

SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA:
I have given notice several times.

MR. SPEAKER: There are large number of notices which are being given by hon. Members. Assam is also one of them.

Now, Shri Kundu,

12.16 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1979-80—
contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the other day I was speaking about foreign publicity and I said that there is a great scope for further revamping of our foreign publicity and in this job we are already in.

Now, coming to another aspect, namely passport, I would like to give certain information to the hon. House. Since the new Government came into being, demand has been made frequently that we must liberalise the procedure of issuing passports. We immediately jumped into this work and I am glad to say that due to the liberal policy that we have introduced in regard to this, the issue of passports have increased from 3.33 lakhs in 1974 to 12.13 lakhs in 1978. And during these years—and practically within last and this year—we have opened five new passport offices in Bangalore, Kozhikode, Jaipur, Bhopal, and Bhubaneswar. We will also open shortly another 5 passport offices at Patna, Gauhati, Jullunder, Srinagar and Simla. Sir, hon. Members also desired that the certification of the passport should also be done by MLAs and MLCs. They demanded that the procedure should be streamlined and MLAs and MLCs should be authorised to do certification. We have also extended that power to MLAs and MLCs, i.e. to certify the passports

and also to the Members of the Metropolitan Council. We are also still thinking what further we can do to improve the various procedures in regard to passports. One of them is in regard to bringing out passport application forms in the regional languages. We have decided to bring out passport forms in 11 regional languages in addition to Hindi and English.

Sir, we committed ourselves in this House that we will try to open one passport office in each State to the extent possible. We are trying our best to see how far we can reach that target.

Having said that about passports now I will take the hon. Members to the Arabian countries. Now, this voyage will not be to enjoy the stories of exploits of Sindbad the Sailor or the episode of Alibaba and the Forty Thieves, but to tell hon. Members, how much we are trying our best to fulfill the desires of the Muslims of this country to make Haj pilgrimage to Jeddah in Saudi Arabia. Since the new Government came into being, we have introduced various reforms. We have done our best to streamline this procedure of selection of Haj pilgrimage. As a matter of fact last year we granted 20,000 people foreign exchange which is definitely a much better number than what was done earlier. And in this year also we are trying to give the concession which has been given to them last time. We had decided that pilgrims by Moghul line ships may be charged Rs. 1900 as returnfare. Bill the Moghul lines wanted much more but we are giving a subsidy of about Rs. 1 crore to the Moghul Lines so that one of the noblest desires of the Muslims, particularly the poorer Muslims, would be fulfilled. In 1977, the pilgrims had to pay an amount of Rs. 4552 as return fare for the charter flights; in 1978 we reduced this to Rs. 3830. This has given a big relief for the Muslims who want to do Haj pilgrimage by chartered flights. This year, we have been trying to have the same provision, but unfortunately,

[Shri Somarendra Kundu]

we have not succeeded as yet. We are still discussing this matter with the Saudi Arabian Government.

In 1977, the amount of foreign exchange released to the sea pilgrims was S. Rs. 2,000/- and to air pilgrims S. Rs. 1900/-. In 1978, these amounts were raised to S. Rs. 2,500/- and S. Rs. 2250/- respectively.

Then, previously, the medical mission deputed to Saudi Arabia from India for looking after the health of Indian pilgrims consisted of ten doctors and ten compounders. We have increased the strength to 15 doctors and 15 compounders. We have also increased the number of ambulance vans and the Haj Committee has also donated one heavy duty water cooler for installation in front of the Indian Dispensary, Mecca, for the benefit of pilgrims.

We have also posted some additional officers there and we continue to see that the pilgrims are looked after well. I have myself gone and seen the sailing of the ship twice and I continue to get reports about the welfare of the pilgrims. I would like to assure this House that we would continue to see that the Haj pilgrims who go to offer their prayers at Jeddah are looked after in a much better way.

I will just take a few more minutes to tell the House about the administrative matters of the Ministry. The Ministry has to administer the headquarters, where the pressure of work has gone up because of the increasing number of passport offices in all parts of India. We have also to administer 127 missions and posts abroad. The dynamic thrust in our foreign policy has inevitably increased the range of the functions and responsibilities of our missions abroad, especially in the economic, commercial, consular and cultural fields. Therefore, we have decided to contain this by examining possible reforms in the four fields, viz. rationalization of staffing abroad,

modernisation, purchase/construction of our property and administrative reforms, particularly about the IFS (B) officials who constitute a large number in this Ministry. We have taken some action in this respect and the Members will be happy to know that.

We have been told very often that very few people from scheduled castes and scheduled Tribes are given job in this Ministry. We have been relentlessly trying to see that the quota of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled tribes is filled, but at times there are certain difficulties and we are not able to get qualified persons from these categories. Therefore, this time, when some persons were to be promoted to the post of Under Secretary, we decided to have a special examination to enable those who are not covered by the present conditions of eligibility, from these communities, to be promoted as Under Secretaries. This we have done in order to see that their quota could be filled as much as possible. We are right at the job.

When we took charge of this Ministry, we found that there were more than a hundred persons who had been working for many years as casual labourers in this Ministry, but their cases had never been considered to regularise them. We, therefore, took a decision to regularise them in accordance with Government policy on the subject. About forty people have already been regularised and we intend to regularise the remaining persons very shortly.

Then, Group D staff consists of peons and such other staff. We found that there was a big gap between them and the senior officers as far as availability of the amenities are concerned. We are, therefore, trying to bridge this gap to the extent possible. Earlier, some of these Group D staff were not allowed to take their families abroad. The hon. Members will be happy to know that now they will be able to take their families to some of the neighbouring countries. (Interruptions) We have undertaken to review the

cadre of the entire IFS(B), which is designed to look into the structure of the Service, with a view to restructuring the Service, so as to provide adequate promotional facilities to those in every grade, while ensuring that the needs of the Ministry of External Affairs and its Missions, in terms of special knowledge and skills, are met in full.

With these words, I thank the hon. Members for the co-operation that we have all along received in running the Ministry of External Affairs, and for the patient hearing which all the hon. Members have given me, including Dr. Subramaniam Swamy.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN (Satara): Sir, I must thank you in the beginning for giving this Ministry a sort of priority for discussion in this House, because I have always found that this Ministry had a lower priority for discussion. Really speaking, I would also make a request to you that this discussion, on the occasion of the examination or consideration of the Demands, is not enough. Once again, some time in the later part of the year, there should be some sort of a debate on the international situation.

We are to-day living in a dynamic world, where changes are taking place so rapidly; and they are so important.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my desire to have a discussion every session.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: It should be not on the motion of the Government. Some time you should allow it on the motion of Members either from this side or from that side. We are now in a strait-jacketed time-table.

I hope you will permit me to speak a little longer to-day. Before I proceed further, I also must express a word of appreciation of Mr. Vajpayee, as the Minister of External Affairs. I have seen him functioning for the last two years, and this is the first occasion that I am speaking. I must express my word of ap-

preciation here, because I had earlier found him expressing his views as the leader of the Jana Sangh. I have now found, during the last 2 years that he has a flexible attitude and quite an elastic mind, to justify some of the legacies of Nehru's Policy. It certainly goes to his i.e. Mr. Vajpayee's credit. And it also certainly goes to the credit of Nehru's policy. (Interruptions).

We are discussing this question of foreign policy of India to-day, in the year 1979. I would hope that the Minister of External Affairs would look to this problem, not only as a matter of policy for one year, but also agree that India should now consider the projections of foreign policy for the 1980s, i.e. for the next decade—what is the world going to be like, what are the world movements going to be like and, in regard to the region in which India continues to exist and continues to influence, how it is going to change and what will be our policies. What is the assessment for a decade, for a longer time, and what is the longer perspective?

Foreign policy is one subject which can very well be handled only if there are long-term perspectives. I hope that after listening to the debate, Mr. Vajpayee will not merely answer the points made here and there, and get away with the usual eloquence that he has, but will try to take us into confidence and give us his assessment of some of the problems of longer perspective.

There are 4 important criterion which the foreign policy of any country can be judged. The first criterion is, what is its relations like, with its immediate neighbours, and secondly, with the countries in the region in which this country exists. Naturally if we take the first, thing as an important criterion to be taken into consideration, I find there is some sort of a sense of complacency in the mind of the government. They are giving

[Shri. Yeswantrao Chavan]

two impressions, that the relations with the neighbouring countries are very good, there is nothing to worry about that and that has happened only after the Janata government had come to power. Both these aspects are rather misleading. If there are good relations with the neighbouring countries diplomatically and in other respects, they were there even before. But to say everything is all right with the neighbouring countries is absolutely wrong because neighbouring countries do not necessarily mean Pakistan and Nepal and Bangladesh; that also means China. It has been the continuation of the foreign policy of Pandit Nehru and we are glad that we are inheriting a framework of policy and if we are honest and loyal to that framework, to the basic principle, no foreign minister, no government can ever go wrong. We will have to be very honest and careful about the basic approaches that have been laid down as the foundation of the policy.

We know our relations with Pakistan have somewhat improved but the process started during the regime of the last government. At the time of Bangladesh there was war. After that war there was a new phase and then came the Simla agreement and thereafter a series of agreements were entered into between Pakistan and India; bilaterally the relationship was being improved. The principle of bilateralism is a very important principle not only in regard to the neighbouring countries but also with regard to other countries in the world. We will have to emphasise the bilateral aspect of the relationship and work more and more for it. I am glad the new government had carried on that process forward. But do not be under the impression again that you have got some little more agreement and therefore everything is all right, because let us see what Pakistan is doing. Only the other day we were trying to know from the government what Pakistan were doing in the nuclear field, what new agreement they have

reached with China and France and other countries, what were their intentions and so on. We will have to be constantly vigilant about their intentions, about their preparations, etc.

With Nepal our relations were always good. They had some misgivings about certain aspects, they were interested in some sort of a separate transit agreement. If you showed weakness and gave them two agreements instead of one agreement in respect of trade, an agreement for trade and an agreement for transit, I tell you, please take care; these are dangerous seeds; you are trying to become unrealistic about the relationship with our neighbours. Small, they are. But I know we should take into consideration the complex in their mind about our bigness in size. I am prepared to concede that position, that we should be rather considerate in these matters. But in this, let us not get swept off our feet and go on accepting unreasonable things. If you ask me, what is the criterion if good relation and friendliness, I will say the real test of friendliness is about what they are going to do about the common river projects for Nepal and India. Every year when we discuss the agricultural demands, we discuss the question of floods in this country. Floods in the north are mostly there because we have not been successful in working out river project with Nepal. We have raised this question many times; there had been some goody goody response to it but nothing further is there, it is making no progress. I remember in 1978 when I visited Nepal we had an opportunity to raise this question with the highest authorities in Nepal and a letter of intent was exchanged between the two foreign secretaries. I remember that when the present foreign minister visited Nepal on return from Nepal he also made some mention about certain further progress being made about the river projects. I would say, concentrate on that. If you want to have good relations between Nepal and India,

merely having goodwill visits is not enough. Certainly we should have goodwill visits. I have nothing against them. It is a good thing because that also helps. Personal contacts with the leadership of any country is a good thing. So far so good, as far as goodwill visits are concerned. But let us see what are our priorities of relationship. Merely having goodwill visits is not the final test. The real test of good relationship is, what is going to be the attitude on more important aspects. Therefore, I mentioned these river projects. I am sure the Foreign Ministry and the Foreign Minister, while taking up our relations with Nepal, look into it the real priorities.

With Bangladesh, they say our relations are good. Certainly the relations with Bangladesh were certainly good in the previous regime also. As a matter of fact, Bangladesh got its birth because of the previous regime's contribution to the whole process. You cannot forget history. (*Interruption*). Certainly it will be remembered in history. There is no doubt about it. Now you say, relations have improved because you have given them more water at the cost of poor Calcutta. I sympathise with my friends from West Bengal. Now they say, the relations are very good. But don't go by these things. This is not the test of good relationship. The test of good relationship is a little longer perspective, their attitude towards the question of refugees coming this side, the question how minorities are treated, etc. All these are very important questions. (*Interruptions*). Forgetting these things, merely declaring from the top of the house that our relations with our neighbours have improved in the last two years, as if they were very wrong before two years—that is not the right thing to give an impression like that.

The most important neighbour is China. Personally, I have no grievance about Shri Vajpayee's visit to

China because I think the Minister should go to China. But he very jocularly said in his Television interview that he would not go to God, if God does not invite him, but even if Satan invites him, he will go! It is all right when you say that. Nobody can go to God without invitation and I wish he does not go to God for a long time. But I would also advise him to be careful about Satans. Only because you receive invitations, don't rush to them! About China we will have to take a little more cautious view. I know the process of improving the bilateral relations and diplomatic relations started during the previous Government's regime—the Congress regime. But what we had in our mind at that time was the awareness of the realism of the assessment of the situation in China, round about China and most of the Asian region. Has China changed? If you want to take a view, an assessment of a country like China, you must not merely take the view of a communique issued in Peking when you visited China. China is one of the important countries in the world. It treats itself as a big country and it is a big country. Population-wise and taking many other considerations, it is certainly a big country. What is its attitude towards its neighbours? What is its attitude. What is its world view? This is much more important. When you think in terms of relationship and friendship with a country like China, you will have to take these aspects into consideration.

What is China's world view? China firmly believes in a Third World War. China does not believe in detente. China thinks that unless there is a Third World War, there is no hope of a further revolution. That is one aspect of it.

Has it changed its attitude towards its neighbours? No. In 1962 we had an experience. In 1979 Viet Nam had an experience. The mind is the same. Chou En-lai and Mao may be there no longer, now there is Deng, Hua

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]
and others, but it is the same China as far as its neighbours are concerned.

