

कभी कभी उबर हुआ हो जाए तो उस हलके को खत्म करने के लिए पूरी ताकत बना कर, पूरी कतिबत बना कर जितना ज्यादा मुस्ताफ देना हो दे कर अपनी बात को हासिल किया जाए । मैं धाय से अपनी इस विदेश नीति पर बहुत के बीगन इसकी नांग करता हूँ ।

बाहिर विदेश नीति है क्या । मैं एक अपना नेता हूँ । विदेश नीति एक ऐसी पत्नी है (इंटरफ़ॉन्स) भाप चाहें तो मैं बाप में उलट दूंगा [विदेश नीति एक ऐसी पत्नी है जिस का पति है अन्न और उद्योग विभाग और जिस का बेटा है राजा बना थाके । तो विदेश नीति का पति है अन्न और उद्योग उसका बेटा है पलटन और सेना । लेकिन हमारी विदेश नीति जिस ढंग से चल रही है उस में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह पुत्र हीन विधवा बन गई है । कोई ताकत इस में नहीं है] मैं पलट देता हूँ । अगर भारत की जगह मैं ले ले तो मैं कहूंगा कि बंस लोपी बिहुर बन गई है । इस में कोई ताकत नहीं रह गई है । बस लोपी बिहुर, ऐसा एक मर्द जिस में अब कुछ बंस को बनाने की ताकत नहीं रह गई है । जब विदेश नीति इस स्थिति के ऊपर पहुंच जाए तब हम को पूरो ताकत के साथ फसला करना पड़ेगा कि बाहिर हमारा संकल्प कैसा हो ।

13 hrs.

बसे बाब मैंने जजबारों में पढ़ा । विदेश मंत्री धाह्य कहते हैं कि चीनियों की हमारी जमीन के ऊपर तो लकीबत नहीं लेकिन कुछ राजनीति की लकीबत है । इसको पढ़ कर मुझे ऐसा लगा कि ये जाबब माओ लो दुब से कहीं निक कर तो नहीं जाए हैं ? किसकी ही हमारी जमीन उनके बाहिकार में चली गई है फिर भी वह हजरत कहते हैं कि चीनियों की बाब हमारी राजनीति पर नहीं है, उन की बाब हमारी राजनीति पर है । क्या उन की बाब की उजायाब या को

राममूर्ति पर है ? किम पर है उन की बाब ? अगर उन की बाब जमीन पर नहीं है, तो कहीं है ?

कल जब श्री चपलकांत भट्टाचार्य ने संस्कृत का एक श्लोक पढ़ा, तो मैं तदन में नहीं था । मैं कालीधाम के कुमारसंभवम् से हिमालय के बारे में श्लोए पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ । भायद दुनिया को सारी कविता में हिमानय को ले कर ऐना श्लोक नहीं है और वह भकेला यह सिद्ध करता है कि अगर हिमालय किसी का है, तो वह हिन्दुस्तान का है—मेरा मतलब भारत से नहीं है, बल्कि मेरा मतलब उस हिन्दुस्तान से है, जो भारत और पाकिस्तान को बिना कर बनेगा ।

भस्त्वुत्तरस्या दिशि देवताः(४) हिमानयो नाम नगाधिराजः

पूर्वापरा तापनिष्ठा विवाह्य स्थितः पृथिव्या इम मानदद.

यह है हिमानया । इम हिमालय के लिए .

Mr. Speaker: We adjourn for lunch now.

12.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Lohia may resume his speech.

He has lifted the debate, by quoting Kalidasa, to Himalayan heights. I wish the sublime height is kept and not brought down.

डा० राज कर्पोहर लोहिया : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हों कि जहाँ हिमालय है वहाँ मैदान में बंसा भी जाती है, अगर मैदान की बंसा पर हम को नहीं उतरने दोगे तो हिमालय से फायदा ही क्या है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But the classical poetry is on that level. We should remember Kalidasa.

डा० राज कर्पोहर लोहिया : दोनों ही को रहने दो, तब जा कर कहीं भारत बनेगा। तो उस का धर्म में बागना माहब को खानी हसना ही कह कर बताता हूँ कि उस माहरी की जैसी माहरी दुनियाँ में हिमालय के बारे में कहीं नहीं है और यह मैं एक सबूत समझता हूँ, सिमाही सबूत समझता हूँ कि हिमालय भारत-नहीं, मैं गलती कर रहा हूँ, हिन्दुस्तान का है, भारत और पाकिस्तान को जोड़ कर के जो मुल्क है, हिन्दुस्तान का है। लेकिन बार बार जब यह सबाल आप के मामले आया तो फिर एक गलती आपसे होती जा रही है। मैं उस का सबब समझता हूँ और कुछ हयदवी भी आप से करता हूँ। पहले वहन जब चीनियों ने आप से कह गलती करवायी, हमला किया तब आपने उन से अपने तास्नुक नहीं तोड़े। फिर दूसरी तरह से जलील किया, आप ने अपने तास्नुक नहीं तोड़े। तब अब की बार सिर्फ एक दो आधमियों को उन्होंने पेंकिंग की गलियों में जलील किया इन पर तास्नुक छोड़ने में सचमुच आपको बुरा लगा, किसी को भी बुरा लग सकता था। कोई भी इन्मान यह समझता है कि अब अपने मुल्क पर हमला हुआ, हमारी जमीन छीनी, मेरे हिमालय से तो चीनी लोग करीब। साब कर्पोहर कर्पोहर के गए हैं, तब उस वक्त हम ने उनसे अपना रिश्ता नहीं छोड़ा तो अब किस मुंह से रिश्ता छोड़ सकते हैं? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक सबब है भी आप को हमें कर्मचारी बनने रहता है। साथ में ही-कोई

है कि आप के मन से इस कर्मचारी को निकाल दूँ और हमें का के लिए आपके अब मैं यह बात जानूँ कि एक गलती जो हो चुकी है, लगातार होती चली जा रही है, मैं नहीं कहता इसलिए कि आप के कुछ राजदूतों का वहाँ पर अपना हुआ इसलिए आप रिश्ता तोड़ें बल्कि इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब चीन की जो गिलाह हिमालय के ऊपर है यह उस की राजनीति के साथ बुरी हुई है क्योंकि जैसा मैं पहले कह चुका हूँ पागल कुत्ते का बाल जब किसी सत्ता मांस से टूट जाता करता है जैसे क्लेमाव धीर मालू जैसे तो। यह मुत्तमय मांस को बूझने की किक प्रवृत्ता है और हिमालय वह मुत्तमय मांस है इस बात को जब आप समझ जायेंगे तो फिर चीन के साथ रिश्तों की दूसरी बातें भी समझने में आसानी पड़ेगी।

तो सब के पहले मुझे आप से यह धर्म करना है कि चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों के मामले में अब बिल्कुल खबरदार रहना है और इसी बरसात में हो सकता है अफसूस में हो सकता है खबरदार अगर आप हो जाओ तो मायद उन के हमने न हों, लेकिन अगर हमला हो जाता है इस बार तो पिछली गलतियाँ नहीं होंगी चाहिए। इतना बार मत करते रहना कि धंधेय क्या कहते हैं, कम क्या कहता है, धमेरिकी क्या कहते हैं। यह सब अपना कहते रहते हैं। बाब में इन की बातें सुन लेना। एक तरफ, लेकिन मैं बार बार कहना कहता हूँ कि एक तरफ जहाँ कहीं से पाकिस्तान हमला करे मत भुलना इस बात को कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान की अधिकता बनता पाकिस्तान के जाल से ही बिल्कुल नारख हो चुकी है, पतल नहीं करती है हिन्दू मुत्तमय के बीच को नारख और दूसरे के आकार पर पाकिस्तान बना, उस को वह भावस्य करती है कि वह सबूत में आपकी कई बार है चुका हूँ, तो अगर पाकिस्तान का-हस-अगर आक्रमण हो तो सबूत को कुछ मत जाना और यह भी-अब

भूल जाना कि वह संकल्प व्यक्ति है ठोरा बाका नाक साहब के पुल के टूट जाने पर भी माहौर को ले लिया करती, न जाने ऐसे पुल किस्मती वने टूटे हैं लेकिन घोर किस्ती देश का तियासी नेतृत्व मजबूत रहा है तो उसने, अपनी पसन्दों का ठीक इस्तेमाल कर के मकाई जीती है । मैं इसरायल की मीजुवा टूटी को बिलकुल नापसन्द करता हूँ लेकिन उसकी संकल्प व्यक्ति को प्राय को कसता हूँ, मुझे नहीं पता था कि छ' दिन में वह इतना कर डालेगा ? 60 मील, 50 मील, मोच की मरम, न जाने कहा कहा पहुंच गया और मुझे मरम अपने ऊपर लगती है क्योंकि आखिर को धरती एशियाई हैं, मैं भी एशियाई हूँ, क्या हम एशियाई इतने निकम्मे और नालायक हैं और मंगठन में इतने गिरे हुए हैं कि यूरप की मभ्यता और संस्कृति में पले पोसे लोगों के नामने टिक नहीं सकते ? तो आखिर सबकी बार जरा मेहरबानी कर के उस पर ध्यान रखना । हा सवाल कई उठेंगे, डर लगेगा, यहां पर बेमनसब अमेरिका और रूस का बिक किया गया, उन की संघिबा किन में है ? कहा रहा रूस ? किन मानिर साहब की ओर किन सीरिया साहब को रूस ने मदद की ? सब क्यूबा साहब को मदद दी थी ? यह सब तो बोधले हैं । रूस की संघि तिक एक मुल्क से है । मैं बिलास के लिए कहना चाहता हूँ जैसे सायब दो बार और हों । वह है पूर्वी जर्मनी से । अगर कभी अमेरिका ने पूर्वी जर्मनी पर प्रांच उठाने की कोनिक की, एक भी बम गिराया तो प्राय बेचना रूस की सारी ताकत अमेरिका के खिलाफ चल पड़ेगी । तो वह है पूर्वी जर्मनी । उसी तरह से अमेरिका की भी संघि तिक जापान के साथ है । अगर कहीं चीन और रूस की एक प्रांच भी नास बिक जाय तो देखना अमेरिका की धुरी ताकत सब काधनी । वह है सन्धिवादी । मैं कहीं जानता कि प्राय हम सन्धिवादी के साथक है वा नहीं

