then President, Mr. Eisenhower, and they have not been resumed but it seems probable that Pakistan still serves as a base for the United States intelligence activities along the southern rim of the Soviet Union. Pakistan is also a potential base for operations in the event of war."

It has been stated that this is a consideration which, according to the dip-

lomatics in the United Nations, is responsible for the American attitude and if that is the reason, then no persuasion could avail where the question is one of convincing United States on any matter with regard to our differences with Pakistan. Continuance of dispute has been considered by the United States as the best method of promoting peace. Shutting their eyes to rights and wrongs has been considered the best method of securing justice. Sir, right, justice, etc., are all considerations which have no place where you have got to back up a particular country because you have got a military alliance with that country. The matter is still pending in the Security Council and I shall say nothing about what appeared in this morning's papers about the conduct of the American Delegate.

Now, it has been said . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The latest reports seem to be that they have been vetoed.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: . . . that our publicity is at fault. Sometimes that has been said. Now, on that point I can speak from personal experience.

' MR. CHAIRMAN; I could give you only another three minutes.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Very good. Sir, publicity can only convince. I have had an opportunity of meeting many people in many countries about the Kashmir matter and certain other matters and my feeling was that they were convinced about the correctness of our position. There was no answer to the question—what is it upon which Pakistan is basing its claim? Religion, in law, is no basis. But we cannot do anything when people have to act in a particular manner even after they are convinced about the correctness of our position.

There was one other matter, namely, Pakistan's misrepresentations and keeping up the propaganda at low

levels. We could not make any misrepresentations. Our publicity cannot make any misrepresentations. Our representatives will be torn to pieces in Parliament and objections would be raised as to why they are lowering the dignity of our country. They will be asked, 'Why are you giving false facts to others?'. Therefore my view is that our publicity is not at fault. When certain countries act in a particular manner, they act for certain reasons.

**श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी** (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

सभापति जी, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर विचार करते समय स्वाभाविक रूप से हमारा ध्यान आज जो अणु-परीक्षण चल रहे हैं उनकी ओर जाता है। हम एक विचित्र विश्व में रहते हैं जहां अणु-परीक्षण भी होते हैं और शान्ति-सम्मेलन भी आयोजित किये जाते हैं और आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि शान्ति के सम्मेलन केवल भारत जैसे तटस्थ देश में ही नहीं होते बल्कि जिस देश ने अणु-परीक्षण न करने के संबंध में हुये समझौते को सबसे पहले तोड़ा वह, रूस भी, एक शान्ति सम्मेलन का आयोजन कर रहा है। अणु-परीक्षण कोई भी करे हमें उसकी निन्दा करनी चाहिये क्योंकि आज मानवता के सामने दो ही विकल्प हैं, सर्वोदय अथवा सर्वनाश; या तो सम्पूर्ण मानव-समाज सद्भावना के आधार पर इस भूखंड में जीवित रहेगा अन्यथा सम्पूर्ण मानवता शस्त्रों की दौड़ में सर्वनाश की लपेट में आ जायेगी। हमारे देश में अभी अणु-शस्त्रों के विरोध में एक सम्मेलन हुआ था।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

उस सम्मेलन में बैठे हुए मुझे अनुभव हुआ कि यद्यपि हमारी आवाज शस्त्रीकरण के खिलाफ उठती है फिर भी आज परिस्वितियां ऐसी हैं कि हम अपने को हथियार बन्द करने के लिये विवश हो गये हैं और जब हम दूसरे देशों को उपदेश देते हैं कि वे हथियार इकट्ठे न करे तो वह कहें या न कहें शायद वह मन ही मन इस बात पर हंसते होंगे कि जो भारत

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

अपनी रक्षा के लिये सभी देशों से हथियार खरीदना चाहता है और खरीद रहा है वह जब हमें उपदेश देने का मौका आता है तो उपदेश देने में किसी से पीछे नहीं रहता। उस सम्मेलन में यह भी कहा गया कि हमें एकतरफा कार्यवाही करनी चाहिये कि हम हथियारबन्द न रहें। जिन्होंने यह बात कही उन्होंने बड़ी ऊंची भावना से प्रेरित हो कर कही। यह भारत का शाश्वत स्वर है जो कोलाहलों के बीच में, शस्त्रों की झंकाओं के बीच में सुनाई देता है। लेकिन वह एक धादश की स्थिति है जो आज व्यवहार से मेल नहीं खाती और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अच्छा किया कि यह बात स्पष्ट कर दी कि संत कुछ भी कहें लेकिन शासक के लिये वास्तविकता की धरती पर पैर रख कर चलना आवश्यक है। लेकिन भारत के जो महानुभाव मास्को में होने वाली पीस कांफेंस में भाग लेने के लिये जा रहे हैं मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर अणु-परीक्षण बन्द करने के लिये नैतिक दबाव डालने का कोई मौका है तो यह मौका है और हमारा यह कदम उठना चाहिये कि हम मास्को की पीस कांफेंस में शामिल होने से इन्कार कर दें और कहें कि जिस रूस ने सबसे पहले अणु-परीक्षण न करने के समझौते को तोड़ा उस रूस में शान्ति सम्मेलन का आयोजन करना एक मखौल है और उस मखौल में भारत के नागरिक शामिल होने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं यह नहीं जानता कि यह बात कहां तक मानो जायगी।

सब से बड़ी कठिनाई यह है कि अगर निःशस्त्रीकरण कर दिया जाय तो फिर जो उपनिवेशवाद है, आक्रमण है, अन्याय है, उसका सामना किस तरह से किया जाय ? हम शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से गोवा की समस्या का हल नहीं कर सके और मैं नहीं समझता कि भारत की जो भूमि आज पाकिस्तान या चीन के कब्जे में है वह शान्ति के रास्तों

से निकल सकती है। अब, या तो हम आक्रमण के सामने घुटने टेक दें या हिम्मत के साथ आक्रमण का मुकाबला करें और इस स्थिति में शस्त्रों को पूरी तरह से छोड़ कर कैसे चला जा सकता है यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती।

महोदया, अन्ततोगत्वा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति पर हमें भारत के हितों को ध्यान में रख कर विचार करना होगा और आज भारत के हित संकटग्रस्त हैं इससे कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। विश्वशान्ति के लिये हम धावाज उठावें, लेकिन इस बात की भी आवश्यकता है कि हम अपने देश के हितों की रक्षा करें। आज कश्मीर की समस्या सुरक्षा-परिषद् में पड़ी है और हम दुनिया के बड़े देशों को यह समझा नहीं सके कि काश्मीर में पाकिस्तान आक्रमणकारी है और उन्हें इस बात के लिये दबाव डालना चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान काश्मीर से अपनी सेनाएं हटा ले। पाकिस्तान प्रचार के लिये काश्मीर के सबाल को सुरक्षा-परिषद् में उठाता है, वह भारत को बदनाम करना चाहता है। उसके लिये काश्मीर जमीन का एक टुकड़ा हो सकता है लेकिन हमारे लिये काश्मीर हमारी सर्वप्रभुता का, हमारी असाध्य-दायिकता का, हमारे लोकतंत्र का प्रतीक है।

हमने काश्मीर को भारत में शामिल किया है, इसलिये नहीं कि जब कभी मौका मिले, अपनी जनता की भावनाओं को उभाड़ने में हम उसको काम में लायें। लेकिन आज पाकिस्तान इसी तरह के हथकंडे पर चलता है और सुरक्षा परिषद् के कुछ देश जानबूझ कर या अनजान में—मेरे लिये कह कहना मुश्किल है—पाकिस्तान का हाथ बंटाते हैं। शायद यह स्थिति आ गई है कि हम सुरक्षा परिषद् को स्पष्ट कह दें कि काश्मीर के बारे में आपका एक ही काम है कि आप पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण को हटाइयें। अगर आप यह काम नहीं करते तो फिर सुरक्षा परिषद् को भारत विरोधी अभियान करने का एक

मंच बनाने का जो पाकिस्तान का प्रयत्न है, उसमें हम साथ नहीं देंगे और सुरक्षा परिषद अगर काश्मीर के बारे में बहस करेगी तो भारत उस बहस से अलग रहने के लिये मजबूर हो जायेगा।

लेकिन काश्मीर का जो हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है हम उसको भूल नहीं सकते। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ठीक किया कि युद्ध विराम रेखा के आधार पर पाकिस्तान से समझौता वार्ता करने के प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लिया। लेकिन एक बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। चीन से भी हमारा सीमा के बारे में झगड़ा है और कोई साढ़े चौदह हजार वर्गमील भूमि पर चीन कब्जा जमा कर बैठा है। चीन को भी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक सुझाव दिया था कि हम एक सूखरे के नक्शे के हिसाब से अपनी सेनाएँ हटा दें, यह सुझाव १९५६ में सबसे पहले दिया गया। अभी इसको दोहराया गया है। चीन ने इस सुझाव को दोनों बार ठुकरा दिया। इस बार हमारे प्रस्ताव को ठुकराते हुए उन्होंने जिस भाषा का प्रयोग किया है उसकी ओर मैं सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। चीनी हमारी प्रमाणिकता पर ही संदेह करते हैं। उनका कहना है कि 'यह विश्वास करने के लिये कारण मौजूद हैं कि भारत सरकार ने उपरोक्त सुझाव गम्भीरतापूर्वक नहीं रखा है।' वे आगे यह भी कहते हैं कि 'चीन सरकार इस तरह की एकतरफा तौर पर थोपी गई दब्बू पत्रों को मान लेगा, ऐसी चारणा कोई कैसे बना सकता है? क्या चीन कोई पराजित देश है?' अपने २ जून के नोट में चीन ने इस भाषा का प्रयोग किया है और यह शर्त लगाई है कि 'नेफा' के क्षेत्र में जितने भूभाग पर चीन दावा करता है उससे भारत को हट जाना चाहिये, तब तो वे सदाकत में अपनी फौजें हटाने के बारे में विचार करेंगे अन्यथा नहीं करेंगे, जिसका अर्थ यह है कि चीन, ने प्रधान मंत्री जी के प्रस्ताव को ठुकरा दिया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ वह प्रस्ताव कायम है या वह प्रस्ताव खत्म हो

गया? कायम रहने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है, और यह स्पष्ट होना चाहिये कि जब चीन इस स्थिति में भी बात करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है तो फिर चीन से समझौता कैसे होगा, जो भारत की भूमि चीन के कब्जे में चली गई है वह कैसे वापस आयेगी।

मुझे यह देख कर दुःख होता है कि देश में कुछ ऐसे दल हैं, कुछ ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जो पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे झगड़े को तो बढ़ा चढ़ा कर बताते हैं मगर जब चीन का सवाल आता है तो चुप्पी लगाकर बैठ जाते हैं। मेरे साथी कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता श्री भूपेसा गुप्ता ने इतने संशोधन दिये हैं मगर उनमें चीन के साथ हमारे झगड़े का उल्लेख तक नहीं है, जैसे चीन ने आक्रमण किया ही नहीं है। जैसे चीन के साथ हमारे बड़े मित्रता के सम्बन्ध चल रहे हैं (Interruption) यह साम्राज्यवादी खेल नहीं है, यह देशभक्ति का तकाजा है कि चाहे आक्रमण भी न से हो चाहे पाकिस्तान से, भारत में रहने वाला, अपने को देशभक्त कहने वाला हर एक व्यक्ति उन आक्रमणों की निन्दा करे। मगर कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी आक्रमण की निन्दा करना तो दूर रहा, अपने प्रेस में चीन को भारत विरोधी सामग्री छापने का मौका देती है। यह मंत्रालय भले ही कार्यवाही न करे, मगर मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कि यह जो "बाइना टु डे" है जो कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के प्रिंटिंग प्रेस में छपता है, जिसकी प्रतियां जप्त हो चुकी हैं, इस अखबार को छापने से कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी इन्कार क्यों नहीं करती? अभी इस अखबार ने चीन के नोट छापने शुरू किये हैं और उन नोटों में हमको गालियां दी गई हैं, हमारे प्रति अपसव्यों का प्रयोग किया गया है। हमारी भूमि हमारे खिलाफ प्रचार करने के लिये काम में लाई जा रही है और भारत सरकार यह कह कर बच नहीं सकती कि चीन सरकार जो भी नोट भेजती है चीनी राजदूतावास का वह अखबार वह नोट छाप सकता है। क्या हम

### [श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

इतना कानूनी दृष्टिकोण लेकर चलेंगे ? चीन में भारत के राजदूतावास को क्या सुविधाएं हैं, क्या इस सम्बन्ध में कोई सम सहयोग की नीति नहीं होनी चाहिये ? वहां हमारे राजदूतावास के कर्मचारियों पर अनेक प्रतिबन्ध लगे हैं । तिब्बत में हमारे कर्मचारियों के साथ क्या व्यवहार किया गया, उसकी तुलना में हम कितनी छूट देते जा रहे हैं, इस पर सदन को गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये ।

महोदया, एक बात जो विदेशी सहायता से जुड़ गई है हमें उस पर भी विचार करने की आवश्यकता है । भारत ने किसी भी गुट में शामिल न होने का फैसला किया है । यह फैसला ठीक है और हमें दृढ़ता के साथ इस नीति पर जमे रहना चाहिये । हम सभी देशों से आर्थिक सहायता ले रहे हैं लेकिन हमने आर्थिक सहायता के साथ कभी बन्धन स्वीकार नहीं किये । लेकिन सोवियत मिग विमानों की खरीद को लेकर अमेरिका में जिस तरह की बातें कही गई हैं और हमें मिलने वाली आर्थिक सहायता को जिस तरह से काटने की कोशिश की गई है वह संसार में लोकतंत्र को बढ़ाने में सहायक नहीं हो सकती । आर्थिक सहायता के साथ जब बन्धन आते हैं तो वे कोई मोटे रस्सों के रूप में नहीं आते, वे सूत से भी बारीक बन्धन होते हैं जो दिखाई नहीं देते, संकट के समय अनुभव में आते हैं । अमेरिका के नेता अगर यह समझते हैं कि भारत को आर्थिक सहायता देकर उन्होंने हमें खरीद लिया है तो वे बड़े मुगालते में रहते हैं । अपनी शरीर को भिटाने के लिये, देश में आर्थिक समृद्धि लाने के लिये हम सभी देशों से आर्थिक सहायता ले रहे हैं । मगर आर्थिक सहायता के लिये हम भारत के सम्मान को वाणिज्य के बाजार में नीलाम पर चढ़ाने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ, हमारे देश के नेताओं के खिलाफ जो बातें कही गईं वे किसी के भी मन में रोष पैदा कर सकती हैं । मैं इस

सवाल पर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के दृष्टिकोण से नहीं देखता, मैं एक देशभक्त के दृष्टिकोण से देखता हूँ । हमने गोवा में फौजें भेजीं, यह हमारा अपना फैसला था । हमने कोई अमेरिका की तरह रात के अंधेरे में क्यूबा में फौजियों को उतारने की कोशिश नहीं की । हमने जो कुछ किया खुले आम किया, दिन बहाड़े किया, भले ही वह हमारी नैतिक घोषणाओं के अनुरूप नहीं होगा । किन्तु अमेरिका को इसमें उंगली उठाने का क्या अधिकार है ? मगर लोग कांच के घरों में रहते हैं और दूसरों पर पत्थर फेंकने में बुद्धिमत्ता समझते हैं ।

काश्मीर के सवाल पर भी अमेरिका की नीति इस क्षेत्र में साम्यवाद के प्रसार को रोकने में सहायक नहीं हो सकती । अमेरिका वाले कहते हैं कि वे पाकिस्तान को हथियार इसलिये दे रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान के द्वारा विश्व के इस भाग में साम्यवाद को रोकना चाहते हैं । लेकिन अभी "सीएटो" समझौते के अंतर्गत जब थाइलैण्ड में फौजें भेजने की बात आई जाहिर है अमेरिका के उद्देश्यों के अनुसार वह साम्यवाद को रोकने के लिये किया जा रहा है—तो पाकिस्तान ने थाइलैण्ड में अपनी फौजें नहीं भेजीं । मैं नहीं चाहता, थाइलैण्ड में फौजें इकट्ठी हों या पाकिस्तान वहां अपनी फौजें भेजे । लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने ही थाइलैण्ड में अपनी फौजें भेजने से इन्कार करके यह साफ़ कर दिया कि उसे कम्युनिज्म का प्रसार रोकने में कोई रुचि नहीं है, वह तो भारत के खिलाफ़ गश्त्रों को इकट्ठा करना चाहता है । और जो देश चाहते हैं हम रूस से विमान न खरीदें, उनको चाहिये, पाकिस्तान को विमान देना बंद कर दें । वे क्यों पाकिस्तान को विमान देते जा रहे हैं । वस्तुतः वे सैनिक संतुलन बिगाड़ने के दोषी हैं । अगर हमें सस्ते दर पर अच्छे विमान रूस से मिलेंगे तो हमें खरीदना चाहिये । कोई विमान कम्युनिस्ट और गैर कम्युनिस्ट नहीं होते, जैसे यदि हथियार कोई पूंजीवादी या गैर पूंजीवादी नहीं होते । लेकिन जो देश चाहते हैं हम रूस

से हथियार न खरीदें उन्हें पाकिस्तान को हथियार देने की अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये और अगर वे पाकिस्तान को शस्त्र देते रहेंगे तो अपनी रक्षा के लिये हमें जहाँ से भी हथियार मिलेंगे हम खरीदेंगे और अगर इस मामले में कोई बोलेगा तो हम उसे भारत के घरेलू मामलों में हस्तक्षेप समझेंगे। और अमेरिका के नेताओं से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो भी हमें आर्थिक सहायता दी है, कोई एक क्षण ऐसा आता है कि जब उस सारी आर्थिक सहायता पर पानी फिर जाता है।

1 P.M. आप गोवा के सम्बन्ध में भारत की जनता की भावना को नहीं समझ सकते, अगर आप काश्मीर संबंधी हमारी नीति को नहीं समझ सकते, और आज हम सोवियत विमान खरीदने के लिए क्यों विवश हो रहे हैं, यह आप नहीं समझ सकते, तो फिर आपके हाथों में संसार के लोकतंत्र का भविष्य सुरक्षित नहीं दिखाई देता है। दुनिया में लोकतंत्र अगर जीवित रहेगा तो लड़खड़ाते हुए सिंहासनों और डगमगाते हुए राजमुकुटों को हथियार देने से लोकतंत्र जीवित नहीं रहेगा। पाकिस्तान की सैनिक तानाशाही को शस्त्र देकर अगर अमेरिका विश्व के इस भाग में साम्यवादी प्रभाव को रोकना चाहता है तो यह एक बड़ा गलत विचार है। साम्यवाद एक जीवन दर्शन है, अगर उसका मुकाबला होगा तो उससे अधिक प्रभाव जीवन दर्शन से होगा। प्रकाश की टक्कर प्रकाश से हो सकती है, अन्धकार से प्रकाश को नहीं मारा जा सकता। लेकिन अगर अमेरीको यह समझते हैं कि हथियार को दीवार खड़ी करके विचारों के प्रसार को रोक देंगे तो उनको अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये। सारा भारत इस नीति से महमत है—गायद कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को छोड़कर— कि हम किसी गुट के साथ न मिलें। लेकिन अगर ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा होगी कि हमारी स्वतंत्रता की सुरक्षा के लिए कहीं से हथियार लेने के लिए हमें विवश किया जायेगा तो हम हथियार खरीदेंगे और भारत सरकार इस

संबंध में जो भी कदम उठायेगी उसका मेरी पार्टी पूरी तरह से समर्थन करेगी।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आपका सिर्फ तीन मिनट बाकी रह गया है।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मुझे पांच मिनट और दे दीजिये।

श्री उपसभापति : आपको बीस मिनट दिया गया था।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Give him five minutes, Madam, because he is supporting the Government of India.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: But I am attacking the Communist Party.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : कुछ छोटी बातें हैं जिनकी ओर मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। जैसे चीनी दूतावास भारत विरोधी प्रचार में संलग्न है, वैसे ही उत्तरी वियटनाम का राजदूतावास भी कभी कभी भारत विरोधी प्रचार करता रहता है। अभी तो उन्होंने ऐसा नोट छपा है जिसमें अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कमिशन के घारे में भारत की आलोचना की गई है। लेकिन इससे पहले जुलाई १९६१ में उत्तरी वियटनाम के राजदूत ने यहाँ एक प्रेस सम्मेलन में भाषण दिया था जिसमें भारत की नीतियों की आलोचना की गई थी। मैं नहीं समझता कि कूटनीतिज्ञता के अनुसार यह कोई स्वस्थ परम्परा है कि दिल्ली स्थित विदेशी राजदूत भारत में बैठकर हमारे खिलाफ प्रचार करे। इस पर हमको गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये।

एक और बात की ओर मैं ध्यान दिलाना चाहूँगा और वह यह है कि हमारे एक स्पेशल सेक्रेटरी जोर्डन गये थे। उन्होंने वहाँ एक प्रेस सम्मेलन में भाग लिया और इजरायल को मान्यता न देने के संबंध में भारत की जो नीति है, उसके बारे में कहा कि हमारी नीति "प्रो अरब" है। "प्रो अरब" शब्द का उन्होंने प्रयोग किया और यह बात अमान रेडियो से कही गई। मैं नहीं समझता कि भारत की

[श्री ए० वी० वाजपेयी]

नीति का इस तरह से वर्णन करना ठीक होगा। मैं इस बात को नहीं समझ सका कि हमने इजरायल के साथ पूरी तरह से दौत्य संबंध कायम क्यों नहीं किये? उनका दम्बई में कौंसिलेट है। अगर वे नई दिल्ली में कौंसिलेट लाना चाहते हैं तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये। सचमुच हमें उनके साथ पूरी तरह से दूतावास के संबंध स्थापित करना चाहिये क्योंकि बहुत से विदेशी यात्री जो इजरायल से सीधा भारत आना चाहते हैं, इजरायल में भारत का राजदूतावास न होने के कारण यहां आने के लिए सीधा बीजा प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते। उन्हें ब्रिटेन के जरिये बीजा प्राप्त करना होता है और उसमें एक महीना लग जाता है। इस तरह से बहुत से विदेशी मेहमान जो यहां आना चाहते हैं वे भारत आये बिना वापस चले जाते हैं क्योंकि इजरायल से आने के लिए उनके लिए कोई रास्ता नहीं है। मैं नहीं समझता कि भारत सरकार इस संबंध में अपनी नीति क्यों नहीं सुधार सकी।

(Time bell rings)

एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा। संयुक्त-राष्ट्र संघ के लिए हमारे प्रतिनिधियों का निर्वाचन किया जाता है, किस आधार पर किया जाता है, उसको मैं अब तक नहीं समझ सका हूँ। दो साल पहले मुझे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जाने का मौका मिला था और उस समय जो प्रतिनिधि थे, मैं जो बात कह रहा हूँ, उन पर लागू नहीं होती। लेकिन मैंने इस बात को अनुभव किया है कि प्रतिनिधियों के चयन में कुछ सावधानी से काम लिया जाना चाहिये ताकि वे न्यूयार्क की ठन्ड में बीमार न पड़ जायें, या बर्फ के ऊपर फिसलकर उनकी टांग में चोट न आ जाय अथवा शाम होते ही अपने कमरों को बंद करके न सो जायें। इस तरह वे भारत के हितों का वहां पर अच्छी प्रकार से प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं कर सकते हैं। मैं प्रतिनिधि मंडल के नेता के बारे में भी एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। उनकी प्रतिभा बड़ी प्रखार है श्रीशउनाखी वृद्धि बड़ी विलक्षण है।

किन्तु जब वे बोलते हैं तो उनकी जवान काट करती हुई चलती है और उनके हाव भाव भी बड़े उत्तेजक होते हैं। काश्मीर के सवाल पर भारत के पक्ष को उन्होंने बड़े बल पूर्वक ढंग से रखा। लेकिन मैंने संयुक्तराष्ट्र संघ में इस बात को अनुभव किया कि क्या हमारे भावों को इससे अच्छे ढंग से नहीं रखा जा सकता है। क्या बड़ी बात को चासनी में डुबाकर नहीं कहा जा सकता है? क्या ऐसी बात को कहना जरूरी है जो काट करती हो, जो लोगों के हृदय पर आघात करती हो? मैंने कहीं पढ़ा है कि अच्छा कटनीतिज्ञ वह है जो अगर किसी से यह कहना चाहें कि आप को नर्क में जाना है तो उसे इतनी अच्छी तरह से कहें कि मुनने वाला एकदम नर्क में जाने के लिए तैयार हो जाय। पर हमारे प्रतिनिधि मण्डल के नेता ऐसे हैं कि अगर किसी को स्वर्ग में जाने के लिए भी कहें तो वह इतनी बुरी तरह से कहें कि वह स्वर्ग में जाने के लिए कदापि तैयार नहीं होगा। इसका यह अर्थ नहीं है कि श्री कृष्ण मेनन यदाकदा भारत के प्रतिनिधि मण्डल के नेता न हों। भारत के प्रतिनिधि मण्डल का नेता कौन होगा, यह भारत सरकार को तय करना है। मगर भारत में ऐसे व्यक्तियों की कमी नहीं है जो भारत की नीतियों को अच्छी तरह से और मधुरता के साथ रख सकते हैं, जो लोगों को आकृष्ट कर सकते हैं, वे अपनी बात पर डटे रह सकते हैं, और दूसरों को आफ़ेंड किये बिना ही अपनी बात कह सकते हैं। हमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र में ऐसे नेता की आवश्यकता है।

इस तरह की छोटी छोटी और बातें हैं जिनका कहना आवश्यक है और उनका संकेत मैंने अपने सशोधनों में किया है।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, we are facing a very critical situation in the world today and the Prime Minister has a most difficult task in which he needs the support of a united country. I shall briefly touch on some of our immediate problems.