I remember that after 1962 I was just telling Subramaniam here of one of the conversations that I had with one of the Ministers who attended the conference to consider the Colombo proposals which were made at that time. I think the story must be known to many Members of Parliament, because that Minister told this to many Members of Parliament, that during his visit to China he was told by Liu Shao Chi, the then President of the Chinese Republic: "Tell that country, please tell the Indian friends that if they do not learn lessons, we will do it again, again and again." That is China's mind towards its neighbours. They believe in teaching lessons to their neighbours, small and big. Why? Because they think they are the Middle Kingdom, they are the country which dictates terms here. This psychology we must not forget. Knowing this, we must try to make an effort for improving our bilateral relations, I agree, but let us not forget this assessment.

China is considering a long-term programme of modernisation. They are talking of four modernisations—modernisation of industry, modernisation of agriculture, modernisation of technology and modernisation of defence preparedness. What will China be in 2000 A.D.? This is the perspective with which China is working. What is the perspective with which we are working? We are only working with the perspective that our visit to China has created a good impression.

Only this morning I was reading the speech of the Prime Minister, and he has declared that our relations with China have improved. Even after the lesson that they have taught Viet Nam, are you going to tell us this? We would certainly like to know

from you, Mr. Minister. Do not merely quote the sentence from the joint communique. What is your personal impression? What is your assessment? Do you think that the process that we have started will lead us to any profitable, useful, and helpful results?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): What joint communique? Joint Communique with Russia?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: With China. Some statement was issued after your visit. You may call it a communique or a joint statement.

श्री राज न.र.यण : ज्वाइंट स्टेटमेंट कह दीजिए ।

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: There was no joint statement.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I will say the statement that you made after coming back, the unilateral communique, if you want to have it.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: You must be precise in what you say.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I am prepared to be corrected.

That gives an impression, the statement made unilaterally, gives the impression of a talk between both sides.

Therefore, there is an impression. Yesterday, in his speech, our very respected and senior Member, Mr. H. V. Kamath, made a proposal....

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Good proposal.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: ... that there should be an agreement of peace and friendship. This has resulted from the euphoria you have created. I do not blame him.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): After the border question has been resolved. As we have with Russia.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: We had no border problem with Russia. You are thinking of a peace treaty.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: With China as with Russia.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: During our period, we improved relations with the Western side as well.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We believe in genuine non-alignment.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Russia upholds China's claim on Indian territory. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Let China say that. Why do you say that? You are not appointed by China to say that. You speak about India's problems. You are not China's Ambassador in this Parliament.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal): Don't act as a spokesman of China.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Are you a spokesman of Russia?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: We are the spokesmen of India. (*Interruptions*)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Why don't you ask Russia to correct the map? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us have a quiet debate.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I was making only a limited point as to how the people are misled by certain atmosphere of euphoria ...

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is not euphoria.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: ... that Mr. Vajpayee has visited China and the friendship has come about. There are so many complex problems between China and India. China's attitude towards India will have to be considered; China's attitude towards other neighbours in this region will have to be considered. China's inside policy will have to be taken into account. Then we will have to think about more. Once you start creating hopes also, then, certainly, we can go into the old Bhai-Bhai era. We do not want to repeat the same mistake ...

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: You are for Hindi-Russi Bhai-Bhai now.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: If you are suffering from a complex of anti-Russianism. I cannot help it. I am not suffering from any complex. I am very glad indeed that after the visit of Foreign Minister to China, a visit of the Soviet Prime Minister took place and they agreed and signed certainly some good agreements. I am very happy about it. They have done a good balancing thing. For that, the Government certainly deserves compliments. I am prepared to give compliments where they deserve. I have no hesitation in doing that.

I was talking about the criteria. The first criterion was of the relationship in the neighbourhood and the relations with the countries in the region. I think, I have dealt with his subject as far as it was necessary.

The second criterion is what is the work that we do in the international field. India can do its work in two ways. First, as a sponsoring member of the non-aligned movement. The contribution that it makes in the non-aligned movement is a very important area where we have to find out how they are functioning, how they are going further. I must say, in this respect at least, I have no grievance to make about what Government has done

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

in the last two years. They certainly have participated in all the important meetings of the non-aligned movement, the coordination bureau meeting, the Foreign Ministers' meeting; the Summit meeting, of course; they are yet to wait for and they have taken the right positions at the right time in the non-aligned movement. It is good. It is the Nehru legacy that we are carrying on. But while they do it, they are doing it with reservations in their mind. I have to go into that. They are constantly telling the world and themselves that they are genuinely non-aligned....

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): What is wrong about being genuine?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: The wrong about it is, telling the world that you are genuine. You must be genuine. Once the lady starts protesting too much....

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no lady here.

SHRIMATI MRINAL GORE: The lady is on the other side.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I must say that I have made this criticism out side the House and it would be honest for me to make that criticism here also that is they put the word "genuine" behind "non-alignment" and they go on repeating constantly, continuously, as some sort of a mechanism or a cover for their tilt towards the West.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: May I remind him that this Government has been elected on the mandate of 'genuine non-alignment'?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: You were elected on so many mandates. Have you forgotten all about them? Why are you telling me about mandate? We know the mandate.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Would you like us to forget all the mandates? That cannot be your intention. You would like us to remember all the mandates.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I am glad you are doing it. But when you are repeating it so much and so many times, then we are afraid. After all, non-alignment does not mean neutrality. Let us try to understand what 'non-alignment' is. Non-alignment does not mean this: you have Soviet Russia on this side; and America on that side; be friend here and be friend there call one 'Your Majesty' and call the other 'Your Highness'. That is not non-alignment. Non-alignment is a positive concept. It has the content of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism, and you will have to test every move, every step, every event, every position that you take, whether it meets that point of anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism. This is the test of non-alignment. This sort of non-alignment, with the positive aspect of non-aligned movement, must be kept in mind and we will have to work for that.

I would only remind one thing, because when we are talking about non-aligned movement in the world and our contribution to it, we can certainly make further contribution because there is something like economic content in foreign policy. One very important decision was reached at the Colombo Summit when the non-aligned countries met for their Summit Conference. They have agreed on collective self-reliance because we have found in the last decade that the dialogue between the developed countries and the developing countries was continuously being frustrated by the attitude of the developed countries. Wherever there was the question of transfer of real resources, whenever there was the question of proper share of trade, whenever there was the question of giving some sort of concessions in the matter of debts whenever there was the question of reforming the monetary system, to suit and benefit the developing

countries, the developed countries have always taken an adverse position, a negative position. Therefore, the Colombo Conference came to the conclusion that the developing countries, the non-aligned countries, must work out a programme of self-reliance, a collective self-reliance. Nationally we speak about self-reliance. When we talk about non-aligned movement, we talk about collective self-reliance. We have to follow up this position. India will have to take a lead in this matter because India is in a position to take a lead in this matter, because we have certainly got a good industrial base, we have certainly a good technological base, unless you forget the principle of self-reliance and dismantle the scientific progress that we have made, of which I am afraid there are possibilities. I must warn them of that. If they do that, then that will be the end of India's future. Naturally we on this side of the House will not allow them to do that. We should have self-reliance in industrial activities.

Now, what is non-alignment? Non-alignment is self-reliance in foreign policy self-reliance in technology is essential for our modernisation. These are very important matters. We would like to know this because we really do not know what is your position, what position you take and when. We were told in this House by the hon. Prime Minister that he had made a unilateral declaration that there would be no peaceful explosion. Vajpayeeji makes statements occasionally which are quite contrary to that. (*Interruptions*) Not contrary, but you will make your position clear at the end because we would like to know exactly what your position is. If it is that, you have unilaterally taken a position not to resort to nuclear explosions, that means that you have taken a position of not making progress in nuclear technology. You may have done it as the government, but we would like to tell you and the world that the people of India have not taken this position. The people of India have taken a position that we have every right to make every effort in the field of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. . .

SHRI VASANT SATHE: They have a mandate for that also. Vajpayeeji said that.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chavan, you have taken 25 minutes. You have only 39 minutes left for your Party.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: You may extend the time.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Please extend the time.

MR. SPEAKER: It will mean gullotining others. That will be the difficulty.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: This is one thing. The first point was the contribution made by the Nonaligned Movement and the other is the role that India has played in the United Nations because that is also one of the important forums where we certainly can make a significant contribution.

I was trying to look through this report of the External Affairs Ministry to see about the work that we are doing for the last 2 years in the United Nations or as a Member of the Security Council. There is not much information given about what role and what positions we have taken in the Security Council consistent with our national policy. . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We are no longer a Member of the Security Council.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I know. It ended on 31st December. Sir, this is the only announcement he has made—that we have ceased to be a Member of the Security Council. In the paragraph about the world and the Security Council—this is the announcement they have made, as if this is an announcement of joy, 'No, we are no longer a Member of the Security Council.' . . . (*Interruptions*) I will tell the hon. Minister there. There is a school of thought in the Foreign Ministry—I am not talking about the Foreign Minister—which believes in isolation as far as the Security Council is concerned. . .

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: When you were there also, the same was the position.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I was for taking responsibility in the Security Council. We were defeated once. Even then we persisted and got elected and got the membership of the Security Council. Therefore, I would like to say...

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan): Pakistan got elected, not India.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I tell you that India was defeated once but next year India was elected. Therefore, we were a member. You have no information about that.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur): For one year you were not a member, when you were defeated.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Once a Member is elected, it is for two years.

Therefore, we would certainly like you to take note of that, that it is a very important role that India can play. We should certainly take an opportunity again to get into the Security Council because this is the place where you can influence important opinions, decisions and discussions of the world politics, and India has the respect of the world because India has taken correct decisions on correct occasions because India is not a military power. Nor is India an economic power in the sense it is understood though it is not an ignorable proposition. Certainly it has made progress in both the fields. I would like this one point to be taken note of that in the foreign policy areas India's voice is heard with respect.

I was talking about our relations with the big powers. Well, our relations with the USA are good. They are improving. Visits are taking place. Their President came here and our Prime Minister went there and you meet most of the Foreign Ministers when you go to the United Nations. It

is a good thing to discuss. But I would like to utter a word of warning here. When you think about good

13.00 hrs.

relations with big powers, they are like machines and they have no heart. They only have national interests—not only national interest but also global interests whether it is Soviet Union, U.S.A. or China. They all go by global interests. How far India has got priority in the U.S.A.'s assessment? I am afraid, as far as U.S.A. is concerned, India has got a very low priority because there is no question of making any movement, we started with the mechanism of the Joint Commissions with the big powers in cultural, economic and industrial matters. I have no doubt that this is making some progress. And when it comes to the matters of importance for us, like when it comes to the nuclear technology, they do not think about that warmly but only think of blunt and cold letters. That is what President happened to speak here and he just happened to have leaked that out, thanks to a press man. So, one will have to find out about these big powers whether we have any real priority with them. As far as your geo-political interests are concerned, your priorities are considered in terms of geopolitics. What is your priority in geopolitical terms with the Soviet Union and with the U.S.A.? It is only on that that you can afford to build your relations with these big powers. Otherwise, mere exchange of your visits does not mean anything. It does not mean anything because this has become a game of the world diplomacy to say "Thank you. How are your excellency and how are your highness?" This is the language of the diplomacy everywhere and everyone does that. So, one will have to go by what your priority is in this field and not by mere formalities of goodwill.

Now, when we come to the question of Diego Garcia, one of the worst things is happening there. If U.S.A. is a member or is a friend of a particular country of the littoral countries, then they must come forward and say we

discontinue this from to-day. In one of the speeches made during the debate I saw that. I think it was Shri Stephen who quoted it somewhere that Russia had made a declaration that they are prepared to discuss it with other countries. We are not against their general movement in Ocean of their navigational power. But, certainly, every power can move about in the world. That is because it is an open road in the Indian Ocean! But they have a military base. It is not only a threat to Independent India but I would like to tell you that the whole area, as somebody called it, is a crescent of crisis. I look at it as some sort of an arc—there is Africa; taking the Gulf countries, India, Pakistan and also South Asia, it is an arc. This Diego Garcia is at the centre of that arc. So, it is a threat to African countries. It is a threat to countries on both sides of Suez. It is a threat to Gulf countries. It is a threat to India which is a most important country in this part of the world. When we raised this question, the other side smiles and says that they take a formal note of it. If you want to talk about genuine non-alignment we will have to make it as a test on which they take their position. Please make them sit round with you. Let the big powers say that they are no longer big powers. Otherwise, it is a permanent threat to Independent India. This you will have to take note of. This is the test of this Government. This is a real test on which we can base our judgment; That is how you will have to go about trying to make friendship with that country. So, one will have to be very very careful about the Big Powers, particularly about U.S.A. which has got a base. Somebody said that Russia has also got its presence in the ocean. Russia certainly has its presence. But, these big powers have their presence all over the world and not only in the Indian Ocean.

My main point is this—who has got a base? Soviet Union, has not got a base here. It is the U.S.A. which has got the base which you will have to keep in mind and take note of it and

all your calculations about your relationships should be only on this basis. Sir, I have not spoken to criticise the government. I have not spoken to criticise A or B. I have merely spoken with a view to espouse the cause of national interest in the area of India's foreign policy and that is what I have done.

13.05 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA (Bombay South): Mr. Speaker, Sir I have heard with rapt attention the assessment of the foreign policy given by hon'ble Shri Chavan Sahib. Sir, our foreign policy is based on national consensus and the touchstone on which it could be tested is clear and that should be whether it reflects the nation's enlightened interests and aspirations and whether it protects the priorities at home. Sir, this government's policy is significant in three features: (a) genuine non-alignment which some of my friends on the opposite side tried to ridicule or tried to exhibit their ignorance as to how it is being implemented; (b) Sense of direction in the Third World; and (c) link of cohesion with South-East Asian countries.