और हमारे मुल्क को ऐसी सन्धिवादी तरी जाहिए वा नहीं करनी जाहिए । लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सन्धि प्रांच को दुनिया में सामरिक जोख में कारगर धरर होती है तो तिक या तो वह पूर्वी जर्मनी और रूस बानी है और या वह जापान और अमेरिका वाली है उसी दम को । और बाको सन्धिवादी तो दिल का बहुमाने के लिए गालिब ज्वाल मज्जा है तो इन्लिए प्राय अपनी पकल्प व्यक्ति को मजबूत करां जिन की कि बहुत मज्जा कमी मैं यहा पर पाना हूँ । जब मैंने कछुए का प्राण कहा या मुर्गी का दिव कहा तो प्राय को चिढाने के लिए नहीं, हम सब ऐसे ही हैं । इधर हम नांग भी बिराधी दल बाने अगर प्राय लं' कही कोई लडाईं हूं' गईं तो मुक मे बून इतना डार से उबनेगा कि मालूम हूंसा कि बम सब चढ़ ही जाने बाने है । लेकिन अगर जरा रही दल पाच दिन पिट पिटा गए तं। हम सब चिल्लाने नगेने, धरे, इतने आदमी मरने चने जा ग्हे है । यह कुछ राष्ट्र की कमी है । नहीं तो यह नामुसकिन होता जब चीन ने पोकिय की सबको पर हमारे राजदूतों के साथ बर्बरता दिखाई तो उसी तरह से यहा पर दिव्सी की सबको पर चीन के राजदूती आदमियों के साथ बर्बरता दिखायी जाती । वह नामुसकिन होता बर्बरता की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी । हमने चीन का अनुकरण नहीं करया है, उन के जैसे जवली नहीं बनना है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय . माननीय सदस्य प्राय समाप्त करें ।

की शिक्षणारम्भ (बस्ती) : इन को पाच मिनट और दोबिए । जरा बोलने दीजिए ।

डा० प्राय मन्धेर मोहिबा : पांच बरा दल मिनट बिलबायो । बातें तो बहुत थीं । बिचब सबनी चली गई—क्या बरौठे—

[बा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

बैर मेरी बात उन तक पहुंच जायगी। असल में, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक बात साफ़ करना है कि हमारी विदेशी नीति क्या कैंसे? कोई विदेशी घाये धीर इन इलाक़े में घुसे और इस लोक सभा पर फहराते हुए झण्डे को देखे, कौन सा झण्डा? राष्ट्रीय झण्डा। फिर मन्त्रिमालय के ऊपर राष्ट्रीय झण्डे को देखें, फिर जो सबसे झण्डा इमारत राष्ट्रपति भवन है—उस के झण्डे, को देखें, उसका मन कौतूहल से बिलकुल ऊब जायेगा कि यह मुल्क कैसा है? क्या यह कबायली, जंगली लोगों का मुल्क है, जिसके राष्ट्रपति के भवन पर ऐसा झण्डा ऊब रहा है जो राष्ट्रीय झण्डा नहीं है। यह क्या तरीका है, हम को जल्द बन्द कराइये में सब झण्डों के जमाने की रटी धावने चली आ रही है, इन धावतों को धीरे तक धापने बचना नहीं है। इसी तरह की धमकों के जमाने को धीरे धीरे बहुत सा धावते हैं अगर कबो जकरत हों तो मैं धापको 20-25 धीरे भी बड़ी बड़ी गन्दों धावते बना दूंगा जो झण्डों जमाने से चलो आ रही हैं बिनको धाप धीरेन खत्म करंगे, नब पग्देशी समझेगा कि यहां धाजाद मुल्क को विदेशी नीति चलो रही है। अगर धापके नामने देन का हिन धीरे देन की मसल्यधों की रखा का ित है तो उनमें पूरा यथार्थवाद होना चाहिये। देन को लोभा कैसी है—वैते मनु य का चमड़ा है। चमड़े पर जरा भी खरोच कर दा तो धावनी निलमिना जाता है, उसी तरह से राममूर्ति को देन की लोभा जरा खर्च हो छो तिलमिना उठना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं इन कलत हूरी बात कह रहा हूँ—इस कलत में विश्व हिन के लिये धापर्म-धाव की बात कह रहा हूँ। मुझे तब से बड़ी पसली यह विचार है रही है—पिछले 20 वर्षों में इस देन धीरे राष्ट्र में विश्व हिन की कोई यथार्थवादी नीति नहीं धपनाई है, यथार्थवादी नीति धपनाई है, जो फल धीरे धपरीका की है। कल धीरे धपरीका को

में धमक सकता हूँ उन के पास ताकत है। जहां धाग लयती है, ऊब को दीवना पड़ता है, उन का स्वाभिल्व रखना पड़ता है। यदि हमें इस दुनिया को बनाना है—मैं एक मिलाव देता हूँ—निरस्त्रीकरण के मानने को लेकर दुनिया के मानने हुयेगा प्रस्ताव धाये है, संयुक्त राष्ट्र परिषद में धाये है, लेकिन निरस्त्रीकरण के साथ साथ निर्वाहीकरण का प्रस्ताव अगर हिन्दुस्तान ने छोड़ा धीरे कहा, होता कि दुनिया एक रोप में फंसी हुई है—इसके दा पहलू है धमकेलिया की दरि-ना धीरे—धूमरा पहलू है—यूरोप धीरे धपरीका का धमक। कल धीरे दरिखता—धमक इन दोनों में लड़ोगे, तब जा कर नई दुनिया बना पाओगे :

धाज धाप जानने हैं बियतनाम युद्ध में धमरोको लाल कितना खर्च कर रहे हैं—बा। हमारे देनकी साथ धर की धामधनी है, वह केवल बियतनामी युद्ध में धमरीकी बाग खर्च कर देते हैं। एक सिपाही को मानने के लिये, यह बात बहुतों को मान्य नहीं है, एक बियतनामी सिपाही को मारने के लिये धमरोकी नाम 20 लाख रुपया खर्च कर रहे हैं। धमक मेरे पास ताकत होती धीरे मैं उस जगह होता—मैं तो क्या उस जगह होता, धमक होता तो धीरे जगह होता—लेकिन मेरी सलाह मानना, संयुक्त राष्ट्र में जाकर कहना कि इन दोनों को जोड़ो धमक चाहते हो कि दुनिया से हथियार खत्म हों अगर चाहते हो कि यह बम मोला खत्म हो, तो फिर उसके साथ साथ दरिख को भी खत्म करो। इसी लिये मैं इन लाल धमन्तियों की बात किया करता हूँ, क्योंकि धमकी कुछ देर पहले "भी" बांसे कर बराबी बात चम पड़ी थी—मैं नर धीरे मारी में समानता चाहता हूँ। लोगों में उस कलत समझा नहीं बा, नर धीरे मारी की समानता उठी तरह से चाहता हूँ—धार्मिक धामन्तियों में चाहें मेरी दोस्ती इधर कुछ लोगों से बड़ी

है, लेकिन मैं समानता चाहता हूँ मैं नहीं चाहता कि गरीब और खमीर में इस तरह की खाई बनी रहे। मैं समानता चाहता हूँ जातियों में— जो धारणी टकराव है उन को खत्म कर के जातियों की बराबरी चाहता हूँ। इस तरह की मान क्रान्तिवा मसार में बन रही है। एक और क्रान्ति सुन कर धारणी तबियत खुश होगी और वह क्रान्ति है—“मनुष्य समाज का शोषण न करे, शोषक मनुष्य समाज का खत्म न करे।” लेकिन उसके साथ साथ सर्वश्रेष्ठ राज्य व्यक्ति को धार न खत्म करे—यह क्रान्ति चाहता हूँ। इस विषय पर हम क्रान्ति को लेकर धारने कक्षा कोई नयना दिखाया—20 वर्षों में कुछ नहीं दिखाया है— तो हो सकना है कि या पश्चिम और मेरे जैसे नाग—किसी हद तक हम दोनों हा माधु हैं—किसी हद तक हम देश का कक्षा उठा सकने धार उागना महब धारणी तो उस यज्ञ में थोड़ा बहुत भर्तुति हो जाय।

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Secunderabad) Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, today, West Asia is very much in our minds. A great deal has been said about West Asia, and I do not want to add much to it. But there are certain statements made in this House which I would like to contradict. It is said that we are no longer non-aligned, and some people have even gone to the length of saying that we are friendless.

How are we not non-aligned? Our position is such that on the one side the Soviet Union, which belongs to one bloc is supporting us, and on the other side, France which belongs to another bloc is also supporting us. So, not only are we non-aligned, but we have penetrated through the alignment of both the blocs. Therefore, our position is rational and in the interests of the world.

Some people have said that this is no aggression 'at' all'. Shri M. R. Masani had said that the Gulf of

Aqaba had been blocked, and, therefore, Israel had a right to attack. Some hon. Member on my side, Shri Manabendra Shah had compared this with the attack on us by Pakistan in the 1965 war. I am very much pained to hear this. Here is the document entitled *News of Israel* issued by the Consulate of Israel in Bombay. And this is when it says:

“Defending herself along the borders was thus an impossible task. She could only save herself by going beyond her borders”

Then, it says:

“Surprise air attack to inflict on the enemy maximum initial damage was necessary”.

Then, it comes to the conclusion:

“The Israeli plan that emerged was dictated by the above considerations”,

and the summary is:

“Surprise was the basis of the operation. She had, therefore, to resort to aggression.”.

This is what has come out from the document circulated by the Consulate of Israel. In such a case, what should we have done? The case of Pakistan was different. Pakistan had attacked us and we had gone in self-defence. But, here there was no attack. The only thing that President Nasser had been doing was that he had been making loud noises and violent noises and so on, but there was no positive action against which they could act. Therefore, this attack of Israel was deliberate, planned and really vindictive.