First, I would like to say a word about the discussion that is going on



regarding Kashmir in the United Nations. We have made our position regarding Kashmir repeatedly clear to that body. It is amazing that after Mr. Jarring's report in which he had pointed out that the pattern of power politics had changed in South East Asia or in this part of South East Asia, and Mr. Justice Owen Dixon's support of bilateral talks—he was not very friendly to us—and his opinion that Pakistan had acted in contravention of international law, that great Country, the United States, should be adopting an attitude which we cannot but deeply regret. More disheartening is the attitude of the Irish Government which is proposing to sponsor a resolution repeating or making pointed reference to previous resolutions on Kashmir and advocating bipartisan talks in the presence of a third party. We have repeatedly made it clear that we are prepared for direct talks and a no-war declaration between our two countries. There is no question of war so far as we are concerned, with Pakistan. We have made that clear beyond the shadow of a doubt. Despite the fact that Pakistan is in possession of territory which legally belongs to us, it has been using war-like language. American military aid has made a big difference in our military situation and we cannot be, therefore, blamed for adding to our military strength by the purchase or manufacture of MIG aircraft from the Soviet Union if we can get them from that country on reasonable terms. No deal has yet been made by us and greatly as I appreciate the value of our friendship with the U.S.A., I confess that I cannot admit the right of any country, big or small to dictate to us as to from whom we shall purchase material for our defence requirements. I felt pained at some of the statements which have been made by distinguished Senators about our country and I hope that America's attitude will not be influenced by the MIG business or the possibilities of acquiring military bases in Pakistan or using Pakistan as a base for possible attacks against the Soviet Union.

377 R.S.—3.

I would like to say that I am also grieved to find that Pakistani Ministers of high stature have made statements accusing us of genocide and ill-treating our Muslim brethren in our country. We have severely condemned some disturbances of peace in some isolated parts of our country. The Muslims do not enjoy second class citizenship in our country. There is no second class citizenship in our country. We are a secular and democratic State aiming to provide equality of opportunity for all our citizens. There have been regrettable incidents in East Bengal, and the Santhals have had to flee from Pakistan and seek shelter in our country. We owe a duty to them and we must provide them with facilities for good living in our country. Our attitude in these matters is vastly different from that of Pakistan. The ideology of that country is hatred and our attitude is of friendship and goodwill. But while we are a peaceful country which is trying to work out in actual life the legacies left to us by our great master, I do not definitely believe in appeasement for we have witnessed the tragedies that occurred in Europe after the surrender of the Western countries to Hitler at Munich and Prague and the rape of Ethiopia by Mussolini. We are therefore patiently pursuing a policy which will emotionally integrate all our people, and I am certain that we can count on the loyalty and support of our Muslim brethren in our country. We do not wish, by yielding on Kashmir or other such like matters, to create a situation which will not be to the interests of our Muslim brethren whose rights are amply protected by our Constitution and whom we want to help in the development of that composite culture which is part of our heritage.

We accepted secession of some parts of our country but we did not accept the two-nation theory. And whatever might happen, we shall never accept the two-nation theory because we do not think that religion can be a right basis for nationality in a country such as ours.

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

We have been blamed for our action in Goa. Now, we waited patiently for fourteen years for the solution of this Goa problem. And *The Guardian* which is a liberal and sober paper was critical of us 'on this question and Warned us for not exhausting all peaceful methods. But *The Guardian* too had to admit that Goa was part of our land and that we could not be accused of a breach of the Charter in the sense that we had committed aggression against any particular country. Personally, I think that from the point of view of international law, the case for our country was admirably put by the representative of the Soviet Union when he declared that Goa was an internal matter and that our action amounted to nothing more than police action.

I shall now briefly touch the question of China. Intrusions have no doubt been made into our borders. China has no doubt been aggressive and what is worse, she has created the unfortunate impression that no reliance can be placed upon her words. We have been patient with her and while we are building up our defences, we have rightly not ruled out negotiations with her, and I venture to think that the Prime Minister's suggestion that both the Indian and the Chinese troops should withdraw from the disputed territory in Ladakh, that China should be permitted by us -to use the Aksai Chin road and that we should even be prepared, if China does so, to pull back our troops from the east, provides a fair basis for negotiations. It is easy to talk of war with China but war with China would spell disaster not only for this country but for the whole of Asia, perhaps for the entire human race.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam, I sit down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The list is so big. You may take two or three minutes more.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We should be

firm but firmness does not mean unreasonableness. Firmness plus^ reasonableness cannot be described as amounting to appeasement. China is feeling more and more isolated and one feels that she will continue to feel more isolated, and all this will, in the ultimate analysis, retard her economic development if she does not see the light of reason and if she sticks to an outmoded ideology which even the Soviet Union has rejected.

It is a matter for satisfaction that the situation in Laos shows some signs of improvement. Three Princes representing the Right, the Left and the Neutralist attitudes have agreed to a coalition Government, and I hope that they will pursue this path and not drag their country into the vortex of war. Their main problem should be the economic advancement of their country and the Big Powers should help them do so.

May I turn for a moment to the Geneva Conference? For the first time, a few weeks back, two great countries, Russia and America were able to arrive at eight agreed principles which should guide their future discussions. On ethical and humanitarian grounds we are opposed to all nuclear tests, whether they be by the Soviet Union or the U.S.A., whether they be in outer space or in the atmosphere or underground. We, along with other neutral countries, have put forward a plan for verification and inspection, that is to say, that neutral inspection teams should be posted near zones where atomic weapons are concentrated. It should be open to these teams to request the country, which it has reason to believe, has conducted any tests in defiance of the moratorium imposed upon these tests to subject itself to their inspection, and if the country so requested declines, it would place itself in the wrong. I do not deny the importance of inspection and control, but there should be flexibility in the approach of Big powers towards this problem. What should be aimed at is a world free from war; what should be aimed at is complete disarmament including a

reduction in conventional weapons which ensures parity between the two Blocs. Personally I am in favour of nuclear-free zones in Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa.

The German question is no doubt a most complicated one. Our sympathies are always with countries which are seeking greater unity, but the fact has to be recognised that the East German Government, whether we like it or not, exists—(*Time bell rings.*) I am just asking for two minutes if you would pardon me—and a solution cannot be imposed either on East Germany or West Germany by the use of force. The Oder-Neisse line should be recognised as the frontier of Germany, for the Poles need security.

As regards Berlin, there has been some trouble in Berlin recently. Our view is that there should be free access between East and West Berlin. I do not think that the presence of NATO troops in Berlin will solve the problem. I am somewhat doubtful as to whether United Nations' presence in Berlin will lead to any tangible result. A spread of nuclear weapons among the countries of the world will create most insoluble problems for the world. If nuclear weapons spread, no one can be sure as to what might happen. It would be possible for any small country or any mentally deranged person in charge of these weapons to plunge the world into a World War, the consequences of which will be disastrous for mankind. The survival of the human race is of greater importance than the victory, the temporary victory of any particular ideology. I have faith in the democratic, humanistic, socialistic pattern of life, and I think the principles embodied in this creed are of an eternal character. If the human race survives, even communism, of which the Americans have such a great horror, will get humanised and liberalised. I think therefore that Bertrand Russell, whom I look upon as a prophet of the new age, is taking a sane

view. While I think it neither possible nor desirable to demonstrate our disapproval by sending a ship to the Christmas Island, our efforts should be to see that these tests do not continue to poison the air and place the life of even future generations in jeopardy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope that is the end.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Now I would like to say just a word about the ECM. The nations of Africa- and Asia—and we are one of these nations —have a right to an assurance that their future plans and present plans for improving their living standards will not suffer by tariff arrangements which, in our case, may hit our export trade. The ECM has political implications. I do not wish it to develop into a holy alliance for keeping old colonial countries backward. Before I conclude I would like to pay my meed of tribute to the Algerian nationalists.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How long will you take to do that?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: They have struggled for the independence of their country in a manner which evokes the admiration of us all and we are hoping that very soon by the 15th of July, as a result of a referendum they will become a free and independent country and as soon as they / establish an independent Government we should recognise it.

I would also like, Madam—this is my final remark—to say a word about Gizenga. I think we should use our good offices for the release of Gizenga.

And may I just point out one more thing? We have been accused of taking an unreasonable attitude towards Southern Rhodesia. Now, when this African Federation was launched, the late Clement Davies, a distinguished Liberal leader in the House of Commons then, described it as an act of aggression. Southern Rhodesia is no doubt self-governing,

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

but the Statute of Westminster does not apply to her; defence and foreign affairs of Southern Rhodesia are under British control, and the Parliament which gave the so-called self-government to Southern Rhodesia can also repeal that Act. I think it was a tragic, grievous blunder, for a liberal power like Britain to have granted real self-government to Southern Rhodesia, and by doing so she has placed the coloured races of Southern Rhodesia at the mercy of a white population which has no regard for moral values.

I thank you very very much. I am very sorry to have abused your goodness. I hope you will forgive me for doing so-

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Govinda Reddy. Just fifteen minutes.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Thank you, Madam. At the outset I would like to touch upon some of the things which are just like a silver lining in the stormy cloud of the international affair, of today. It is a very happy feature, Madam Deputy Chairman, that a coalition Government is being formed in Laos and this unfortunate Indo-China country, which was tied to, and which became a pawn in the hands of, the cold war countries, has at last been able to effect a compromise, and the newspapers say that today a coalition Government will take office there. We look forward to this event with great satisfaction and the Government of India has spared neither pains nor efforts nor expense to bring about an easing of the situation prevailing there. In this connection I have, on behalf of this House, to extend our highest appreciation for the personnel of the Supervisory Commission, particularly the personnel of our country who have played a notable part in effecting such a happy compromise in the Laos situation.

The next thing, Madam, which I would like to refer to is the rather re-

lieving situation that we seem to be having in Algeria. The Prime Minister has already referred to the very sad history of the Algerian Movement and how the Nationalists have suffered severe loss by death and also loss of property. Today we are happy to hear that there is an agreement between the ruthless O.A.S. French settlers in Algeria and the Nationalists. I hope that these ruthless people will at last realise that they have to give up their brutal activities and then come to terms with the Algerians. They seem to have realised it, considering the number of events that have taken place during these recent four or five days. We all wish that very soon there will be a very happy atmosphere in Algeria and when plebiscite is taken there will be no trouble about it. I hope that our Government which has all along sympathised with the Algerians will extend their recognition to the Algerian Government and we will soon come to have our diplomatic relations with Algeria established.

There is another happy thing very close to us, that is, the news that the French National Assembly's Foreign Affairs Commission has yesterday adopted a report authorising the French Government to ratify the treaty which was arrived at between India and the French Government. This House remembers, Madam, that in 1954 we entered into treaty about the de facto transfer of the French Settlements in India to the Government of India and the Treaty in this connection was initialled in 1956. Since then we have been only waiting for the *de jure* transfer. It is a happy feature that this National Assembly's Foreign Commission has resolved adopting this Report and I hope very soon the *de jure* transfer also will take place.

With regard to the China border, there seem to be certain relieving features. The Prime Minister has, both in this morning's statement as well as in his Press Conference the other day and in the other House

when questions were raised in this connection, has given us an indication that the situation seems to be taking a turn to our advantage. I hope that the vigorous efforts we have made in establishing communications on all the sides of this border and in making installations as also the volume of opinion that the country has expressed time and again by expressing their resentment against the aggression by the Chinese, have made the Chinese realise that the odds are against them, and perhaps it is this feeling or this realisation that has made them not to make fresh incursions. However, as honourable Mr. Pathak and Mr. Vajpayee were saying,— This is a power which can hardly be trusted. There is also the news on the other hand that they have been making preparations by way of erecting air-fields at and by way of mobilising their Air Forces to the borders. If these reports are true, as we should expect them to be true, we have to be careful.

We have, Madam Deputy Chairman, a very authentic report about the Chinese intentions towards India. I am referring to the Lord Minto-Morley correspondence which took place with regard to this. It is interesting to see how in 1905—10 the Viceroy of India very clearly saw that the Chinese had aggressive intentions regarding India. One sentence in a letter written by Lord Minto to Lord Morley is like this. I am quoting that sentence:

"The Chinese shadow is extending on the North-Eastern Frontier and we should be extremely careful."

That is the statement which he made. There is another sentence which was written by him in a letter dated December 10, 1906.

"As China is trying to assert rights on the Eastern Tibet which did not previously exist, it is impossible to say what boundaries she might, acting perhaps on foreign instigation, claim."

And the same thing applies to today's situation. All those fears have come true. That is why I say that this is a power which can never be trusted even when they offer negotiations. In this connection. Madam Deputy Chairman, I would urge upon the Government to take vigorous step\* in seeing that the Chinese moves are countered. No doubt the Government are alive to it, but in some respects, I do not know what difficulty the Government have, they are slow I think-

Shri Vajpayee was referring to the dismal fact of an Indian political party, namely the Communist, Party, allowing malicious statements made in the 'China Today' to be printed in their press, the New Age Press. When a question was put in the other House with regard to this, the statement was made on behalf of the Government that under the existing law it is not open to us to stop its publication but that action was being considered to be taken against the press. I wonder why we should not be able to amend our laws if the present laws are unable to stop its publication. I do -no\* think, Madam Deputy Chairman, diplomatic immunity should extend to the point of dishonouring a country, abusing a country on its own soil. This is a thing which has to be stopped.

In this connection I have also to submit to the Government that there is anti-Indian propaganda carried on by China in their broadcasts to South-American countries, and as hon. Members of this House know, the South American countries are very sympathetic to India. They appreciate the heritage, the culture and the non-aligned stand that India has taken in international affairs. So, we should try to build up this goodwill in all these countries instead of allowing anti-Indian propaganda to go on there. We have diplomatic relations only in some of these countries. I think it would be good for the Government to cover (al) the South Am»-

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] rican countries with our diplomats and then at least to counter such a propaganda. I do not mean to say that we should go on blowing our own trumpet. But at least we must be able to counter the anti-Indian propaganda that is going on in South American countries. The meeting of the Security Council again about this Kashmir question, as our Defence Minister has stated, was quite unnecessary. It is very strange that leading countries of the world, countries like the U.S.A. and the U.K., who should set an example to others, as permanent members of the Security Council, in upholding rights and justice, should now try to evade upholding rights and justice and try to pacify the aggressor. Madam Deputy Chairman, while reading the speech of the British delegate the other day, Sir Patric Dean, in the Council, I was very sorry to note that a British statesman should lend himself to a statement like this: for he is reported to have said:

"We have deliberately not gone into the rights and wrongs of the dispute", and again, "but we have respectful friendship for both these countries."

Where is the respectful friendship here? If Pakistan is in the wrong, what prevents Great Britain or the U.S.A. from saying so to Pakistan? Although they know very well that Pakistan had committed aggression, although they know very well that Pakistan has not abided by the agreements which were arrived at in the Security Council meetings and has not fulfilled the conditions that Pakistan had agreed to, still these two countries are trying to evade facing this issue. The United States of America is seeking to postpone the proposition and the U.S.A. is seeking postponement in the hope that she may get some more powers as co-sponsors of the resolution which they want. But unfortunately for them and fortunately for us, no power except Ireland seems

to have come forward and this morning we read that only Ireland is sponsoring the resolution and not even the U.S.A. It is high time that the Security Council sees justice in the case of India and then gives up the matter as a whole if they had not decided already that Pakistan is the aggressor and Pakistan should get out, and not be influenced by the Pakistan delegate and give the field for Pakistan to carry on anti-Indian propaganda.

I have some minor points also to refer to. With a sad heart I have to refer to the relations with Pakistan that are getting worse. This House knows about the Malda and Rajshahi incidents- Pakistan has given occasion for malicious things to be published in their press and a number of deaths have occurred due to violence in Pakistan. In this connection, I do not know what action is open to the Government to take, in order to bring home to Pakistan that these events which have happened probably with the connivance of the Pakistan police and military, should not recur. The shooting of the Santhals who were coming to India was a very disgraceful thing. The attitude of Pakistan, in spite of the friendship that we are extending to them, in spite of our doing that in almost everything, whether it is adjustments of our finances, whether it be about our border disputes and so on, in spite of our Prime Minister always giving the fullest consideration to the other's point of view as full a consideration as he gives to his own, in spite of our taking a liberal and sympathetic attitude, Pakistan is taking a very hostile attitude. Mr. Mohammed Ali who was once the Prime Minister of Pakistan, when he came to India and met our Prime Minister, he was very happy to call him as "Bara Bhai". But today the same man says that our secularism is Nazism, and the Foreign Minister says that there is genocide here and that we are wiping off the Muslim community. These statements are not made by ordinary people. We could

have understood if the man in the street had made such statements. But these statements are made by responsible persons, by those who occupy a high place. So this is a very sad thing and it is very sad that those who are guiding the destinies of Pakistan should be deliberately fomenting anti-Indian and hostile policy.

*(Time bell rings.)*

I will refer to only one more thing before I sit down, since you have already rung the bell. I refer to the reduction in the sentence passed on Col. Battacharya. The President of Pakistan has been pleased to reduce it from 8 years to 4 years. Although there was no case against Col. Battacharya, still this is something by way of small mercy to congratulate ourselves for— Thank you.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Kerala): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am sorry that we should be discussing the international situation in an atmosphere of utter gloom. The struggle for supremacy on this earth, in the air, in space and in outer space, that is going on between the big giants—I don't say big devils—the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., is causing nervous anxiety to the entire human race. These two whales think that the entire sea is their private property, they try to poison each other's portion of the sea, forgetting that the sea is one and that the poison spreads out and contaminates the whole sea. What right have these two nations to poison the sea which is the abode of so many living things? Now one of the mad monsters is trying to tamper with outer space, in spite of the warnings of the best of scientific minds. One does not know what the dimensions of the disaster will be, when nuclear weapons are exploded in the outer space. How can we call these two so-called power blocs as two nations comprising human beings? Even monkeys do not monkey with things which affect their existence. These big monkeys are so swollen-headed and so fearful of each

other that they are out to annihilate humanity itself. "Why should the world exist, if it is not the realm of man's domination?" That seems to be their attitude.

I do not think that any amount of moral pressure will have any effect on them. Some non-violent method of pressure has to be evolved to restrain the two big monkeys which have gone mad and want to start forest fire which will annihilate the entire life on this planet. So Madam, I would ask whether the United Nations can devise a convention or some method by which the President and the war-lords of the U.S. will have their office in the Kremlin and the Prime Minister and war-lords of the USSR. will be stationed in Washington, a kind of mutual hostages?

Starting a war now must be literally and figuratively a suicidal step for these conspirators against humanity. I wonder whether we in India can play a vital role in averting a war. I do not think anybody pays much heed to us nowadays. We do remember how Russia treated with contempt the entreaties of India, and the non-aligned nations, when she unilaterally started nuclear tests and broke the moratorium on tests. I wonder how Russia or the communists or Shri Bhupesh Gupta have any moral right to condemn the Americans when they have their turn to poison God's good heaven and earth and condemn the present and future generations to all sorts of known and unknown miseries, diseases and damnations?

Madam, I wonder whether the West is accepting India as a non-aligned nation. For them non-alignment seems to mean aligned to them with invisible strings. The hon. Member Shri Pathak, was referring to the strings attached to economic aid. The pattern of behaviour that is recently noticed in the Aid India Club and the U.S. Congress shows that beggars cannot be choosers. They do not like our going in for defence equipment to

[Shrimati K. Bharathi.]

U.S.S.R. Madam, even if we have to remain beggars, let us not beg and then we shall be choosers. After arming a military dictator whose aggressive intentions are no secret, who has proclaimed that the U.S. gift of death-dealing weapons will be used against India, as and when occasion arises, after upsetting the military balance in this hemisphere, what right, what moral right has the U.S. to frown on us, if we go in for weapons to other quarters w

here terms are less exacting and where the attitude is more helpful? Madam, we are thank-ful to U.S. for all the help that she has rendered to us but when they give the butcher's knife to the Pakistan Dictator, we wonder whether they are fattening the calf to be butchered than to be nurtured!

Madam, the support that the U.S. gives to the communalists, I mean the theocratic authoritarian State of Pakistan, will drive the non-aligned States into the sphere of communist influence. That is inevitable. For my part, Madam, I will prefer communism to communalism but let me hat-en to add that in my State of Kerala, the Communists are communalists, they take advantage of communalism. Here also internationally, we are driven between Scylla and Charybdis— Pakistan, the foster child of the West and China, the Dussasana of the Kaurava family of Communists. Indeed we are not feeling very happy, Madam, with a Red dragon sprawling along our frontiers, grabbing bit by bit of our territory. But the strange thing about it is that the foster child of the West and the vicious brother of Russia have become quite chummy; strange bed-fellows and a united front against non-alignment, I believe !