Sir, I beg to submit that the present government has been following the policy of non-alignment which is not only genuine but is dynamic. I would say that it is a dynamic non-alignment policy which is responding to ever changing conditions at home and abroad. I would I hear the criticism that this is not a genuine non-alignment, I would like to remind them what was the attitude of the previous regime as far as the policy of non-alignment was concerned. They were crying hoarse on the word of 'non-alignment' but whenever it came they were leaning like the tower of Pisa towards only one world power and day in and day out where abusing the other world power. May I ask whether this was the non-alignment that you were trying to implement or

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]

follow in letter and spirit. If I am allowed to submit, I would say that hitherto non-alignment was not followed in letter and spirit and there are examples galore to prove that. Sir, I am one of those who has accepted and who is believing that Jawahar Lal Nehru has contributed in such a memorable manner in evolving and establishing our foreign policy that this country will not forget but at the same time to lean like the tower of Pisa and throw the entire country in the lap of one super power would be stabbing in the back the policy of non-alignment. Sir, my friend and hon'ble leader Shri Chavan has left. Had he been here I would like to have asked him why were they silent when Hungary was raped? At that time Mr. Chavan was in the government. What happened when Mr. Dubeck was taken and liquidated. At that time Mr. Chavan was part and parcel of the government. On that issue Mr. Ashok Mehta resigned because he knew that genuine non-alignment policy was not being pursued. That was the real test of the non-alignment policy. Unfortunately, Mr. Chavan has left otherwise I wanted to raise so many queries.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: You were also a party to it at that time.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I objected and led a procession of the students on the street of Bombay when Czechoslovakia was raped by Russia. I am for all friendship with Russia—for eternal friendship with Russia. I am prepared to vouchsafe for it. But, Sir, merely to suit our purpose, and to lean like a tower of Pisa on Russia, and not to point out their defects, is not genuine non-alignment. (Interruptions) Well it may be your way of implementing it. But that is not the way of this Government, which is wedded to the policy of genuine non-alignment. That is why we are telling this from our house-tops. Mr. Chavan was asking our

External Affairs Minister: Why are you going on repeating every day the word 'genuine'? I say this, because, you have done something which was not genuine. And that is why we have got to convince our people, the masses of this country, who have given us a mandate for genuine non-alignment. And that is why, Sir we are repeating it. Mr. Chavan must at least understand this and pardon us, if we are repeating this word, because there is some implication, there is some history behind it and because of that history we are compelled to say that this is the genuine non-alignment policy.

So, Sir, having submitted this, let me say this. The tilts that were there, visible in the previous regime, have been already balanced and the policy has been made even-headed. And, Sir, if that is a crime of the present Government, let me say, the present Government would continue, it intends to continue—the Janata party intends to continue—committing that crime. Because, we don't want tilting of that foreign policy. Sir, Jawaharlal Nehru has stated that we should have independence of judgment on every issue. He said, we shall have to judge every issue independently. Accordingly, looking through the glass of our national interest. We are going to decide on our policy, on each and every issue.

श्री राजनारायण (रायबरेली) : यह तो बताइए क्या है आप के नेशनल इंटरिस्ट में ?

श्री रतनसिंह राजडा : वह बता रहा है। आप यहां पर बैठें ये मैंने देखा नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा निवेदन यह है कि राष्ट्र-हित में इस समय विदेश नीति क्या होनी चाहिए, यह बोलिए। चक्रवाण ने क्या किया, कांग्रेस ने क्या किया उस को छोड़ दीजिए, जहलूम में जाय, आप क्या करने जा स पर बोलिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him speak. Mr. Raj Narain, let him speak. Let him say whatever he wants to say.

SHRI RAJ NARAIN: What is your genuineness?

जो मेन्टेनेबल है, जो मनेजेबल है वह चीन रख ले, वह हम रख लें —

Is this your policy?

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I think this time must be given to me later because unnecessarily they have interrupting me.

SHRI RAJ NARAIN: Yes, you have it.

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा निवेदन है कि इस समय हमारी विदेश नीति बिलकुल डावांडोल है, गलत रास्ते पर जा रही है। ... (ब्यवधान), एक दिन समय बढ़ा दीजिए और इस पर पूरी बहस हो।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has expressed his opinion.. Why do you object?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं तो उन के इंटररेस्ट में कह रहा हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, Raj Narain, please take your seat.

श्री राजनारायण : इस की सिफारिश से विदेश नीति नहीं चलेगी और टेनीविज्ञान पर पिक्चर दिखाने से विदेश नीति नहीं चलेगी। देश की जनता में जाये तो वहाँ पता चलेगा कि क्या होनी चाहिये हमारी विदेश नीति। ... (ब्यवधान)...

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Hon. Members from the opposition....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him speak.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Hon. Members from the opposition have taken to task our....

डा० बलदेव प्रकाश (प्रमृतसर) : जनता के ठेकेदार यहाँ पर सिर्फ एक ही श्रावमी हैं और बाकी नहीं हैं...

श्री राजनारायण : जो थे सन को 72 में देखा गया, फिर 77 में देखा गया ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please take your seat now, Mr. Raj Narain.

डा० बलदेव प्रकाश : जनता का ठेकेदार कौन है यहाँ पर ? जो यहाँ पर आए हैं वह जनता के ठेकेदार हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं जनता का ठेकेदार हूँ। मैं डा० साहब की इज्जत करता हूँ। मैं इन की बात कर रहा हूँ। जनता के हित में चलिए। जनता के हित में कितनी बार जेल काटे हैं ? किसानों के हित में, विद्यार्थि के हित में, महिलाओं के हित में कितनी बार जेल काटे हैं... (ब्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Raj Narain, please take your seat. Whatever you say hereafter will not go on record.

SHRI RAJ NARAIN: **

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Let me say this. Sir, that on the contrary, I stand here, I rise here, to congratulate our hon. External Affairs Minister and I wish to say that he should refuse stoutly to lean towards any of the power blocs but that he should implement our policy of genuine non-alignment which is based on our national interest.

Now, Sir, I would come to the point raised by our Raj Narainji.

Sir, because of the implementation of the correct policy look at what relations are with other countries.

**Not recorded.

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]

Our relations with USA have improved. There is marked improvement with our relations with USA. At the same time, we do not do detail to everything that USA tells us. On the question of NPT (Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty) we had made some plain speaking. When President Carter came to India we made it very clear. We told him about our stand-ard that was appreciated by Mr. Kosygin also. When Mr. Kosygin came we also expressed our views very frankly and there also we made clear our stand on Kampuchea. We had told him, that we did not use the word 'aggression'. We do not say that because there is marked difference between the Chinese aggression on Vietnam and other things. Interference in other countries is also there. For instance, in respect of other countries also we have not appreciated.

SHRI RAJ NARAIN: I want to ask one thing. In Parliament it is allowed. Let me ask this....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is not yielding.

SHRI RAJ NARAIN: Where is the word 'Aggression' in the Government of India? There is no aggression. Why do you say 'Aggression'? In Government of India, there is no such 'Aggression'. So, I ask you, why do you say 'Aggression'?

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Sir, the new dimensions, directions and trends adopted by us have manifested themselves....

श्री राजनारायण : इस देश में ऐसे भी मंत्री हैं जिन्होंने सन् 42 के मूवमेन्ट में माफी मांगी थी। .. (स्वबचान) ..

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: ...in our greater concern and, sense of involvement with neighbours in Asia and developing Afro-Asian countries. Sir, with Pakistan also there is marked improvement in our relations, (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Whether you get time or not, you can take it up with your whip. Why do you interrupt his speech?

श्री राजनारायण : दो तीन दिन पहले श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने मुझ से कहा कि फारेन पालिसी पर बोलने का समय आरको नहीं मिलेगा। (स्वबचान)।

विदेश मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी) : मैं ने ऐसा नहीं कहा कि इनको समय नहीं मिलेगा। समय के बारे में तय करना न्हिप का काम है या आपका काम है। लेकिन बिना समय दिए ही माननीय सदस्य जितना समय ले रहे हैं उसका भी जरुरा सदन को ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा।

श्री रतनसिंह राजदा (बम्बई दक्षिण) : राजनारायण जी, हमने आपका क्या बिगाड़ा है, हमारे बीच में आर क्यों इटरफियर करते हैं

The new dimensions, directions, and trends adopted by us have manifested themselves in our greater concern and sense of involvement with neighbours in Asia and developing Afro-Asian countries. Sir, with Pakistan there is marked improvement in our relations. All these augurs well for the future of India's bilateral and multilateral relations with Afro-Asian neighbours, with Commonwealth² partners, across the globe, with USA and USSR and with international institutions and bodies like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and so on. We have been contributing very actively on all these fronts which my hon. friend Shri Raj Narain should appreciate. Sir, Atal ji has envisaged on enlarged Asian community from Iran to Indo China. Afro-Asian countries are yearning for powerful collective identity on political and economic fronts in the world. We must understand that cold war between USA and USSR has yielded place to a new confrontation between the rich and the poor nations, to the surprise of all those friends who fall-

ed to take a detached view. They will see that in this game the USA and USSR feature on the same front.

Sir, on the question of NPT the attitude of both the super-powers is almost the same. Therefore viewing from this standpoint, I would urge my friends to understand the implications of genuine non-alignment which is being followed by this Government.

As far as Arab countries are concerned, the policy of the Janata Government is very clear and it has been made known also. We want to support the Arab cause everywhere Arab nationalism has come to stay. The question of doing justice to them must be there. Recently, a treaty has been signed by President Sadat with Israel. We say that only a comprehensive settlement could lead to a just and durable peace in West Asia. Israel must withdraw from all occupied Arab territories including Jerusalem. There must be restoration of the inalienable rights of Palestinians.

Sir, our policy is based on beneficial bilateralism. New dimensions have been reached as far as this policy of beneficial bilateralism is concerned. We have developed good neighbourly relations with all the immediate neighbours which are surrounding our country. Mr. Chavan was asking about our relations with Nepal. I would like to tell him that today there is better relationship and understanding between India and Nepal. Formerly, our attitude towards Nepal was of a big brother and they thought, we might injure or harm their interests in future and because of that there was some lurking suspicion in their mind always. Today, that has been removed and there is a better understanding. Shri Chavan should have appreciated these developments that have taken place. Even with Bangladesh, there is a marked improvement in our relations with them. Shri Atalji went there and our Prime Minister is also going there. We have developed better relations and a new healthy climate has been created in the relation-

ship between our country and both these countries.

Much has been said about China's visit by our Foreign Minister. I say that our Foreign Minister has taken a bold step. Contrary to it, negotiations with China were started by the Previous regime, but the same stopped half-way. If Shri Atalji goes there, they find fault with him. Why do they find fault with him? Is it because he has carried on the negotiations with them and he wanted to bring about a normalisation of the relations between the two countries? Is it a crime? Is it a fault on his part to bring about normalization between the two countries? Only an insane person would say that normalization of relations is a wrong thing. When these negotiations were in progress, it is a fact that China behaved in a fashion which it ought not to have behaved. China is an aggressor, which this Government has said on the floor of this House and elsewhere. The Prime Minister was the first person to issue a statement saying that China was an aggressor. In this august House, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee also stated that China has committed aggression and an aggressor cannot be allowed to enjoy the fruits of his aggression. This is a clear-cut policy. But when our Foreign Minister was on the soil of China, China did some misadventure and that is why, we find fault with Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and his policy. I think, we are stretching things too far and we are trying to find fault when there is none.

Having said this, I would like to congratulate our Foreign Minister for establishing good neighbourly relations with all these countries. There can be normalization even now. We shall have to be conscious of one thing always that the attitude of China has always been an attitude of cane, China wants to punish others as the teacher wants to punish students in the classroom. This attitude of arrogance would never be tolerated by any self-respecting nation in any part of the

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

world. As far as this is concerned, nobody would try to sympathise with China, but at the same time we shall have to sit round the negotiating table. We shall not negotiate out of fear, as President Kennedy once said. This should be our attitude in dealing with China.

श्री राज नारायण : हो गया ।

श्री रतन सिंह राजदा : आपने पहले ही बहुत डिस्टर्ब किया है, अब कहते हैं - हो गया । नेताजी, हम तो आप के भक्त हैं ।

श्री राज नारायण : हमारे मित्र ने कहा है कि नेपाल में और हम में कोरडियल-रिलेशन बढ रहे हैं । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ—वहाँ दो रेवोल्यूशनरीज को फांसी दे दी गई, गोली से उड़ा दिये गये—क्या यह मित्रता का सुबूत है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप फिर उन का समय ले रहे हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : मान्यवर, फारन-मिनिस्टर उन की बात को गलत समझा इसलिए कह रहा हूँ ।

SHRI RATAN SINH RAJDA: Raj Narain Ji is incorrigible, if nothing else.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The trouble is that Mr. Raj Narain thinks that he will not get his turn to speak. So, he is trying to put everything into others' mouths.

श्री राज नारायण : यह बहुत गलत बात इन्होंने कह दी । आप खुद रियलाइज करते होंगे कि हमारे सदन में इतने अपरिपक्व लोग भी हैं जो थर्ड फोर्स का मतलब थर्ड ब्लाक समझते हैं । वे थर्ड फोर्स का सही मतलब नहीं समझते ।

The Third Force is on the level of the people. And the Third Bloc is on the level of the Government.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप का जो भाषण है, वह श्री रतनसिंह राजदा के भाषण के बीच-बीच में आ रहा है । आप उन को कहने दीजिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह इन्होंने बहुत गलत बात कह दी । इस से तो चीन और भारत के सम्बन्ध विकृत होंगे ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप उन को बोलने दीजिए ।

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Having submitted this, I would like to draw the attention of our Minister of External Affairs to certain developments or to certain situations at home. It is stated that because of a wrong sort of policy being pursued in that Ministry there are certain members of the staff—I do not know whether it is right or wrong; he can check it up—who have developed an attitude of pro-this or pro-that country. We want our officers to be neither pro-Russia, nor pro-America. They must be pro-India. Our cadre shall have to be pro-India; and it would be the greatest achievement of our Minister of External Affairs if he cleans up the Augean stables from his Ministry and is careful about those people who sponsor either the Russian lobby or the interests of USA. We want all those officers to be committed to India, to the soil of India and to the tenet of patriotism towards this country.