Shri Masani quoted Prof. Toynbee. But he forgot to mention that Toynbee himself says that they have no right to seek by military force territory that has now become the State of Israel. That is his own view. He gives the Arab view, the Israeli view and then his own view. Further, he says that partition is responsible for this conflict and neither Israel nor the Arab

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

countries but 'we', that is, the British, the Germans and the Americans are responsible for the present conflict. This is what Toynbee said and he was not properly quoted by Shri Masani.

What is the alternative? The alternative plan given by UK and USA is: recognition of Israel and free peaceful passage in the waterways and something for the refugees. Excepting the refugee problem, these were the war aims of Israel. If you surrender at the very outset and accept the aim of the adversary, where is the need for further talks? Hence, the stand that our Government have taken is really the correct one.

As for recognition, we must remember that Israel was created—and it is an accepted fact—by Great Britain. Great Britain introduced that poisonous doctrine in the 20th century that a State can be formed on the basis of religion. I am sorry that we in this country have accepted that idea. I am glad that at least one country, Egypt, has rejected this idea, and quite rightly. They have done this on their own. They have gone against this very concept in their own country. It is a Muslim country, but they have banned the Muslim Brotherhood. We have not banned the Jamiat-i-Islami. We have not banned the RSS. So how can we, pining and feeling pain in our heart at the partition of this country, not admire the stand that Egypt has taken?

Therefore, this talk about supporting Israel makes me feel that the Yankee love is sometimes so blinding that it cannot see beyond Israel on the one side and Formosa on the other. That is the position. May I ask: suppose the Parsis who were driven out of Iran and some Zoroastrians, with the support of some great powers, and the Parsis of Bombay formed a State in Iran, will Iran recognise it? Will you be surprised if they reject that idea and fight to the bitter end? Therefore, the stand the Arab countries have taken deserves our sympathy and support.

I will go further. Apart from the recent debate, a person like Sir Alex Douglas-Home says:

"The only modification likely would be an international guarantee so specific as to amount to automatic response to aggression".

This is in favour of Israel. Why then a delayed response in the case of Egypt? Aggression is aggression. If the Arabs are the aggressors, then there should be automatic response. Why should there be delayed response when it is the other way about?

Further, I would like this House to note very carefully what he says—this is about Egypt:

"If in their state of bankruptcy and destitution in the next six months, Egypt had to turn to the US for wheat or other aid, Britain should impress on the US that they have leverage which ought to be used in order to ensure that the international waterway is open to shipping of all nations"

Those countries which are receiving aid from the USA should realise the danger inherent in this aid when it can be used as a lever for their own ends.

Now I proceed further. What has happened further by which you can test whether we were right or wrong? They have taken some territory—all right. They do not want to withdraw unless there is some guarantee—all right. They go much further. General Dayan says about Gaza when somebody asked him, "What about Gaza?":

"It should be integrated with Israel."

As regards the Walling wall, he says:

"It had not been taken simply to be handed back"

These are not just his personal opinions. Let us see what Mr. Aba Eban, their Foreign Minister says. Only last week in London in an interview he said: 'Territorial questions would be reserved for peace discussions'. About Jerusalem, "Israel is not contemplating withdrawal". So this is the attitude of a country which, I am sorry to say, is finding support in this House.

The UN is the hope of mankind. If it is to fail, then the hope of mankind is shattered. But what do you find if you look around. If there is a conflict involving big powers, as in Korea or Israel, there is some settlement. If they are not interested, things remain. Let us not forget what happened about our own Kashmir. We took the matter of our own accord to the UN saying, 'Here is the aggressor; please declare him so'. What did the UN do? What did the Big Powers do?

Shri Nath Paj (Rajapur): What did Nasser do?

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: My hon. friend is asking 'What did Nasser do?' Your policy does not depend upon what Mr. Nasser does or what Mr. Aba Eban or Mr. Ben Gurion or anybody else does. Nepal did not vote with us when that resolution was put to vote in the UN. Does that mean that you will change your policy towards Nepal? You must give some specific reasons for following a particular policy.

We took our case to the UN. They not only did not condemn Pakistan as aggressor, but equated the two. There the line is drawn for the last twenty years; bitterness is growing, enmity is aggravating and our troubles are not coming to end. It was a simple thing for the UN to declare Pakistan as the aggressor. It was a simple fact which was admitted latter on.

Similarly, today they are posting Gen. Odd Bull to watch the Suez Canal on both sides. Probably the

cease-fire line will stay and things will go on lingering, I do not know for how long.

I have done with Israel and come now to the question of China. It is not only a problem but is also a puzzle. There is a great deal of talk about collaboration and collusion between China and Pakistan. What exactly do we want? Why, day in and day out, should we talk about the China-Pakistan collusion? Is it for the consumption of foreigners? They have their own ways of finding out how things are. Is it for our own selves? Then I ask, what particular steps, either as a matter of defence or in terms of diplomatic action, are we taking to counter this tremendous collusion? I have got my own doubt about this collusion. Is it not possible that Pakistan might be serving as an 'American' window in Peking? It is quite possible. How otherwise do we explain America getting unnerved when anything happens anywhere but not reacting when Pakistan has intimate relations with China?

Seven hundred million people cannot be wished away. Neither can five hundred million people be bullied without the bully paying for it. The choice before us is war or peace. The same choice is there before China, and the same stakes are there. Therefore, people say it is Chinese madness. Is China trying to find a soft spot, or does she need enemies so that there is internal cohesion and there is support for Mao Tse-tung? Or is it not possible that their mind is conditioned by the Russian revolution? They know that in Russia, because of this *cordón sanitaire* all round and the whole world being an enemy, Russian nationalism was able to succeed and win the battle of communism. Similarly, they do not go far enough to provoke, but they want to keep this tension. Otherwise, why do they go round and provoke all these friendly countries. Therefore, we must understand what China wants. Any position of hostility or war is playing the game of China, that is what I want

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

to say. If China is to be contained and to be chained, it can be only through peace.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Guna): Our foreign policy has always been defined as nonalignment. I submit that non-alignment cannot be the policy of a nation, it can be only a principle. Suppose we do have a principle like this which I think sometimes we enunciated by saying that we will not settle any dispute by means of arms but by peaceful means, that will be only a principle. What policy requires is that there should be strategy, tactics and diplomacy. All these go to constitute the foreign policy of a nation, and all these must be directed towards the self-interest, enlightened self-interest, of the country.

We have been told by successive Prime Ministers that this nonalignment is not a negative principle, but it is a dynamic principle. Of course, I believe it is a dynamic principle, and a dynamic principle of cowardice, because every step that we have taken in all these years has been dictated by fear. When there was a national revolt in Hungary, our people said that it was just like a riot in the streets of Ahmedabad. Why did we say that? Because we were afraid of Russia. In the case of China, we are again afraid. Why don't we have anything to do with Formosa. Though Formosa is a member of the UNO, yet we will have nothing to do with it. Even though China has committed aggression on our country, yet we do not consider even our enemy's enemy as our friend. If we have nothing to do with Formosa, it is out of fear. I submit, of China.

Then, we are afraid of the Arab world. Why do we not have some more intimate relations with Israel? Because we are afraid of the Arab world. We are afraid of the Muslim opinion in this country. We are afraid of Pakistan.

All that may be true, but is the national policy of a Government, the

foreign policy of a Government, to be decided through fear? Pakistan will not come to our aid, nor will the Arab countries come to our help, when we are in trouble. We have to safeguard our own interests through our own strength and through any alliance that may be helpful to us.

Take the question of Tibet. I am not going into the details of that question. I have spoken about it several times. The claim of China over Tibet is based upon its right of suzerainty. I submit to my communist friends that suzerainty is an imperial conception. They are sanctioning that imperial conception because it is the case of China. If any other country based its claim on conquering another country on suzerainty, they would have said this is imperialism, but they are precluded from saying so because it is China. If they are really students of Marx and of Engels, and even of Lenin if they were not only the disciples of Mao, they would have considered this as an imperialist conception by which no country can lay claim over another country. I leave it there.

Now we come to this recent question of West Asia. I believe, as we all believe, that when Israel was settled as a nation in the country occupied by the Arabs in Palestine, it was an act of injustice, but who committed that injustice? It is not the Israeli people. The Israeli people had always considered that they would one day return to their promised land, they had never made any bones about that. They got an opportunity, but who gave that opportunity? Israel did not create that opportunity. I submit that the opportunity was created by the Western nations, by America, by England, by France. Why? Because they had a guilty conscience about the Jews. The Jews had to be settled somewhere or the other. They were wandering in ships, and nobody would allow them to get into their country. In order to solve their problem, they induced Israel in Palestine. It was

not the fault of Israel, because they had considered that that was the promised land to which they would go anyhow, even after centuries.

Considering that, what did the Arabs do? The Arabs first of all blocked the international waterways of Suez. Nobody was allowed to travel from and to Israel from Arab countries. Then, even after the ceasefire of 1948 they said that they were at war with Israel. They also times out of number said that they wanted to annihilate Israel. Considering all these things, we must come to the present position to decide whether Israel was the aggressor or the Arab world was the aggressor.

First of all, there was this international force stationed to keep the peace. They presented the presence of that international force, and wanted it to be withdrawn. I think the Secretary-General of the UNO committed a great mistake in withdrawing that force at the instance of the Arab world only. He did not consult, so far as is known, Israel. He did not consult the UNO itself, but he withdrew the force. Today, when they want to bring peace, they again want international observers, having withdrawn them once, which was the only check to the conflict between Israel and the Arab world. So far as constant incursions are concerned they were there all the time as they are between India and Pakistan.