Madam, this is how the Communist phobia drives the U.S. more and more into wrong doings. Yes, she has admitted at last in the U.N. Security Council that she is climbing a slippery pole as regards the Kashmir issue. Take the case of Goa and now take *Tie* case of Kashmir. In the case of

Goa, the sympathy of U.S. continues to be with the most reactionary of all colonial powers on earth, who contends that this tiny bit of Indian territory i.e. Goa, is part of Portugal. To say that Goa should not have been liberated, is like saying that a dagger that is planted into your body by a ruffian shall not be removed by you and that you must bear with it as long as the ruffian chooses to leave the dagger there, and all indications— nay even declarations—have been that the ruffian means to leave the dagger there and also now and then to play with it too. Madam, India bore with it patiently for fourteen long, long years and there was no sign of good sense dawning on Portugal. So, in a swift, almost bloodless and painless, operation, India r

emoved the dagger but strangely enough it is the U.S. that is hurt "deeply" and more than the U.S. Mr. Stevenson. Madam, I felt really sad when I found Mr. Stevenson reacting that way. My image of him was that of a liberal and large-hearted man with progressive ideas. I do not know how the U.S. is going to win the ideological war against U.S.S.R. if they continue to back or encourage Pakistan over the Kashmir issue. A soldier-dictator and a theocratic State want the destiny of • people to be decided on the basis of religion. Madam, do not the words "referendum" and "ascertainment of the people's will" sound mockingly in the mouth of Field Marshal Ayub Khan, he who gags the entire nation of Pakistan and rules by the might of arms instead of the consent of the people? Why does President Ayub Khan not allow a referendum in Pakb-toonistan and allow them to join the Afghan State? After all, if religion is the basis for a nation, let all the countries from Pakistan to Morocco unite to form one single unit, on State.

Madam, Indian effort to maintain a secular State is sought to be jeopardised by Pakistan and Muslim Leaguers and the Hindu Sanatanists. All these people are of the same kind. In this sub-continent with many groups



divided communally, racially, linguistically and religiously, there live a hundred millions of people. Among them are social and unsocial and antisocial elements. One cannot rule out the possibility of these unsocial and antisocial elements, now and then, showing their ugly heads. That is why we maintain the police and the courts of law. The question is whether the State is on the side of the anti-social elements or not. No honest man can say that our State has not acted promptly when the anti-social elements showed their ugly heads. But is it the case in Pakistan? The recent speeches in the Pak National Assembly reveal that they look upon the Muslims of India as their own kith and kin, blood of their blood and flesh of their flesh. I wonder whether the Pak leaders feel that the non-Muslims there are their kith and kin. No, they do not. How can a primitive theocratic State feel in terms of human beings? And in India we have the Muslim Leaguers who try to cultivate among the Muslim masses a feeling that they are not the kith and kin of the people here, that they are strangers here, that their spiritual home is elsewhere. For this they use or—shall I say—misuse all the facilities offered by this secular democratic State. Madam, there are no two opinions that we have some of our foremost nationalists and outstanding personalities in the Muslim community. They are and we are an asset to the nation. We have to strengthen the nationalists so as to counter the elements which feel that they are foreigners here.

Madam, as an integral part of our foreign policy, we must strengthen ourselves against those whose spiritual home is Communist China or communist Pakistan. More than arms or military equipment, in order to make our position strong, we have to be a strong, solid, well-integrated nation.

Thank you.

2 P.M.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I

rise to support the amendment that has been moved from this side of the House in approval of the policy pursued by the Government of India in relation to the present international situation.

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

Since the hon. Prime Minister in his opening address has tried to describe the very tangled web of world affairs to day and since our policy and our general attitude towards the various items have already been covered by previous speakers from this side of the House, I shall address myself directly to the series of amendments that have been moved from the other side of the House. It is really very gratifying, so far as I am concerned, to find that there is a general agreement—at least the two main Opposition parties have already expressed their approval—so far as the fundamentals of our policy, the general reading of the international situation are concerned.

I shall refer first to the amendments moved by the representative of the Jana Sangh, our esteemed friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. His amendments are two in number and they are just two sides of the same shield. One side reflects his complaints and the other side the suggestions he is making and they more or less go together. His main complaint is—though what he said in explanation of his amendments did not bear out what is in the amendments themselves—that our China policy has not been really stiff enough and that we should sever our diplomatic ties with China. Having said that the fundamentals of our foreign policy are correct, to say that our diplomatic relations should at once be severed so far as China is concerned is to exhibit a gross misunderstanding of the very concepts of our foreign policy. The moment we sever our diplomatic relations with China we take away the very basis of negotiations and one of the fundamental

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.] policies of this Government is to decide disputes by discussion, consultation and negotiation. We therefore do not want to place ourselves in a position where we cannot talk, where we cannot discuss, where we cannot negotiate. He wishes it to be said that our primary objective so far as China is concerned is to try to recover our lost territory as early as possible as if this calls for any enunciation. Anybody who has lost his territory would try to get back the territory as early as possible and this is also the intention of the Government of India. But how do we do it? Do we do it by mock heroics exhibited in Parliament? Do we do it by a display of a toy army? It is in the matter of how we regain our lost territory that, that main difference perhaps lies so far as the Jana Sangh is concerned. We do not believe—and I draw pointed attention to one stray remark by the hon. Prime Minister this morning—in the solution of a dispute by war. Even if the solution is still distant, if a problem remains unsolved for a long time, even then we remain anti-war; we do not go to war even if that remain unsolved for a considerable period of time. This is what the hon. Prime Minister\* said, and this is one of the basic tenets of our policy and anyone who has faith in this basic tenet would not like to recover the lost territory by rushing into war and by indulging in mock heroics.

Then there is another suggestion that because our policy towards China has been very slack and unrealistic our relations with Nepal have been very delicate. It is admitted that our relations with Nepal have been delicate for various reasons. It is not because mainly due to China that our relations with Nepal have been a little strained but everybody knows that even at certain risks we are trying our best to cultivate better relations with Nepal. In the recent agreement concluded between the two Governments—the clauses are

well known—I personally feel a little bit hurt by one of the clauses of this agreement which admits that Nepalese officials in that Committee will be enquiring into our affairs within our territory. It hurts my national pride. It will be a joint Committee of Indian and Nepalese officials and it hurts my pride that the officials of another nation would enquire into affairs in my own territory. Even so, I am prepared to go to that extent even because I want to cultivate better relations with Nepal. That is also one of the cardinal principles of our foreign policy. Even if the policy hurts our pride at times, hurts our prestige at times, we must not take a step which might go towards the embitterment of our relations with any other country.

So far as Kashmir is concerned, I am coming to that in connection with Shri Bhupesh Gupta's series of amendments. When I come to my esteemed friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta's amendments, I could not help a subdued smile. If he had disapproved of the Government of India's policy or if he had very divergent views in respect of Government of India's policy, maybe this long series of amendments might have been necessary. All these amendments could indeed be squeezed into three or four. I have analysed these amendments and the amendments Nos. 4 to 17 are in full and absolute support of whatever the Government of India has been doing in respect of those various items. In Nos. 18 to 26 also I do not find anything that really goes against the various aspects of the policy of the Government of India. In fact, every single thing is being attended to as described in the amendments. But a very significant thing has already been pointed out by Mr. Vajpayee. This is no new thing. It has amazed me as it would amaze anybody here that in this long series of amendments—54 in number—there is not one single word about China. This is not the first time. Perhaps this is the fourth time in respect of our

debate on foreign policy when China has been  
....

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN** (Andhra Pradesh): Nor in his speech.

**DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY:** Nor in any of his speeches does he ever refer to the India-China dispute. I would not dilate at any length on this aspect, that is, his non-mention of the India-China affair so far as our foreign policy is concerned. It explains itself. Whoever knows the two shades of opinion of the Communist Party of India in respect of, this India-China issue can understand the silence of my esteemed friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. The point of departure starts from Shri Bhupesh Gupta's amendment No. 27. There in respect of the German Democratic Republic, he pleads for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. This is not the first time that he has been pleading for it and this would not be the first time when the Prime Minister would be giving an explanation of our difficulties as to why he cannot give that recognition at the present moment. We do not rule it out. The Prime Minister never rules it out. He only says that this would npt.be the proper moment when we could,, go in for their recognition.

Then, in amendment No. 28 he says that—our agreement with the German Federal Republic for the carrying out of joint advisory activities for the development of agriculture in the Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh gave him the impression—that the Government of India was treating West Berlin as if it was a part of the German Federal Republic. If he has got this impression, he has read more into the agreement than is vouchsafed by the words used in that agreement. I have also read that agreement. It did not give me that impression. I believe he has read a little too much in consonance with the views he holds.

Then, in amendment No. 29, he accuses the Government of India's

policy in respect of India joining hands with Canada in the International Commission and Supervision in Viet-Nam and accepting some of the South Viet-Nam accusations of infiltration and subversive activities. This is, again, not correct. We are not joining hands with anybody., We are co-partners with Canada in that connection and it is only the justness or otherwise of certain actions or non-actions by the disputing parties. One's judgment may be wrong. One may disagree with one's judgment. One may not agree with the terms of the Report and the Report is still confidential. We do not know anything about it. But to say that we have joined hands is again to misunderstand and I should say willingly misunderstand our role in Viet-Nam. I would also say that Mr. Gupta's attitude and approach have been partly due to lack of understanding of the policy we have been pursuing not only in Viet-Nam, but also in Laos and generally speaking in South East Asia and elsewhere in the world.

On one point I would agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I have also my misgivings in respect of the European Common Market. It has struck me too that there has been a little divergence between what the Prime Minister said in his Press Conference or in his other statements—his evaluation of the European Common Market, political not economic evaluation— and the political evaluation by our Finance Minister. There is a slight divergence somewhere and I would like to get some illumination on this point. I want to be assured that we are acting with a common purpose, with a common mind and a common policy.

Thank you.

**SHRI A. D. MANI** (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the House is indebted to the Prime Minister for nig lucid and very instructive survey of the international situation, and I may say that whatever might be the

[Shri A. D. Mani.] differences of some Members of the House with him in matters of detail, the country at large endorses the foreign policy which he has been executing with commendable skill for the past fifteen years. Before I mention some of the matters, related by the Prime Minister, I should like to refer to the amendments tabled by my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. There are, I believe, 54 amendments. I was agreeably surprised that not one amendment related to China. My hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, ties refer red to a variety of subjects from Alaska to New Zealand, and I take it that in the absence of any reference to China.....

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): He has endorsed the policy of the Government of India.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, he has endorsed the Government of India's policy of asking China to vacate the aggression.

The Prime Minister referred this morning to the Anti-Nuclear Conference which was held in Delhi. It was addressed by him and by our ex-President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. I think that this conference was held a day too late. It should have been held at the time of the tests near the Christmas Islands two months ago. All over the world protest meetings and marches have been held as a demonstration of disapproval of these nuclear tests. But this is the first time that a countrywide rally was held in Delhi on the subject. I may say that I was not very satisfied with some of the decisions reached by this conference. They are good only as far as they go and they do not go far enough. There is no point in a conference of this kind sending a delegation to meet the concerned powers. We have a remedy in our hands and that is the Disarmament Conference. My good friend, Mr. Arthur Lall, is representing India at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva and it is time

for us t'o consider whether we should not take a decision at some stage that if they continue these tests, India and the smaller nations would walk out of the Disarmament Conference. By being in the Conference we are not going to regulate disarmament, because we are not an armed nation ourselves. We are there by courtesy and on account of the pressure exercised by the Soviet Union that the neutral powers should be represented. If we threaten at least and if we make it very clear to the powers concerned that the continuance of these tests would lead to the withdrawal of the neutral nations from the Disarmament Conference, it would give a lead in mobilising public opinion against these tests. When these tests were being conducted or were about to be conducted near the Christmas Island, Shri Rajagopalachari wrote to the Prime Minister offering to go to the place of the tests, so that he may be in the fall-out region as a protest against nuclear explosions. The gesture of Shri Rajagopalachari might have been considered theatrical and somewhat dramatic, but if the Prime Minister examines the implications of what he said, he will find that it is only a projection of the Gandhian theory of non-violence. We should not dismiss a gesture of this kind as something which is eccentric or unusual. It may become necessary for us to tell the powers concerned that if these tests are continued, we will have to send some people to the fall-out zone as a protest against the continuance of nuclear explosion. In this matter we have the assurance that Earl Bertrand Russell would also join us and there would be others from Japan and other affected countries who would be willing to go to the fall-out zone as a protest against these tests.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Why should he have the permission of the Prime Minister?

SHRI A. D. MANI: He must get a passport from the E.A. Ministry.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That would merely complicate matters.

<sup>c</sup> SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to refer to the debate on Kashmir in the Security Council. The Prime Minister did not mention this morning—perhaps the news reached him very late—that the Soviet Union had exercised its veto on the resolution in the Security Council. As far as the presentation of the case of India in the Security Council is concerned, I should like to say that the House warmly endorses what Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon did in the month of May. He took the offensive and made it very clear that the 1949 Resolution of the United Nations did not apply to India, but certain expressions were used by him in the course of his speech which permit of a little clarification by the Prime Minister. I am mentioning this on the floor of the House because a good deal of misunderstanding has been created abroad about some of the views expressed—not that we disagree with the views but with the way in which they were put. Mr. Krishna Menon said in the debate in the Security Council in the month of May: "Whatever Earl Mountbatten might have written, whatever our Prime Minister and others might have been quoted as saying, that does not necessarily mean a plebiscite." This has been misrepresented by our critics in the United States to mean that we are going back on the promise of a plebiscite. I agree that the question of a plebiscite does not arise now because the situation has vastly changed, and this has been testified to by the delegates who have spoken in the debate, by the delegate from Ghana, by the delegate from Rumania, by the delegate from Venezuela, and even Mr. Boland was forced to admit that the situation was quite different. Sir, I would like to say that the situation in Kashmir corresponds to the situation which exists over Berlin. Berlin is bound by the Potsdam Agreement of 1945, and under the Potsdam Agreement the administration of the City of Berlin was under

a Kommandatura. The Kommandatura does not exist now. The situation has changed, but nobody in a discussion of the Berlin question has ever referred to the 1945 Agreement at Potsdam. They say that the situation has changed. I thought I should raise the matter because whatever the Prime Minister might say on this subject will have far-reaching repercussions on world opinion, and I am sure that the House would agree that we have no desire to go back on anything that we promised. We have a right to point out, however, that the situation has changed and that it is not possible to have a practicable solution on a resolution passed 13 years ago.

Sir, I should like to go on to another problem and that is our relations with China. Three days ago answering a question of Mr. Vajpayee the Prime Minister said that the Chinese want to save their face and they want to have some kind of a settlement—I am not quoting all the verbatim report because that will take some time. He also made a similar statement in the other House. I quite understand the anxiety of the Chinese to save their face because they have lost their face with Russia over the dispute regarding Albania, they have lost their face with the Western world, they have lost their face with us, but whatever negotiations. China may like to start at the present time, we should like the Prime Minister to have certain objectives clearly in mind and in his view. The negotiations which Pakistan has conducted with China over the delimitation of the Pakistan-China boundary compromises the stand that we have taken in regard to Kashmir. The Ministry of External Affairs issued a note in the first week of June in which they recalled that in 1956 Mr. Chou En-lai had told our Ambassador in Peking that, according to him, the people of India had expressed their views on the question of accession of Kashmir to India. Later, when the Secretary-General visited Peking last year, some kind of an impression was given to him that the Chinese were supporting

[Shri A. D. Mam. J. us. While I fully support the Prime Minister's foreign policy in respect of China, I am bound to say that in regard to this matter, there has been a let-down on the part of the External Affairs Ministry. We should have pinned down China to this issue of accepting our sovereignty over Kashmir. This was not done in a very specific way, and there was a reference in the note of the External Affairs Ministry published in June that some kind of an impression, was given to the Secretary General. If I may ask the Prime Minister, I should like him to tell us what the Secretary-General discussed—there must be some notes about it—because what he said at the time and what the Chinese representatives also mentioned on that subject are of vital importance. Sir, I would like to say that before we start negotiations with China on any matter over Ladakh or over the Macmahon Line, we should ask from China a clear enunciation of her views on the question of our sovereignty over Kashmir. I am laying some stress on this matter because the implications of the Chinese action in trying to delimit what they call the Sinkiang territory constitute a serious danger to India. If China wants to negotiate with us, let her first recognise our sovereignty over Kashmir. Incidentally I may mention that China is the only Communist country which has not recognised our sovereignty over Kashmir. It has taken the position which some of the Western powers have taken.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should like to refer to the Congo on which there is an amendment moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I think the situation in the Congo has greatly changed over the last twelve months, and from the recent reports that we have had and which have appeared in the press and magazines, the position is that Mr. Adoula who is the head of the Central Government is as much leaning towards the United States and Belgium as Mr. Tshombe.

There is a lot of traffic going on and Belgian mercenaries have been recruited by Mr. Tshombe and Belgian fighters have been acquired by Katanga, and the plan of the United States seems to be to have an island in Africa which will be free from Communism. It was for this reason that a sum of 100 million dollars was sanctioned by the U.S. senate and bonds were allowed to be sold. If we are in the Congo we should not be there, to serve the ends of the United States. There was a question raised this morning about the release of Mr. Gizenga. Some reports say that he is dead, and I should like the Prime Minister to tell us whether the Ministry of External Affairs has received any information whether Mr. Gizenga is alive or dead because there is a lot of confusion about this matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Most probably he is alive.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Most probably he is dead. I think the time has come to call for a reappraisal of our policies in regard to the Congo. We have sent our troops, we have spent a lot of money, and we are not going to be there to see that the United States plan of isolating the Congo from the Communist influences is served. If I may say so, the Prime Minister may agree to send a Parliamentary team to study the affairs in the Congo and report to him. If such a study team goes there and we come to the conclusion that there is no point in India's staying in the Congo, we should pull our troops from that place. *(Interruption)*. It is possible for us to tell the world that we have done our best and that America should shoulder the burden because Mr. Adoula is as much leaning on the United States as Mr. Tshombe, and both are very friendly to the Belgians.

Sir, in the two or three minutes that I have I would like to say a few words about the Commonwealth

Immigration Bill. I know that the Ministry of External Affairs and the Prime Minister have expressed their disapproval of the Commonwealth Immigration Bill. But I would like the Prime Minister to study the debate on the Commonwealth Immigration Bill which took place in the House of Commons in November 1961. Mr. Gaitskell made a number of points and he clearly proved that there was no case or justification for the Bill and that the Bill was an expression of colour bar. Unfortunately Britain has also been caught in this kind of business, and I am afraid that if the present policies are continued, they will lead to the Weakening of our Commonwealth link. Mr. Butler, when he spoke on the Commonwealth Immigration Bill, paid tributes to the Government of India for the discretion they have shown in controlling emigration to their country. That means to say that our record has been good. Sir, I would like to suggest to the Prime Minister that at some stage we should bring this matter before the "Government of the United Kingdom and point out that unless we have a quota system by which a certain number of persons would be allowed to emigrate from India, it will weaken the Commonwealth link in our country and strengthen those forces which are there which want India to sever its connection with the Commonwealth altogether.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL (C than): Vice-Chairman, at the outset, I would like to congratulate the Government on their able handling of our external affairs. In the last few months many problems have come up before them, problems affecting our national interest, and I am happy to say that the Government have handled those problems with tact, with courage and with discretion.

I have to express gratification that India was elected to the 18-nation Disarmament Committee and it is all the more gratifying because it was this country that for the first

time raised the question of cessation of nuclear tests. I need not go into the history of all those matters. But I like to point out that it was in 1954 that the Prime Minister sounded a clarion call to the various nations and asked for a standstill agreement. In 1957 a resolution was unanimously adopted in the Lok Sabha calling for the cessation of nuclear tests and banning of nuclear weapons. After that, our country has been continuously, since 1957, sponsoring resolutions in the United Nations calling for an immediate halting of nuclear tests. And I am glad to say that since the last three or four years those resolutions are being unanimously adopted. After our election to the Disarmament Committee of the 18 nations, we have continued to function effectively in that Committee also and a proposal for a test ban treaty was made by eight nations on this Committee. The text of this proposal I need not read out but I would like to refer at least two points over which there could possibly be an agreement. The proposal was put up on behalf of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the U.A.R. Now, we have been told that there have been all kinds of hurdles to a test ban treaty. What are those hurdles? On the one hand the United States and the Western powers have been saying that they must have verification and inspection. On the other hand, the Soviet Union has been saying that that will be tantamount to espionage. What is the basis? I read out the points which were raised before that Committee on the 16th April, 1962, which could be the basis for a test ban treaty:

"They believe that possibilities exist of establishing by agreement a system for continuous observation and effective control on a purely scientific and non-political basis."

Mark these words. Then they suggested further:

"The feasibility of constituting by agreement an International Com-

[Shri N. C. Kasliwal.] mission consisting of a limited number of highly qualified scientists, possibly from non-aligned countries together with the appropriate staff might be considered."

These proposals which have been put forward by the eight neutral nations were accepted, I understand, by the Soviet Union but were not accepted by the United States. I say that a test ban treaty is a symbol of man's hope for a peaceful world; a test ban treaty represents man's right to live. It is most unfortunate that the life of mankind today is in the palms of two Great Powers, and any day a few politicians who are in authority in those two countries may possibly make some mistake and dash the world to pieces. These two countries which have been conducting these nuclear explosions must be told now in no uncertain terms that it is time that they stopped all these nuclear tests. Never in the history of the world has man lived on the brink of existence and annihilation as he does today and I appeal to the Prime Minister to take the lead again as he has taken the lead previously on this matter and to call for a unilateral cessation of nuclear tests. He should now send a clarion call that no useful purpose will be served by the explosions. Already the world has any amount of nuclear weapons and it can be destroyed many times over with the weapons which are already in existence in this world, in the possession of these three or four Powers. I ask: What purpose has been served by resuming these tests? Why did the Soviet Union resume its tests when the United Nations General Assembly was sitting? Why has the United States now resumed those tests? I cannot understand it. It reminds me that it is like two rich men who are only exhibiting their vulgar finery and their wealth. It is nothing but international vulgarity. The Prime Minister has been good enough to refer to the Anti-Nuclear Convention which was held recently in I

Delhi. I like to congratulate the organisers of that Convention. I think that they have done a good thing and if they are able to influence public opinion in the world, well, it will be for the better.

I n'ow mention one other point in this connection and that is the question of an atom-free zone. For the first time the question of an atom-free zone was adumbrated by the Rapacki Plan. The Polish Foreign Minister put forth this Plan in 1957 before the United Nations Assembly but he did not draw much attention. But I may say that now people have begun to realise more and more that there is force in the idea of a denuclearised zone in Central Europe. After that last year Ghana sponsored a resolution in the United Nations to declare Africa a denuclearised zone and that resolution was adopted, if I remember correctly, unanimously. Subsequent to that, even the Balkan States have passed a resolution declaring their territory to be a denuclearised zone. May I appeal to the Prime Minister to consider the question of having an atom-free zone in South East Asia? I do not know what difficulties there could be. I wish he calls a conference of the heads of the governments of the States in South East Asia, discuss the question with them and, if possible, a resolution declaring South East Asia as a denuclearised zone could be adopted. Such a conference should be called at such a time that subsequently a resolution to that effect could be sponsored in the United Nations at the ensuing session which is to begin in September this year.