There are certain incidents which have taken place in our country. There is an organization called the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society. When Mr. Kosygin came over here, there was a functions. In that function, the President of that society—I think Rajeshwar Rao is the name of the President—and Mr. Shankar Dayal Sharma delivered speeches, in the presence of the foreign dignitary. Patriotism demands that whenever a foreign dignitary is visiting, a certain decorum has got to be maintained. I am very sorry to say that some Indians do exist on the soil of India

who, in the presence of Mr. Kosygin, have criticized not only the foreign policy of this Government, but also criticized it in the following words—I quote:

“They told that the masses in this country would not get justice at the hands of the present Government.”

If this is true, it is really highly condemnable. No Indian should make any remark, in the presence of a foreign dignitary, criticizing the policy of our Government, especially when that policy happens to be the foreign policy which is based on national consensus. That point I would like to stress. When such things happen, our Minister of External Affairs shall have to look into the working of such organizations which are playing to the tune of foreign interests. Are we going to allow these foreign interests to play through such agencies? It may be America; it may be USSR. I don't care. We should not allow any Indian national to play to the tune of any foreign interests. This point is highly important and significant. We shall have to look into this.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi had recently gone to London. When she went there, there was a function where the Indian High Commissioner was present. And the Indian High Commissioner stated that he spoke on behalf of the Government of India, etc. Thereafter, Mrs. Gandhi told them that Mr. Gore had spoken on behalf of the Indian Government. “Now I speak on behalf of the Indian people.” This sort of attitude should not have been adopted at least by one who was adorning the Prime Minister's chair in this country. On the foreign land we should see that we do not fall a prey to all these gimmicks. And this gimmickry does not help in the long run. In that reception committee, one Mr. Swaraj Pal was the chairman, who organized the reception for Mrs. Gandhi. I would request Atal Ji to enquire as to who this gentleman Mr. Swaraj Pal is. I am told that there are many cases pending against him, and that his passport had been im-

pounded. Such persons are becoming representatives and mouth-pieces of the people of this country and speak as Indians. I say: lie upon them who pose as Indians and speak on foreign soil in a way which is against the interest of this country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please wind up now; you have taken more than 25 minutes.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I should like our foreign policy to be more dynamic. There should be some overhauling in our external affairs ministry; our M.Ps. should be put more and more in touch with the functioning of the external affairs ministry in the sense that there should be briefings to them from time to time from close quarters so that there is correct knowledge and appreciation of the working of the external affairs ministry. With these words, I once again extend my felicitations to our Prime Minister and to our External Affairs Minister for implementing the genuine non-alignment policy, for protecting the interest of this country
... (Interruptions)

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Cananore): Our foreign policy, according to the foreign minister is a policy by which we want to create friendship with all; we also want to promote genuine non-alignment. Here I should like to raise certain issues which, I think, are of great importance so far as the foreign policy is concerned. The report may have been prepared by the bureaucrats sitting in the south block who have a particular bent of mind and I do not want to put the blame on the minister for everything.

SHRI GAURISHANKAR RAI (Ghazipur): Do not blame the officers; this is not that type of democracy which you believe in, which is in your fatherland, where officers are attacked. Here the Minister is responsible.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do not get diverted by these remarks: you look to me.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I look to you but there is this type of disturbance.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Ignore the remarks coming from these people.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: The point is, why in the past certain countries like the United States behaved in a fashion, not so friendly to India? Was it accidental? The report gives the impression that after the new government has come into power, they have been pursuing a genuine non alignment policy and relations are improving. It is not a fact. The United States and other imperialist countries have interest which are going quite contrary to the interest of India and developing countries. It was they, not India, which tried to have unfriendly relations; it was the United States which tried to pursue a policy by which it wanted to isolate India, they wanted to destabilise India; they tried to arm countries like Pakistan; they made military blocks and they took decisions against the vital interests of our country in relation to Kashmir, in relation to Goa and so many other issues. In that context, it was naturally impossible for a country like India, like many other nonaligned countries, to have friendly relations with United States. It is valid even today. Even after the genuine policy of nonalignment is being pursued by this Government, what is the policy of United States in relation to India? United States is continuing its policy of unfriendliness towards India any other nonaligned countries, because basically USA is against nonalignment itself. Because of the very fact that nonalignment, as it was very well explained is an anti-imperialist policy and is a policy of

supporting those people who are fighting for their independence, we come into conflict with USA. When India adopts the policy of supporting the countries in Southern Africa against apartheid and racialism, you will find that these racial regimes are back and supported by USA in the most unashamed manner against the entire conscience of mankind. When we adopt the policy of supporting the PLO and Arab cause, we find that USA is trying to divide the Arab countries, trying to enter into the so-called peace treaty and trying to put the Arab nations into disarray, though they have not succeeded in that. Therefore, India's policy goes against the policy pursued by USA. These are facts of life. We are one of the most important countries in the nonaligned world and when we are pursuing our policy, they are trying to teach a lesson, like your friend, the Chinese. What is the latest decision of USA? Apart from having a military base in the Indian Ocean—it is a dagger pointed against the resurgent world in the Arab countries, Africa and Asia—over and above that, they have decided to patrol the gion. The age old gun boat diplomacy! I do not know whether Mr. Vajpayee agrees with that, but this report says that India is against military present in the Indian Ocean. The question is not that The question which agitates the littoral countries in Asia, Africa the Arab world and the entire world for that matter—the UN had said that Indian Ocean should be kept as a zone of peace—the question is, there is a military base, and a military base for no joke. It is a military base with which they wanted to interfere in countries wanting to pursue on independent policy of their own. Your friend, Mr. Kissinger, said, "If the Arab countries will decide the price of oil the way they like, we have a right to interfere militarily in their countries." (Interruptions) Gromyko, did not say like that. It was fear of Gromyko which prevented USA from interfering there. That is another matter. When a country

like USA persistently follows a policy against the newly independent countries, it is something inherent in them. This is what you forget. You say accidentally it happens. No. It is like looking for a vegetarian tiger! Imperialism has inherent in itself the quality of aggression, the quality of subjugation of countries, the quality of unleashing war against people who try to pursue an independent policy. Your foreign policy book refers to nothing of that sort.

You are little out of tune also in relation to things happening in the world. I must appreciate you, Mr. Vajpayee, because you often come out with corrections when the bureaucrats, whom you once described as faceless, nameless official spokesmen, make mistakes. These faceless, nameless official spokesmen at least three times went against your policy. They come out very often, but you cannot prevent them. What did they say? When Dr. Bhaktiar took over, they said it was a welcome development. You can deny it, but the press reported like that. I do not say that the press often reports lies. They misled our Samavendra Kundu about the Sadat-Begin Agreement. The official spokesman said it was a welcome development and Kundu made a statement in Bhubaneshwar, thinking it was the official policy. Later you came out here and said it was the nameless, faceless official spokesmen who had said it.

Again, they say in this Report something about the military presence of Super Powers being dangerous. Only at one point I found Mr. Chavan got something there, but there I beg to differ. I would like to make the point very clear because the Soviet Union is friendly with India. There may be mistakes. If there is no mistake in their policy they must be angels. They are not angels they are men. But the over-all policy which they pursued after the October Revolution is....

PROF. SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Wonderful!

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: It is a wonderful policy. You gave me a good word. It is from a strange quarter that I got a good word.

PROF. SAMAR GUHA: Even the nuances you do not know!

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: What I am saying is that they consistently pursued a policy by which they supported the national liberation movements everywhere. They supported countries after becoming independent to preserve their independence. Economic diplomatic and even military aid when it was necessary was extended and the socialist world and the Soviet Union stand as a guarantee today to the newly liberated countries facing the aggressive designs of imperialism. You may ignore it.

SHRI GAURI SHANKAR RAI (Ghazipur): What about Kampuchia?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I read the speeches of my learned and distinguished friend Mr. H. V. Kamath and others. What about Bangladesh? It is Bangladesh further ease. A dictatorship inflicted on people a regime which was hated by the entire people and a liberation movement like the Bangladesh liberation movement came about.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: We withdraw our troops.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: You withdrew your troops after the job was done. But I must say that in the world where you live today the countries which are supporting the liberation movements....

PROF. SAMAR GUHA: My friend forgets that it was Pakistan which committed aggression on India and in reply to that India had to send its army.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: You will get chances and you make your point very clear.

Today we are living in a new world, changing world, the pace of which we know. There is imperialism with all its designs, it is gradually dying. It is a fact of life. All the military mechanisms they made, including the CENTO, have met with their death, and countries which they thought would serve their cause, like Iran, got away from the clutches of imperialism and became independent. Other countries which are prepared to do that job are tottering. A new lease of life to this tottering world is attempted to be given by the Chinese Maoist-U.S. imperialist collusion. I say this because there is a reason for it. Some people are living in a cold-war age and, for them, history is not moving. But history has gone further ahead. So many things the world has witnessed. Let us not live in '40s or '30s.' We are today in 1979.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Cuba?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Cuba is doing a glorious job. You will not understand that; you need not understand that; you need not worry about it. We do not bother about it.

Lastly, in an effort to build bridges of friendship with others, Mr. Vajpayee paid a visit to China, inspired by or rather pushed into that by Dr. Subramaniam Swamy and company....

AN HON. MEMBER: What a discovery!

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: What happened? The basic questions which will decide finally, whether we will remain friendly with China or not, all those questions, remain un-resolved. You made a trip. That is very good. But, take for example, the case of Naga, the Mizos. You raised it. After all, you are Foreign Minister. You have a right to raise it. They heard you. This is what the report says that

they said, it will be treated as a thing of the past.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What does that mean?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: It means something very big. But it does not happen. What happens is more important. The meaning is something different. According to our information—it is coming in the press; I do not have any private information....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: That is not correct.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: You deny it; I will be happy. But what is happening is something different. They are helping the insurgents; arm smuggling is being done. They have set up a communist party of their own in Nagaland. That is what is happening.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Every communist country has a communist party of its own in India.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: That may be your idea. But that idea you could not sell anywhere. That sort of things are happening. What about other important things—What about the territory occupied by them? What about Korakoram road? What about Aksaichin Road? What about the map? Even today, in China, they are teaching a map to students in the schools and they are trying to create a bellicose attitude amongst the students, among the your generation, more in a fashion to commit aggression against others. This sort of a policy. I think, would not bear fruit.

You should distinguish between friends and enemies. That does not mean that you should become a camp follower. I am not suggesting that. I am not also saying that there should not be friendship and good neighbourly relations with China. I am all for it. But I must make that also

very clear. You cannot have good neighbourly relations with a country which is trying to teach lessons to others. So long as China pursues that policy of teaching lessons to others, you should think about it many times.

.One last word. This Government, as I said in the beginning, takes things as an accident. "Imperialism is against us", they say, because it was an accident, sometimes friendly and sometimes unfriendly; "Soviet Union is friendly" because, they say, it is an accident; "China is unfriendly", again, they say, because it is an accident. Here is a quotation of Mao Tse-tung.

Mao Tse-tung says:

"I read two books which my cousin had sent me and learned of Kang Yu-wei's reformatory movement. One was the New People's Magazine published by Liang Chi-chao. I read and re-read them until I knew them by heart. I worshipped Kang Yu-wei and Liang Chi-chao."

These two people he worshipped. And Kang Yu-wei wrote:

"Let us develop our industry and build steam engines. We can draw resources from Europe and America. We have four or five hundred million people which can give us ten million soldiers. We have inexhaustible resources of iron and metals which can provide us with thousands of warships. And then we shall be able to march through the five continents and there you will see the flags of the yellow dragon flying high and dancing in the air.

Liang Chi-chao, the other author, said:

"Our nation grew in two ways: by assimilating innumerable peoples within and without our frontiers and by resettling representatives of our nation, year after year,

in the frontier areas and expanding our territory... For five thousands years this has been our history's path"

So, Mao got them by heart and his successors are implementing it. Do you realise these things? In the foreign policy, I don't see that realisation about Maoist imperialism and their game nor about our friends also.