Further, the Arab world closed the Gulf of Aqaba. Then they marched their armies towards Israel in the desert of Sinai. If Israel had not acted as it did, I think it would have been annihilated. If the Arab world had been able to occupy Palestine, I have absolutely no doubt that the Israeli people would have been liquidated. Therefore, to say that the Israelis were the aggressors makes no sense because they took prompt action. I am sure if we had taken prompt action when the infiltrators entered into India in Kashmir and had attack-

ed Pakistan, without waiting to be attacked, we would have occupied Lahore and many other places. You do not fight on your own territory when you know that war is coming and war is inevitable and in this case when the international force had been withdrawn. Exit is denied to them; the Gulf of Aqaba is blocked up. What course had they but to take immediate step? The only fault of the Israelis was that they knew that war was coming and they acted. They did not wait like we Indians who wait even when a person insults us. What the Indian would do is to go home and then it would occur to him that he was insulted. By that time, the enemy disappears. It is our way. I am sorry the Israelis did not take that way. Therefore, our blaming the Israelis is absolutely unwarranted. I had a private talk with the Prime Minister and I suggested to her that it was premature to declare Israel an aggressor. I said: what you have said and what our Foreign Minister has said was enough; all that you have to say is to declare that we are friendly to the Arab World and especially to the UAR but as the fight is proceeding, and is likely to result in a world conflagration we stand by what has been said in the UN by our representatives, that the fight must stop, that there should be a cease-fire and both the parties should retire to their original position. But this advice was not followed. We went out of our way to name Israel as aggressor even without waiting. Today you find that Israel says that it is being attacked and the Arabs say that they had been attacked. Can you decide between the two? It is impossible unless there is a commission of inquiry to decide who was the aggressor and who was not. That can only be done when peace is restored. Any previous assertion that such and such party was the aggressor I think is very poor and foolish diplomacy.

I have been listening to the radio. When the radio talks of the Arabs and the Israelis, the whole time it is

(Shri J. B. Kripalani)

talking as if the broadcast was not coming from Delhi but from Cairo. We have become the advocates of the Arab world and I do not understand why this should be so. I have also heard that the ship laden with food for our country was coming from America in pursuance of PL 480 and that it was in the Suez Canal. The ship's authorities asked that they might be permitted to take any route which the UAR prescribed. But no, it was to be there. Then I am told that our Government said that poor Egypt is in distress, so the grain might be given to the Egyptians. I have no objection to the grain being given to the Egyptians when they are in distress. But that the Egyptians should not have allowed that grain ship meant for India to proceed by any route—that does not show any friendly attitude. I have heard that the Indian Government has promised to supply the Arab world three MIGs. I do not know how far it is true. If it is true, then I submit that a non-aligned country like ours cannot take sides to the extent of giving military weapons to any of the fighters. The best policy would be to remain neutral.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Let this should gain currency I should like to intervene and say that all these three statements, made by my hon. friend are baseless and without any foundation. Firstly, he said that the Egyptian authorities did not permit the ship to take a different route. The truth is that the ship was being repaired and before the repairs could be finished the canal was blocked and so it could not go out to the south or to the north. The second statement that we have supplied three MIGs, that is also incorrect. The third statement, that we offered to supply the foodgrains to the Egyptians, is also without any foundation. The foodgrains are still lying in the ships.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: From the very beginning, we have been trying to play a very important role in world affairs. It was not justified by our strength or by our economic position. People who wanted to dabble in world affairs must have some strength in themselves; they must be able to stand at least against their enemies. We have seen that we have not that strength. There is Ceylon, Burma, the whole of Southeast Asia; there are so many countries in Europe and South America; they do not dabble in world affairs as we do thinking that we are going to bring about the peace of the world. The peace of the world can be brought about by strong nations, not weak nations. The ban on the experiment of nuclear weapons was not brought about by us but was brought about by Russia and America agreeing with each other. We must understand where we stand; we must not talk big. We must also know that in this world no nation however powerful whether it be America or Russia can depend upon its own resources alone in order to save itself. It must have help from somewhere or the other. Let us be frank about it. Did we try to get help from outside when we were attacked by China or not?

May I also submit that one Congressman wrote that our first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, approached the President of the USA, Mr. Kennedy, to send a portion of his fleet to the Bay of Bengal, and nothing was done to that Congressman. It was said that the Congressman was not speaking the truth and some disciplinary action would be taken. That Congressman said that if they took disciplinary action, "I am going not only to adduce evidence but I am going to expose many other deals" that they had in those days. Fortunately or unfortunately, that Congressman is no more with us.

So we cannot, in this respect, stand alone. I do not want any military

alliance. Nobody wants military alliance with us. What advantage can we give to them? We can give no advantage; but we must come to some understanding with certain nations. Let it be Russia; let it be even China if it is willing; let it be anybody in the world. Let us realise that we cannot stand alone in this world; that Russia cannot stand alone in this world against Chinese attack; that America cannot stand alone against the attack of Russia or China. If we think that we can stand alone and oppose China and Pakistan and any other enemy that may arise hereafter, then I think that we are day-dreaming. We do not know the ABC of international politics which depends upon strength.

When our External Affairs Minister was asked, "Why are you keeping our embassy in China, and why don't you cut off diplomatic relations with China," he said "we have a window there." It is not that we have a window; it is China that has a window here.

An hon. Member: They have a door.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: They have their bank by which they subsidise money to our internal enemies. So, it is not we who have a window; it is they who have a window. I submit that if you had a window in Taiwan, you would have known whether they are strong or weak, whether they are prosperous or not prosperous, whether their friendship would be useful to us or not. If you had a window in Israel, you would not have been so forward in support of the Arab world; you would have known how far Israel was capable of dealing with the Arabs alone. You know that today one member of the Arab world, Saudi Arabia, has said that "we have investigated and England was not concerned in this business therefore we are going to supply them with oil." Is that true or not? If you had a little window in Israel, you would have known that even if they were 20 times, all Arabia combined together,

it would not be possible for them alone to defeat Israel, small as it is. Why? Because every man and woman knows in Israel the stakes that are involved. They know that if they are defeated by the Arabs they would be wiped off the face of the globe. The Arabs have said that they want to wipe them off into the sea.

So, we must be careful in these things. Have a little more diplomatic wisdom than going on blindfoldedly and out of fear of this man, that man and the other man. No diplomacy can proceed from fear. It can only proceed from people who are courageous, who are willing to take risks. That is all; thank you.

श्री जे. बी. कृपालु (बाद) :
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इस सदन में जो बहस चल रही है, उसमें कई बातें कही गई हैं। पिछले दिनों जो कुछ भी हुआ, उसमें दो बातें साफ़ नजर आती हैं। एक तरफ तो कुछ लोगों का कहना है कि अरब देशों की सन्तियों को देखते हुए इसराइल के साथ अन्याय किया गया है और वे लोग उस अन्याय की आलोचना कर रहे हैं। अभी आचार्य कृपालानी ने इसी दृष्टिकोण का सदन के सामने रखा। दूसरी तरफ से यह देख रही हूँ कि यह लोक सभा — और साथ साथ सारा देश — इस प्रश्न पर विभाजित होता जा रहा है कि हम अरब देशों को जो समर्थन दे रहे हैं, हम उन के साथ जो रिश्ते निगाह रहे हैं, वह सही है या ग़लत। विदेश मंत्री इस बात से इन्कार नहीं कर सकते कि आज सारा देश दो भागों में इस तरह बंट गया है, विभाजित हो गया है, जिन तरह पहले कभी नहीं हुआ था।

जब जवाहरलाल जी जिंदा थे और जब इस सदन में विदेश नीति प्रतिपादित होती थी, तो कई बार ऐसा हुआ कि सारी की सारी संसद् ने सरकार की विदेश-नीति

[बीमती त रने गरी सिलः]

को धपनाया बा। हमने इस संसद् में, इस सदन में अस्ताव पर अस्ताव पास किये हैं, जब कि सारा देश सरकार की विदेश-नीति के पीछे था। बाकिर भाव कोई बात तो है कि इस संसद् से धीर बाहर भी दो तरह की भावनायें हैं, जो एक दूसरे से भेद नहीं आती हैं। भाव विदेश मंत्री इस बात से इनकार नहीं कर सकते कि इस प्रश्न को लेकर जो एक विभाक्त आतावरण पैदा हो गया है, वह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। यह कोई हिन्दू-मुसलमान का प्रश्न नहीं है और न ही यह कोई एक देश धीर दूसरे देश की मित्रता का प्रश्न है। सारा देश इस तरह से एक समस्या पर विभाजित हो जाये, हम लोग इपराईस धीर धरब मुल्कों को दो नजरों से देखने लयें, कुछ लोग धरब देशों की तरफ बहुत सम्भावना धीर सहानुभूति से धीर इपराईस को नफरत की भावना से देखें धीर दूसरे तबने के लोग इपराईस को संवेदना के आँसू से धीर धरब मुल्कों को नफरत की निगाह से देखें, यह इस देश में लिये अच्छा नहीं है और न ही यह विश्व के लिये अच्छा है।

भाव हम धरब देशों धीर इपराईस को दो तरह के तराजू पर बंल रहे हैं—हम इपराईस के मुका से न धरब देशों को बढ़ा करते हैं धीर धरब देशों के मुका से न इपराईस को बढ़ा करते हैं। मैं धाप के द्वारा विदेश मंत्री से यह प्रश्न आहती हूँ कि क्या यह इपराईस में रहने के यहूदियों के लिये कि 1948-49 में तराजू के दो देशों में यहूदियों पर अत्याचार किये गये, लाखों यहूदियों को मारा गया धीर उनको वहाँ से भागने पर मजबूर कर दिया गया। धीर क्या यह धरब लोगों का दोष था कि उनके हूबब के बीच में इपराईस को बढ़ा कर दिया गया? इन परिस्थितियों में धरबों धीर इपराईस के बीच में सझाई हुई, क्या यह उनका दोष था?

मैं यह निवेदन करना आहती हूँ कि इसमें उन देशों का दोष नहीं है। पैनेस्टाइन के यहूदियों की बसना धीर इपराईस का स्वाभवा एक ऐतिहासिक तथ्य है, जिसका जन्म बहुत ही बातों को लेकर हुआ। यूरोप में नास्त्रियों धीर हिटलर के द्वारा यहूदियों के खिलाफ भयंकर कार्यवाहियों की गईं। कई धीर देशों में भी यहूदियों पर जुल्म हुए। इन में कोई शक नहीं है कि 1939-45 की लड़ा के बाद लरेटीका, ब्रिटेन धीर जर्मनी ने मिल कर यह फैसला किया कि हम पैनेस्टाइन में यहूदियों को बसायेंगे।

15 hrs.