(.Interruption.)

Having said so, I do not propose to go into the question of disarmament in detail. On the question of disarmament we have already had a comprehensive resolution which was sponsored by us last year and I do say that even now that can be the only basis for disarmament negotiations. It contains certain directives. Both the blocs are now seized of that



resolution and a time may come when that resolution will finally form more or less the basis for an agreement on disarmament. The Prime Minister was pleased to say today that a preamble to the disarmament treaty has been agreed to.

Having said so, I will come next to the question of China and I do so for two reasons. One is that Mr. Vajpayee has put forward an amendment in which he has said that the China policy of the Government has been unrealistic, 'inert and ineffective, and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has not said anything about our China policy. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to say immediately that the China policy; the Government has neither been unrealistic nor inert nor ineffective. I may recall that at the time when the Joint Communiqué in April, 1960 was issued {here was any amount of trouble with regard to the attitude of the Government of India. And since then what happened? Since then the entire thing has been turning in our favour. The Prime Minister said the other day—and even today he said—that now the situation has considerably changed and is changing in our favour. Time has been on our side in this respect *and* if there is a little more time, I am quite sure that we will strengthen our hands in such a way that perhaps by negotiations alone we will be able to recover our lost territory. You will also recall that in that Joint Communiqué there are two or three things which have ultimately been found to be of great importance to both countries, and one was that border clashes and border skirmishes should be avoided, and you will see that since April 1960 there have hardly been any border clashes or border skirmishes of any kind. The other was that an official team should sit down and examine factual material and find out what is the traditional boundary line between India and China. That factual material has been found and that factual material has proved our case to the hilt and today the entire world knows what is India's case against China so 377 RS—4.

far as border dispute is concerned. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, if the Prime Minister says that the Chinese are no longer happy over the border situation, he is quite right. How can they be possibly happy when they know that they cannot save their face before an international forum? They perhaps realise now that there may be mistakes on their part and it is quite possible that they want to wriggle out of a situation which they created thinking that India was keeping quiet and doing nothing.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Vajpayee has been very critical of our attitude towards China, but he had never said what we should do if we do not negotiate. The Prime Minister said the other day and he has been saying it so many times that we will continue to negotiate, and we will negotiate to the bitter end, and the offer that he made on the 14th of May was also one facet of the negotiation. He has said in a most friendly manner "we withdraw our forces and our checkposts and you withdraw your forces and your checkposts." Of course the Chinese have not accepted it. We will continue to negotiate and I can assure you, Sir—as the Prime Minister has said—that we will continue to negotiate right to the bitter end. But if it comes to a question of fighting, then I am quite sure that we will fight, and just as we are negotiating to the bitter end, we shall fight to the bitter end. I *do* not want to use the Churchillian phrases, but let me assure this House—I think I can say on behalf of almost everybody—that once it comes to a question of fighting, we shall fight on the mountain tops, we shall fight in the valleys of the Himalayas, we shall fight on land and in the air and recover our lost territory. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not want to speak in such high-sounding language on this matter, but I want to say that we, as far as this side of the House is concerned, have been trying our level best to solve the problem of this dispute with China by negotiation.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

[Shri N. C. Kasliwal.] And I am quite sure that with the patience that we have been showing, we will be able to succeed in solving this question, without going to war, without fighting with our neighbour China.

Madam Deputy Chairman, now I will pass on to another subject, and that is the question of Kashmir. Just now news has been received saying that the Soviet Union has vetoed the latest Resolution which was put forward yesterday in the Security Council. Now the extraordinary thing, Madam Deputy Chairman, is that every time the Kashmir question crops up in the Security Council, they say, "Well, you can have arbitration, you can have mediation, or something of that sort. How can we possibly have any kind of arbitration or any kind of mediation? They give the example of the Indus Waters dispute. The Indus Waters dispute was entirely on a different footing than what the Kashmir dispute is. In Kashmir there has been aggression, and you will be surprised to know that even now, even today, the question of aggression has not been defined by the United Nations. If there was aggression in Kashmir, it is but proper that that aggression must be vacated. It is only then that the question of negotiation can arise. The Prime Minister said today that he has already, more than once, made an offer of 'no war pact' with Pakistan, not only on the question of Kashmir but extending to other questions as well, and that offer has continuously been made. And yet Pakistan has all the time refused to accept that offer.

Madam Deputy Chairman, there is only one small matter on which I now want to speak, and that is the question of Laos. I am very happy to see that at long last, after so many negotiations and protracted and prolonged discussions the Laos question has been solved, and I must congratulate our Government also, because it is our Government which took a

lead in the very beginning, at the 1954 Geneva Conference, that the two power blocs should keep aloof from Indo-China States. Ultimately, it is that suggestion of our Government which has now been accepted by them. If the power blocs remain aloof from the area, I am quite sure, Madam Deputy Chairman, that the questions of all these South-East Asian States will be solved and they will remain neutral in a peaceful world.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, as this is the first time that I am taking part in this House on the debate on foreign affairs and on the foreign policy of this Government, I hope the House will allow me to start with certain fundamental facts because, after all, it is facts, geographical, historical and economic, that are the sure and secure foundations of any system of foreign policy. And may I point out that it is not the ideology, however high-placed or whatever its origin may be, but it is the interest of the country that ought to be the determining factor of the foreign policy in any country because, after all, an ideology is a philosophy of life, and in its very nature it tends to be absolute, comprehensive and monolithic in its consistency. It dictates, rather than suggests, the principles and practice of foreign policy. It does not change, it does not modify, it is not flexible, it gives no time or room for manoeuvre, whereas the interest of the country makes one's foreign policy flexible, changeable, according to the changing circumstances and conditions in the country and in the international situation. It makes foreign policy varied and various from time to time. It is always the interest of the country, economic and political and the interest of the country in the international situation that determine foreign policy. The consequences of basing one's foreign policy on an ideology, like the ideology of non-alignment, once called neutrality, later changed into neutralism, and still

later changed into dynamic neutralism, and now put forward before the world as non-alignment, the consequences of such an ideology—the influence of the practice of such an ideology, the profession of such an ideology—on foreign policy is that your foreign policy is laid down for all time; it does not change according to circumstances.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Non-alignment does not mean that, pro-lessor.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: What does it mean, then?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It means, according to our best interests we are guided; we are not tied down to any Woe.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Take the foreign policy of the Government of India in regard to recent occurrences, occurrences like the invasion of Tibet by China. Now, the independence of Tibet is absolutely necessary for the defence of India. It was realised by the British, by Lord Curzon, who organised an expedition to Tibet, not in order to bring Tibet under the suzerainty of the Government of India, but in order to defend Tibet against the incursion of China such as has taken place in recent years. This was an instance where the interest of India demanded that we should have protested against the occupation of Tibet by China. But because of our profession of this ideology of non-alignment, this profession of Panchsheel, we allowed Tibet to be gobbled up by China. Similarly, in regard to Hungary, here was a case where a free people wanted to shake off the shackles of the Government which they did not like, the Communist Government, which they did not like. The Russian Forces were rushed into Budapest and that popular movement was suppressed. The reaction of the Government of India, of the Prime Minister, was not instant as in the case, for instance, of Suez. And why, pray, do we not recognise diplomati-

cally the independence of Israel? It is because we are committed to this ideology of non-alignment.

Madam, on the other hand, if from this ideology we turn to the country's interest, our foreign policy would have been more flexible and we would have thought of useful alliances. I cannot understand why the present Government is so allergic to alliances. Alliances are in the tradition of India. They are according to the genius of India. You find it illustrated in the treaties of *Arthashastra* of Kautilya. You find this policy of alliances followed in our epics, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. You find this practice of alliances being followed throughout the whole course of Indian history. In modern times, in America a statesman like Alexander Hamilton, one of the founders of the Constitution of the United States of America, said:

"There is nothing absurd or impenetrable in the idea of a league or alliance between independent nations for certain definite purposes, previously stated in a treaty, regulating all the details of time, place, circumstances and leaving nothing to future discretion and depending for its execution on the good faith of the people."

Fortunately, people and statesmen are better than their creed, and so although the Government of India's present leadership repudiates the policy and practice of alliances with people who will be useful to India's defence, implicitly they have observed at least one alliance, and that is with the United Kingdom. That alliance with the United Kingdom is implicit in India's membership of the Commonwealth.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: May I interrupt the hon. Member? Is it the intention of the hon. Member that we should align ourselves with a Power whether that Power is right or wrong?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: We must practise this policy of alliance

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.] and change from time to time as and when they are not useful to our country. We should have an alliance that is changeable. You should be able to ally with one country at one time and ally with another person at another time according to the circumstances of the country, according to the needs of the country.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: In which sense? In which sense are we allies of Britain? Alliances have different meanings. In what sense does the hon. Member mean?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: It is not alliance. It is an implicit alliance. You consult the Commonwealth on matters of Defence. You send your Generals year by year for consultations with the Chiefs of Staff of the United Kingdom as to the organisation of your Defence. The alliance with the United Kingdom is implicit in your membership of the Commonwealth of Nations. Why should we not start by allying ourselves with the nations of Asia, with the South-East nations to start with, South-East Asian nations which are threatened by the Power which threatens our own integrity, our own independence, I mean, the Chinese Republic? Then, if I might utter the staggering word, why not have alliance with the United States of America? Why not have even a military alliance with the United States of America in the present conditions and circumstances of the country? With one blow such an alliance would stop all the intrigues and all the moves that Pakistan is making with China. The whole foreign policy of Pakistan, the present moves of Pakistan would be instantly neutralised if the Government of India entered into a military alliance with the United States of America. In one word, Madam Deputy Chairman, my attitude towards our foreign policy questions, towards our relations with foreign powers in the present international situation as well as in internal situation is that it is the interest of India

that must determine the formulation of our foreign policy. If the interest of India requires that we should ally ourselves with America or with any other power, we should ally ourselves with it. And certainly it is much better to ally ourselves with the friends of democratic freedom than with the doubtful friends of international peace. If I am asked to choose between interest and ideology, my vote would be on the side of interest because I think of the interests of India in the changing circumstances. In the changing circumstances and conditions of the international situation, the interest of India, the peace of India, the integrity of India, the defence of India—in one word, the interest of India—should be the determining factor in the formulation of the foreign policy of any patriotic government.

श्री गंगा शरण सिंह (बिहार) : जनाब डिप्युटी चयर्मैन साहिव, फोरन अफेयर्स के संबध में बहस करते समय सब से पहले जिस परेशानी का सामना मुझे करना पड़ता है वह यह है कि आज देशी मामलों में और कुछ हद तक विदेशी मामलों में भी जिन शब्दों का उपयोग किया जाता है, हम यह देखते हैं कि भिन्न भिन्न विचारों के लोग ही नहीं बल्कि परस्पर विरोधी विचार रखने वाले लोग भी उन्हीं शब्दों का उपयोग करते हैं। जैसे उपनिषद से और वैदिक मंत्रों से भिन्न भिन्न मत के मानने वाले अपने मतलब के अनुकूल अर्थ निकाला करते हैं उसी तरह आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में भी भिन्न भिन्न शब्दों के भिन्न भिन्न मतलब लगाये जाते हैं, अपने अपने मतलब के मुताबिक अर्थ लगाते हैं। "पीस एण्ड न्यूट्रैलिटी" शब्द ऐसे हैं जो एक जमाने में जिस तरह से समझे जाते हैं उसमें शायद कोई मतभेद नहीं होगा, उन का अर्थ शायद एक ही होगा, उन का प्रयोग भी शायद एक ही होगा। लेकिन आज हम देखते हैं कि पीस एण्ड न्यूट्रैलिटी जैसे सीध और सरल शब्दों में भी खींचातानी की जा रही है, और परस्पर विरोधी विचार रखने वाले लोग, ऐसे लोग जिन का शान्ति

अबना पीस के साथ कोई संबंध नहीं है। वं भी आज पीस या शान्ति की चर्चा करते हैं। पीस को अपने डंग से इंटरप्रेट करने की चेष्टा करते हैं। ऐसी अवस्था में मैं कुछ थोड़ी परे-छानी, हेण्डिकैप, महसूस करता हूँ, और उसी हेण्डिकैप के साथ बोलना पड़ता है।

कुछ अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न ऐसे होते हैं जिन का तात्कालिक संबंध तो नहीं मालूम होता, लेकिन आज के इस वैज्ञानिक उन्नति के युग में तात्कालिक नहीं मालूम होने पर भी यह नहीं कहा जा सकता कि किस समय ये प्रश्न तात्कालिक और सीधा संबंध रखने वाले हो जायें। जिस तरह आज विज्ञान की उन्नति ने और उद्योग की उन्नति ने समय और स्थान की सीमा को समाप्त कर दिया है, उसी तरह आज जो राजनैतिक और आर्थिक प्रश्न आते हैं, उन की सीमाओं में भी, उन की परिभाषाओं में भी परिवर्तन कर दिया है, ऐसा लगता है। लेकिन फिर भी स्पष्ट देखने से आज ऐसा तो लगता ही है कि कुछ प्रश्न ऐसे हैं जो हम से तात्कालिक संबंध रखते हैं, जैसे उदाहरण के लिये अभी चीन के साथ हमारी सीमा का विवाद है, पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे संबंधों का प्रश्न है। मैं शुरू में ही यह कहूँ कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने लोक सभा में और अपने प्रैस कान्फ्रेंस में सोमा के संबंध में जो बातें बतलाई और जो उत्साहवर्धक बातें कहीं, मेरा ख्याल है कि सारा देश उस के लिये उन का शुक्रगुजार है और कम से कम हम, इस देश में रहने वाले लोग, उन से उसी भाषा और उसी बात की आशा रखते हैं। हमारी शिकायत उन से तब होती है जब जो भाषा वे अभी बोल रहे हैं, जिन शब्दों का उन्होंने प्रयोग किया, वह जब नहीं होता तब हमारी शिकायत होती है और हम तब आलोचना करते हैं। निरपेक्षता की बात वे भी करते हैं, निरपेक्षता की बात हम भी कहते हैं, निरपेक्षता की बात कांग्रेस भी करती है, हम भी करते हैं। लेकिन फिर भी हम को उस की आलोचना इसलिये करनी पड़ती है क्योंकि हम देखते हैं कि निरपेक्षता का जो सही

दृष्टिकोण है उस दृष्टिकोण से काम नहीं होता है, सरकार उस पर ठीक से अमल नहीं करती और कभी कभी उस निरपेक्षता के सीधे रास्ते में नहीं, बल्कि अगल बगल के दूसरे रास्ते में चलती नजर आती है। इसलिये हमें आलोचना करनी पड़ती है। हमें बतलाना पड़ता है कि निरपेक्षता की चर्चा के बावजूद निरपेक्षता

का जो सीधा रास्ता है उस से हम 3 P.M. भटक गये हैं। अतीत की बातों का जिक्र कर के मैं अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता। इस सम्बन्ध में काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है। अभी जो बात कहनी है, वह यह है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने अभी हाल में एक प्रैस कान्फ्रेंस में यह बात कही थी कि चीन बहुत खुश नजर नहीं आता है। फिर उन्होंने जो बयान दिया, उस में यह भी कहा कि चीन को आशंका है, खतरा है और डर भी है। मुझे इस बात से खुशी होती, यदि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने चीन के बारे में जो वे बातें कहीं, उन के बारे में कोई सन्देह न हो। लेकिन फिर भी मुझे उन की बात पर यकीन है, मुझे विश्वास है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर की हैसियत से, गवर्नमेंट की हैसियत से उन के पास ऐसे सन्देह होंगे जिन को सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से सब के सामने कहना शायद सम्भव नहीं है। इसलिये मैं विश्वास और यकीन करता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा, उसके लिए उन के पास कोई आधार होगा, सन्देह होगा। लेकिन जो बात हमारे सामने आई है उससे न किसी तरह के भय का पता चलता है, न उन की नाखुशी का पता चलता है और न दुःखी होने का पता चलता है। जो नोट हमारे सामने आया है उस में तो एक तरह का संघर्ष और धमकी की बात है, एक कानफिलिट की बात है, एक धमकी की बात दिखाई देती है। जो आदमी डरता है, दुःखी होता है और किसी तरह का मेटलमेंट चाहता है, तो वह कम से कम इस तरह की भाषा का प्रयोग नहीं कर सकता। जैसा कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि इस में शक नहीं कि चाइनीज के ड्राफ्ट काफ़ी समझ-बूझ, काफ़ी

### [श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

तैयारी के साथ और शब्दों का काफी ख्याल कर के लिखे जाते हैं। ऐसा नहीं होता है कि कोई शब्द बिना समझे लिख दिया जाये। ये दोनों बातें पहली की तरह हैं। एक तरफ तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब का यह कहना है कि चीन वाले दुःखी हैं, आतंकित हैं और दूसरी तरफ उन की जो नीति है वह कानफिनक्ट की है और धमकी की है। इस से मुझे परेशानी मालूम होती है। शुरू से ही जहां तक चीन का मामला है, तिब्बत का मामला है, हमारा कांग्रेस और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से मतभेद रहा है। हम समझते हैं कि शुरू से ही इस मामले में ढिंढाई हुई है, शुरू से ही इस मामले को जो महत्व दिया जाना चाहिये था, वह नहीं दिया गया और उसी का नतीजा यह है कि आज हम यहां पर इस तरह की परिस्थिति में आ गये हैं। लेकिन आज यह जान कर खुशी हुई और मेरा ख्याल है कि देश का हर आदमी खुश होगा कि सीमा के सम्बन्ध में हमारी तैयारी हो रही है और आज परिस्थिति हमारे अनुकूल है। मैं तफसील में नहीं जानना चाहता और न यह जानना चाहूंगा कि हमारी क्या तैयारी हो रही है और सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से इस तरह की बातें जानना उचित भी नहीं होगा। लेकिन प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब का यह कहने का क्या आधार है कि सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से या सीमा की दृष्टि से आज परिस्थिति हमारे अनुकूल है। हमारा तो सिर्फ इतना काम है कि जहां पर सरकार जो शान्त काम करती है, वहां पर उस का ध्यान आकृष्ट कराये और उस के आगे सही काम करने की जिम्मेदारी उस की है। लेकिन हमारा काम यह भी है कि हमारी ओर से जितना हो सके, उन के सही काम में मदद करें।

अभी तो चीन का प्रश्न हमारे सामने है और चीन की बातों पर हमें बहुत ज्यादा भरोसा नहीं करना चाहिये। इसलिये कि काश्मीर के मामले में उस ने स्पष्ट और अस्पष्ट दो तरह से दो बातें कहीं। एक तरफ तो उसने हमें आश्वासन दिया था। एक तरह से क़बूल किया

था कि काश्मीर हमारा है। काश्मीर के संबंध में जो हमारा स्टैंड है, जो रख है, वह सही है। लेकिन इस आश्वासन के बावजूद, इन बातों के बावजूद, आज वही चीन पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौते की बातचीत कर रहा है, उन के साथ सीमा की बात कर रहा है। हमारे इतना कहने के बाद भी वह पाकिस्तान के साथ सम्पर्क कायम करना चाहता है और हमारी बात नहीं सुन रहा है। ये बातें ऐसी हैं जिन से हमें अपने को ठीक जगह पर रखना चाहिये, हम जो बातें कहते हैं उस पर अमल करना चाहिये, उस के लिये जरूरत पड़े तो मिट जाना चाहिये। मैं इसी के हक में हूँ।

श्री रत्नस्वामी जी ने अलाइन्सेज की जो बात कही है, मैं उस के हक में नहीं हूँ। किसी साधारण से लाभ के लिये अगर हम इस तरह के अलाइन्सेज से अपने को जोड़ते हैं, इस तरह से हम दायों, बायां, दक्षिण, उत्तर की ओर जाते हैं, तो उन के इम्प्लिकेशन के बारे में भी हमें तैयार रहना चाहिये जो एक आसान चीज नहीं है। जहां तक हमारे मित्र श्री रत्नस्वामी का सम्बन्ध है वे काफी समझदार हैं और श्री रत्नस्वामी जी ने जो बात कही है उस का स्वयं प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब जवाब देंगे। लेकिन जहां तक चीन का सवाल है यह मामला जल्दी तय होने वाला नहीं है। यह मामला बहुत लम्बा चलेगा। हमें इस मामले पर बहुत मुस्ती के साथ चलना है, मुस्ती के साथ आगे बढ़ना है।

जहां तक पाकिस्तान का सवाल है वह एक नासूर की तरह हो गया है। साधारण जख्म होता है तो उस का इलाज हो सकता है, लेकिन नासूर बढ़ता रहता है। इसी तरह से पाकिस्तान का जो सवाल है वह नासूर की तरह हो गया है और ऐसा लगता है कि पाकिस्तान का जो सवाल है वह अब पाकिस्तान का सवाल ही नहीं रह गया है बल्कि उसके साथ अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय बातें भी जुड़ी हुई हैं। इस मामले को हमें कई बातों को सामने रख कर

देखना होगा, इस के पिछले इतिहास पर भी गौर करना होगा। जब आप इस के पिछले इतिहास पर गौर करेंगे तो आप यह पायेंगे कि जब भी यू० एन० ओ० में काश्मीर का मामला आता है तो पाकिस्तान में साम्प्रदायिक दंगे होते हैं। जब कभी हम देखते हैं कि हमारी अर्थ-नीति जम रही है, शरणार्थियों का प्रश्न सुलझ रहा है, तो उस समय आप पायेंगे कि पाकिस्तान से जो हजार, चार हजार, दस हजार शरणार्थी सीमा के पार से लाये जाते हैं। मैं इस मामले के बारे में अच्छी तरह से नहीं जानता हूँ लेकिन एक बाहरी आदमी की तरह यह प्रतिक्रिया मुझ पर हुई कि जब कभी इस तरह की बात होती है तो यह बात देखी जाती है। इसके साथ ही साथ जब कभी हम किसी कम्युनिस्ट मुल्क की सही बात का समर्थन करते हैं, उनके साथ हमारा किसी तरह का सम्पर्क होता है तो वैसे मौकों पर भी इस तरह की बातें होती हैं। इस तरह की जो बातें की जाती हैं उनका कोई इंटर-नेशनल सम्बन्ध है। मेरा ख्याल है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब इस बारे में ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से बतलायेंगे कि यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्बन्ध क्या है। जिस तरह से चीन का अलग मापदंड है, उसी तरह अमेरिका तथा कुछ दूसरे देशों का भी अलग मापदंड है। हमारे कुछ इंजीनियरों ने रूसी इंजीनियरों से हवाई जहाजों के सम्बन्ध में कुछ बातचीत की और उन्होंने इस बातचीत की रिपोर्ट हमारी सरकार को दी। हमारी सरकार यह विचारने लगी कि क्यों न इस तरह के हवाई जहाज खरीद लिये जायें। इस पर हमारे अमेरिका के जो मित्र हैं उनको उज्र हुआ कि हम कम्युनिस्ट मुल्क से हवाई जहाज लेने की चर्चा कर रहे हैं, बातचीत कर रहे हैं। लेकिन वही अमेरिका के लोग जब पाकिस्तान और चीन आपस में सलाह मशविरा करते हैं, सीमा के सम्बन्ध में बात करते हैं, नाजायज़ तरीके से बात करते हैं, उनके साथ मिलकर एग्रीमेंट करते हैं तो उस पर उनको उज्र नहीं होता है। लेकिन जब हम कोई

बात करते हैं तो उन्हें उज्र होता है और उसके लिए तरह तरह की बात कहते हैं। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि यह डबल स्टैंडर्ड है, दो मापदंड हैं, दो बटखरा है। हमारे लिए एक बटखरा है और पाकिस्तान के लिए दूसरा बटखरा है और इसका हमको बराबर ख्याल रखना चाहिये। हमने जो सिद्धान्त तय किये हैं, जो नीति हम ने तय की है, उस नीति पर दोनों ओर से आघात होता है। ऐसा लगता है कि दोनों तरफ के लोग इस बात की चेष्टा कर रहे हैं कि हम उस नीति से डिग जायें। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि दोनों गुटों के लोग चाहेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान जैसा बड़ा मुल्क, जिस की इतनी आबादी है, हिन्दुस्तान जैसा बड़ा मुल्क जिसकी इतनी बड़ी परंपराएं हैं, वह किसी एक गुट में शामिल हो जाये। दोनों तरफ से दबाव डाले जायेंगे, प्रेशर पड़ेंगे, पीछे भी पड़े हैं और आगे भी पड़ेंगे, इस लिए हमें आज यह सोचना चाहिये कि यह प्रश्न सिर्फ राजनैतिक नहीं रह जाता है। यह प्रश्न आर्थिक और दूसरी तरह का भी हो जाता है। इस दबाव को हम किस तरह से रोक सकेंगे? इसके लिए हमें पूरी चेष्टा करनी चाहिये और हमें पूरी तरह सचेष्ट रहना चाहिये, नहीं तो जिस तरह आर्थिक दृष्टि से हमारा देश पिछड़ा हुआ है, जिस तरह औद्योगिक और वैज्ञानिक मामलों में हम पिछड़े हुए हैं, जैसी हमारी आवश्यकताएं हैं, उन में इस बात का खतरा है कि हम कभी दायें जा सकते हैं, कभी बायें जा सकते हैं। मुझे उम्मीद है कि हमारी सरकार और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब इस बारे में पूरे सतर्क रहेंगे।

एक सवाल और भी सोचने का आ गया है। काश्मीर का मामला जिस समय हम ने यू० एन० ओ० में रखा था उस समय भी इस देश में बहुत से ऐसे लोग थे जो उसके खिलाफ थे और वे चाहते थे कि काश्मीर का मामला वहां न रखा जाये। खैर, जब रखा गया तो वह अच्छा हुआ या बुरा हुआ, मैं

[ श्री गंगाशरण सिंह ]

उम में इस समय नहीं जाना चाहता। लेकिन अगर हम यह अनुभव करते हैं कि अब सारी परिस्थिति बदल गई है, अगर हम यह अनुभव करते हैं कि वह पृष्ठभूमि नहीं रही, अगर हम यह अनुभव करते हैं कि जिस जमाने में हम ने यू० एन० ऑ० में मामला पेश किया था तब से सारी चीजें बदल गई हैं और अब दूसरा नक्शा हां गया है, तो क्या यह सोचने का मौका नहीं आया है कि कम से कम हम अपनी तरफ से इस मामले को पेश न करें, वहां न रखें? मैं मानता हूँ कि शायद यह भी हो कि अगर हम इस मामले को वहां से वापस ले लेंगे तो . . .