श्री गौरी शंकर राव (गाजीपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे मित्र, श्री चन्द्रपतन, के भाषण के बाद मेरे मत में यह बात आती है कि पहले मैं सारे संसार में चलती हुई वैदेशिक नीति के बुनियादी सिद्धान्तों के बारे में कुछ बातें कहूँ। खास तौर से हमारे कम्युनिस्ट मित्र, श्रीर दूसरे लोग भी, इस सदन में श्रीर इससे बाहर जब बातें करते हैं, तो ऐसा लगता है कि वे एकदम दकियानूसी, पिटे-पिटायें श्रीर पुराने वैदेशिक नीति के सिद्धान्तों की बातें कर रहे हैं।

जहाँ तक कम्युनिस्ट नीति का सम्बन्ध है, लेनिन ने 1917 के बाद सब से पहले यह सिद्धान्त अपनाया कि जब पूँजीवादी देश, या पूँजीवादी और फ़ासिस्ट देश, आपस में लड़ेंगे, तो हमें सँका फायदा उठाने— श्री विल शॉन दि कान्पाडिकशन आफ फ्यूल्ड एण्ड आबिटरेरी फोर्सिज एण्ड टे एडवांटेज आफ इट। उन्होंने यह जो कहा कि हमें वासाई संधि द्वारा मारे हुए देशों को समर्थन श्रीर शक्ति देंगे श्रीर उसके बाद दुनिया में हमारा स्थान होगा।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि को-एग सिसटेंस हमारे देश का विश्वास है, हमारे देश की संस्कृति है; वह भारत की भूमि से निकली हुई चीज है। लेकिन लेनिन ने कहा है कि को-एग सिसटेंस हमारी स्ट्रेटेजी है, हमारी ट्रांझिशनल-संक्रमण-काल की नीति है। फ़ारिन पालिसी में कोई सिद्धान्त नहीं होता है। मेरा विश्वास है कि यदि आज रूस

[श्री गोरी शंकर राय]

में चार का शासन होता और चीन में पुराने एम्परा का राज्य होता, तब भी वे दोनों दोनों देश आपस में लड़ते, जिस तरह कि ये कम्युनिस्ट देश अपने अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों के लिए आपस में लड़ रहे हैं। अमरीकी ने भी समझा था कि बियतनाम में फीज भेज कर कम्युनिस्टों की बढ़ती हुई शक्ति को खत्म कर देंगे। लेकिन पूंजीवादी देशों की सारी कल्पना ध्वस्त हो गई। पूंजीवादी देशों के समर्थक चाहते हैं कि हमारी विदेश नीति की रचना और निर्माण वाशिंगटन में ही, जबकि कम्युनिस्ट देशों के समर्थक यह चाहते हैं कि हमारी विदेश नीति मास्को में बने। लेकिन अब हमारी विदेश नीति नई दिल्ली में बनाई जायेगी।

हमारे कम्युनिस्ट मित्रों की वही पुरानी, रीएकनरी (जब उन लोगों का ही शब्द है), करसरवोटव, एण्टीकवेटिव, पिटा-पिटाई चीम चलीं आ रही है। वे अब भी अपने तथा-कथित कम्युनिस्ट सिद्धान्तों की बात करते हैं। श्रीमन्, आप समाजवादी रहे हैं और इस लिए मार्क्सिज्म से आपका बड़ा ताल्लुक रहा है। लेकिन ने कम्युनिस्ट मूव-मेंट को कभी भी अपने नेशनल इन्टरेस्ट्स के खिलाफ नहीं जाने दिया। हमारे बुजुर्ग, सी०पी०आई० (एम०) के लीडर बोल रहे थे। यह बता रहे थे कि कम्युनिस्ट हथियार अच्छा होता है और पूंजीवादी हथियार अच्छा नहीं होता।

मैं यह बता रहा था कि संझांतिक दृष्टि से दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद जिन दो महाशक्तियों बड़े अम्पुयय हुआ दोनों की सैनिक शक्ति कहीं थी और दोनों की बड़ी सैनिक शक्ति कोन मा मान कर राजनीति चलने लगी। लेकिन अपने मित्रों से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश नीति का यह झंझा जाने बबल गया। मिडिल ईस्ट आज आज बड़ रहा है। अफ्रीका के देश जो आये हैं। भारतवर्ष भी एक माध्यम-प्रगत शक्ति के रूप में जाने आ गया है और

अब इन दो दुर्गों से बची हुई देश का विदेश नीति नहीं होगी, न बुनिया के किसी देश की विदेश नीति ऐसी है। यही नहीं, लेकिन ने और कम्युनिस्टस ने तो यह भी एंटेसिपेट किया था कि जब द्वितीय युद्ध महायुद्ध होगा तो प्रत्येक देश में सिविल वार होयें और कम्युनिस्ट लोग हमारी मदद करेंगे, हम उस सेना को पार कर देंगे। इन्होंने कहा था कि फासिस्ट और पूंजीपति लड़ेंगे तो हमें तमाशा देखेंगे। लेकिन जब जर्मनी ने रूस पर हथियार उठाया और झगड़ा किया तो फ्रांस और ब्रिटेन के चरणों में नत ही गए, उम की सहाम्मता लेने की आवश्यकता उन को पड़ गई। इसलिए मैं अपने मित्रों से एक वाक्य यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पुराने भ्रमों को छोड़ कर नवीन असलियतों पर आये। बल्कि मैं अंग्रेजी में कह दूँ—

Kindly get rid of the old myths and come to the present realities.

तब समझ भ आया। इन 1945 पेटे पुराने शब्दों को अब छोड़ दें।

हमें प्रसन्नता है कि अब नान-एलाइन्ड की प्रवृत्ति कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी करती है। वक्त थोड़ा है नहीं तो मैं आप को बताता, कोरियन वार के लिये जिन बी के इन्फनन को ये प्रगतिशील और क्रान्तिकारी समझते थे उन को भी गालियां दी थीं और नेहरू को भी अमेरिका का बलाक कहा था। डाक्टर लोहिया ने एक पत्र लिखा था, एक आर्टिकल लिखा था, बर्ड कैम्प का बात की थी तो उस को आलोचना रशियन वेपर्स में की थी और डाक्टर लोहिया को कहा कि ये पैसिफिक इन्टरेस्ट सर्व करते हैं, पूंजीवादी इन्टरेस्ट सर्व करते हैं। तो नान-एलाइन्ड को जो लोग गालियां देते रहे हैं वे आज नान-एलाइन्ड की प्रवृत्ति कर रहे हैं। उन की दृष्टि में अब यह सुट करे तो यह क्रान्तिकारी

है और तब वह एण्टी इम्पीरियलिस्ट है। लेकिन भारतवर्ष किसी के इशारे पर एण्टी इम्पीरियलिस्ट और एण्टी कोलोनिअलिज्म नहीं हुआ। जब एण्टी कोलोनिअलिज्म की राजनीति शुरू नहीं हुई थी तब महात्मा गांधी ने साउथ अफ्रीका में कोलोनिअलिज्म के खिलाफ लड़ाई शुरू कर दी थी जब रूस और अमरीकी की फौजें दुनिया में नहीं थीं। तो हिन्दुस्तान को किसी से सीखना नहीं है, न एण्टी कोलोनिअलिज्म सीखना है न एण्टी-इम्पीरियलिज्म सीखना है। मैं अपने मित्रों से कहूंगा कि पिटी पिटाई पुरानी बातों को छोड़े। आज जो नवीन आवश्यकताएं और नवीन परिस्थितियां हैं उन के समकक्ष बात करें।

एक बात और कह दूं कि इन के खुदा ने और ये दूसरे जिन को ये हमारे भाई कहा करते थे, उद के खुदा ने, दोनों खुदाओं ने तय कर लिया हैं—

Both super powers came to the conclusion:

"Only direct threat to national survival could justify a resort to war".

इन दोनों ने तो यह तय कर दिया है लेकिन

"There are certain friends who are more loyal than the king".

यहीं से प्रवृत्ता कर रहे हैं और उस के लिए परेशानी में पड़े हुए हैं।

मैं इस विषय पर ज्यादा बक्त नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। नान-एलाइन्ड के बारे में एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। नान-एलाइन्ड के सम्बन्ध में भारतवर्ष की एक नीति रही है ईमानदारी से और संकल्प से। नेहरू के जमाने से भी पहले जब देश मुग़ल या तो इण्डियन नेशनल कांग्रेस ने अपनी कार्रवाई पालिसी पहले ही निश्चित कर ली थी। यह नेशनल कांग्रेस का नीति है बल्कि

भारतवर्ष का पुराना नेशनल कांग्रेस नीति है। भारतवर्ष की सभी संस्कृति सम्बन्ध की संस्कृति रही है और हम ने किसी का साथ नहीं दिया है। यह हमारी राजनीति है। नान-एलाइन्ड हिन्दुस्तान की नीति है। मैं ने आपसे कहा, बक्त नहीं है, नहीं तो मैं पढ़ कर सुनाता आप को, लेनिन ने कहा है—

Perhaps it is a strategy of a transitional phase.

उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि जब समाजवादी शक्तियां सशक्त हो जायेंगी तो सारी दुनिया को ठीक कर लेंगी। कांट्रिब्यूशन पूजीलादी देशों से नहीं हुआ बल्कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टीज के नेशनल कांट्रिब्यूशन आपस में शापन रूप और आज चीन और रूस आपस में लड़ने की स्थिति में हैं। हमें खशी है कि आज चीन के एग्जेशन को आप एग्जेशन कहते हैं। आप ने भारत पर चीन के एग्जेशन को एग्जेशन नहीं कहा इसलिए कि उस समय हम दोस्त थे और चीन भाई था। लेकिन उस पर हम गुस्ता नहीं है। हम यह कहना चाहते हैं अपने दोस्तों से कि राइट परस्पेक्टिव में भारतीय की दृष्टि से इण्डियन इण्टरेस्ट में, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय शांति की दृष्टि से भारत की विदेश नीति की व्याख्या करने की आवश्यकता है। हिन्दुस्तान नान-एलाइन्ड की मजबूतस्थिति में बड़ा

14.00 hrs

है। पहले भारत था या दो चार देश के, अब 88 देश हैं। कोरियन युद्ध के समय अमेरिकन कांग्रेस में जो आलोचना हुई थी, अभी हाल में मैं ने उसे पढ़ा, हमें गालियां दी हैं और कोरियन वार के समय डामे साहब ने लिखा है कि ये मनी बैंग के एजेंट हैं दोनों ने गालियां दीं। जब जूता दर्द करता है, चुभता है तो जूता खराब है और जब जूता नहीं चुभता है तो वह टीपी है ऐसा दृष्टिकोण हमारे मित्रों को छोड़ना चाहिए।

[श्री गौरी शंकर राय]

नान-एलाइनमेंट के बारे में हमें सन्देह नहीं है। चीन का वियतनाम के ऊपर तो आक्रमण है वह निन्दनीय है। कोई भी उसकी निन्दा करेगा और उस देश के लोगों ने हमेशा निन्दा की है।

14.01 hrs.

(Dr Sushila Nayar in the Chair)

जिन लोगों ने भारत के ऊपर चीन के आक्रमण को आक्रमण नहीं समझा उनकी देशभक्ति संदिग्ध ही नहीं बल्कि निश्चित रूप से दूसरे पक्ष में है। आज भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस मजबूती के साथ भारत इस बात को मानता है कि चीन एग्रेसर है उसी मजबूती से यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी वियतनाम की फौज कम्बूच्या में है। मेरे मित्रों ने उसको बंगला देश से कम्पेयर किया लेकिन बंगला देश में जब चुनाव हुए थे उसके पहले ही जनता ने बता दिया था कि पश्चिम पाकिस्तान के लोग एक साम्राज्यवाद के रूप में पूर्वी पाकिस्तान पर काबिज हैं। वहाँ जनमत प्राप्त होने के बाद सेनायें गईं और एक करोड़ रेफ्यूजीज का मामला हल करके सो दिन में हमारी फौजें चली आईं। अपने देश के सम्मान के विरुद्ध बात करने में कुछ लोगों को गौरव मालूम होता है, उसमें हमारे कम्प्यूनिस्ट मित्र भी हैं। हमारी फौजें बंगला देश से वापिस चली आईं और आज बंगालदेश से हमारा कोई मतलब नहीं है। आज हम शर्म के साथ कहना चाहते हैं तो हमारे कम्प्यूनिस्ट मित्र गर्व के साथ कहना चाहते हैं कि कम्बूच्या में वियतनाम का कब्जा श्रीपनिबशिक रूप ले चुका है। वहाँ पर फौजें हैं और वह हट नहीं रही हैं। हमारे मित्र कह रहे हैं कि उसको मान्यता दे दी जाये। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कम्प्यूनिस्ट देशों के अलावा 88 नान-एलाइन्ड देशों में किसने मान्यता दी है? क्या खाली भारत मान्यता दे दे? मैं अपने विदेश मन्त्री से कहूँगा कि हलभाव-प्रस्त होकर और लोगों को प्रसन्न करने के लिए सरकार ने यह काम नहीं किया है, यह उचित ही है। किसी नान-इकोइन्ड कन्ट्री

ने मान्यता नहीं दी है। इसलिए कम्बूच्या की बंगलादेश से तुलना करना कुतर्क है, अन्वय-पूर्ण है। मैं अपने मित्रों से कहूँगा कि कभी तो आप भारत देश के इन्ट्रेस्ट में सोचें। सर्वथा इधर उधर के इन्ट्रेस्ट की बात ही न सोचें क्योंकि इसका सिद्धान्त से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। कम्प्यूनिस्ट देश भी आपस में लड़ सकते हैं और पूंजीवादी देश भी लड़ सकते हैं। आप अपने पूर्वग्रह को छोड़ें। कम्बूच्या के मामले में भारत का सिद्धान्त सही है। जो यह कहा जाता है कि जैनुइन-नान-एलाइनमेंट क्या है तो उस के बारे में मैं आगे बताऊँगा, लेकिन कुछ मित्रों के लिये जैनुइन नान-इलाइनमेंट यह है कि अगर मास्को में बारिश होती है तो यहाँ पर छाता लगा लें, मास्को में कड़ी धूप निकलती है तो एग्र-कण्डीशनर यहाँ पर चाल कर लें। मास्को के मौसम से यहाँ का मौसम जज नहीं होगा। हमारे कम्प्यूनिस्ट मित्रों को मालूम होना चाहिये—न वॉशिंगटन न ब्रिटेन, न मास्को, किसी भी दूसरे देश के इशारे पर भारत भूमि का मौसम नहीं बनेगा। हमारी नान-इलाइनमेंट की नीति सही साबित हुई है, जब कि उन की नीति सही साबित नहीं हुई है। आप देखते हैं कि पूंजीवादी भी आपस में लड़ रहे हैं और कम्प्यूनिस्ट भी आपस में लड़ रहे हैं—अपने नेशनल इन्टरेस्ट में।