यह भी सही है कि जिन तरह हिन्दुस्तान का नागरिक किसी दूसरी जाह बसा जाय, तो जब तक उसकी याददास्त रहेगी, तब तक वह हिन्दुस्तान की गया—जमुना को धपनी ही नदिया मानेगा, उसी तरह का धरब यहूदियों का—धीर धरबों का भी—है इस को धाप रोक नहीं सकते। पैनेस्टाइन में जो यहूदी गए, उन में यह आता था कि वे ईसा से भी पहले गढ़ा रहते थे। इस आना को हम धीर धाप रोक नहीं सकते हैं। इस लिए हम उन देशों को—धरबों धीर इपराईस को—दोष क्यों दे रहे हैं? विदेश मंत्री से मुझे इस बात की सिकायत है कि उन्होंने लोक सभा धीर राज्य सभा में जो बक्तव्य दिया, अगर उसमें गह कुछ जम्बो का इस्तेमाल करते, तो भाव यह संसद् धीर देश इस तरह विभाजित न होता। जब भी इज्जत मेहनत संयुक्त राष्ट्र या सुरक्षा परिषद् में जाते थे—एक बार मैं भी उनके साथ गई थी—, तो बाहे कोई भी नीति हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की रही हो, लेकिन हम इसका रास्ता बकर छोड़ते थे कि हम धरबियों के समुदाय धपने फैसले को जोड़ नरें। बीमती जिनक सक्ती पंडित बीडी हुई है।

यह इस बात की गवाह हो सकती है कि जो भी नीति हिन्दुस्तान ने अपनायी उस नीति में कोई कंफिड नहीं थी, उस नीति में कोई दुराय नहीं था। परन्तु विदेशी नीति का हुयेगा यह फर्क रहा है कि हम कुछ करते ऐसे छोड़ें जहाँ से, हम जब भी चाहें कदम उठा सकें रास्ता बन्द हो जाता है किसी नीति का चाहे यह देशी नीति हो या अंतर्राष्ट्रीय नीति हो तो यह नीति जल्दी माफिक या उतनी उचित नहीं रह जानी चाहे, जो या वर्तमान को देखते हुए अब अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियाँ इतनी बदल चुकी हैं रोज-रोज बदल रही हैं तो हम अपनी नीतियों को देखते हुए सोचना है कि हम अपनी नीतियों को किस तरह से परिमार्जन करें, किम तरह से उनको रबें। श्री कृष्ण मेनन के सामने भी यह बात 1957 में आयी थी तो गल्फ आफ अकाबा के बारे में संयुक्त राष्ट्र परिषद् में उन्होंने क्या कहा था? उन्होंने कहा था? कि गल्फ आफ अकाबा के ऊपर बातचीत करने का अधिकार और निर्णय करने का अधिकार संयुक्त राष्ट्र परिषद् को नहीं है इसके प्राये और कोई बात नहीं कही थी यह आज भी सही है कि गल्फ आफ अकाबा के बारे में जो कोई भी निर्णय होगा यह आर देण सीरिय, जोर्डन, यू० ए० आर०, और सऊदी अरब मिल कर करेंगे तभी उचित निर्णय होगा और आज भी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ कोई फैसला नहीं करपा सकता। यह सत्य है... माना हुआ सत्य है कि जिस से हम इकार नहीं कर सकते। परन्तु यह बात भी आज हम मानने के लिये मजबूर हुए हैं, कि विदेश मंत्री ने जो बतलव्य बोक सभा में दिया अपर वह बतलव्य न वेते तो जो कुछ भी संयुक्त राष्ट्र परिषद् में विदेश मंत्री ने किया या भारत सरकार कर रही है उसका आज बूढ़ा महत्व होता बनिस्वत कि जो आज हम देख रहे हैं संयुक्त राष्ट्र परिषद् के नीतिगत प्रतिपादित होती है, देण

हार जाते हैं, देण जीतते हैं, उन में कोई बात नहीं किसी देण का मरणा नहीं बटता परन्तु हम जिस बात की तरफ अपने को प्राये से चलना चाहते हैं वह है हमारी नीति। हमारी नीति दो ही हो सकती है न? एक तो हम विश्व में शांति स्थापित करने में मदद करें। सब में बुनियादी नीति यह होनी चाहिए। हमारे देण के राष्ट्रिय स्वायं जिनमें निहित हैं उससे भी महत्वपूर्ण यह नीति है कि हम अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में शांति कायम रख सकें और नम्बर (2) शांति को कायम करने के लिए जिन भी नीति को हम प्रतिपादित करें उसमें प्राये राष्ट्रिय हित का प्रतिनिधत्व कर सकें या उस नीति में हमारे राष्ट्रिय हित का प्रतिबिम्ब मिल सके। यही दो नीतियाँ हैं न आपकी? इनके अनुसार मध्य एशिया में आपकी क्या नीति हम ममय होनी चाहिए? थी? जबकि यह नध्य हम मान कर चलते हैं कि दोनों देणों की स्थिति रहने का अधिकांश है। उन्होंने कहा कि इरायल को उन्होंने मान्यता दी है एक देण के रूप में। आज यह बहुत होती है कि इरायल को जीने का हक नहीं है नो यह मुझे बाल्बिकता में पूरा मान्य होना है। इस तरह की बहस मद में ही। क्यों! जिसको हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने म्यय ही मान्यता दी है? परन्तु हिन्दुस्तान को सरकार को उससे बेसी भाव को बढ़ाने का मोक मिलना था, पर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने उन पर कोई तबज्जह नहीं दिया। आखिर इरायल का क्या होता? अरब देण चाहे जिन भी भाषना से प्रेरित थे, प्राय नहीं थे उन भाषना से प्रेरित। अरब देणों का बटवाग हुआ। अरब देणों की जो भाषना है उनको मैं ममय मकवी हू। वे लोग ऐसा समझते हैं और प्राय उचित भी समझते हैं परन्तु हिन्दुस्तान का क्या यह फज नहीं था कि अरब देणों की उस भाषना को नेकर के चलने में भी यदि कोई सहज रास्ता

[श्रीमती तारके रो सिन्हा]

निकाल सकते तो निकालने की कोशिश करते। अगर इराक को हम मान्यता दिए रखते, अगर इराक से दोस्ती का सम्बन्ध हम बनाये रखते तो आज मध्य एशिया में भारत बह कर सकता था जो दुनिया का कोई दूसरा देश नहीं कर सकता था। अमेरिका कम और जितने भी दुनिया के बड़े देश हैं वह उस जगह पर नहीं हैं जहाँ वह इराक और अरब देशों के बीच में समझौता करा सके। हिन्दुस्तान ही एक देश है क्योंकि अरब देशों से हिन्दुस्तान की भिन्नता है। हम मध्य एशिया में एक ऐसा सम्बन्ध स्थापित कर सकते हैं कि हमारी तर्फ, मध्य एशिया के अरब देश और इराक दोनो देखने। परन्तु वहाँ में आपने यह नीति प्रकियार की कि इराक को मानते हुए भी हम नहीं मानते, वह जीता है फिर भी नहीं जीता है वह रहता है फिर भी नहीं रहता। धाँखिर इराक से आप को समझौता करने में ज़ोर रोकता था? क्या अरब देशों ने आपको इतना मजबूर किया था और अगर मजबूर किया था, तो हम मजबूरी को क्यों आपने माने दिया। भारत में? क्या ज्ञानि की नीति का इसी तरह से प्रथम होना है। टायनबी का एक लेख 15 दिन पहले *Caravan* थाक इण्डिया में निकला था मैं चांगला साहब से श्रुती कि वह उनको पढ़ें। उन्होंने यह कहा था कि हम मानते हैं कि अरब देशों के साथ एक दुटर्बना हुई। य भी कहने के लिए हम कह सकते हैं जो अरब कहते हैं कि अमेरिका ब्रिटेन या जर्मनी ने अपने यहाँ एरुबोस को नहीं नहीं बना लिया? परन्तु किस का बदला किन से लें? धाँखिर यह क्या बात है कि अमेरिका ब्रिटेन या जर्मनी का बचला हम इराक और अरब देशों से लें? चीनसी नीति का प्रतिपादन इससे होता है? मैं आपने साम्यवादी और साम्यवादी लोगों से भी कश्चा चाहती हूँ आज अरब देशों ने कस के ऊपर भी उंगली उठावी कि कस उनकी मदद नहीं कर सका क्योंकि कोई भी देश

जो उंचीबा देश अपने को कहता है जो जानता है कि अणु बलों के साथ युद्ध होगा तो दुनिया मिट जायगी उसमें न अरब देश रहेंगे न इराक रहेगा न और कोई देश रहेंगे जो वह ऐसे कदम उठाने के पहले फूँक कर कदम उठायेगा। आज रूस इपीलिए मैदान में नहीं था रहा है जो कि था सकता है। उसी की संज्ञा पर यह लड़ाई हुई। रूस के पास इतनी ताकत भी है कि वह था सकता है परन्तु गरी धाँखा है क्योंकि विश्व युद्ध का खतरा है। लड़ाई उाकी सोचा पर होगी। और अब जब कि अणु सस्त्रों की लड़ाई होगी तो वह विश्व युद्ध हाँकर रहेंगे।