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं बता दू कि वापस लिया नहीं जा सकता। हमारे काबू की बात नहीं है, वह हमारे कब्जे में नहीं है, वह कौंसिल के कब्जे में है। एक शस्त्र या एक फ़रीक उसको वापस नहीं ले सकता।

श्री ए० बी० ब्राजपेयी : जहां तक डिफेंस मिनिस्टर ने कहा है, उन्होंने यही कहा है कि टैकनिकली वापस लेने में कोई कठिनाई नहीं है, हम वापस न लें, यह बात अलग है। लोक सभा में जो वादविवाद हुआ उसमें उन्होंने शायद यही कहा था।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : लेकिन अगर दूसरा फ़रीक उसको अपना ले, कहे कि रहेगा तो नहीं आप वापस ले सकते हैं। कह दीजिये कि आप का नहीं रहा, लेकिन वह मसला तां रहता है।

श्री गंगाशरण सिंह : जहां तक मुझे स्मरण है, यह कहा गया था कि टैकनिकली इस में दिक्कत नहीं है और उसी के आधार पर मैं बातें रख रहा था। इस बारे में हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने कुछ भी कहा हां, लेकिन हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब जो समझते हैं और जो कहते हैं या कहें, उसको मैं ज्यादा टीक समझूंगा। मेरे कहने का आधार

यही था कि मैं यह समझता था कि टैकनिकली उस में कोई डिफिकल्टी नहीं है।

हमारी बगल में एक और देश है, नेपाल। जिसके साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध बहुत अच्छे रहे हैं। शायद ही दो पड़ोसी देशों के सम्बन्ध उतने अच्छे रहे होंगे जितने नेपाल के और हमारे रहे हैं। लेकिन आज धीरे धीरे परिस्थिति यह हो गई है कि हमारे सम्बन्ध जैसे थे उस तरह के नहीं रहे और किस हद तक उस में खराबी आई वह तो हर आदमी के अलग अलग दृष्टिकोण की बात है। लेकिन इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि नेपाल के साथ जो सम्बन्ध हमारे थे, आजादी प्राप्त होने के समय, वे आज नहीं रह गये हैं। हो सकता है कि इस में वहाँ की परिस्थिति का भी कुछ कसूर हो। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी तरफ से भी इस मामले को जिस तरह से हैंडल करना चाहिये था, उस तरह से हैंडल नहीं किया गया। पहले भी कुछ थोड़ी सी खबरें निकली थीं, लेकिन आज के अखबार में एक ज्यादा स्पष्ट खबर निकली है। नेपाल में जो बात हो रही है, उसके सम्बन्ध में नेपाल सरकार के एक प्रमुख मंत्री ने यह दावा किया है कि जो कुछ हो रहा है वह हिन्दुस्तान के कहने से या हिन्दुस्तान की उत्तजना से या हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों की सहानुभूति से हो रहा है। हमारी सरकार ने उसका खंडन किया। हमारी सरकार ने उसकी जानकारी हासिल की और उसके बाद बहुत मजबूती के साथ उसका खंडन किया। लेकिन आज अखबारों में यह निकला है कि नेपाल के कुछ आफिशियल्स और हमारे कुछ आफिशियल्स मिल कर इस सम्बन्ध में जानकारी हासिल करेंगे, जांच करेंगे। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उसके सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार जो कुछ कहती है, हमारी सरकार का जो कहना है, वही मान्य होना चाहिये। हमारे देश में क्या हो रहा है, क्या नहीं हो रहा है, इसके सम्बन्ध में हमारे



आफ्रिसियल और उनके आफ्रिसियल मिल कर कोई जांच करें, तो इस में मुझे एक खतरा नजर आता है और आजकल के लिए ही नहीं, भविष्य के लिए भी यह नीति मुझे कुछ खतरनाक मालूम होती है। इस सम्बन्ध में बात स्पष्ट नहीं हुई है, इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब कुछ बतलायें, कुछ स्पष्ट करें कि यह जो ज्वाइंट इन्वॉयरी की बात है, इसके माने क्या हैं, इसके इम्प्लिकेशन क्या हैं, भाग चल कर क्या होने वाला है? आज यह एक छोटा सवाल नहीं है, एक छोटे देश का सवाल नहीं है, भविष्य में और भी ऐसे प्रश्न उठ सकते हैं। हमारे देश में कुछ हो रहा हो या न हो रहा हो, कल चीन कह सकता है, पाकिस्तान कह सकता है या कोई दूसरा मुल्क कह सकता है कि आपके मुल्क में अमुक बातें हो रही हैं और फिर इसी तरह का चार्ज लगाया जा सकता है और उसके बल पर यह कहा जा सकता है कि ज्वाइंट इन्वॉयरी हो। मैं चाहूंगा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब इसका स्पष्टीकरण करें। इस तरफ मैं उनका ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहूंगा।

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में इधर कई अच्छी बातें भी हुई हैं, जैसे लाओस में। लाओस में जो कुछ हुआ उसका बहुत बड़ा श्रेय हमारे देश को भी है, हमारी सरकार को भी है। जो कुछ खबरें आ रही हैं, वे अगर सही हैं और उनके अनुसार अगर आगे काम चला तो एक संघर्ष का जो क्षेत्र था वहां संघर्ष की संभावना कुछ कम नजर आती है।

दूसरा इसी तरह का अल्जीरिया का प्रश्न है। अल्जीरिया का प्रश्न काफी दिनों से चला आ रहा है। अल्जीरिया के लोगों ने जो त्याग किया, उसके भागे तो हम सब का खिर झुक जाता है। एक बात मेरी समझ में आज तक नहीं आई कि अल्जीरिया की जो क्रांतिकारी सरकार है, वहां के लोगों के जो प्रतिनिधि हैं, उनको हमारी सरकार ने आज तक रिकग्नाइज क्यों नहीं किया? अभी हास

में हम लोगों ने देखा होगा कि उस क्रांतिकारी सरकार ने जो वादा किया था उसको किस सफाई के साथ उसने पूरा किया। शायद जो दूसरा पक्ष था उसने उस सफाई के साथ उसको पूरा नहीं किया। इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि यह क्रांतिकारी सरकार अल्जीरिया के लोगों का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है। शायद इस तरफ पहले ध्यान नहीं गया था, लेकिन अल्जीरिया के जो प्रतिनिधि यहां भारतवर्ष में रहते हैं, उनके सम्बन्ध में जो सलती हुई थी, मुझे सुची है कि हमारी सरकार ने उसका निराकरण किया। इसी तरह से मैं समझता हूँ कि अल्जीरिया की सरकार को स्वीकृति भी मिलनी चाहिये। उनके हित में क्या अच्छा होगा, क्या अच्छा नहीं होगा, इस सम्बन्ध में मैं समझता हूँ कि हम को अल्जीरिया के लोगों से ज्यादा गाहड़ होगा चाहिये और उनकी बात ज्यादा माननी चाहिये, बनिस्बत इस के कि जो हमारे सलाहकार या दूसरे लोग कहें। उनके हित में क्या होगा यह वे ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से कह सकते हैं, बनिस्बत हमारे।

इस में तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई दो रायें इस देश में हैं नहीं और जैसा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने यहां हमारे सदन में प्रश्नों के उत्तर में कहा था कि जहां तक हमारे देश के लिये हथियारों के हासिल करने का सवाल है, वह बिलकुल हमारी मर्जी की बात है— हासिल करने की बात भी और उनका उपयोग करने की बात भी। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस में सारा देश उन के साथ है और इस मुस्तीदी के साथ है कि इस के लिये अगर कुछ बलिदान भी करना पड़े, कुछ आर्थिक क्षति भी उठानी पड़े, इस के लिये अगर हम को किसी तरह का कष्ट भी झेलना पड़े, तब भी मैं समझता हूँ कि सारा देश उन के साथ होगा, इस बात को कायम रखने के

### [श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

लिये कि हमारे देश के भीतरी मामलों में और किसी देश से हम क्या लें, क्या नहीं लें। इस में किसी तरह का प्रत्यक्ष या अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से दखल देने का अधिकार किसी को नहीं, है चाहे वह रूस हो, चाहे अमेरिका हो।

अभी एक बड़ी चीज हमारे देश में हुई और जिस में मुझे खुशी है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर, हमारे प्रेसीडेंट और हमारी सरकार ने भी सहयोग दिया, वह है अणुबम विरोधी सम्मेलन। वह सम्मेलन यदि कुछ और ज्यादा तैयारी के साथ होता, और बड़े पैमाने पर होता, कुछ और ज्यादा दिन चलता और उस का संगठन और ज्यादा अच्छा होता, तो मुझे खुशी होती। लेकिन वैसा नहीं हो सका। फिर भी जो कदम उठाया गया वह सही कदम है। यह ठीक है कि वहां कुछ भिन्न भिन्न तरह की बातें भी हुई, लेकिन जो कुछ वहां हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा, उससे मैं बहुत हद तक सहमत हूँ। हमारे भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति ने यूनिटेल डिस्आरमामेंट की बात कही। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो निःशस्त्रीकरण में विश्वास रखते हैं, जो शांति में विश्वास रखते हैं, उन का यह लाजिकल कान्क्लुजन है, लेकिन थोड़ा अंतर होता है एक आदर्शवादी में और एक डिमाक्रैटिक लीडर में, एक जनतांत्रिक कार्यकर्ता में। एक आदर्शवादी बिना जनता की अपेक्षा किये ही अपने आदर्श के लिये आगे बढ़ सकता है, लेकिन एक मनुष्य जिस को डेमोक्रेटिक तरीके से फंक्शन करना होता है, जिस को जनतांत्रिक तरीके से चलना होता है, उस को कभी कभी अपने विचारों को दबा कर के जनता के साथ चलना पड़ता है। इस प्रकार दोनों में इतना बड़ा अंतर है कि एक आदर्शवादी जनता की राय के विरुद्ध भी कोई फ़ैसला कर सकता है और उस के अनुसार कार्य कर सकता है, लेकिन जिस को जनतांत्रिक तरीके से काम करना पड़ता है, उस के लिये जनता का ख्याल रखना जरूरी

होता है। इसीलिये हमारे भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति ने जो एक आदर्श की बात रखी, वह आदर्श की दृष्टि से सही है लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि आज की परिस्थिति में शायद ही कोई ऐसा देश हो, जो उस को कार्य रूप में परिणत कर सके। इस में समय लगेगा और इस के लिये जनता का शिक्षण होना आवश्यक है, लेकिन इस के माने यह नहीं है कि यह बात नहीं कही जानी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रकाश की किरण को—चाहे वह कितनी ही छोटी क्यों न हो—हमें बराबर प्रज्वलित रखना चाहिये। प्रकाश की किरण चाहे वह छोटी सी ही हो, अंधकार को कुछ न कुछ कम करने में, नष्ट करने में सफल होती है। आज तक कहीं भी यह नहीं देखा गया कि प्रकाश की किरण अंधकार के जोर से नष्ट हो गई हो। घना से घना अंधकार भी प्रकाश की किरण को लुप्त नहीं कर पाता है। प्रकाश की किरण अगर बुझती है तो अपनी कमजोरी से बुझती है, शक्ति के अभाव से, साधन के अभाव से, वह बुझती है, लेकिन कहीं प्रकाश की किरण अंधकार के बल से बुझी हो, ऐसा कभी नहीं नजर आया है। इसलिये प्रकाश की जो किरण है उसे हमें बनाये रखना चाहिये और अपनी शक्ति और सामर्थ्य के मुताबिक इस का समर्थन करना चाहिये और इसका यथासंभव व्यवहार भी करना चाहिये। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, while rising to accord my fullest support to the motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister, I express my gratitude to him for giving us a chance to express our views and comments on the international situation as obtaining at present in relation to India. While moving the motion he took up the disarmament problem and the conference held here in India as the first item. Madam, India has put in consistently and persistently all the efforts possible to see that a climate of peace is established all over the world.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

We have always voiced the same sentiments in all the international conferences but unfortunately in spite of the large number of nations which have been doing a great deal in connection with disarmament conferences, the situation has not improved. The proceedings of the Geneva Conference—I am speaking of the recent conference—reveal that the matter has not been solved to an extent which would warrant felicitations from this House. Sir, while speaking on this problem I am quite conscious of the fact that the nations which are involved in these nuclear experiments must have a full appreciation of the situation. The problem is whether we are going to co-exist or whether we are going to destroy ourselves together. If we opt for the former one there is absolutely no scope for any nuclear experiment. The fact of the matter is that we are non-nuclear powers and what we have in our armoury is the moral and spiritual voice which we can raise and that is the heritage we have received from the Father of the Nation. We can appeal to these powers, \*You have had enough of these experiments. Tarry.' The horrors of the nuclear war must impinge on the conscience of these nuclear powers with terrifying immediacy. That is all I can say. If insanity prevails we have no other remedy except to appeal to these powers who would be mainly responsible if any catastrophe comes down upon the world.

The other problem that the Prime Minister referred to was about Algeria. He expressed his gratification about it and we join him in sending our felicitations to that great country which fought for its liberation. When I use the word 'great' I intentionally use it, meaning not the enormity of the population but the greatness of the people and their valour. About a million Algerians have spilt their blood for the sake of their liberty and that will go down in history as a great

contribution to the history of liberation movement all over the world. Therefore I also join along with the Prime Minister to send my gratification to that nation. I remember, Sir, I said on the floor of this House earlier that the Fourth Republic of France was doomed because the Algerian problem was not solved. It was then that I cautioned—probably it was in 1960—while speaking during a debate on foreign affairs in this House that the Fifth Republic also would meet the same fate if a proper solution was not found. I am happy and I congratulate the President and the Prime Minister of the Republic of France for having found a solution and the time would not be far off when Algeria would be fully independent, and our envoy will be accredited to that country.

The next country referred to by the Prime Minister was Laos. If we go through the proceedings of the International Control Commission, it is a long and tortuous process. It was most amazing sometimes. We thought that next day the matter was going to be solved; it appeared in the Press that everything was satisfactory, everything was O.K. But the next morning there was the mortifying news that whatever had been done was absolutely wiped out. I am happy to know that at present somehow or other better sense has prevailed and the three Princes met together and a solution has been found to establish a Government to the satisfaction of all. This could be done only after three-fourths of the territory came under the influence of Pathet Lao. Anyway I do not want to go in detail into these factors; the three Princes are now together and the portfolios of Defence and Interior have been conceded to Pathet Lao. The matter has ended well and my congratulations to that country too.

The problem of problems that faces us today here in India is that of China

[Shri Satyacharan.] China has become, at least the affairs of China have become, a great irritant to this country. It was probably in 1959 that our relations began to deteriorate. Since then there had been series of conferences, exchange of notes and lodging of protests but unfortunately the more we tried for improving the situation the more it has deteriorated. Now what we have to see at present is whether there could be any improvement in the situation. The hon. Prime Minister has already said that as far as the dispute with this country is concerned, in Ladakh area, there has been some improvement in the Indian position. Now I am also told that we are in a better and more advantageous position than what we were formerly. That is a most heartening news to us.

Now, a certain section of the Press and also some Members have spoken rather disparagingly. I am happy to note, especially in this House Members on the other side have been very charitable; their expressions have been sober and appreciative but I speak at this stage about the debate in the other House.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: On a point of order, Sir, how could an hon. Member ...

SHRI SATYACHARAN: Since I happen to be a citizen of India and since such opinions and expressions get publicity in the Press, I have a right to refer to those matters.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member is not right in saying that.

(Interruptions.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I suggest that it should not be made a practice in this House to refer to debates in the other House? It is a bad practice. Of course, it may be justified technically but it is a bad

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

practice; the other House discussing this House and this House discussing the other House it will get into trouble.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: All right. Sir, I withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask you not to refer to that House.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: I have already withdrawn it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reference that you have made to the other House will be expunged from the proceedings.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: Now, Sir, I was referring to the check p

osts or the border dispute, the delimitation of the border in the Ladakh area. The exact problem before us with which we are at present confronted is this, whether we are going to have a war with China or whether we are going to have negotiations. These are the only two alternatives. If we are going to take recourse to war, the natural consequence would be that we would be damaging our relations with China for generations and generations. Are we prepared for that? Naturally the only course that is left to us is the course of negotiation and rightly the Government of India has been pursuing it. The course of diplomacy is rather a very delicate one. It involves great patience. It involves persuasion and strict vigilance. When I say negotiation, it means that you have to be conscious of your right. At the same time, if by conceding certain things you can gain a greater object for your country, that has to be welcomed. At this hour I am not prepared to speak at length about certain things which have cropped up. The course of negotiator that the Government of India has so far followed has revealed probably that China is also feeling that she has also sinned somewhere. It may take a decade or even more. It does not matter. I say patience is also an element of diplomacy. That is part of

diplomacy. It may take some time. ] am absolutely hopeful that there will be a time when India-China relationship would be much better to our satisfaction and all the acrimony that is prevailing at present would be a thing of the past.

Sir, one thing that I have noticed is most intriguing. At present the Government of India have sent a note to the Government of China. The People's Republic of China did not find any common point of agreement. It relates to the border in the northwest and in the north-east, the point of tri-junction. On the border which we accept in the north-west area of India, there the three countries meet, viz., India, China and Afghanistan; and in the north-east area, India, Burma and China. It is most intriguing to me that China, which had earlier repudiated the claim of Pakistan to these territories, has somehow or other silently acquiesced in it and it appears that there is some sort of conspiracy going on. Even after the Government of India's pressure, the matter has not been properly clarified.

Then, there is also the propaganda unleashed by China I am told that in Latin American countries too China has been carrying on a propaganda of calumny and slander against India, I do not know how far our External Publicity Department had been meeting it, but that is a thing with which we feel concerned. Here, of course, in the Chinese press, we find that our Prime Minister has been charged with designs of aggression and chauvinism. This is too much. As a matter of fact, this is a thing which we not only object to. We think that it is besmirching etiquette and the very canons of decency, involved in the art of journalism.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, I have to speak about the present discussion going on in the Security Council. It is at the instance of the United States of America that Mr.

Francis Plimpton, Mr. Stevenson's deputy, has opened this issue. Why have they opened it? This is not a matter of surmises and conjectures. It is quite clear that this matter has been revived. I thought, or most of us thought, that it was a dead matter. After all Kashmir is a part of our country. It is an integral part of our country. It has been endorsed by a duly represented Council and by popular representatives. Even after that, in spite of perfect and completely democratic elections, it is sought to be revived. It cannot be replaced with the plebiscite and demilitarisation resolution. This is a thing in which we have to find out who are our friends and who are our opponents. This is not an occasion when I should pass any recriminatory remarks. But I have to caution the House. This is the time when we have to be extremely beware of friends and foes, as the conspiracy is going on in the United Nations. That is a thing of concern for all of us. Time does not permit me. I should have thrown some light on some of the excerpts, the very tone of some of the speeches of Ministers of Pakistan. [I only caution the House how successive events would shape. We have to be extremely vigilant, because remember that we have got to safeguard the interest of our country with our blood, with our determination and with whatever we have got. Thank you.