मान्यवर, फ्रेंच रेवोल्यूशन के बाद जो राष्ट्रीयता का जागरण हुआ, उस के बाद ऐसा लगा कि सारी दुनिया में उस का प्रभाव बढ़ेगा। हम बड़े आशान्वित थे लेकिन दस साल से मालूम होता है कि और भी भयानक राष्ट्रीयता का युत् चलाया गया, नेशनल फ्रेगमेंटेशन तक होने लगा। समय क्या है?—मैं कुछ और बातों के बारे में भी कहना चाहूँगा। हमारे राष्ट्र का कुछ सम्मान है। हमारे राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व, फर्सेनैलिटी प्रोजेक्शन में हमारी मदद करें। किसी देश से हम को कोई शिकायत नहीं है। कम्प्यूनिस्ट देश हमारे मित्र हैं, सब हमारा बड़ा दोस्त है—

उसके लिये हमें नाख है। वह हमारा मददगार रहा है। हम हमेशा दोस्त रहेंगे, लेकिन ईस्ट यूरोपियन कन्ट्रीज के एन्वैसेडर्स ने अभी ड्रेड भूतियन की तरह से एक कान्फेंस भारत देश की भूमि पर की। हम चाहेंगे कि किसी मित्र देश को इस प्रकार से संकोच में नहीं डालना चाहिये। यह विश्व की डिप्लोमेटिक परम्परा के विपरीत है। मिडिल ईस्ट के लोग भी हमारे दोस्त हैं—मैं अभी यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में था—सरकार और देश की नीति के अनुरूप हम ईजराइल और दूसरे सारे मामलों पर बोले। यहां पर मिडिल ईस्ट के जो मुल्क हैं उनका प्रदर्शन हुआ, ठीक है। लेकिन डिप्लोमेट की वाइज ने भी डिमांडेशन में हिस्सा लिया—यह बात सारे डिप्लोमेटिक नामों के खिलाफ है। इस के खिलाफ मन्त्री गी को मजबूती से कहना चाहिये। जैसे हांगकांग में फ्री-पोर्ट बताया जाता है, जिस किसी को स्मॉलिंग का सामान खरीदना हो, वहां चला जाय, उस प्रकार से इस देश का अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रोपेगण्डे के लिये फ्री-पोर्ट न बनाया जाय।

पड़ोसी देशों के साथ सम्बन्धों के बारे में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मौजूदा सरकार की नीति के अन्तर्गत सारी दुनिया के देशों से हमारा होस्टिलिटी बढ़ा नहीं है, कम हुई है। पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध बढ़े हैं। हथियारों की होड़ में हम किसी के साथ उतरना नहीं चाहते हैं।

जहां तक इण्डियन मोशन का सवाल है—सन् 1964 में पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अपने बीमारी के बिछोने से कहा था कि वहां पर शक्तियों की होड़ खत्म होनी चाहिये। सन् 1969 में मिस्रिज गांधी के फारन-मिनिस्टर श्री दिनेशसिंह ने न्यूयार्क में और यहां की पार्लियामेंट में भी कहा था कि दोनों बड़ी शक्तियों का बढ़ाव इण्डियन मोशन में नहीं होना चाहिये। 1972 के बाद जब हमारे पञ्जाब साहब फारन-मिनिस्टर बने—उन्होंने डीमो-पार्लियामेंट विचारें दिये। वह बड़ी सही हैं, हिन्द महासागर में सैनिक और

नौसैनिक शक्तियों की प्रतियोगिता एक बुरी बात है। इस क्षेत्र के तीस तटस्थ देशों के लिये वह खतरनाक बात है। समय नहीं है—दो-एक बातें और कहना चाहता था। सन् 1964 में, 1969 में, यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की जनरल असेम्बली के रेजोल्यूशन्स —मैं नम्बर कोट नहीं करूंगा, उस में जहा गया कि दोनों शक्तियों की प्रतियोगिता न हो। वहां एक कमेटी में यह कहा गया कि दोनों शक्तियों में जो प्रतियोगिता चल रही है रूस के सैनिक बेड़े का री-फ्यूलिंग, रिपेयर और सारे इन्तजाम हो रहे हैं, दोनों मजे से घूम रहे हैं, रोज शक्ति बढ़ रही है। ये दोनों शक्तियां इतनी आसानी से खत्म होने वाली नहीं हैं। कार्टर साहब ने 1977 में प्रोपोजन दी थी, रूस को कहा था कि तुम हटलौ तो हम भी हटलौ—लेकिन किसी ने नहीं हटला। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि दोनों शक्तियां हिन्द महासागर से दूर रहें। मैडम चेयरमैन, यह उसी प्रकार का व्यवहार है, जैसे अंग्रेज कहा करते थे कि हम चले जायेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान का काम चलने वाला नहीं है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ—मैं जब यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में था तो वहां एक सवाल पेश हुआ—मैं ज्योमेफिकल बाउण्ड्री की बात कह रहा हूँ—इस के हिसाब से हमारे भीहदे बढ़ा दिये जायें। इस मामले में नार्थ अमेरिकन और अफ्रीकन कन्ट्रीज ने हमें सपोर्ट किया, लेकिन जब ईस्ट यूरोपियन कन्ट्रीज और बेस्ट यूरोपियन कन्ट्रीज का सवाल आया तो उन्होंने अफगानिस्तान और वियतनाम को डांट कर भगा दिया। इस लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने इण्टरेस्ट में काम करते हैं, ज्योमेफिकल एरिया के हिसाब से कोई काम नहीं करता।

भारत सर्वदा विश्व शांति के लिये काम किया है। इस लिये हम नान-एलाइन्मेंट किसी से सीखना नहीं चाहते, हम उस पर चलेंगे, इस के लिये किसी से शिक्षा लेने की जरूरत नहीं

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Ashok Raj—
not here.

SHRI VASANT SATHE.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): While I shall appreciate the genuine effort which Shri Vajpayeeji is making to develop goodwill all round and follow genuinely the non-aligned policy of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I must express the genuine fear which I have about the general international scene and particularly, the developments in our part of the world.

Sir, it is axiomatic that the external policy of any country is only the extension of its internal policy. It is also equally well settled that anywhere in the world, whatever laudable objectives that you may proclaim the real respect for a country is gained only on the basis of its own strength.

We may eulogise and you may talk philosophically and all that. He has been going abroad to other countries again. We also had an opportunity to go somewhere. We found that the only way you are respected is on the basis of how self-reliant and how strong you are.

Therefore, I would like to place only few facts. India and China came into their own more or less in the same period. In fact China's present regime came two years later. See the developments. I am taking the entire view of the past thirty years and posing this problem as a national problem. I am not looking at it as it whether you did it or we did it in that way. Let us see what the facts are—to-day see the Chinese forces militarily. In spite of the economic strength that it has, look at the total amount of defence expenditure of China. This is our neighbour a most powerful neighbour. When we think of it, what is our position. That is why I am giving you here the figures of defence expenditure.

Defence Expenditure of India	Rs. 3,000 crores
—do—China	„ 29,000 „an- nually.

(Interruptions)

The total armed forces in India are 10,96,000 whereas in China they are 43,25,000; the combat forces in India are 9,50,000 as against 36,25,000 in China; if we take the mountaineering divisions, in India the armoured brigades—infantry—come to 16 whereas in China it has 150 regiments; India has 661 combat aircraft whereas China has 5600 fighter bombers; India has 605 interceptors whereas China has 4,500; in the Navy, India has 8 submarines whereas China has 75 submarines; India has 16 missile boats whereas China has 70; India has 7 coastal patrol whereas China has 300.

What I am trying to say is that apart from that, nuclear bombs and missiles—long range missiles—with nuclear heads have also been acquired by China. And no one raised his little finger. Even Mr. Kissinger went on to say why was China having nuclear explosion—nuclear bombs. When you did the nuclear explosion, your arms were twisted. You said 'I have said it only of my own, unilaterally that even for peaceful purpose, we will not have nuclear explosions'. Why? Because of Tarapur. Everybody knows it. So, let us not hide that. There is a saying that when you go for butter milk, you do not hide the butter milk pot. Therefore, it has been amply demonstrated that it is clearly based on your constraint on Tarapur Nuclear fuel that you have made. What is called, a grandiose statement unilaterally about your nuclear policy. This is disheartening not only to your scientists but it is demoralising the whole country's moral.

And you claim to the world that you will not do any explosion even for peaceful purposes.

Let us take another aspect of our so-called non-aligned policy. We do not want to have a tilt. I am entirely in favour of those friends who say

genuine non-alignment throughout. If there was any tilt, yes the tilt should have been set right. But let me know on merit where was the tilt? You mean obsession with Russia. Let us not be obsessed but judge on merits. When Soviet Union stood by India on the issue of Kashmir; when it stood by India on the issue of Bangladesh; when the Seventh Fleet came and it stood by and made the Agreement in the field of self-reliance in steel and oil shall we not give the due that a particular country should have.

Now, let us consider the Agreement Shake-Hand. Whichever the country tried to tilt and rely on American help—even for its economic revival—see what has happened to those countries. Take, for example, Chile, Zaire, Morocos, Ethiopia, Vietnam, Pakistan, and Iran is the latest. Where have (they helped countries) to become self-reliant? How many examples can my friend, Shri Subramaniam Swamy can give. I have given you half a dozen examples. Whoever tried to kiss the dollar hand it has been a kiss of death for him.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: So, kiss the rouble:

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Whenever you kissed you have not suffered for it—say in petroleum and steel. But I do not want you to be a kissing germ.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I will be concluding, Madam. The word 'genuine' is being flaunted. I would say this word is like his 'genuine' bachelor. Vajyapee is a bachelor. Madam, you know there is a word 'Brahmchari'. If you say a particular person is 'Brahmchari' or 'Brahmchari' but the moment you say that such and such 'Brahmchari' is an 'Asli Brahmchari' that creates doubt about the 'Brahmacharya' itself. The moment you say 'real bachelor' or 'genuine bachelor' what do you mean? Therefore, I do not want to

question the genuineness of your bachelorhood but all I want to say is that don't say too often that you are genuinely bachelor. Similarly, in genuine non-alignment. If you are non-aligned you are non-aligned. You say if there has been any imbalance we will correct it but don't go on repeating genuine, genuine and genuine. That will create doubt. Coming to this region, there is a warning that I want to give, sir, there is deliberate attempt by the Imperialist powers in the world to shift the entire area of tension from Europe to place. They don't want it there. Already they have *detente* there. They want to shift the tension even from Middle-east now to the South-East Asia region. Therefore, please beware of this. This process of de-stabilising the entire continent beginning with Vietnam and Kampuchea is there. It is coming nearer home, I can come home nearer. And, let me tell you, if that happens, then; this area will become an area of tension. It will affect the whole country. I have no time to expand this theme. But I had said this in the Consultative Committee. And I say it now again. The game of the imperialist powers is to make use of our subservience. They tried it in Iran. They failed. Now the only big country, major country, in this region is India. That is why they want to do it here. But, let me tell you, I am sorry, there are elements in this country who want to befriend the imperialist powers, multi-nationals etc. in the name of our development. Let me tell you, that will enslave our country and it will make it a breeding ground for all troubles.

May I ask: Why is my friend reluctant to call a spade a spade? I say, none of the super-powers should be present anywhere in the Indian Ocean. Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace, free from nuclear base. But, is there any difference between bases and naval movement? Are you so naive as not to understand even that much? And here is Diego Garcia. Atal Bihariji himself, on earlier occasions, con-

[Shri Vasant Sethi]

demned it in no uncertain terms. He said it, if I am not wrong, about having the base there. Now I ask them: Why do you now dilute that position? It is there. We condemn that. Any further expansion also must be condemned forthright.

As far as Kampuchea is concerned, Kampuchean regime controlled by Pol Pot was a stooge regime of China. People were unhappy....

AN HON. MEMBER: Chinese army was not there.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Does not matter. Not necessarily. You can have stooges without having armies there. So the Pol Pot regime was overthrown. So, the first thing that India should have done is to recognise the new regime there. Now, you know, the design of China, is to subjugate that entire region. The people there want to live together. You are not helping in that. You are not standing by that. When you say this about China, I can understand this. You want to normalise relations. By all means do it. I say this as I said in the meeting earlier. My friend Rajda was saying this. He said: "What is wrong? It does not matter. They have beaten or they have attacked Vietnam. Yet we must try to normalise." I say to him: "Yes. My dear friend. Do normalise. But you cannot be respected if you go to a person who, while inviting you, slaps you both on your right and left cheek, and then says, 'you come to me.' And while you turn, he gives you a kick in your back. This is what is done by China. Are you going to be respected by China? Have you earned your respect by going there or by your saying even now, although we are kicked in our back, we want to normalise? What is this sort of attitude denoting? What is this exchange you are talking about? Is it exchange of some *natakmandali*? Is that going to normalise relations? This ping-pong, *natakmandali* diplomacy is not going to help us. The only way to normalise

relations with China is to become stronger yourself and to create a situation on our borders with China that if any time they think in terms of teaching another lesson to India, they will get a bloodier face than they got in Vietnam. They must know this. Then alone they will be able to respect you and talk the proper language. Let us strengthen our country economically, have a stronger base. Let us concentrate our national energies irrespective of parties to have a national policy to strengthen ourselves. This is the only way to become stronger and be respected in the world. Then alone, we would be able to pursue our real foreign policy. I wish Shri Vajpayeeji all success in trying to evolve such a national consensus. You recognise Cambodia and talk in favour of Tibet; then alone China will understand your language.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur): Madam Chairman, I have been listening with great attention to the speeches made from that side. They have only made out two points. One is non-alignment. But do they really understand what is non-alignment? All cry of non-alignment simply means that we become the camp followers of a certain power. One of my friends openly said: "join the non-imperialist camp and be in it." We in India just do not wish to be a satellite of anyone or a camp followers of anyone. The second complaint that they have always been making is that Janata Government is tilting towards America. Where is the tilt? If we refuse to recognise Cambodia, we are perfectly right. What are the nine divisions of the Vietnamese army doing there? We had an objective in Bangladesh. After achieving the objective, we withdrew. We as a victor had the right to expand our Siliguri area which is the narrowest chicken neck. Unfortunately, if some day China and Bangladesh act together your North-Eastern area can be cut. We had the right to expand, but we refused

to do that. Here is non-alignment in action. And if our Foreign Minister or Government has refused to recognise Cambodia, there is nothing wrong about it. We are asking people to do what we have done. Non-alignment means action; what you preach, you act also. Non-alignment does not mean high invectives which are being issued by countries round about us.