तो अब हमारे लिए दूसरा कौनसा मौका है? हम नमज़ते हैं कि मध्य एशिया में जो छः दिन की लड़ाई हुई वही अन्त और अन्तःप्रारत ? नहीं। जो समस्या है वह आज वहाँ के चलो था रही है और वहाँ तक कायम रहेंगी इ छ दिन की लड़ाई ने समस्या को और भी जटिल बनाया है। परन्तु साथ साथ ही यह भी गममती है कि इ छ दिन की लड़ाई ने लोगों की धाँखि धाँखों है। क्यों न सबसे बड़ी समस्या जो अरब और इराक देशों के बीच में है वह शरणार्थियों की समस्या है। इतने मारे शरणार्थी हैं हिन्दुस्तान में उनके बारे में जो क्या कोई काम किया? आप इराक से दोस्ती का सम्बन्ध रखते तो जायद अरब शरणार्थी जो इराक की संज्ञा पर कराक करीब एक करोड़ से ज्यादा हो गए हैं और इराक के अन्तर जाँचते हैं बड़े नहीं रहने के बराबर हैं जायद कोई फैसला कर सकते। इराक और अरब देशों में बराबर युद्ध है, छः दिन का युद्ध तो बड़े ज़ोरों से हुआ। एरेबन की बात बिदेस मन्त्री महोदय करते हैं वेनी समझ से नहीं धाँखा कि एरेबन क्या है? एरेबन तो बहा होता है जहाँ युद्ध भी हुकमात हो। इराक और अरब देशों के बीच भी अरब देशों के कहने के मुताबिक

बराबर ही युद्ध है। आज जरा जोंगों से बढ गया। इसलिए एग्जेशन की बात भी मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। भारत देशों और इसरायल में भी बराबर ही युद्ध की दशा है जो कि भारत देश मानते हैं। यह लड़ाई आप कह सकते हैं कि एन्कलेट हो गई बढ गई बहुत भीषण युद्ध शुरू हो गया। परन्तु युद्ध की स्थिति तो वहाँ से ही भी क्योंकि भारत देशों ने खुद इस को माना है कि इसरायल से युद्ध की नीति बरकरार चली आ रही है क्योंकि इसरायल को हम मानते नहीं। ऐसी स्थिति में भारत बहुत बड़ा हिमायती बन सकता था मान्ति का और एक बहुत बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण काम कर सकता था रिस्पूजीब के बारे में। आज मारे विषय की नजरों में शरणार्थी जो हैं उनको लेकर बड़ी जटिल समस्या खड़ी हो गई है। इसरायल वाले कहते हैं कि हम जगह खाली नहीं करेंगे और वेग कहते हैं या दूसरे लोग रहेंगे हैं कि जहाँ पर तम्हारी सेनाएँ हैं वहाँ से जब तक हटा नहीं लेते तब तक कोई बात नहीं हो सकती। मैं यह पूछना चाहती हूँ कि यह तो दो दलों की बात हो गई बीच में कौनसी ऐसी बात आती है कि जिसके ऊपर बुनियाद की उम्मीद बंधेगी कि उस जगह पर मान्ति आयेगी। यह तो दोनों दलों की दो बातें हो गई इसरायल कहता है कि हम नहीं हटेंगे और भारत देश कहते हैं कि जब तक हटा नहीं करे तब तक हम स्वेज को नहीं छोड़ेंगे। परन्तु इसमें बीच में क्या विदेश मन्त्री ने सोचा कि कौनसी बात ऐसी हो सकती है कि जिससे समस्या का समाधान हो ? मध्य एशिया में भी हालत है और संयुक्त राष्ट्र परिषद् ने जहाँ बहस हुई है उसके इमारतों को देख कर क्या निष्कर्ष निकलेगा; यह नहीं चाहिए कि मध्य एशिया के युद्ध स्तर के मामले को निकाल करके आर्थिक स्तर पर इस बीच को नें जाय ? मध्य एशिया में कितना... अपना खर्च हो रहा है इसरायल की तरफ से और भारत देशों की तरफ से भी ? ... कुछे पांच बिलियन डॉलर और हैं। जो सामग्री ने भी अपने इस लेख में कहा कि भारत हम राजनीति से हट कर

शरणार्थियों की समस्या का समाधान करने की धीरे-धीरे, यू० ए० आर० के विदेश मन्त्री ने भी कुछ थोड़ा सा इसका इशारा किया था बाद में पता नहीं क्या हुआ कि उन्होंने इशारा कर दिया कि यह ऐसा नहीं बोलेंगे, परन्तु अखबारों में जो कुछ छपा उससे यह उम्मीद होती थी कि इसरायल के साथ अब वह एव समझौता करना चाहते हैं और वह उनको करना भी होगा आज वह नहीं भी चाहते हैं तो भी इसरायल का भारत देशों के साथ समझौता होगा और भारत देशों को इसरायल के साथ समझौता करना होगा। एक दूसरे के ऊपर गाली गमोज बाहें तितना करते जाय एक दूसरे की हस्ती से इंकार नहीं कर सकते दोनों देश। इसीलिये हमको इस समस्या को राजनीति से निकाल कर इसके आर्थिक पहलू के बारे में सोचना चाहिये। हमारे क्या आर्थिक सुझाव हैं, कौनसी योजना हम विश्व के न मानें सकते हैं, अब इनके एव आर्थिक समझौता हो जाय ? इसरायल ने भी यह सारा रण-बाजता हुआ है, इसरायल जीत की बजह से मुस्ती से कहता है कि यह इसे नहीं छोड़ेगा। परन्तु मेरा ख्याल है कि विश्व की सभी शक्तियाँ, अमेरीका, सोवियत यूनियन और बाकी जितने देश हैं, वे इकट्ठे हो, हिन्दुस्तान भी इकट्ठा हो, तो इस मामले पर समझौता हो सकता है। आखिर एक प्रस्ताव था कि कौनसे राष्ट्रे हटें, इसरायल के कब्जे में जो यू० ए० आर० या भारत मुल्कों की जमीन है, उनको यह छोड़ें। इससे कोई इंकार नहीं कर सकता है कि उनको यह छोड़ना पड़ेगा, उबर छोड़ना पड़ेगा। परन्तु साथ साथ यह भी होना चाहिये कि इस समस्या का हल हो, यह निश्चय हो कि आगे यह समस्या कैसे रहेगी शक्ति में विश्व के सामने इसरायल यह प्रथम समझौता है कि उनका यह नहीं रख सकता। परन्तु आज के इसरायल को नौका मिला है कि इस समस्या का हमेशा-हमेशा के लिये समाधान करे और यह करने के लिये उत्साह है, इसीलिये यह इस तरह की बातें करता है। मैं आपसे इच्छा करती

[श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

विदेश मन्त्री जी से कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस मस्यवा को राजनीतिक धरातल से निकाल कर आर्थिक धरातल पर लाकर कोई समझौता कराने की कोशिश करें, ताकि इसका समाधान हो सके।

एक बात मुझे स्वेज नहर के सम्बन्ध में कहनी है। स्वेज नहर यू० ए० आर० ने बन्द कर दी है। हमारे उनसे इतने अच्छे तात्सुकात हैं। मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि आखिर स्वेज नहर के बन्द कर देने में किसको घाटा होने वाला है क्या अमरीका को घाटा होने वाला है या ब्रिटेन को घाटा होने वाला है? वे बड़े मुल्क हैं, 10-15 करोड़ का नुकसान उनके लिये कोई नुकसान नहीं है, वे सामान भेजेंगे लेकिन घाटा हमें 52 करोड़ का हो चुका है। ऐसे मुल्कों को घाटा होगा जो हमारे जैसे गरीब मुल्क हैं, जिनकी आर्थिक व्यवस्था विषटित हो जायगी। इसलिये आप यू० ए० आर० का कहें कि स्वेज नहर को राजनीतिक दाव-पेच का जिका न बनाये और स्वेज नहर जो जहाज याते जाते थे उनको जाने दे उसको मान्यता क्या होगी मैं उसने नहीं जाना बहरों, लेकिन जा आवागमन का रस्ता है, उसको फिर से जारी किया जाय और उसके लिये हम से बदला न लिया जाय। यहाँ बड़ी बात हो गई कि आज इजराइल और यू० ए० आर० दोनों एक दूसरे से बदला ले रहे हैं जबकि न इजराइल अपने आप मध्य एशिया में आया था और न यू० ए० आर० न अपने आप विषटित हुआ था। ब्रिटेन और अमरीका ने, यह प्रतिहारक कार्य है, इजराइल की रक्षा-प्राप्त की थी। हमने देखा, यू० ए० आर० का गुस्ता किसी से है, लेकिन उसका बदला वह हमारे जैसे देश से ले रहे हैं। इस लिये यू० ए० आर० से हम अपील करें कि वह स्वेज की नहर को खोल दे।

Shri Manoharan (Madras North):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as a representative of the DMK party, I want to make some observations regarding the problems ranging from national to in-

ternational. Ever since we gave up our secessionist demand, we have developed a sense of national outlook and we cannot afford to have complete isolation from the issues ranging from national to international. As the third biggest party in Parliament we think that it is our bounden duty to express our views on the issues relating to West Asia, Israel or Egypt, and other countries which are now facing a serious crisis.

I am very happy to announce here that my party belongs neither to the American lobby, nor to the Russian lobby the only lobby to which my party belongs is the Indian lobby....

Shri Nath Pai: It is South Indian lobby.

Shri Manoharan: and this is completely in consonance with the genius and leadership of my party.

Much has been said about the foreign policy followed by the Government of India. The Government of India is being accused of following a policy of oscillation or vacillation, as my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai used to say very often. I think in Politics and in the international arena we talk too much and do little. The result is the image that we have built up is being threatened to be denigrated in the eyes of the world. A sort of psychological projection or a sort of imposition of self without any kind of logical provocation has landed this country into this miserable plight. For example, in certain matters we should have kept quiet. But, so far as the Government of India is concerned, it has become a fashion that unless and until something is blabbered it cannot keep quiet. But I think there are instances in the world which we can emulate. For instance, Japan refused consistently to get involved in any dispute; on the contrary it concentrated its attention on economic reconstruction and thus became the top Asian leader in economic prosperity. In a short period of 15 years, it became the largest ship-

builder, the largest producer of electronic instruments for supply to the United States, the largest producer of heavy machinery, a nation which counts,

Utilising this opportunity, I want to say on behalf of my party something about the West Asian crisis. Our foreign policy is based, we are often tom-tomming from house-tops, on non-alignment, which means that we are against any form of imperialism, hegemony or military alliances. The aim of non-alignment is to strengthen international peace, not by the division of the world but by expansion of areas of freedom, independence and co-operation, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. I think we stand for peace, definitely peace of the living, not the cold stillness of the grave.