شری اے - ایم - طارق (جموں)  
 اور کشمیر): جناب والا - میں وزیر  
 اعظم کی طرف سے پیش کی گئی  
 خارجہ پالیسی کی حمایت کرتا ہوں -  
 اس کے ساتھ ہی ایک اچھی بات جو  
 میں نے ہاؤس میں پائی وہ یہ ہے کہ  
 اس ہاؤس کے تمام ممبران چاہے وہ  
 حکومت کے ساتھ ہوں یا مخالف  
 جماعتوں کے رہے ہوں اس بات سے

[شہری اے - ایم - طارق]

سب کو اتفاق ہے کہ ہندوستان کے لوگ ایک روٹی کھا کر گزارہ کریں گے لیکن اپنی غیرت پر اپنے ملک کے معاملات پر کسی دوسرے ملک کی سرداری کو تسلیم نہیں کریں گے۔ جناب والا - اس میں کوئی شک نہیں کہ ہندوستان جس خوشحالی کی طرف جا رہا ہے - ہندوستان جس مستقبل کی تعمیر کرنا چاہتا ہے اس میں یہ ضروری ہے کہ ہم باہر کے ملکوں سے اپنے دوست ملکوں سے امداد حاصل کریں لیکن اس کے یہ معنی نہیں ہیں کہ اس امداد کے ساتھ شرائطیں عائد کی جائیں - اس امداد کے ساتھ ہم کو ڈکٹیٹ کیا جائے کہ ہمیں کیا کرنا چاہیئے - جناب والا - میں اس ہاؤس کے عزیز ممبران کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب اس مسئلہ کو کہ ہندوستان کو حکومت امریکہ کی طرف سے امداد ملنی چاہیئے اس کمیٹی میں پھس گیا گیا جس کمیٹی کو اس امداد کی سفارش کرنی تھی تو اس کمیٹی کے چیئرمین مسٹر فلبرائٹ نے جو کہا ہے وہ میں آپ کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں :-

"There is a strong feeling among the members on the attitude of Mr. Krishna Menon, especially on his un-co-operative attitude in the United Nations.

Mr. Fulbright said at a Press Conference that Mr. Menon had adopted a pro-Soviet point of view

on such questions as nuclear testing.

He added that the members of the Committee also appeared to feel strongly about India's use of force in Goa and its refusal to negotiate a settlement on the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan."

جناب والا - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس امداد کے ساتھ اس قسم کے الفاظ کو استعمال کرنا ہندوستان کی خود داری پر حملہ کرنا ہے - حکومت امریکہ ہو یا حکومت انگریز ہو یا یونائیٹڈ نیشن کے ممبران ہوں وہ سب جانتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے درمیان شکایت کسی چیز کی ہے تو کشمیر کی ہے - کشمیر کا مسئلہ متنازعہ نہیں - یہ کوئی تیسپھوت نہیں - کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے اس پر پاکستان نے حملہ کیا اور جب حملہ ہوا تو اس حملہ میں ہندوستان کے شہری مارے گئے - چاہے وہ ہندو تھے یا مسلمان - وہ ہندوستانی تھے - اور حملہ آور پاکستان کے تھے - اس شکایت کو لیکر ہم اقوام متحدہ میں گئے صرف اس خاطر کہ ہم انصاف چاہتے ہیں ہم یہ چاہتے تھے کہ اقوام متحدہ جو دنیا میں امن چاہتا ہے - وہ یہ بتا دے کہ حملہ آور کون ہے اور حملہ کس پر ہوا - لیکن اقوام متحدہ میں صرف بڑی بڑی تقریریں ہوئیں - باجیہٹی جی نے کہا اور گلنا شرمن جی نے بھی کہا آخر ہم اقوام متحدہ کے ملکوں کو سمجھانے میں کامیاب کیوں نہیں ہوئے -

یہ مسئلہ تھا ہے - میں اپنے دوست تو بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ جانتے ہیں کہ مسئلہ کیا ہے اور ان کے دلوں میں یہ حقیقت معلوم ہے کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے لیکن بین الاقوامی حالت اور ہندوستان کی خودداری کو ہر نازک موقع پر تھمس پہنچانے کے لئے اور جب ہندوستان کو کسی بات پر بین الاقوامی قانون کرنا ہوتا ہے تو پاکستان کے ساتھ ملکر اقوام متحدہ میں اس مسئلہ کو اٹھایا جاتا ہے - مسٹر چیورمیں اس مسئلہ میں اقوام متحدہ کے بارے میں مہربانی جو رائے ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ —

وہی قاتل وہی سائل وہی منصف تھہرے۔  
اگر با مہرے کریں قتل کا دعویٰ کس پر -

یعنی اس حملہ کے پیچھے جب پہلی بار اقوام متحدہ نے کشمیر میں کمیشن بھیجا تو اس میں کمیشن کے ایک ذی عزت ممبر ڈاکٹر کھلے جو جیکو سلواکیہ کے نمائندہ تھے انہوں نے پہلی بار دنیا کے سامنے اس سازش کا انکشاف کیا کہ اس کے پیچھے ایک ایٹمی امریکن ہلاک ہے اور وہ چاہتا ہے کہ اس مسئلہ کو کمیشن میں طے نہیں ہونا چاہیے - وہ کونسی کوشش ہے جو ہندوستان کے وزیر اعظم نے نہیں کی - پاکستان کی طرف دوستی کا ہاتھ بڑھایا - جبکہ ایک طرف کشمیر پر حملہ ہو رہا تھا اس پر حمایہ اب بھی جاری ہے - باپو نے کھلے پر وزیر اعظم کی خواہش کے مطابق ہم نے

دروازوں روکے دیتے ہم نے ہر وقت یہ چاہا کہ پاکستان سے ہمارے تعلقات اچھے ہوں - ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہمارا ملک خوشحال رہے - ہمارے پورے ملک ہمسایا ملک خوشحال رہے - لیکن ہر وقت جب جب ہم نے یہ کوشش کی تو اس کا جواب ہمیں کیا ملا - اس کا جواب ہمیں مکہ کی صورت میں ملا - اس کا جواب ہمیں یہ ملا کہ ہم ہندوستان کی سرحدوں کے وزیر پاکستان کے والٹیر بھیجیں گے - ہم ہندوستان کی سرحدوں میں داخلہ کریں گے - اس کے باوجود وہ صورت اب نہیں ہے - میں چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان کی حکومت اور وزیر اعظم ہندوستان واقع طور پر اس ہاؤس کو بتائیں کہ کیا ہم کرنا چاہتے ہیں اور ہمیں کیا کرنا ہے - کیونکہ صورت جب اس حد تک پہنچ گئی ہے - جب ہم کو یہ دھمکیاں دی جا رہی ہیں کہ چند منٹوں میں امرتسر اور دلی اور بمبئی کو تباہ کر دیا جائے گا اور تباہی کے ہتھیار کام میں لائے جائیں گے جو حکومت امریکہ نے حکومت پاکستان کو دیے ہیں - لیکن آج وہ صورت نہیں ہے - پاکستان ہمارا ہمسایا ہے - پاکستان میں رہنے والے ہمارے عزیز ہمارے دوست اور ہمارے بھائی ہیں - بہت سے لوگ ایسے ہیں کہ چلپوں نے ہندوستان کی آزادی میں ہمارا ساتھ دیا، رہنمائی کی - ان میں ایک میں انتصار الدین ہیں - میں ان کو سلام

[شہری اے - ایم - طارق]

بھیجتا ہوں جو ابھی فوت ہوئے ہیں - انسان مرتا ہے لیکن میں انتظار کی صورت کے پیچھے پاکستان حکومت کا جبر ہے۔ یہی صورت بادشاہان کے ساتھ کی جاتی ہے - پاکستان اس جہز پر چیلنج کرتا ہے کہ کشمیر میں استصواب رائے ہونی چاہیئے - لوگوں سے پوچھا جانا چاہیئے - اس وقت جس وقت ہندوستان کی قسمت کا فیصلہ ہو رہا تھا ہندوستان کے لوگ جس وقت آل انڈیا اسٹوٹ پیوپلس کانفرنس کے صدر پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو تھے اس وقت شیخ عبدالہے جیل میں تھے - اس کنیشن کے سامنے جو حکومت برطانیہ نے ہندوستان کا فیصلہ کرنے کے لئے بھیجا تھا اس میں ہم نے کوشش کی - ہم نے ان سے منوانا چاہا اس بارے میں ریاست کے عوام کی رائے پوچھنی چاہی لیکن اس وقت اس کی مخالفت کرنے والی جماعت مسلم لیگ تھی اور اس کے قائد مسٹر جناح تھے جنہوں نے یہ کہا کہ ریاستوں کا فیصلہ ریاست کے راجہ اور نواب کریں گے - ہم نے اس کے خلاف تحریک چلائی لیکن وہ شدت سے دت گئے - جب ہندوستان کی آزادی ہوئی ریاستوں نے اپنی اپنی جگہ تقسیم کی - کشمیر نے یہ فیصلہ کیا کہ ہندوستان میں رہے گا - ہم پر حملہ ہوا - اس کے بعد کشمیر میں کئی الیکشن ہوئے اسمبلی کے الیکشن میں

اور ہر الیکشن میں وہاں کی برسرالقدار پارٹی کی جیت ہوئی - اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ وہاں کے عوام اس بات پر اتفاق کرتے ہیں کہ وہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ رہنا چاہتے ہیں - اس وقت یہ رائے جو تھی وہ صرف کشمیر کے لوگوں کی رائے نہیں جو اب وائے ہوئی اس میں ہر ہندوستانی شامل ہوگا اور کشمیر کی حیثیت ہندوستان کے آئین میں وہی ہے جو ہر ہندوستانی ریاست کی ہے - آج ہندوستان کے صوبوں کی ہندوستان کی سرحدوں کی تقسیم بنا پارلیمنٹ کی مرضی کے کیسے ہو سکتی ہے - ہندوستان اس مسئلہ کو اس نظریہ سے نہیں دیکھ سکتا ہے - پچھلے چودہ پندرہ سالوں میں کشمیر نے بڑی ترقی کی ہے - اب وہاں پہلے جیسی صورت حال نہیں ہے جو اس وقت تھی جب حملہ ہوا تھا - جذبات والا - میں اس مسئلہ کی طرف ان تمام بزرگوں کی توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں جو یہ جاننا چاہتے ہیں کہ سیکورٹی کونسل میں کیا ہو رہا ہے - پچھلے چار پانچ دنوں سے ہندوستان کے لوگ عجیب قسم کی کشمکش میں تھے کہ وہاں کیا ریزولوشن آتا ہے اور ان کے پیچھے کن کن کے ہاتھ ہیں ابھی کل رات ظاہر ہوا کہ اس ریزولوشن میں حکومت انگریز اور حکومت امریکہ کے نمائندے شامل ہیں - کہانا اور جو لے لے رہے ہیں جانبدارانہ صورت اختیار



کی - اور سوویت ریپبلک نے ویٹو استعمال کیا - میں چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم اس بارے میں سوویت ریپبلک کو مبارکباد دیں - اس لئے کہ انہوں نے تصدیق کو ٹھکرا دیا کیونکہ وہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے - وہ سب جانتے ہیں لیکن صرف اس لئے کہ ہمارے ملک کی سیاست ہمارے وزیر اعظم ہر وقت پدیشانی سے مطلع کئے جائیں اس لئے اس قسم کی تصدیکیں اٹھائی جاتی ہیں - اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ جہاں یہ سازش امریکہ کے نیویارک کے وسیع ہال میں چلی تو دنیا کے تمام لوگوں کو یہ کانفیڈنس تھا کہ وہاں ہمارے حق میں فیصلہ ہوگا - لیکن اس بڑی جماعت لانے میں صرف ہونٹائیڈ اسٹیٹس امریکہ کا ہے باقی کا تو ہے - انصاف جسکی طرف ہونا چاہیئے اس کے لئے تو ہے -

اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ آپ لوگوں کو ذی عزت ممبران کو بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج ہمارے ملک میں ایک بہت بڑی سازش چل رہی ہے - ہر ملک کے لوگ جن کا ہم سے اتفاق نہیں ہے ہندوستان کے کچھ لوگ بھی اس سازش کے پیچھے ہیں جو یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے درمیان کشمیر کے مسئلہ پر تنازعہ چلتا رہے - ہاؤس کے سامنے مجھ کو یہ بات کہنے میں کوئی گریز نہیں ہے کہ ہندوستان کے کچھ اخبار پچھلے چار

پانچ چھ دنوں سے متواتر اس چیز کے پیچھے لگے ہوئے ہوں - ہندوستان کے کچھ سیاست دان اس چیز کے پیچھے لگے ہوئے ہیں - جو یہ بات پھیلاتے ہیں کہ پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو کی صحت خراب ہے میں اس دلیل کی تردید کرتا ہوں اور اس کی تردید کرنے والے خود ہمارے جواہر لال نہرو ہیں جو اس وقت مسکرا رہے ہیں - ان کی فوتی اس انداز سے کھینچی جاتی ہے اور دنیا کے ملکوں میں بانٹی جاتی ہے ہندوستان کے کولے کولے میں پھیلائی جاتی ہے جس سے روز بروز جو جواہر لال نہرو کو نہیں دیکھ سکتے انہیں یہ یقین ہو جائے کہ جواہر لال نہرو کی صحت ٹھیک نہیں ہے - کل ہی بمبئی کے ایک اخبار میں ایک تصویر عجب عجب و غریب چھپی ہمارے وزیراعظم کی اور لکھا کہ وزیراعظم کی بیماریوں کا مسئلہ ہے اور اس بیماری کا تذکرہ سڑے باہر کے ملکوں میں بھی کیا جاتا ہے - وہاں آفٹر نہرو - وہاں آفٹر نہرو کا ہم نے فیصلہ کرنا ہے - ہمیں نے فیصلہ کرنا ہے - وہاں آفٹر نہرو میں میں بھی ہو سکتا ہوں - لیکن آپ کون کون ہو سکتے ہیں فیصلہ کرنے والے - یہ ہنسلے کی بات نہیں ہے - میں آپ کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں -

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did Mr. Fulbright?

شری اے - ایم - طارق : ہم فیصلہ

کر سکتے ہیں - فیصلہ اس کا ملک کو اور بھوپیش گپتا کو کرنا ہوگا - اور یقیناً اس کا جواب ملے گا - لیکن میں ہندوستان کے وزیراعظم سے ان دو باتوں

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق] کا جواب چاہتا ہوں جو اقوام متحدہ میں ہمارے خلاف اتنی بڑی سازش کے بارے میں ہے۔ آخر کب تک ہم اس معاملہ کو لٹکنوں کے۔ آخر ہم کب تک اس چھوٹے مسئلہ کو روکیں گے۔ لیکن پاکستان جس وقت سے اسلامی ملکوں میں اور خاص طور سے مڈل ایسٹ کے ملکوں میں ہندوستان کے خلاف نفرت پیدا کر رہا ہے۔ ہندوستان کے خلاف نفرت کا مرکز بنا رہا ہے مڈل ایسٹ میں۔ ہندو اور مسلمانوں کے نام پر۔ اس کے بارے میں ہماری منسٹری ہمارے وزیر خارجہ اور ہمارا پیبلسٹی سیکشن کیا کر رہا ہے۔ میں پرائم منسٹر کو یقین دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ضرورت اس بات کی ہو گئی ہے کہ ہم ان ملکوں میں اپنا ذیلی ڈیولپمنٹ پروگرام اور وہاں کے لوگوں کی توجہ صحیح حالت کی طرف دالیں۔ بات یہ ہے کہ مڈل ایسٹ کنٹریز میں انگریزوں کا اثر ہے اور اس اثر کا فائدہ پاکستان اٹھانا ہے ہندوستان کو بدنام کرنے میں۔

†[श्री ए० एम० तारिक् (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : जनाबेवाला, मैं बच्चीरेआजम की तरफ से पेश की गई खारजा पालिसी की हिमायत करता हूँ। इन के साथ ही एक अच्छी बात जो मैंने हाउस में पाई वह यह है कि इस हाउस के तमाम मेम्बरान चाहे वे हुकूमत के साथी हों या मुखालिफ जमायतों के रहनुमा हों इस बात से सब को इत्फाक है कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोग एक रोटी खा कर

गुजारा करेंगे लेकिन अपनी ग़रत पर, अपने मुल्क के मामलात पर किसी दूसरे मुल्क की सरदारी को तसलीम नहीं करेंगे। जनाबेवाला, इस में कोई शक नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान जिस खुशहाली की तरफ जा रहा है, हिन्दुस्तान जिस मुस्तकबिल की तामीर करना चाहता है उस में यह जरूरी है कि हम बाहर के मुल्कों से, अपने दोस्त मुल्कों से इमदाद हासिल करें। लेकिन उस के यह मायने नहीं हैं कि उस इमदादके साथ शरायतें आयद को जायें, उस इमदाद के साथ हम को डिक्टेट किया जाये कि हमें क्या करना चाहिये या क्या नहीं करना चाहिये। जनाबेवाला मैं, इस हाउस के अजीज मेम्बरान की तवज्जो इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस मसले को कि हिन्दुस्तान को हुकूमत अमरीका की तरफ से इमदाद मिलनी चाहिये उस कमेटी में पेश किया गया जित कमेटी को इस इमदाद की सिफारिश करनी थी तो उस कमेटी के चेयरमैन मि० फुलब्राइट ने जो कहा है वह मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ :—

"There is a strong feeling among the members on the attitude of Mr. Krishna Menon, especially on his un-cooperative attitude in the United Nations.

Mr. Fulbright said at a Press Conference that Mr. Menon had adopted a pro-Soviet point of view on such questions as nuclear testing.

He added that the members of the Committee also appeared to feel strongly about India's use of force in Goa and its refusal to negotiate a settlement on the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan."

जनाबेवाला मैं समझता हूँ कि इस इमदाद के साथ इस फिल्म के अफ़ाज का इस्तेमाल करना हिन्दुस्तान की खुदारी पर हमला करना है? हुकूमत अमरीका या हुकूमत अंग्रेज हो या

यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के मेम्बरान हों वे सब जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के दरम्यान शिकायत किसी चीज की है तो काश्मीर की है। काश्मीर का मसला मुतनाजिया नहीं। यह कोई डिस्पूट नहीं। काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है उस पर पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया और जब हमला हुआ तो उस हमले में हिन्दुस्तान के शहरी मारे गये चाहे वह हिन्दू हों या मुसलमान। वह हिन्दुस्तानी थे और हमलावर पाकिस्तान के थे। इस शिकायत को लेकर हम एक्वाम मुतहिदा में गये सिर्फ इस खातिर कि हम इंसफ चाहते हैं। हम यह चाहते थे कि एक्वाम मुतहिदा तो दुनिया में अमन चाहता है कि वह यह बता दे कि हमलावर कौन है और हमला किस पर हुआ। लेकिन एक्वाम मुतहिदा में सिर्फ बड़ी बड़ी तकरीरें हुईं। वाजपई जी ने कहा और गंगाधरण जी ने भी कहा। आखिर हम एक्वाम मुतहिदा के मुक्तों के समझाने में कामयाब क्यों नहीं हुये। यह मसला क्या है। मैं अपने दोस्तों को बताना चाहता हूँ कि वह जानते हैं कि मसला क्या है और उनके दिलों में यह हकीकत मालूम है कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है लेकिन बेनुलअवामी हालत और हिन्दुस्तान की खुदाओं को हर नाजुक मौके पर टेस पहुंचाने के लिये और जब हिन्दुस्तान को किसी बात पर पिन डाउन करना होता है तो पाकिस्तान के साथ मिल कर एक्वाम मुतहिदा में इस मसले को उठाया जाता है। मि० चेयरमैन इस मसले में एक्वाम मुतहिदा के बारे में मेरी जो राय है वह यह है कि—

यहीं कातिल यहीं सायल यहीं मुंसिफ ठहरे।  
अकरेबा मेरे करें कल का दावा किस पर।  
यानी इस हमले के पीछे जब पहली बार एक्वाम मुतहिदा में काश्मीर में कमीशन भेजा तो उस कमीशन का एक ज़िद्दत मेम्बर डा० खेले जो चैकोस्लोवाकिया के नुमाइन्दे थे उन्होंने पहली बार दुनिया के सामने इस साजिश का इनकसाफ किया कि उसके पीछे एक एंग्लो अमेरिकन ब्लाक है और वह चाहता है कि इस मसले को कमीशन में तय नहीं होना

चाहिये। वह कौनसी कोशिश है जो हिन्दुस्तान के वज़ीरेआजम ने नहीं की। पाकिस्तान की तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया जबकि एक तरफ काश्मीर पर हमला हो रहा था, उस पर हमला अब भी जारी है। बापू के कहने पर वज़ीरे-आजम की स्वाहिश के मुताबिक हमने करोड़ों रुपये दिये। हमने हर वकत यह चाहा कि पाकिस्तान से हमारे ताल्लुकांत अच्छे हों। हम यह चाहते हैं कि हमारा मुल्क खुशहाल रहे। हमारे पड़ोस का मुल्क, हमसाया मुल्क खुशहाल रहे लेकिन हर वकत जब हमने यह कोशिश की तो उसका जबाब हमें क्या मिला। उसका जबाब हमें मुक्के की सूरत में मिला। उसका जबाब हमें यह मिला कि हम हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों के ऊपर पाकिस्तान के बालिष्ठयर भेजेंगे। हम हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों में दाखिला करेंगे। उसके बावजूद वह सूरत अब नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत और वज़ीरेआजम हिन्दुस्तान वाजया तीर पर इस हाउस को बतायें कि क्या हम करना चाहते हैं और हमें क्या करना है। क्योंकि सूरत जब इस हद तक पहुंच गई है जब हम को यह धमकियां दी जा रही हैं कि बंद भिनटों में अमृतसर और दिल्ली और बम्बई को तबाह कर दिया जायेगा और तबाही के हथियार काम में लाये जायेंगे जो हुकूमत अमरीका ने हुकूमत पाकिस्तान को दिये हैं। लेकिन आज वह सूरत नहीं है। पाकिस्तान हमारा हमसाया है। पाकिस्तान में रहने वाले हमारे अजीज, हमारे दोस्त और हमारे भाई हैं। बहुत से लोग ऐसे हैं जिन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी में हमारा साथ दिया, रज्जुमाई की। उनमें एक मियां इफतखारुद्दीन हैं। मैं उनको सलाम भेजता हूँ जो अभी फौत हुये हैं। इन्सान मरता है लेकिन मियां इफतखार की मौत के पीछे पाकिस्तानी हुकूमत का जबर है। यहीं सूरत बादशाह खान के साथ की जाती है। पाकिस्तान इस चीज पर चैलेंज करता है कि काश्मीर में इस्तसबाव राय होनी चाहिये। लोगों से पूछा जाना चाहिये। उस वकत जिस

[श्री ए० एम० तारीक]