The second implication of non-alignment, as I understand is the dynamic policy. It is not a policy of neutrality; it is a policy of having our right to pick and choose and pick and choose those very things, very issues which are akin and which go to help our immutable national interest. This is our non-alignment. I am afraid, my friends there are talking Rip van Winkle. They cannot understand that somebody else also has brain to think about it. They only know robot-like repetition of Hindustan—Indira and Indira—Hindustan. There is a robot-like repetition; and they cannot understand anything further. I must congratulate Mr. Sathe for the figures that he has given, of the Chinese arms build-up. I would have been happy if he had said this during the Defence debate. I had demanded an army of more than 4 million men. Did Mr. Sathe have the courage to say 'yes' to it? He did not have the courage to speak.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Should I speak on every Demand?

श्री वासन्त सठे : जो हिसू जहाँ का है, वहीं बोली, प्रत्येक बात से काम नहीं चलता।

Mr. Sathe and commonsense can never go together. The basis of our non-alignment is genuine non-alignment. He has been making jokes about the genuineness of it, and it has set me thinking whether he is genuine in what he is speaking and saying so far, or whether he is only biased.

A threat is developing all over the world, which is a danger to peace

and security. For our development peace is absolutely essential. We cannot deny peace. My friends have been saying and talking loudly: "This power should withdraw from here, and that power should withdraw from there." Has any power ever withdrawn by loud talking? Nightmares have never been wished away. They have to be fought out. My friends talk about imperialist powers. Who are the imperialist powers? Have my friends ever talked to Dubcek of Czechoslovakia, or Mr. Ceausescu of Romania?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What have you done?

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: I was not even here at that time.

वही किस्सा हुआ, उल्टा चोर कोतवाल को डंटे।

You should not ask that question. Have they asked the Hungarians, who is an imperialist? Have they asked the East Berliners, who is an imperialist? And have they cared to go to Poland and ask Janas Kadar who is an imperialist and who pulled out his nails in the secret service prison? All of them are imperialists; the Red Czar of Moscow, the yellow emperor of Peking, the son the Heavens, and the dollar imperialists in Washington.

They have been talking of bases. Diego Garcia was mentioned. Have they asked the Russians about their base on the Scootra islands at the mouth of the Babel Mandap, or about the base at Aden? Did they ask them about Somalia turning out Russians from their base at Berbra, and how many Russians were there then? There were 22,000 Russians there. It means one-and-a-half divisions. What were these divisions doing in Somalia? But my friends will never talk about them. They will only talk like a broken HMV record, repeating "bhain, bhain".

[Shri Yadvendra Dutt]

I, therefore, request the Foreign Minister to build up a national consensus of all the sea-borne States on the African continent; on the Indian Ocean, viz., India, South-east Asia, Shri Lanka, African Sea-borne States and to build up a national conscience and bring pressure on these foreign powers and imperialists to withdraw from these places. And for bringing about that pressure, it is also necessary that the highest judicial vision or moral vision should be there; but they also need the backing of the requisite force. That should be developed in this country. We have been told that Russia is our only friend in the world. I asked Mr. Sathe details about the kiss of the rouble. He gave me a long list. May I remind him—and I hope that the Foreign Minister will also take pains to read that agreement—about the agreement which Russia imposed on us while giving heavy water for our Rajasthan plant? That agreement was the worst, even worse than the non-proliferation treaty or the Vienna international inspection treaty. Our arms have been twisted too long, by all the Super Powers. Let us be done with them. Let us stand on our own strength.

Madam, they have been talking of Russia as our friend. When China attacked us, what was Russia doing? Even when Mr. Kosygin came here, a communique was issued, but telling China to withdraw was not mentioned in it. But did he agree to put in a word that he also asked China to withdraw from occupied Indian territory? Has any where, in any Communique, this thing has come? These are our friends.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Did you say that it should be included?

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: The Foreign Minister will answer that; I

am putting a poser; I was not in the talks; I am posing the question.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: If you knew that he was asked and he said, 'No', then you can say.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: Russia has been interfering in our internal affairs too much which, as a friend, it should not do. I want to be friends with Russians, the Russian people are excellent people but then there is a limit to friendship. Hymns of praise on the emergency was sung by the Moscow radio. What was it? An attack on the RSS was broadcast by the Moscow radio. What was it? That is interference in the internal affairs. RSS may be good or bad; it is for you and me to decide, not for a foreigner; he has no business to interfere in our internal matters. This interference by Russia must stop. If the Russians want our friendship we will give that but it should be as equals. People have been saying that India needs the friendship of Russia True. But Russia equally needs our friendship; this must be clearly understood. Whatever respectability Russia has got in the non-aligned world is because of our support. If because of geo-politics India becomes hostile one day to Russia, the entire under belly of Russia can be opened to total destruction; this must also be understood by my friends over there.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: On a point of order. Both the Ministers are not here.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: One Cabinet Minister is here. It must also be coming is due to the rise of nationalism in different areas in different garbs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: You have given twenty minutes to Mr. Sathe and 31 minutes to the opposition leader; please allow me for five more minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN You have taken 12 minutes; you can have three more minutes; please try to be brief.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: The danger is that about 26 small and large bush fire wars are going on around the world. If I had the time I could quote all the names: in Turkey, in Lebanon, in Iraq, South Yeman, Northern Ireland, Spain, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Uganda Sahara, Chad, Rhodesia, Angola, Namibia, Afghanistan, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia and all these countries.

The recent treaty between Egypt and Israel may be good or bad; that is immaterial; but what is material from our point of view is that America is going to be present in Sinai; America is going to hold a base in Sinai on peace making mission. I am a very small man. I caught hold of a map which clearly shows the developments. I am sorry I have not got that small map here, showing Americans in Sharm El Shek in Israel, in the Sinai, between the Egyptian forces and the Israeli forces. American base in Diego Garcia is completely armed. Russia is bound to make a riposte. I make bold to predict that it may come either in the Middle east or in Central Asia. The Chinese attack on Vietnam has made Russia lose its credibility. Russia may gain a base at Camron Bay; it would have a base for its pacific fleet. The super powers will not agree to lose a base. As China has exposed Russian credibility, Russia is concentrating its entire army on the Central Asian Republic, Azerbaijan, Turkmenia, Uzbekistan and all these areas. Or the riposte may come in Afghanistan because it is only 350 miles from the Gulf of Hormuz, through which the entire oil flows to Western Europe and America and Japan. If that way is held, the entire

economy of the country will be strangled. This is the danger spot. And if the Suez canal is closed what happens to us. That is a danger to us also. We must look into this. On the South East Asian area it is the richest economic raw material area. I do not know whether our Foreign Minister, when he met the Prime Minister of Thailand, talked to him or not on the question of oil exploration in Thailand. Thailand has recently given concession for oil exploration to America, to the Shell Co. I wonder if they talked or not because if there is trouble in the Middle East, be careful, oil is not going to flow to us. We have got to find an alternative source of oil. But for that there are two possibilities for which I have been speaking, writing and saying for years. One is Thailand and the other is Mexico and Burma. Mexico is a country sitting on oil, as big as Saudi Arabia. Mexico will never give this oil to America because of historical reasons. Historical clashes have come down, like the two yellow and red emperors having clash in the Central Asia. This is the time when we can move in. We have got certain oil technology. We can offer to Mexico our oil echnology. In return we can get the Mexican oil for us. People will say ships will go empty. I say survey the Mexican market and you can supply Mexico all the consumer goods cheaply than Japan supplies and we may have better chance of getting oil. We should fix up our oil now as Mr. Chavan said 1980s are going to be an era of struggle for oil and in that it may not go in. I am afraid, we will be in for a hot time.

Our Embassies abroad have come under direct attack. I regret to say that their behaviour is worse than the behaviour of ICS. I know when our people go to the Embassies they say, come to-morrow, and that to-morrow never arises. It is easier to get visa endorsement in French or British Embassies than ours. This thing must be corrected.

[Shri Yogendra Dutt]

The Embassy should be there and the Embassies are expected to be there to help our people. They are not there to boss over us. This attitude, this approach must change.

Secondly, I would suggest as I have been hearing the criticism of the officers of Foreign Affairs or Defence, why criticise the officers. If they are bad, if they take lessons from Washington, turn them out, if you have any proof. If you have none, you have no business to blackmail them and demoralise them. From my personal experience I can say that the officers in External Affairs Ministry are equally good and patriots, if not more than most of us here. Therefore, to criticise them is just only to blackmail them. This must stop. The hon. Minister is here. Criticise him as much as you like.

My third suggestion is that the Foreign Embassies in Delhi behave as if they own Delhi. I will give you one example. You take the number of accidents by the people in foreign embassies attached to different consulates and the rash driving that they do. They never care for your signals. Air Marshal Latif was probably the victim of these gentlemen. I do not think that mere apology is sufficient. I would say that if they misbehave, they should be declared *persona non grata* in this country.

Our intelligence has not been very good. Our Foreign Affairs Minister went to China. There is nothing wrong about it. But I would say international and Embassy intelligence failed to inform him of the impending attack. The Indian intelligence failed to inform you of the impending attack... Which of the failed, I do not know. But this failure of intelligence has to be corrected. Therefore, the intelligence must be pulled up.

Finally I would say that the toy States of Europe and City States, as

they call it, of San Marino have Consuls here. Do we know how much provision they import? If they import it freely, how much of it goes to the black? There is the point of danger to our economy.

Before I sit down, I will again request the Foreign Minister to take into consideration the coming problems of the 80s. The basis of diplomacy the Super Powers of 80s would be of capturing of strategic points in their global interest with the force of might and oil—we should take that into consideration and build your foreign policy accordingly. So far what you have done is excellent. With these words, I support the Foreign Minister's policy and the demands of his ministry.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY
(Bombay North-East). Madam Chairman, last year at this time I had participated in this debate on the demands of the External Affairs Ministry. During this one year, the Government of India has achieved many notable successes, particularly at the bilateral level. Certainly the handling of the United States and the question of nuclear issues is a matter which I would single out for compliment. The way we have conducted ourselves in our relations with the USSR culminating in the visit of Premier Kosygin to this country is also something on which I would congratulate the Government. There were certain thorny problems plaguing us for a long time, which also we have solved, particularly handing of small countries like Nepal.

Last year when I spoke—I have the debates with me—mine was almost a lone voice in making some critical points about our policy. Listening to the debate today and the other day, I do find that the number of critics seems to have grown and in my opinion, criticism is a good thing because it means you are doing something. It is only when you are not doing any-

thing that really there is no criticism. Once you find that people are saying that this should not be done or should be done this way or that, it obviously means that the Government is in the process of moving along a certain direction and it is only that direction which we ought to consider. Last year I said that I disagreed with the foreign policy on its basic content, but I also said that the conduct of foreign policy was very good. This year I find from some of the criticisms made than even the conduct has been called into question; most of the cases have been wrongly called into question. The Foreign Minister's visit to China and his conduct there have been called into question by the members of the opposition, for justifiable reasons from their point of view, because he is disturbing an established *status quo*. For that matter, his visit to USSR just before going to China also came in for some criticism. I would say that that criticism is not entirely without foundation. But the essence is that the Foreign Minister has been doing something, the Government has been doing something and it is that that we should really welcome. And, I welcome that fully.

A fundamental issue which has been raised from time to time is the question of non-alignment. The issue has been only on what is the meaning of genuine non-alignment and whether Jawaharlal Nehru's words are followed to the letter or whether there being followed to the letter or whether there is deviation. I feel the time has come for this Parliament to ask the fundamental question: what should our foreign policy be in the present context of international environment?

When we formulated the non-alignment policy, there were only two Super Powers, Big Powers; it was a bi-polar world. The choice before India was to align herself with either of these Powers, and Jawaharlal Nehru, and I think before him actually in 1949 Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia,

propounded the thesis that we should be with neither. It was thought that it was impossible to do that, but we managed to do it. It was a contribution to foreign policy.

I do not object to non-alignment as a policy, but the question I am raising is: in this multi-polar world that the world has become, with India being the tenth largest industrial power in the world having the seventh largest income and the third largest scientific manpower should we seek to pursue a policy which was based on the concept of a bi-polar world. We ought, therefore, to consider whether we should pursue a foreign policy which is more in tune with India's position today with India as a pole in this multi-polar world.

Mr. Chavan was complimenting the Foreign Minister on what he called his elastic behaviour. Mr. Chavan having an elastic conscience, I am not surprised that he found elasticity a very great quality. But I would say to the Foreign Minister: let us examine this question *ab initio*. It is not enough to say that when Governments change, national interests do not change. What is our national interest today in this multi-polar world? What is the role that India has to play? That is the question that has to be asked, and that basic question has not been asked here.