Israel today remains a dangerous spot, a military spearhead of the West, capable of starting a global war at any time. The very creation of Israel, as our Foreign Minister once said, has created tension in that part of the world. The very creation of Israel, according to some closely connected with the lobby of the Government of India, has created misunderstanding in the minds of the Arab nations. It has been a systematic attempt on the part of the white supremacy with the definite intention of introducing dissensions among the Arab nations with the ulterior motive of continuing its influence. I think the non-official spokesman of the Government of India very recently uttered in the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference....

Shri Nath Pai: Who is it?

Shri Manoharan: ...that Israel was conceived, midwived, nursed and maintained by imperialist forces and this was no other person than Shri V. K. Krishna Menon. I think that seems to be the view of the Government of India.

The fact remains that we have recognised Israel. After having

known, after having appreciated and understood that the creation of Israel has caused tension, what made the Government of India to recognise Israel, I cannot understand. But once Israel is accepted, automatically and logically the diplomatic relations ought to be established. After having known the intention of the white supremacy of creating Israel with the view to exploit the Arab world as well as the Afro-Asian world, the Government of India thought it fit to recognise as a fait accompli. After having recognised it, if the Government of India has reluctance as well as hesitation to have diplomatic relations with Israel, that is thoroughly illogical and I cannot understand how we are going to reconcile these two extreme positions.

But one thing I want to say. Israel claims that Palestine is their homeland, the religious home of the Jews since thousand years ago. But they seem to forget that thousand years before Israel was created, Palestine was the Arab homeland, that it was the British and other imperialist nations that created a national home for the Jews in Palestine and that the creation of Israel was a full-fledged aggression on Arab territory. Acharya Kripalani, while he was speaking, said, it is not our business to say whether Israel is an aggressor or not. Of course, I am prepared to concede with him. Whether Israel is an aggressor or not, even Israel cannot be in a position to repudiate the general charge that Israel aggressed first.

The issue is this. The Government of India has already recognised Israel. It is the duty of the Government to see that the United Arab Republic which is a very good friend of India should come forward to recognise Israel and have diplomatic relations with Israel. How can it be done? It is the duty of the Government of India as well as non-aligned nations to see that the spirit of the resolutions sponsored and moved and subsequently defeated in the United

[Shri Manoharan]

Nations Organisation is given a new life. All the Israeli forces stationed in the occupied areas of the United Arab Republic should be withdrawn to the original position. Finally, a Round-Table Conference or something like that can be convened and differences ironed out. The snap victory which Israel enjoys today should not blind her eyes and the military junta should not be precipitated throughout with the help of the foreign powers, the Western powers. Israel should understand it. Somehow or other something happened. But the duty of the non-aligned countries should be to restore peace throughout the world, specially in that part of the world.

The United Nations which is the symbol of the hope and the confidence of the nations of the world has proved pathetic, as our Foreign Minister said, that the resolution sponsored by the non-aligned nations which are belonging to the family of nuclear have-nots has been defeated and rejected by the United Nations. I think, this has created a very bad impression in the minds of the non-aligned nations about the sanctity, the nobility and the purpose of the United Nations Organisation. The general talk is that the United Nations Organisation is being controlled, guided and dictated by certain Western powers. It is proved now through the rejection of the resolution sponsored by the non-aligned countries.

Another thing that I want to say is that the present situation has posed new problems altogether. The United Nations Organisation was formed some twenty years ago when about 47 countries were represented in it. Now, after twenty years, we know that many African countries have emerged out as free nations and have declared themselves as independent nations of the world. They are also represented in the United Nations Organisation. Today, to the tune of

120 countries are representing the United Nations Organisation. Therefore, the present situation, I think, demands a re-appraisal, a re-orientation, of the constitution of the United Nations Organisation because Afro-Asian nations which are in bulk in the United Nations representing that world body should have equality and equal position in that world body. Otherwise, one or two countries like the United States of America, Britain or France are dominating the entire scene, sabotaging the true aspirations of the people of Africa as well as of Asia. The present international situation pregnant with new thoughts of dimensions demands a re-appraisal of the constitution of the United Nations. I think, the Government of India can take an initiative in this regard and see that something is done in the matter.

Now, the position about the United Arab Republic is this. It is expected to accept the existence of Israel. Though personally and on behalf of my Party I feel that Israel aggressed first, the fact remains that Israel can never be wiped out from the map of the world. That fact should be accepted by the United Arab Republic. I think, gradually, they are accepting it.

The Government of India, so far as foreign affairs policy is concerned, should have a sense of realism and practical wisdom. I want to say that the foreign policy of this country should be formulated and framed on the solid rock of Afro-Asian philosophy of friendship. There is no point in thinking about export help from the United States of America or from Western countries. I am neither pro-West nor anti-West. But this country should have friendship with sincere countries like, Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, of course, necessarily, Pakistan, Russia, Cambodia, and we cannot ad-

ford to lose friendship with these countries in the international field. This is another thing that will definitely help and benefit this country.

I want to say a word as to how long we can suffer from certain lamentable legacies which the late Prime Minister Neru bequeathed and which are continued by the present Government.

A word about China. I do not like to say much about it because everybody has talked about China. It is very clear and it is proved also that the so-called cultural revolution of Mao's empire has ceased to be an exportable commodity and much less even for internal consumption. China has created animosity with so many countries around for example, Burma, Indonesia, and Nepal. These countries have highly resented the actions of China. China should be completely isolated. China herself is getting isolated from the international ethics and, what I call, decency.

One more word, about Tibet. Much had been talked about Tibet three days back when the Resolution on Tibet was being discussed on the floor of the House. Our Foreign Minister, Mr. Chagla, said, "Though I have got enough sympathy with the people of Tibet, though I appreciate their present position, we cannot do anything simply because historical facts prevent us from doing things." He said—if my memory is correct—that in 1956, after that Agreement, the suzerainty of China over Tibet had been accepted by India. He claimed it as a historical fact. I say that it is a historical blunder committed by the Government of India. Today, the position is different. There are 45,000 Tibetan refugees all over the world; they have no hope at all. Arguments are advanced by some people that Tibet has not been an independent country. Here is a positive proof that Tibet has been an independent country in the past, from 1910 to 1956. In order to prove that, I say, it is in 1966 that China invaded and Tibetan people were driven out.

Now, they are like nomadic men and so many times the Government of India have been approached by Dalai Lama to help them. I request the Government of India to forget the past commitment. That had been done without a proper appreciation of the situation. The situation now is different. Now, the people of Tibet under the dynamic leadership of Dalai Lama have come forward to you for help. It is the duty of the Government of India to liberate Tibet. I hope the Government of India will, once again, consider that also.

15.23 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I want to say a few words about Vietnam. I do not want to say much about that also because so many Members have spoken about it. The one thing that I must say, in this matter, is that we have identified with the Government of India's stand with some reservation. We must be still more effective. I want to say one thing on the floor of the House that I congratulate the brave people of Vietnam who are striving their very nerve for preserving their freedom. History will definitely record it. While I talk about Vietnam, I talk about North Vietnam obviously. The people of North Vietnam under the dynamic leadership of Ho Chi-Minh are trying to re-unify Vietnam which has been divided between the two parts. I had been to Algeria. During 8 years of solid fight, 15 lakhs of people have been massacred and butchered by the French domination. But ultimately what happened, what resulted? You know, Algeria is an independent country today. Therefore, I am confident that the day will come when Vietnam liberates herself from the clutches of foreign domination and declares herself as an independent country.

Finally, I want to say something about Ceylon. The Implementation Agreement Bill has already been passed. The Government of India has

[Shri Manoharan]

entered into an agreement with Shrimabo; the historic Bull, the historic Pact, Shrimavo-Shastri Pact Implementation Bill has been passed in the Ceylon Parliament after much debate and fight. Everything was all right. Something has been done, but before implementing it, they are sending 5,25,000 people as repatriates to this part of the country. I would request the Government of India to consider only one thing. I do not like to speak about it, but I want to quote what The Madras Mail has faithfully recorded and has written about repatriation

"Repatriation will cause a lot of suffering. While the Indian Government is already seized of the problem of resettling the repatriates (the bulk of whom are plantation workers) on the tea and rubber estates of Mysore and Madras, the Ceylon Government must take care to ensure that the process of repatriation is made least painful. Those who have to quit the island must know of it as quickly as possible. Suspense will prove agonising. The most important thing is to provide for the speedy disposal of applications or the transfer of assets of these repatriates. The Ceylon Government will do well to realise that these repatriates deserve a generous financial settlement, as they have been largely responsible for building up the island's biggest exchange-earning plantations. There is every reason to hope that the Senanayake Government will treat this human problem with the sympathy it deserves."

This is our expectation; this is our longing. I hope, the Government of India will do much in this regard and see that something is done.

Utilising this opportunity, I want to draw the attention of the Government to the most excruciating fact which has been swallowed by the people who

are the repatriates from Burma, the majority of whom are Tamils. If anybody comes to Madras, he can come along with me to the China Bazaar and he will see the unfortunate lot cringing and crawling on the platform of Madras. What happened to their assets, what happened to their properties I want to know whether the Government of India has assessed them in consultation with the Government of Burma. Nothing has been done. The general impression is that, if people representing north were in foreign countries and were driven out from there, they are immediately accepted and accommodated by the Government of India. But these poor people, the Tamilians, are there and proper attention is not being shown to them by the Government of India. I am giving this not as an accusation but as a feeling, agonised feeling, of the people of my part of the country. Therefore, I request the Prime Minister as well as the Minister of External Affairs, who is often considered by the people of this country as an absent-minded professor, to consider definitely this problem in the proper light and see that the problem is settled completely.