वक्त हिन्दुस्तान की किस्मत का फैसला हो रहा था, हिन्दुस्तान के लोग, जिस वक्त ऑल इण्डिया स्टेट पीपल्स कांफ्रेंस के सदस्य पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू थे उस वक्त शेर अब्दुल्ला खान में थे, उस कमीशन के सामने जो हुकूमत बरतानिया ने हिन्दुस्तान का फैसला करने के लिये भेजा था उसमें हमने कोशिश की। हमने उनसे मनवाना चाहा, इस बारे में रियासत के अबाम की राय पूछनी चाही लेकिन उस वक्त उसकी मुलाजकत करने वाली जमायत मुस्लिम लीग थी और उसके कायल मि० जिन्ना थे, जिन्होंने यह कहा कि रियासतों का फैसला रियासत के राजा और नवाब करेंगे। हमने उसके खिलाफ तहरीक चलाई लेकिन वह शिद्वत से डट गये। जब हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी हुई रियासतों अपनी अपनी जगह तकसीम की, काश्मीर ने यह फैसला किया कि हिन्दुस्तान में रहेगा, हम पर हमला हुआ। उसके बाद काश्मीर में कितने इलैक्शन थे, असेम्बली के इलैक्शन हुये और हर लैक्शन में वहां को बरसरे इक्वेटरी पार्टी की जीत हुई। उसके मायने यह है कि वहां के अबाम इस बात पर इतनाक करते हैं कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहना चाहते हैं। उस वक्त यह राय जो थी वह सिर्फ काश्मीर के लोगों की राय थी जो अब राम होगी उसमें हर हिन्दुस्तानी शामिल होगा और काश्मीर की हैसियत हिन्दुस्तान के आइन में वही है जो हर हिन्दुस्तानी रियासत की है। आज हिन्दुस्तान के सुबों की, हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों की तकसीम बिना पार्लियामेंट की मर्जी के कैसे हो सकती है। हिन्दुस्तान इस मसले को इस नजरिये से नहीं देख सकता है। पिछले चौदह पन्द्रह सालों में काश्मीर ने बड़ी तरक्की की है। अब वहां पहली जैसी सुरतेहाल नहीं है जो उस वक्त थी अब हमला हुआ था। जनाबेवाला मैं इस मसले की तरफ इन तमाम बुजुगों की तबज्जो दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो ये जानना चाहते हैं कि सिक्किमिटी काँसिल

में क्या हो रहा है। पिछले चार पांच दिनों से हिन्दुस्तान के लोग अजीब किस्म की कशमकश में थे कि वहां क्या रेजोल्यूशन आशा है और उसके पीछे किन किन के हाथ हैं। अभी कल रात जाहिर हुआ कि इस रेजोल्यूशन में हुकूमते अंग्रेज और हुकूमते अमरीका के नुमाइन्दे शामिल हैं। घाना और यू० ए० आर० ने गैर जानिवदाराना सूरत अख्तियार की और सोवियत रशिया ने बीटो इस्तैमाल किया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम इस बारे में सोवियत रशिया को मुबारिकवाद दें। इसलिये कि उन्होंने तहरीक को ठुकरा दिया क्योंकि वह समझते हैं कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है। वह सब जानते हैं, लेकिन सिर्फ इसलिये कि हमारे मुल्क की सियासत, हमारे वज्जिरेआज्जम हर वक्त परेशानी से मुत्तला किये जायें, इसलिये इस किस्म की तहरीकें उठाई जाती हैं। इसके साथ ही साथ जहां वह साजिश अमरीका के न्यूयार्क के वसीह हाल में चली तो दुनियां के तमाम लोगों को यह कांफिडेंस था कि वहां हमारे हक में फैसला होगा। लेकिन इस बड़ी जमायत में सिर्फ यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स अमरीका का 'यस' है बाकी का 'नो' है। इंसफ जिसकी तरफ होना चाहिये उसके लिये 'नो' है।

इस के साथ ही साथ आप लोगों को, जीइज्जत मैन्वरान को बताना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारे मुल्क में एक बड़ी साजिश चल रही है। हर मुल्क के लोग जिनका हमसे इतिफाक नहीं है, हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ लोग भी इस साजिश के पीछे हैं जो ये चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान गौर पाकिस्तान के दरम्यान काश्मीर के मसले पर तनाज्या चलता रहे। हाउस के सामने मुझ को यह बात कहने में कोई गुरेज नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ अखबार पिछले चार पांच छः दिनों से मुतवातिर इस चीज के पीछे लगे हुये हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ सियासतदान इस चीज के पीछे लगे हुये हैं जो यह बात फैलाते हैं कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की सेहत खराब है। मैं इस दलील की तरदीद करता हूँ

और इसकी तरदीद करने वाले खुद हमारे जवाहरलाल नेहरू हैं जो इस वक्त मुसकुरा रहे हैं। उनकी फोटो इस अंदाज से खींची जाती है और दुनिया के मुल्कों में बांटी जाती है, हिन्दुस्तान के कौने कौने में फँसाई जाती है जिससे रोज़बरोज जो जवाहरलाल नेहरू को नहीं देख सकते उन्हें यह यकीन हो पाये कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू की सेहत ठीक नहीं है। कल ही बम्बई के एक अखबार में एक तस्वीर अजीबोगरीब छी है हमारे वज़ीरेआज़म की और लिखा कि वज़ीरेआज़म की बीमारी सारे कौम का मसला है और इस बीमारी का तसकरा सारे बाहर के मुल्कों में भी किया जाता है। व्हाँट आपटर नेहरू। व्हाँट आपटर नेहरू का हमने फँसला करना है। मैंने फँसला करना है। व्हाँट आपटर नेहरू में मैं भी हो सकता हूँ। लेकिन आप कौन हो सकते हैं फँसला करने वाले। यह हंसने की बात नहीं है। मैं आपकी तबज्जो इस तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did Mr. Fulbright?

श्री ए० एम० त्रारिक : हम फँसला कर सकते हैं। फँसला इसका मुल्क को और भूपेश गुप्ता को करना होगा। और यकीनन इसका जवाब मिलेगा। लेकिन मैं हिन्दुस्तान के वज़ीरे-आज़म से इन दो बातों का जवाब चाहता हूँ जो एक्वाम मुतहिदा में हमारे खिलाफ़ इतनी बड़ी साज़िश के बारे में है। आखिर कब तक हम इस मामले को लटकायेंगे। आखिर हम कब तक इस छोटे मसले को रोकेंगे। लेकिन पाकिस्तान जिस वक्त से इस्लामी मुल्कों में और खास तौर से मिडिल ईस्ट के मुल्कों में हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ़ नफरत पैदा कर रहा है हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ़ नफरत का मरकज़ बना रहा है मिडिल ईस्ट में, हिन्दू और मुसलमानों के नाम पर, इसके बारे में हमारी मिनिस्ट्री हमारे वज़ीरेखारजा और हमारा पब्लिसिटी सैकशन क्या कर रहा है। मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर को यकीन दिलाना चाहता

हूँ कि ज़रूरत इस बात की हो गई है कि हम इन मुल्कों में अपना डेलीगेशन भेजें और वहाँ के लोगों की तबज्जो सही हालात की तरफ़ डालें। बात यह है कि मिडिल ईस्ट वॉटरीज में अंग्रेजों का असर है और उस असर का फायदा पाकिस्तान उठाता है, हिन्दुस्तान को बदनाम करने में।]

श्री सभापति : एक साहब और बोलने वाले हैं और उसके बाद वज़ीरेआज़म बोलेंगे।

Mr. Sudhir Ghosh, I am afraid I will be able to give you only ten minutes and then the Prime Minister will speak.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make only a few very brief remarks about the difficulties of India-America relations today and a few very brief remarks on disarmament and nuclear tests, and I will do that in ten minutes.

There has been a very great deal of excitement in this House and outside about the various unimportant matters like some interview given by our Ambassador in the United States, a lot of meaningless talks about whether our Defence Minister is popular or is not popular in the United States as if it is necessary for a Minister of the Government of India to be popular in some other country apart from securing popularity in his own country. There has already been a great deal of resentment about the failure of the American Government to give us this year more money than they gave us last year. They expect to maintain the same level of assistance as they gave us last year, but it seems that the extra money which President Kennedy proposed to give us has been knocked off by the American Parliament. There has also been a lot of talk about the possible causes of the postponement of the May meeting of "the so-called Aid India Club where the American went with their five

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.] hundred million dollars, but the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Canada and Japan pleaded that they needed more time to secure the other five hundred million dollars. There has also been a lot of talk about the American excitement, about the report that they had heard about the possibility—not a decision, but a possibility—of India acquiring supersonic MIGs from Soviet Russia, Mr. Chairman, as one listens to all these excited talks on both sides, the American as well as the Indian sides—some of these matters are obviously of a trivial nature— one wonders what is wrong, what is wrong between the Americans and the Indians today. And as I analyse the Indo-American relations, I see that there is one thing which is seriously wrong, and that is, the supply of American arms to Pakistan. It should be obvious to any reasonable and intelligent American that Pakistan stands in no military danger from India. And yet, a few years ago, the late Mr. John Foster Dulles—may his soul rest in peace—decided in his wisdom to make a military agreement with Pakistan and under that agreement very considerable supplies of American arms and very modern American military equipment have been made to Pakistan and are being made today. Indeed, it is the supply of American arms which has made it difficult for India and Pakistan to come closer to each other and get out of the way the various problems that divide them, including the Kashmir problem.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt at all about the sincerity and the genuine anxiety of President Kennedy and other American leaders to see the Kashmir problem solved and to see that peace, real peace, is established between India and Pakistan, so that both these countries can move forward towards the goal of freedom from poverty for their own people. After all, it was the American President who got the

World Bank to go out of their way to get together 1,100 million dollars, to find a solution of the Canal Waters Dispute which plagued India and Pakistan for years. Last year, it was President Kennedy who by putting forward on his own 1,000 million dollars forced the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Canada and Japan to promise to put forward the other 1,000 million dollars which we needed for the first and the second years of our Third Five Year Plan. I think it would be uncivilised on our part not to acknowledge the fact that the Americans have so far given us, in different shapes and forms, a total of more than 4,000 million dollars to finance our Five Year Plans. But all this generosity is tarnished by this unpleasant fact of American arms supplies to Pakistan. Our American friends do not seem to see the extraordinary lack of logic in the position taken by them when they, on the one hand, desire peace between Pakistan and India and on the other, continue to supply arms to Pakistan, even when they themselves admit that Pakistan stands in no military danger from India. It is difficult for anyone of us to understand how they simultaneously supply F-104 supersonic jets to Pakistan and also get greatly agitated about the report that they have heard about the possibility of India acquiring MIG supersonic jets from some other source. The relationship between America and India will never be what it should be so long as American arms supplies to Pakistan continue.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my own way attempted to bring sharply to the notice of some of my American friends in Washington who occupy positions of authority in that country this extraordinary lack of logic in the position taken by them in their treatment of India and Pakistan. And I have reasons to believe that this realisation is very gradually dawning

upon them. I venture to think that if the American Government today stops military assistance to Pakistan and gives to both the countries only economic assistance to help them to solve the problem of poverty and then even if they reduce India's share of American assistance and give that extra bit to Pakistan, no reasonable Indian is going to resent it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: One word, Mr. Chairman and I sit down. And that one more word is about disarmament and nuclear tests. As we go about our business in the world today, we do not seem to realise how near—how desperately near—we are to a thermo-nuclear holocaust. The other day in the Anti-Nuclear Armaments Convention in this City, an eminent Russian physicist pointed out that due to a mere mistake or accident, mankind may be involved at any moment in a nuclear war which may render this beautiful earth unfit for human habitation. He mentioned how a few months ago rays of light projected on radar equipment hit the moon and the reflection produced on American detecting instruments was such that they thought that this was the indication of the coming of the Inter Continental Ballistic Missile from the other side, and disaster was a very near thing. This sort of accident may happen any one of these days either on the Russian side or on the American side. Therefore, there is no time to be lost. Disarmament alone can restore to the nations of the world the sense of security which they used to have with weapons to defend, the security which they lost when weapons became able only to retaliate but not to defend.

The Disarmament Conference at Geneva has become a very disheartening spectacle. We have got to accept the fact that it is not going to produce any tangible or concrete result, because Mr. Khrushchev has

made it a duty to plain that he looks upon the people who have been talking at Geneva as a gathering of people whom he continuously describes as mere bureaucrats. He has made it plain that no Russian—not even his own Foreign Minister—will be permitted to make any concessions and no real progress in the disarmament negotiations can be made until he, Mr. Khrushchev, personally meets

Mr. Kennedy. I wonder there. 4 P.M. fore if our Prime Minister

does not see any light on this problem of how to bring about a meeting now—a so-called summit meeting—between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy. Last February Mr. Khrushchev had written to our Prime Minister and as far as we know, Mr. Khrushchev was very eager for our Prime Minister to go to this summit meeting which Mr. Khrushchev wanted in Geneva. I wonder if it is not possible for our Prime Minister to pick up the thread where it was left off last February and do everything in his power to bring about this summit meeting. Sir, I do not suggest this for the sake of the aggrandizement of our country or our Government. I suggest this in the name of our children, and when I say "our children", I mean children, black or white, Asian or African, European or American, whose birthright it is to inherit this beautiful earth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने कल ही अपना नाम बोलने के लिये दे दिया था लेकिन अफसोस की बात है कि मैं अभी तक बैठा रहा और मुझे कोई मौका इसके लिये नहीं दिया गया। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी भी एक ऐसी पार्टी है जोकि यहाँ अपनी एक हैसियत रखती है और देश में भी रखती है। यह अच्छा होता कि

## [श्री गोड़े मुराहूर]

प्रधान मंत्री हमारे विचारों की भी सुन लें। मैं चाहूंगा कि अभी ही हमें यह मौका मिल जाय।

श्री सभापति : मेरे ह्याल में बहुत से लोगों को मौका दिया गया। जितना वक्त था उसको अच्छी तरह से इस्तेमाल किया गया है। यह तो ही नहीं सकता है कि सब को मौका मिल जाय। मेरे पास बीस नाम थे और उनमें से काफी नाम मैंने बूलाये हैं, काफी लोग बोलें हैं।

श्री गोड़े मुराहूर : मैंने देखा है कि बहुत से नये नाम भी आये हैं। अच्छा होता कि जो प्रशंसा की गई है उसमें से वक्त काट कर के कुछ मुझे दे दिया जाता।

श्री सभापति : आप तशरीफ रखिये। मैंने काफी वक्त उधर के लिये दे दिया है।

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Mr. Chairman, since I spoke this morning, news has come to us about the fate of the discussion about Kashmir in the Security Council. It appears that a resolution was introduced in the name of Ireland; the Irish delegate who introduced it. It was supported by the permanent delegates, that is, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Formosan China and two of the South American states, Venezuela and Chile, and it was opposed by two neutrals, Ghana and the U.A.R., and opposed also by the Soviet Union and Rumania. Now the opposition action of the Soviet Union that has voted against is called loosely a veto. What the Charter of the United Nations desires is that the five permanent Members of the Security Council should vote together in a Resolution. If one votes against, it is called a veto—it is non-voting or voting against. Anyhow the Soviet Union voted against it. As a result, as it is called, it was a veto by the Soviet Union, and it is supposed to

be the 100th veto that the Soviet Union has exercised in the last fifteen years. A long discussion has taken place about this matter in the Security Council, and our representative, our Defence Minister, spoke at some length expressing his deep sorrow that this Resolution should have been brought forward and, more especially, that Ireland should have brought it forward. And others also spoke. Now the resolution is over and the proceedings are over. But it is a matter for deep regret to me that repeatedly, when matters concerning subjects which concern us greatly, about which we feel rather passionately almost, subjects like Goa and subjects like Kashmir crop up, it should be our misfortune that two great powers, the United States and the United Kingdom, should almost invariably be against us. In a matter like Goa every Member of this House knows how strongly we felt about it and how, in spite of our feeling, we delayed any action till it was almost thrust upon us by circumstances. Yet, this was made an occasion for reading to us homilies and lecturing to us as to why we should behave properly in international matters. In regard to Kashmir also, I suppose in the course of the last fourteen or fifteen years, the facts relating to Kashmir have been so often stated that they must be known, at any rate, to responsible people, men who speak in the Security Council and yet, the patent fact that it was India that brought this matter before the Security Council and brought it complaining of aggression by or through Pakistan has not yet received the full-blooded attention of the Security Council. Always India and Pakistan have been placed, notably by those two powers, on the same level. "It is a dispute", they say, "between two quarrelling people, that they should sit down and settle it." We are prepared to sit down at any time with anybody, even

with people who have done wrong. But this approach has been extraordi-



nary. The United Nations' Commissions have come here, individuals have come here; we have got about ten fat printed volumes, of papers connected with Kashmir. In spite of this, these patent facts have not been realised by them in the Security Council as one would have hoped for. So the only other conclusion one could come to is, having realised them they do not like them, because they have made up their minds, to go in a certain way, to decide some-thing in a particular way, and facts are not important, the fact of aggression, the fact of accession, the constitutional aspect, the legal aspect about which I said something, and, quite apart from all these aspects, also the fact of the consequences of any action that they suggest. Now we are reminded of the resolutions passed in 1946 and 1949 by the United Nations Security Council and by the Commissions they sent, which we accepted, and the very first thing in that resolution was that Pakistan should vacate. Then other questions arose. Now it does not strike the distinguished representative of the United States or the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom to lay stress on the fact that Pakistan has not vacated and has not carried out the Security Council resolution for these fourteen years, and they always go on saying that India has refused to have a plebiscite. We agreed to a plebiscite, and I have no doubt we would have had the plebiscite then and there if Pakistan had withdrawn, its forces, and in the normal course steps would have been taken. But they never withdrew their forces—that was an essential part. Now I am not going into the Kashmir issue here, but I express my deep sorrow that this should be so. As an hon. Member just said, the United States, in addition to this fact, or, maybe, as a consequence of it—I do not know which—gives military aid to Pakistan, which leads to all kinds of consequences. I leads to an aggressive attitude on the part of Pakistan, constantly speakin?

in terms of war. Almost every day or every other day, in the Pakistan newspapers there is something about some kind of aggression on India being thought of, if not by regular armies, by tribal hordes which, consequently, produces reaction on Indian opinion when India feels so strongly over this issue. Well, any person would realise that giving this arms, aid to Pakistan is likely to hurt India, not only to hurt us mentally but physically hurt us and drive us into spending more and more. We are getting aid for civil work and we are very grateful for that aid. But at the same time other steps are taken, like the military aid to Pakistan which compel us, out of our slender resources, to spend more money on defence. All this is very illogical and I really do not understand how these great statesmen of the United States and the United Kingdom fit in all this in their thinking. They are democratic societies and they are pushed hither and thither by the pressure of public opinion or by lobbies or by their Parliament as we are. I wish they would realise that there is such a thing as public opinion in India, there is such a thing that no Government in India can ignore—it is only to some extent that it can press the public to go this way or that way—and that things are done in regard to matters to which we are passionately devoted, which hurt and injure that public opinion. It is very much so and which, unfortunately, create a result which we do not want, that is, creates doubt in our minds about the goodwill of these countries towards India, and unfortunately the work done for years, the work of creating that goodwill which we value so much, is washed out by a stroke of pen or a vote given, or by a speech given. The speech given on the occasion in the Security Council by the distinguished representative of the United States about Goa hurt us, annoyed us, irritated us, angered us. It had nothing to do with the facts. It was based simply on certain

[b]hri Jawaharlal Nehru. J assumptions and, I regret to say probably, to the dislike of India and all that India stands for. And now the same distinguished representative tells us what to do about Kashmir not realising that Kashmir is flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone and all that we know about the facts ar.d about the law are in our favour. However, there it is. Unfortunately, much of the good that we have done in regard to relations with countries—I would not say it is washed out because good work always remains and brings its own result—the immediate effect of it is lessened. And I have no doubt that we shall now have a plethora of good advice from newspapers in America as to how we a"e not behaving properly in Kashmir and how the Soviet Union has misbehaved by voting against the matter.

In this connection I might deal with the issue of the so-called MIGs. Now, the facts are quite simple. At no time did I think that this matter would become the major international issue. Our defence forces, perhaps rightly or perhaps not—I do not know—were agitated ever since the United States gave these sabre jets to Pakistan. No defence force is ever satisfied with what it has. It wanted to make its position more assured. So, they were pointing out that in certain respects Pakistan was stronger in the air than we were and they wanted, naturally, the latest type. For my pa^t I believe, as a practical proposition, it is better to have a second rate thing made in our own country than to rely on the first rate thing which we have to import and which may stop functioning for lack of spare parts or anything. Therefore, our policy has been to make things and we have succeeded very largely. The Defence Minister has particularly laid stress on this and our manufactures in our ordnance factories have grown up tremendously.

Apart from that, we have made right from scratch a very fine supersonic aircraft in Bangalore with the

help of a very eminent German Engineer. But to reproduce it, to make more of it, takes time. It will take two or three years before any numbers are available. If we have them, we would not require anything else. We have made the Avro almost from scratch. We got the blueprint from England and we have made such a good transport plane that some of our nearby foreign countries want to buy off even before we have made it. So, we are concentrating.

So, when our defence people felt anxious, we thought immediately of the manufacture of a plane rather than merely buying it. It is getting terribly expensive, buying these goods and we have to buy to begin with. But we do not want to continue this process. Fortunately, we have got the most excellent engineers and mechanics in our Air Force, those who are in charge of the Avro being made at the Hindustan Aircraft Factory. They are first class men. And what is more to the point, they are men with enthusiasm for their job, not merely as a professional job, but they like building up things for India. So, tbiu was the position. We examined various other plans. We had plenty of information about supersonic aircraft, American, British, French. Some of them were flown by our people too, and they gave us their report in regard to them.

Meanwhile some of our first class engineers were sent by us to the Soviet Union to enquire whether they could make an engine or supply us with an engine for our supersonic aircraft made at Bangalore because the engine we had got from England for it had ceased—not that engine—they had stopped making that type of engine for various reasons. It had nothing to do with us. We were suddenly hard put to it. So, these people were sent out to find out about the engines and they remained there for some weeks, carefully examined the engines, talking, discussing. The engine that

"the Soviet offered us was excellent but it did not fit into our aircraft. They said, "Change the aircraft". We said, "No. We cannot change the aircraft. You change the engine.". There was a long argument as to which was to be changed. Ultimately they agreed to change the engine to fit in with the aircraft. That is the present position.

Only about four or five days ago another team of officers has gone to Moscow about the engine, to decide about small matters as to how that engine is to be fitted in. While this team was previously there, they were interested as experts in the MIG. There was no offer from us, no suggestion from us to my knowledge—certainly I do not know anything about it—but they enquired about the MIG. They saw it. They wanted to offer it. They discussed with the engineers. And it may interest you, Sir, to know about the new language that is growing up, the language of science and technology. To our surprise, our engineer, who does not know a word of Russian but who was a very good engineer, discussed with the Russian engineer without any interpreter in some technical language, which I do not understand, for quite a long time- This language is developing, technical language, words, etc. So, these people when they came back, they reported to us. About the MIG they said that for variety of reasons they thought that the MIG was a good proposition for us. So far as the performance is concerned, they said the performance is about the same as the American or the French Mirage but it was probably more suitable for us. It was meant for rougher work. It could land on not very special airfields but ordinary fields, ordinary air-strips. And it was easier to manufacture. It was not so sophisticated and so complicated as the American or the Mirage was. That is important because although we have developed a great deal in our technology and in our manufacture of aircraft and others, still obviously we cannot compare ourselves with

experienced technicians in America or in Russia or in England when it is a sophisticated thing. And they said that from the ease of manufacture also the MIG was desirable, apart from other reasons. Their performance was the same and the price was much less. That is the first we heard of it. Well, we discussed it amongst ourselves. And just then somehow—I forget how—it got out into the press, not only in the press here, but in the press of England, American, a"nd may be in other places, and then to our great surprise there was a tremendous noise elsewhere. We had not looked upon it in this way. We thought it was relatively a simple operation of our buying anything that we chose to.