Mr. Vajpayee, in his last reply, said that only those who participated in the freedom struggle could understand what non-alignment means. I did not participate in the freedom struggle. Perhaps that is what he meant. But I did participate in the struggle against the emergency. Therefore, I would say that what is necessary is that the issue of the freedom struggle and the issues thrown up in the emergency struggle have to be brought together, and that in my opinion means that we ought to follow a policy which will make the country stand on its own feet, and give the world something. What we can give to the world

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

is human rights. The poor people of the world can have human rights, and desire human rights. This has been established in India in 1977 and this is what we ought to promote.

The question, therefore, is: in this international environment what is India's role? Afghanistan today has had a coup, and we all know that the Soviet Union have gained from it, and in Vietnam too. And we seem to have a lot of Soviet client States on either side of India. This is the question that has to be answered: what is it going to be like in the 'Eighties'? After all, if India is going to be run on human rights, it is going to have an impact on the rest of the countries—Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh. I am not saying that India ought to intervene or interfere in these countries, but we can create a climate which will have an impact.

And it is here that I would say that when we are making choices as to how far to go on the human rights issue bilateral national interests, the issue of China comes up. After all, what is it that India is seeking in normalisation with China? Much has been said about China teaching a lesson. Stupid words can be used by leaders on various occasions. I can find many occasions in history even in this country where leaders used very stupid words. After all, even today, a very distinguished leader of Africa, Julius Nyerere, in describing his action against Uganda, says: "We want to teach Idi Amin and the Government of Uganda a lesson for all time to come". He has used such words. It happens that such words are used, and one suffers for it. Yahya Khan wanted to teach a lesson to that woman, not realising that there are 350 million women in India, each stronger than the other, Parvathi Krishnan included—she has disappeared anyway.

They are saying: how can you trust China? That is not the issue. The question is one of taking a calculated risk, taking steps, China is in posses-

sion of our territory. This is the argument we hear from the CPI and people who consider that friendship with the Soviet Union is the most important thing, but the fact is that the USSR still publishes maps upholding China's claim in Indian territory USSR maps still show Aksai Chin as part of China or they give it a slightly different colouring, to show that it is not part of India. Now we still have relations with Soviet Union. We have relations with Pakistan and everybody has advocated normalisation of relations with Pakistan, although Pakistan is in possession of one-third of Kashmir. That issue never come up and we also have relations with the United States, although the United States aggressed on our territorial waters. Even then there are people who advocate good relations with the United States and they normally seem to get on. Why is it that China is being singled out when we talk about normalisation? They say "look at what they have done in the case of Vietnam. Can't you open your eyes". Well, we signed Indo-Soviet Agreement in 1971, which the present Government of India also upholds. This Agreement was signed just three years after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, Soviet troops were sent across the border into Czechoslovakia and they installed a new Government and removed a Government which was going towards greater and greater human rights. But keeping in view the national interest of our country, we have signed a treaty, which the Parliament also upheld in a resolution. But the fact of the matter is that today, the question is that there are forces which want to stop any attempt to seek and understanding with China based on our national self-respect and sovereignty. Taking back our territory is also a part and parcel of that normalisation process and in that process we will have to have a clear understanding of China's political view, we have to ultimately have a political settlement with China. It is not a technical adjustment with China that on the question of border issue,

they give back what they have taken. We have to have a political settlement with China. We say that we will not have relations with China at the cost of our established relations with the Soviet Union. I think we should also say that our established relations with the Soviet Union is not going to preclude us from exploring friendship with other countries. If both are said, then it will have a sense of genuine non-alignment. Otherwise, if you only say on the one side, that we will not pursue our friendship with other countries at the cost of established friendships, only one side, without saying the other side that our established friendship will not preclude us from establishing friendship with other countries then the genuineness of it gets diluted. (Interruptions). I equate all countries with all countries when it comes to the question of calculating our national interest. The Soviet Union considered China as its brother. But later they changed over. All the countries change according to the national interest and the situation. We have to see what is appropriate for us.

To conclude, on the question of officers, I agree that we should not hold the officers responsible, but the officers should also realise that there is something called Parliament and that they should not try to mislead Parliament, they should not speak disparagingly of the Members of Parliament, they should not mislead the public. It was true that due to certain timing, a piquant situation was created when the Indian Express carried a front page story that two diplomats of USSR have been expelled because of their involvement in spying activities. Prompt came the denial from the External Affairs Ministry that this story is untrue. No USSR diplomats have been expelled. What had happened is that they were found implicated in spying cases and the Government of India has asked the Soviet Union,

because as a friendly Government, you do not expel the diplomats of a friendly country, to better withdraw them. Either the External Affairs Ministry should have kept quiet or it should have stated the exact position that they have not been expelled, but they have been asked to be withdrawn because of their involvement in spying activities. Here is a clear case of trying to mislead the public and the Members of Parliament by Officers. I have myself, gone to China. When I went to China, everyday, the External Affairs Ministry spokesman was issuing statements on what I was doing and what I was not doing. Well, that official now says that he was ordered by the Minister to do so. But that official should have told the Minister that Mr. X is the Member of Parliament and that he as an Officer, has no right to comment on what Mr. X is doing in China or outside China that is why, I want to say that the officers should be told that Parliament should not be taken lightly, the Members of Parliament should not be taken lightly.

15.00 hrs.

With these few words, I am concluding. I cannot terminate my speech without saying a word about Indian employees working in foreign Embassies. Their conditions are terrible. If Indians work in this manner in foreign Embassies, the image of India can never be high in the countries of the Embassies. I would urge upon the hon. Minister to see that all Embassies in Delhi implement the model contract which is essential for employees

*SHRI AMAR ROY PRADHAN (Cooch Behar): Madam Chairman, with your permission I would like to speak in Bengali. The internal policy of a nation has its reflection on the foreign policy of that country. It is no wonder therefore that the

*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

[Shri Amar Roy Pradhan]

falter every now and then. India has on the capitalist economy should falter every now and then. India has earned independence by fighting an imperialist power but we find today that the country is unable to speak clearly and specifically against the imperialist powers of the world. They are finding it difficult to recognise the two representatives of the socialist bloc—China and Soviet Union.

Both the third world and the UNO have said that the Indian ocean should be a zone of peace. It is really unfortunate that even during Nehru's time the imperialist forces of America had set up their military base in Diego Garsia and today it is being expanded at a very fast pace.

The Indian Express Business Standard in its edition dated the 28th March, 1979 had quoted a news from the Washington Star. If you go through this news Madam, and if it is true then I must say it is a very dreadful news. The foreign paper is reported to have said that "the United States appears definitely moving towards—not merely studying—basising a permanent 5th fleet in the Indian Ocean." I would like to quote further from this very source which says, "Under direction from Defence Secretary Harold Brown, the Joint Chief of Staff is studying the possibility of deploying one of the Navy's large Air Craft Carriers into permanent station in the Indian Ocean as a part of new 5th fleet that would substantially raise American Military presence in West Asia."

Have we protested against this situation? On the contrary we have lent a quite support to the above move.

I would like to give you another instance how we concede and support indirectly the actions of the imperia-

lists. Under the leadership of Tom Tornton, the special expert adviser to President Carter on South East Asia, a secret meeting was held in New Delhi on 4th and 5th March, 1979 where representatives from Ceylon, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Soudi Arabia, Iran were present. I would like to know from the hon. Minister for what purpose this meeting was called? Was it an attempt to create a new power bloc in this area of the world comprising of Ceylon, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Iran and Soudi Arabia? But the Government of India, surprisingly enough has adopted an attitude of carelessness about the whole matter; as if they have nothing to do in this matter and as if they are unable to understand the sinister move of the imperialist power. That is why I had said a little while ago that right from the time of Jawaharlal Nehru we had wrapped our foreign policy with a cloak of non-alignment and we have continued to lend support to the imperialist forces of the world. After 32 years of independence the foreign policy of India has come to a stage which can be compared to a fallen woman who has outlived her youth, who does not know who is her lover and who does not know what love is? And that is the reason why at every step the foreign policy of India is faltering.

China and Vietnam are two neighbouring countries. Both the countries have a long history of their struggle against Imperialism. In their fight against the imperialist forces of France and America, China had stood by the Vietnamese with all their might. Therefore, the China, Vietnam war has disheartened all the progressive socialist minded people of the world. The Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin has tried to attack China in his speech breaking all diplomatic norms. But it cannot people of India the working class people of India

rather that of the world feel hurt about the China Vietnam war. I feel happy that my Communist friends have come forward to accuse China as an aggressor on India. Their voice is loud and they do not feel contented merely by saying that China has attacked Vietnam but they would also like to remind the people of India that in 1962 the Chinese had attacked India too. I am reminded of an incident which occurred in 1963. At that time I was a member of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly. Hon. Shri Prafulla Chandra Sen who is now a member of this House was then the Chief Minister of West Bengal. At that time on behalf of our party, the Forward Block of India we had introduced a noconfidence motion against the Government of West Bengal State. The Communists too had given notice of such a motion. Even though they had supported our motion we could not support the motion that was preferred by the Communist party and if it was so it was only because of the fact that the Communist party of India in 1963 could never say that China had attacked India. This policy of the Communist Party of India might have been influenced because the Soviet Union was in two minds about this issue at that point of time.

I would like to reiterate that no progressive minded man can support the attack of Vietnam by China and the way they have talked about their intention of teaching a lesson to Vietnam. No doubt this incident is a very sad one. But why has China attacked Vietnam? We have to analyse the issue and cannot merely by pass it casually under some slogan or the other. It can never be denied by any one that when China attacked Vietnam 19 Divisions of Vietnamese forces were stationed in Kampuchia. May I ask this hon. House as to who had given the right to Vietnam to act as a Holy Father in regard to Kampuchia? But still I will say that by attacking Vietnam China has done

a wrong thing and they will have to withdraw their forces. In a similar way Vietnamese too will have to withdraw their forces from Kampuchia. Both the countries have to solve this problem through peaceful negotiations. But it gives me a great pain to think and I feel hurt and humiliated when I find the Indian foreign Minister cancelling his foreign visit returns to India from China as a mark of protest against Chinese aggression on Vietnam.

If the Foreign Minister did not have any source other than the newspapers to get right information about this incident while he was staying in China then the blame should rest rightly and squarely on the Ministry of External Affairs and no body else. The Foreign Minister had gone to Peking to establish friendship with China after a very long period and he had to come back by cancelling his visit there. In the interest of the defence of our country we want friendship with China. This must be said clearly. Just as we want friendship with Soviet Union, we would also like to have friendship with China too. In fact, we would have the support and friendship of the entire socialist camp of the world. I must say that in Political diplomacy it does not pay to be oversensitive or being touchy about any matter. The interest of the nation is supreme and it cannot be substituted by over sensitiveness.

We earnestly crave for friendship with our neighbouring countries. We want friendly ties with Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, China, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Ceylon and Burma. But it must be made clear that we do not want to buy friendship by sacrificing our national interest or subduing our sovereignty. But what do we find in practice. We have continued to follow a policy of appeasement. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru tried to be friendly with Pakistan by giving a gift of Bera Bari to them. Shrimati Indira Gandhi

[Shri Amar Roy Pradhan]

exchanged 29 sq. miles of Indian territory with 8 sq. miles of Bangladesh. As if this was not enough she proceeded further to make a gift of an inseparable part of India measuring 3 bighas of land on a permanent lease of 999 years and thereby assigned nearly 25,000 Indian people of Kuchili Bari to the mercy of the rulers of Bangladesh. Our present External Affairs Minister is pursuing the same policy and following the footsteps of the previous Prime Ministers he too has given facilities to the police and military administrator of Bangladesh a right of passage to Dahagram and Angarpota area so that these Bangladesh people are able to take part in general elections. You wanted friendship with Bangladesh. Well it is a good thing but should we not expect that the people of Indian enclaves are not denied the democratic rights. While granting the right of passage to the Bangladesh, military and police authorities did you ever numbering over a lakh residing in the 30-sq. miles of the area of India enclaves had a voting rights or not? Did you ever enquire and satisfied yourself whether these Indian people could exercise their votes in Lok Sabha, Vidhan Sabha or Panchayat elections? Are you aware of the facts, Mr. Minister, that rape, robbery, murder and thefts are incidents of daily occurrence in this area? Are you aware of the fact that the rule of jungle prevail in this area and in order to maintain law and order the Bangladesh Government have refused permission for the entry of even one single *chowkidar* what to speak of Indian army or the Indian police in this area. You will be surprised to know Madam, after 1960, no Indian official was permitted to enter this area.

The Government of India is trying to give the right of vote to the citizens of Bangladesh. There cannot be any objection to this laudable idea but what pains me most is that with re-

gard to its own citizens numbering nearly a lakh the Government remains indifferent and they simply do not bother whether these Indian citizens would ever be able to exercise their right and enjoy the freedom that the Constitution confers upon their fellow brethren in India. You are only too anxious to see that the Government of Bangladesh is not annoyed but I would like to remind the hon. Minister that you cannot have real friendship nor can you achieve anything great by following a policy of appeasement.

We the Members of Parliament received a copy of a letter of the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society. I have got a copy of this. I do not know whether other Members also have it with them or not. I would like to present this photo state copy to this House and for the benefit of the Members I would like to read out the letter here.

INDO SOVIET CULTURAL
SOCIETY,
NATIONAL COUNCIL

(Reg. Under Indian Societies Act)
Dated 2nd March, 1977.

Dear Dr. Z. Kruglova,

Regarding Cultural Plan for 1977 we are working on it and Dr. Ultsiferon has given some new suggestions on which I am giving my comments etc.

2. The delegation of National Council ISCUS are ready to come to USSR on the II week of August 1977. Please confirm.

3. I am forwarding herewith a letter just received from the Party regarding Mr. Bahuguna, General Secretary, C.F.D. Election fund. We should be grateful if you would kindly take immediate necessary action in the matter and inform the