Now, may I go back a little and tell another story about the purchase of aircraft from the Soviet Union? About six years ago we were again confronted with the fact that Pakistan had got some aircraft from America and was ahead of us and we were worried about it and we wanted some aircraft,—not to manufacture them—we did not think of it—but just to buy them. And among the things proposed to us was some Ilyushin aircraft, fighter aircraft, which we might buy from the Soviet Union. Now, till then we had not bought any aircraft except from England or America or France. We had not gone outside that charmed circle. Now, it so happened that a Minister of the United Kingdom was here then—I forgot who he was. Anyhow, he was here and we discussed it with him. He said, "You are going out and if you buy these Russian aircraft"—there was no question of aid, mind you, this is a new question which has arisen—"It will hurt us very much. We have dealt with each other all this time and now you go outside and buy abroad." So he pleaded against it. We had in fact, thought of Russia only because the British people had refused us delivery. They could not supply us with that type of aircraft. Then he said, "No. we shall go and see to it that you get it," although previously, to our enquiry, they had said they

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] could not, now they said they would *get* it. Well, rightly or wrongly, we decided to buy English aircraft then, when they promised to give us these in quick time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When was this, in point of time?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: About six years back, I think. And at that time, I wrote a letter to the Prims Minister of the United Kingdom—not the present Prime Minister, but his predecessor—saying something about this, because he had written to me, I think, and I repli

ed to it, and we said that we would not give up the freedom to buy anything from where we like and when we like and that should be admitted. In the present case we said, "as you are prepared to supply what we want—previously you were not—we will buy it." I added that because of our relations, if we want to buy anywhere else, we shall previously let you know and consult you and then decide, the decision being ours. This happened some six or seven years ago and I had practically forgotten it, because there was nothing very important about it. But" I am mentioning it now because when this question arose in this case, I was reminded of this letter and told that I had promised to consult them and to give them a chance before we came to a final decision. I told them that we had consulted our experts and they had considered various aircraft in England, America, France and Russia. They are good aircraft—it is not for me to say—but some are a little more complicated, some are a little more sophisticated, and some are simpler. That is the position. Now, it is patent that no independent country and certainly not India, can agree to the proposition that our purchases of aircraft or anything can be vetoed by another country. It is an impossible thing to agree to. And nofedy has said that to us, I must say that no

one nas mentioned this. They have all agreed that we can buy where we like and what we like. Nevertheless they expressed their regret and sorrow that we should go and buy elsewhere, other than from their own markets. And behind it ail, although it is not said as a threat, behind it all is the question of aid. "Aid will be given," they say, "we shall try our best it will come" and so on. Nevertheless as someone said, although there are no strings attached, something happens that is in its very nature, some kind of a thread, it may be a thin thread, but something which may have a certain psychological effe

ct. We are quite clear in our mind. We have not considered the matter sufficiently. We considered it then and we postponed it then, partly because I was going away and because the Defence Minister was going away. I was going to Kashmir. We shall consider it again from every point of view. But speaking for myself, I have a tendency to resist large sums of money being spent on aircraft or any machines which are very costly and which are out of date after two or three years. It is extraordinary that these aircraft that we are talking about supersonic aircraft, are in fact, out of date in big countries. They send us something out of date; because they have moved to the next stage of unmanned missiles. These are manned aircraft, dangerous things for the man inside. A number of accidents occur. You see frequently in the newspapers a small item of news on the Indian Air Force, something about an accident. It may look a small thing, but it is a serious thing, for whenever an accident occurs we lose one of our bright pilots, whom we have trained for years. It is bad enough to lose the plane, but it is much worse to lose the pilot of it who is a precious person. These things occur in every country—I am not talking of India alone—and when you enter the jet age, the accidents mount up. If we buy a dozen aircraft, we shall have

to be prepared to see a number of them go under, plus the pilot who flies them. So I don't like these. I would much rather have, although it is the next stage, the unmanned missile. There is no pilot there, at any rate. It is more expensive and it is the next development. Now, most of the modern weapons used by the great powers have gone beyond the old style manned aircraft. These are now meant for petty work. Even these latest type of aircraft are out of date, because now they use unmanned missiles, ballistics and What not, with no man put there but simply electronic devices and so forth. So, it is a matter for us to consider how far it is worth while for us to spend a large sum of money on things which will be out of date soon. One has to consider the element of risk in not having it during the period, two or three years by which time, I hope, our supersonic thing will be ready. I am taking the House into my confidence and telling things which are really not mentioned in public but I think we should know what the position is. Apart from this, our coming to a decision on the other facts, one thing is certain, that is, in coming to a decision we are not going to be governed or influenced by either pressure tactics from outside or hopes that aid will come if we did not do it. We want badly aid for our civil, economic programmes. All our Five Year Plans, etc., depend on that aid but we are not going to take that aid or ask for that aid if it means giving up our independence in any respect. Now, I was glad, therefore, that in this matter of MIGs, to observe that those hon. Members who referred to it, although there were differing opinions in many ways, different groups, parties, opinions and almost as the poles as under in other matters, did agree about this, that it is improper for any country to put pressure on us to buy or not buy a particular type of aircraft that we want. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I can understand, for various reasons would

say that but Mr. Vajpayee also said

that and that was a peculiar combination.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But I might as well add that he is combining with you in this matter. That is also a peculiar combination.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha also said it. In this matter there is a certain unanimity which is as it should be. We shall consider this entirely from the point of view of what is necessary and right for India and not be influenced by these pressure tactics and hints almost threats, that aid will be lessened or will not come. It is not that we do not want aid but this is not a matter to be decided this way or that way now. It is a recurring matter. If we surrender our basic position in this now, we shall have to surrender tomorrow, next year and all the time. It will be said that we create a precedent which is bad for ourselves as well as for others. So much for that but I would remind the House that all this business of our buying these MIGs or any aircraft arose because the United States has supplied sabre jet aircrafts to Pakistan. In a sense, in that sense, the responsibility is theirs for taking a step which creates these far-reaching repercussions.

Now, Sir, I should like to come to another subject.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Have they been told that the responsibility is theirs?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Talks? It is patent and it is a fact. I might tell you that it is a fact. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta seemed to doubt my statement and, therefore, I repeat. We have not made any offer to the Soviet Government nor has the Soviet Government made any offer but it is so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I accept that. I never questioned that. I only pointed out from the Prime Minister's speech that it was a negotiation. It

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] may not be technically an offer or a request for supply.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The fact is that we have not even negotiated with them but these original enquiries were made by a team. You might call this a negotiation but it is not. We shall have to send another team to negotiate. Negotiations will come then but obviously one can understand that all this shouting in the world's press must have reached the acute ears of the Soviet Government too. It is obvious. They must know and they must have reacted to it.

Now, I should like to refer to something which I consider rather odd, the hon. Prof. Ruthnaswamy's speech. He said that there should be no ideology in foreign policy. That statement may or may not be true but I do not understand what he means by ideology. For instance, he said that ideology means our policy of non-alignment. That itself is an ideology. That, if you permit me to say so, boron the nonsense saying that. I am sorry that he is wasting perhaps . . .

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Not fantastic nonsense, I hope.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: . . . because for a variety of reasons, broadly speaking, I entirely accept that a foreign policy is there to protect the country's interests. What the country's interests are is another matter. A foreign policy has often to change, not the basis of it but the expression of it, the details of it, if the position changes in the world. Non-alignment means independence of one's foreign policy. That is all it means, not trying yourself up in a military way with other countries which ties you up in your foreign policy and in every case, even in war and peace, you are tied up. Therefore, you should keep your independence to that extent. I am not prepared to say that every country should do that. It may be situated in such a way that some small

countries cannot afford that. That is-a different matter although I think, in the conditions as they are in the world today, it is far better for the small countries as well as for the big ones not to be aligned to any power bloc. When we talk about alignment we talk about alignment with military power blocs, military alliances. I am not again talking about the Arthashastra or the Maha-bharata or the Ramayana, of alliances then but in the circumstances of the world today where there are two big military blocs carrying on a cold war, I say it is utterly wrong and dangerous and futile for a country to be part of a military bloc, most dangerous. Of course, it is going to cost your independence. If you are a strong country, then two strong countries having an alliance affect each other maybe but a weak country and a strong country having alliances simply means that you are dragged by the coat tails by the strong country and today it means in the world joining in this present game of the cold war, that hateful" thing, abominable thing, I think it is, and a thing which if not stopped fairly soon will take the world to uttermost disaster.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: May I ask the Prime Minister if Pakistan is suffering horribly from the military alliance with U.S.A.?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not wish to say much about Pakistan but Pakistan has suffered very greatly and will suffer more if this thing goes on because Pakistan depends so much on its military, because they are there, that if this 'S' withdrawn, Pakistan will be helpless. It is difficult for me to discuss Pakistan. I have rather clear views but they are our neighbours and I do not wish to say much about them. I think they have adopted a policy not only about this but about other matters also the sworn ideology of which is hatred of India. They have exhibited it to the United States even to their SEATO partners and to other

partners and their emphasis, their thinking, ultimately is, call it fear of India or hatred of India. And this recent flirtation they are having with China shows what lack of principle there is. One cannot discuss the inner conditions of Pakistan of course. They have received plenty of money but that has not made Pakistan much stronger.

The hon. Member also said something about Commonwealth membership. The essentials of policy should be that it should be ever changing, he said. It is very extraordinary; in fact we should have no policy at all and should hopf about from one thing to another. That is what it comes to.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: As the interests of India dictate.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The interests do not change from day to day. Non-alignment means that the policy would be governed by the interests of India at every stage and not by pressures from abroad.

Now, I shall refer to the other matters. Mr. Mani said that we should withdraw from the Disarmament Committee unless nuclear tests were abandoned. I entirely disagree with this. It is a bad policy, this kind of boycotting because people do not agree with you. We should remain there. President De Gaulle has boycotted the Disarmament Conference because some thing which is not to his liking took place there or is taking place. I think it is completely wrong. The Disarmament Conference will not suffer by our withdrawal very much. It will go on but the good influence that we exercise at the conference will be no more.

About the Report on Vietnam, I do not know how Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or someone else disapproves of it. I suppose he has not read it. He may have read the criticism of it; that is possible. Certainly the people we have sent there, who have written the report, are some of our ables!

ambassadors and they have done it after personal enquiry and personal knowledge. I for my part accept their report. I may not be personally responsible for it but I do accept it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have you read that? You said you had not read it also.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have not read the final report but I have read the proposals they made and which have been incorporated in this. I have not read the actual last thing; I have read the draft etc.

Again, may I say about this idea that we should withdraw the Kashmir issue from the Security Council, I do not know if the Defence Minister said it. I suppose we could withdraw it but we may be dragged in there by the other party. We cannot refuse to go if the Security Council takes up the subject, at the instance of the other party. We are the complainant, therefore we withdraw but somebody else will be the complainant and we will have to go.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On what basis can Pakistan complain?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member and I may agree that they have no basis but they are strong enough to induce various great powers and small powers to vote for them. That is the basis.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little clarification. When we went to the United Nations we referred to certain articles of the Charter and on the strength of that we filed an application. Now if we withdraw I cannot for one see on what ground Pakistan can accuse us. Under what clause of the Charter of the United Nations?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not going to argue that matter with the hon. Member but it seems to me, we go there as accusers. We

Lanri Jawanarial JNehru.J withdraw; that is, we withdraw our accusation, our complaint, against Pakistan. In effect we withdraw it but we leave it to Pakistan to frame such complaints as they like against us. However, we need not enter into that.

Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha asked about certain joint enquiry on the Nepal iborder. In the joint statement issued by the King and myself it was stated that where any necessity arose, where there was any doubt as to what happened because our facts differed—they said some people have done something from India and we said, 'no'—we can have a local joint enquiry, not a complicated thing, an officer of theirs and ari officer of ours go to a particular place where it is alleged to find out and report to either Government. A little while ago they referred two specific incidents to us and asked us for this enquiry and we promised to send them an officer to do it.

Mr. Mani said something about the officials of the External Affairs Ministry letting us down by not getting China to accept our sovereignty over Kashmir. I do not quite know how the officials could make the Chinese Government accept something or not accept it. From the very beginning—we have repeatedly referred this to them—the Chinese Government have used a language which can be interpreted in various ways. We interpreted it to begin with in a way which seemed to us natural that they recognised our sovereignty but later when the matter was put to them, they were less clear about it and said something that has made their position a little doubtful. I do not know how the officials could make other countries function in a way We like. If that is so, we have had quite a large number of our ablest officers in the United States and in the United Kingdom but they have not succeeded in making any change because nei-

ther U-overnment is prepared to change its mind.

SHRI A. D. MANI: May I clarify the point? What I said was, there has been a let-down in the External Affairs Ministry; in 1956 Mr. Chou En-lai told our Ambassador that the people of Kashmir had expressed their will unmistakably on the question of accession. In July 1961 when the Secretary-General visited Peking he reported to the Government that the impression was left on his mind that China supported our stand on Kashmir. Why should we leave it to a matter of impression? When the matter was mentioned when he went on a tour to which many of us had taken objection, he should have really pinned down the Chinese Government and asked it to clarify its views unmistakably whether it accepted our stand on Kashmir.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The unmistakable clarification would have been against us. He would have insisted on something being sai^l against us. The h<sup>on</sup>. Member is saying something as if our officials or our Ministers or anybody can go and order about Mr. Chou En-lai who is a very clever person to accept something that we say although he does not want to say it. Obviously he did not want to say it. Repeatedly I know if they say something which appears to be in our favour there is a qualifying clause afterwards.

Somebody asked me about Mr. Gizenga. So far as I know, he is kept in an island there.

About the Immigration Bill in the United Kingdom, I think Mr. Mani asked for a quota. I think that would be entirely wrong and rather beneath our dignity. I disapprove ^ of the Immigration Bill, yet I do not like immigration into the United Kingdom from India. And we have tried to stop it—not students and other people who go there. But large numbers of



people have gone there in search of employment, especially from the Punjab, and they go there without knowing a word of the language there, without knowing a word of any language except Gurmukhi and Punjabi. And with their habits and customs, they create social problems there. I do not want our people to be looked down upon anywhere, wherever they go. Therefore we have been discouraging it. Because they could earn so much there, these passport scandals took place, where bogus passports were sold for as much as Rs. 5000. That is the draw there. But asking for a quota is to accept their scheme of immigration and ask for some people to go there. What for?

SHEI A. D. MANI: May I just rise on a point of clarification? The Immigration Act, as it stands now, is an affront to all coloured people. That is what Mr. Gaitskell himself has said and under the quota system which the United States have, there is no question of a colour bar. It is a matter of self-respect of the members of the Commonwealth that they should have the right of admission under a quota system, because I quite agree that every country has a right to control its immigration and we realise Britain's special difficulties in this matter.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The quota system applies to places where large numbers of immigrants go like Australia, like Canada, like New Zealand. I can understand that. Some years back, Australia, New Zealand and Canada agreed to have a quota system, because they have a quota for every country. Whatever the quota was—100, 200 or 500—I do not remember, but the British have no such quota system for anybody. It is a well-populated country. They do not want people from outside to come and live there. It is rather extraordinary for us to ask for a quota system. We are not going to ask for 377 RS—6.

it. quota applies to persons *who* have got to become nationals there. So, to ask them for a quota, so that Indians might go and become British subjects is extraordinary to me.

Now, one thing more and I have done. This is about the migrants from East Pakistan to India. Some reference was made to it. Originally, the story started by some relatively small incident in Malda, about the Holi time in India. This was grossly exaggerated by newspapers there. They said thousands had died and so on. This led to very serious occurrences in Rajshahi district and some other districts, especially Rajshahi, and the casualties were very large. Thereafter, some thousands of people, Hindus, there wanted and expressed their wish to come over to India. They asked for migration certificates. But for some reason they did not pursue this matter further. Some hundreds came and they went back. We did not refuse them facilities to come. I think the Pakistan Government tried to induce them and succeeded in keeping them back. They did some rehabilitation there *too*. Many of their huts that had been burnt were rebuilt and some help was given to them. Anyhow, they did not come, except a few hundreds that came. There is always some traffic coming and going. I gave here too, I think, and in the other House figures of people coming from East Bengal to West Bengal and from West Bengal to East Bengal. It was extraordinary that during all this period of high tension, the traffic was more or less normal. [forget what the figures were, five thousand or six thousand either way. *H* may vary by a few hundreds. Now, when the Muslims were supposed to be, according to the Pakistan press, leaving India in their thousands to go to Pakistan, actually according to our figures, thousands of Muslims in the ordinary course, were coming to India from there. In the same way, thousands of Hindus were going actually to Pakistan at the time these

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

occurrences took place or after. Since then, a new development has taken place and that is what occurred in Rajshahi district. I do not know what happened there, but one night a large number, five hundred or six hundred Santhals at 3 A.M. tried to come across the river into the Malda district. That is the Pakistan veision and they saw this crowd going at night. The police were naturally concerned and alarmed. They came up, they challenged them, whereupon these pe'ople shot the arrows from their bows, and spears they had. And the police fired at them, with the result—the accounts vary—that one or two persons or seven persons were killed. About a number came across, maybe, 100 or 150, and the others went back. Now, the present position is— I heard it today—that about five thousand 'of these Santhals have come to Malda district from Rajshahi. Apparently, they are coming without any obstruction from the Pakistani authorities. They have come thijs time with their animals too. They have come with their animals, bulls, cows, etc. and the Pakistanis have allowed them. Five thousand have come. We do not kn'ow how many more may come. It has affected especially the Santhals and there are round about 20,000 Santhals on the other side. More may come. Now, this raises difficult questions for us. For the moment, naturally, we have to give relief to those who come over, but permanent settlement is a difficult question. It was suggested that we should send them to Dandakaran-ya. Well, we can send some to Dan-dakaranya. We cannot send any unlimited number. For the moment, it has been decided by the Chief Minister, Dr. Roy—he has informed us of this—in consultation with our Government here to send a special train carrying about 1,000 of these Santhal refugees to Dandakaranya and to choose agriculturists from them to go there, because there are many fishermen. Fishermen have no particular place

there. There is no fish to be had in Dandakaranya.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Have you made any enquiries as to why tne Santhals are coming in such numbers.' Does it mean that everything is not quite peaceful in East Pakistan?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have said that originally the difficulties arose because of some conriiet between Santhals and Muslims. The very first thing, was that a Santhal woman was selling some fruit and they had an argument about the price. The woman was slapped on the lace. This was in Malda district. This resulted in the Santhals there too later attacking the Muslims, burning some of their huts and killing two or three persons. Then, on the Holi day, which came soon after, there was another attack by Santhals ton Muslims. The Santhals were roused by this incident. On the other side in the major incidents that happened in Rajshahi district Santhals were also sufferers. But I cannot make out one thing, because nothing has been reported to us for the last month or more or six weeks. We thought that was over and we saw this traffic becoming normal.

5 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How is it that it has not been reported, because in the Bengal papers—also some Pakistan papers come to West Bengal—we did not see reports appearing. How is it that Government has not received reports from its Mission in Dacca?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: About what?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What we are saying now.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU. We have received full repoTts. I am saying that in the last month or six weeks n'othing has happened not only to our knowledge but apparently to

Pakistan Government's knowledge or Bengal Government's knowledge. I do not understand why this time particularly Santhals had come out. They had reason to come six weeks ago. Maybe they were thinking about it and they came to a decision, because they function in more or less a tribal fashion, in a group fashion.

I am sorry to have taken so much time. I commend this motion to the House. There is a large number of amendments of which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is responsible, I understand, for 54. I must congratulate him on the hard work he has put in.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can tell you, Sir, that it is not much hard work. It does not take much work from me. One point I want to clarify because it might give a wrong impression. I never meant that we should withdraw the complaint from the Security Council. In fact I never said that. Probably he misunderstood me because how it can be withdrawn; it is there. What I said in my speech at the beginning was that it should be frozen. I said that we should tell them that since the Security Council has failed to discharge its responsibility and since the other parts of the resolutions are not carried out, the matter now ends, lapses. That is my approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what he intended.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One other question. Why has the Prime Minister not informed us where Mr. Gizenga is, the Congolese patriot? We wanted to hear a little more from him on this. Since we are participating in the U.N. operations there in the Congo, is it not necessary for the Government to find its way to intervening in the situation and seeing that Mr. Gizenga is released? At least it should do its part. That is what I wanted to make out.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am afraid that any action taken by

us would create more difficulties. Privately of course I suppose some suggestions can be made, have been made.

Now many of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's amendments are such that I do not object to them but the whole concept of it is objectionable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Since the Prime Minister agrees with the substance of the amendments, but not the concept which is an intangible term, in deference to him I withdraw all of them. I gave these amendments in order to inform the Prime Minister of the points that he should bear in mind. I thought I would be co-operating with him in this manner.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I regret I am unable to accept the amendments of Shri Vajpayee. Therefore, the first one in the names of Shri Patil Puttappa and Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray I accept.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets—

(i) that Government's attitude towards China continues to be ludicrously unrealistic and consequently its China policy, inert and ineffective;

(ii) that nothing has been done to educate world opinion in general, and opinion in our neighbouring States in particular, about the expansionist designs of China;

(iii) that as a result of this lapse, Government has failed to checkmate effectively China's bid to drive a wedge between India and Nepal;

(iv) that our Nepal policy has not yet succeeded in lessening

[Mr. Chairman.]

strains between India and this neighbour of ours;

(v) that Government has failed to realise that the recent outbursts against Hindus in Dacca, Rajshahi, and other parts of East Pakistan are not just sporadic outbursts of communal frenzy but are clear indications that it has become impossible for non-Muslims to live in the Islamic State of Pakistan with peace and honour, and so the situation there warrants a more radical and realistic approach on India's part than the lodging of mere protest notes; and

(vi) that in their representation of India's case for Kashmir at the U.N., our delegates have failed to reaffirm India's rights over the Pak-occupied portions of Kashmir and her determination to recover them."

*The motion was negatived. MR.*

CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House recommends—

(i) that as a first step to-wards a realistic reorientation of our China policy, diplomatic ties with China be severed:

(ii) that the primary objective of all diplomatic and defence policies and postures *vis-a-vis* China should be clearly accepted as the early recovery of lost territory;

(iii) that a conscious and concerted effort should be made 'it international forums and in our neighbouring States to expose China's perfidious conduct towards India and its imperialist designs in general;

(iv) that effort" towards lessening of Indo-Nepalese strains should be intensified;

(v) that in view of the fact that Pakistan has failed to assure to the Hindu minorities in Pakistan a secure and honourable living, Pakistan must be called upon to cede territory to India to rehabilitate the heavy influx of displaced persons coming over from Pakistan; and

(vi) that Government should make it clear to the United Nations that the only function it has to perform in respect of Kashmir is to help in securing vacation of Pakistan's aggression and that if, instead, members of the Security Council suffered Pakistan to exploit this international forum for a continued slander against India, India would be constrained to dissociate from all U.N. discussions on Kashmir."

*The motion was negatived.*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendments.

*Amendments (Nos. 4 to 57) were, by leave, withdrawn*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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.' "

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the amended motion to the vote. The question is:

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

tFor texts of amendments vide col\*. 1634—47 *suvra*.

1791 International [23 JUNE 1962]

having considered the same, this  
Bouse approves of the said policy."

*The motion was adopted.*

Ms. CHAIRMAN: The House stands  
adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the  
25th June 1962.

Situation 1792

The House then adjourned at  
five minutes past five of the  
clock till eleven of the clock 'on  
Monday, the 26th June 1962.