With these remarks, I conclude.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Every time there is a debate on foreign policy, one has to say something which one has said repeatedly. I should have liked to avoid saying them this time, but some hon. Members of the opposition have again talked on the same points and, therefore, it becomes necessary to give the correct perspective once again.

Foreign policy is conditioned by the objectives of any country's internal policy, and internal policy in turn is a manifestation of the people's aspirations and political philosophy. Our foreign policy has to be governed by what we ourselves have gone through. We have been subjected to foreign

domination and we, at least my generation, cannot forget the arrogance—or the humiliation—of the domination. Therefore, it is natural for us to speak out when we see similar things happening to other people. Even when we were fighting for our own independence, we spoke out for other independence movements; we spoke out for the oppressed of all other lands. I think, that in turn gave us strength and helped our movement. Today also we cannot isolate our policy in this; we cannot isolate our lives from what is happening elsewhere. It is said many times: why are we bothered with what is happening outside when there are so many problems within India? But at no time in history was any country fully isolated. Certainly, in this century and in this part of the century, there cannot be isolation, when we are also closely linked with what is happening in other countries. It may be all right for some small countries who are not so closely linked with various streams, who have not been through a freedom struggle, who have not got our racial memories, to keep aloof; but it is not possible for India, it is certainly not possible for this Government, to keep aloof from what is happening in the rest of the world. Whenever we have not spoken out loudly, it is the members of the Opposition who have accused us then of sitting on the fence and of not speaking as loudly as we might have.

Much has been said about non-alignment. I have, here in this House and outside this House, repeated time and again that non-alignment has at no stage meant neutrality. There are only two ways: either you are non-aligned or you are aligned. I would like to ask my hon. friends of the Opposition this: when they criticise non-alignment, does it mean that they wish us to be aligned and, if so, with whom, with which alliance, with which country? Of those who speak against non-alignment, we have a right to ask this question, we have a

right to have an answer to it from them.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Any country that helps us.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: When there were two main Blocs, the object of non-alignment was to achieve a detente. My hon. friend opposite, Mr. Masani, accused us yesterday of preventing such a detente between the two super powers. I would like to tell him that, far from preventing, if today there is a blurring of these blocs, if there is a tendency for them to talk more and to be a little closer together, it is largely because of the policy of non-alignment followed not only by India but by an increasing number of countries all over the world. This is not merely my opinion; it is the opinion of many people in the world, including some of the people whom Mr. Masani admires. (*Interruption*). He knows best; I need not say.

Today it is not just a question of people coming together. We still believe in the necessity of peace, and when I said earlier that we could not remain isolated from what was happening, this is one of the main reasons; whenever there is a war, it affects us; it affects our economy; it affects not only the Government's policy but it indirectly affects the lives of all the people of this country by pushing up prices, by making the availability of certain things difficult and so on, so that we have a stake in peace. It is not that we are just talking about a high ideal, but it is something which is very essential to our survival, to our existence and to our development. So, we are interested in these countries coming together. But we have to see on what issues they are coming together, how that is going to affect us, how it is going to affect our national interests.

We are idealistic in our thinking certainly, but I do not think that our idealism is in any way divorced from the interests of our people.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

We have gone through, as I was saying just now, in fact, not only India, but most of the countries in Africa and Asia have gone through long periods of foreign domination. We have not yet recovered from that. It is not fair to compare what is happening here, in a vast country of such diversities and such different levels of development with what some small country has achieved and with an enormous amount of foreign aid. We the people of Asia and Africa have to guard our common interest very zealously. We must oppose any move to damage our sovereignty, whether these moves are by way of direct external pressure or whether they take a more subtle disguised form. Sometimes, emotional responses are deliberately engineered to damage the balance of our policies or to push us into a frame of action which is not really in our interest.

Hon. Members must consider, as I said earlier, which pact we should join? Would we have greater freedom if we belong to any one side or would it limit our freedom of action and freedom of judgment. Secondly, would the big powers give us anything we want merely if we sign a piece of paper? I think it would be extremely naive to think so.

Joining a pact would impose limitations on our policies, both external and internal, because our action would be conditioned by the obligations of these pacts or treaties. Today, what is the state of alliances? I think hon. Members know that there is considerable re-thinking about both the CENTO and the SEATO. The blocs are dissolving and several centres of power are crystallising. There are also very subtle nuances in the relationship of the super-powers and their partners. There are significant contradictions and there are also certain parallelisms.

Whatever attitude we take is governed by the ultimate effect of it. Today, some one nation may have won

a war. But what will be the result of this long afterwards? We know that the war has bred tremendous bitterness, and bitterness can be wiped out by words. If we take sides or we assure our support to somebody, it is not just for taking up an attitude or shouting out aloud, or, as my hon. friend Shri Manoharan has said, because we like the sound of our voices, but it is because we feel that in that particular situation, speaking out will help to draw attention to something or which could help the situation or lessen the bitterness. It is up to the hon. Members of the Opposition to feel that in all these twenty years, India's voice has not counted. They are free to say so. But it does not alter the historical facts. It does not alter the facts that on many occasions it is India's voice and it is India's quiet persistent efforts at the UN and at other international....

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai)
Forums.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Forums—I thank my hon. friend Shri Hem Barua—which have produced good results in the end.

For instance, when the Korean fighting was on, India produced a resolution. We were blamed by both sides right and left that it was a very wrong thing to do and we were letting down everybody and so on. And yet that resolution formed the basis of the settlement which later came about.

So, it is not possible, just sitting at this distance, to judge exactly what tremendous work goes on behind the scenes at the UN or how we are able to influence or change the stream of events there. It does not mean that we always succeed. Nobody has always succeeded. I would like hon. Members to tell me whether there is a single big power today in the world which can say that its foreign policy has always succeeded. There is not, and it cannot be possible. But I think

that by and large we have succeeded; of course, we may make mistakes; we are not infallible, but by and large our efforts have made some little dent and we have been able to create the right atmosphere. If you were to go to the UNO, you will know, and I hope that my colleague the Foreign Minister will tell you of his own recent experience, how the people are anxious to know what India is thinking. I know about it; I have not been to the UN, but I have functioned in the UNESCO for five years, and I saw how much weight people put on India's opinion. In fact, it has even happened once that the delegate of a country phoned to his Government to find out what stand he should take on a particular issue, and the reply, to his surprise, was 'Please find out what India is going to do'. It was not a communist country; it was not even an Asian country.

Shri J. B. Krivakal: Send some of the Opposition Members to the UNO.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): Is the object of our foreign policy to see whether we influence the world or not or to defend our own country's interest? What is the main object of our foreign policy?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: It is both

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: The first object should be to save our own interest.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Both are connected. This is what I have been trying to explain. Both are very closely connected. You cannot separate the two. We want to influence world events in such a way as will be in our national interest, as will help us in the long run and in the short run too.

Shri Samar Guha (Contai): A country which has become a global player cannot influence the world.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I do not want to go into the West Asian crisis,

because I have talked about it on an earlier occasion, and I do not want to go into the details of any particular issue here. But I do think that the manner in which some Members make an equation rather facetiously, if I may say so, about little Israel threatened by the aggressive Arabs reminds me in a way of how people in other countries talk similarly of tiny Pakistan being threatened by a huge India. The history of these problems, the psychology of peoples, the tragic use of small but dangerous military establishments against larger independent neighbours must be kept in view when deciding our attitudes.

As I said, our interest is very much concerned with what is happening in these other areas, and we look at them not only from the point of view of what is happening today but also from the point of view of how it affects the future of our country.

My hon. friend Shri M. R. Masanu tried to compare our capture of the Haji Pir and other points with the Israeli aggression, but he forget that Haji Pir is our territory at this moment

श्री: मधु लिखते : फिर भी छोड़ दिया जायने ?

श्री: नाकाबंदी : हट क्यों गए ? छोड़ दिया गया यह बताइये जरा ?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: She is treading on very dangerous ground.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: It is not at all a dangerous ground. We have temporarily come back from there because we made a treaty.

Some hon. Members: Why?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: It is not only Haji Pir which is today under Pakistani occupation, but a great deal more of Indian territory is there on that side....

श्री: मधु लिखते . जो लिया वा वह की की नहीं रखा । नया क्या लेने ?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: We have not separated Haji Pir from the rest of that land. We do not accept Pakistan's occupation of that land; Pakistani occupation of our land covers a great deal more than just those two or three points.

Shri O. P. Tyagi (Morabadbad): In action she has accepted that.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: We did accept it for a particular purpose. If there was time, I could go into the whole thing, the Tashkent Declaration etc.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Now there is a road from Kargil to Leh. With this road, she will know what purpose it serves.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let her continue.

श्री: मधु लिखते . हाजी पीर का प्रश्न तो प्रश्न नहीं है; ने उठाया है न ।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: The point is that all these events are not isolated and we have to assess their total impact on ourselves.

As far as our own borders are concerned, the Defence Minister has spoken here many a time. I have gone there recently not because of any immediate danger, but because I have been taking interest in our border areas and our security forces who are stationed there right from 1962, and have been visiting these areas every year since then. I must tell the House that it is always a pleasure to go there and see the fine spirit of our people, of our forces who are living in such conditions of extreme hardship. It is difficult to imagine what hardships they face unless one goes there oneself and sees for oneself.

I talked earlier about Shri Masani's point concerning detente. We are

certainly interested in the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, but we feel that by itself this does not solve any problem. That is why the 18-nation Commission was not called a non-proliferation commission, but the Disarmament Commission. We believe in total disarmament and we think we should work towards it.

Shri Masani also dwelt at great length on the nuclear shield and blamed us for not following it up. Actually we did take the initiative. Shri Masani knows that Shri L. K. Jha went to various places in that connection. Earlier on, President Johnson had made a statement. However, that was a unilateral declaration and it did not really call for any application on our part. We welcome what President Johnson said. But what we would like to see, and what we feel is necessary must have also is a guarantee given by all the nuclear powers or at least as many of them as would find it possible to do so and belonging to the different camps, to the non-nuclear countries—that if nuclear weapons are used against any of them by a nuclear power, the others would rally to their support. This would act as a deterrent to any nuclear power.

श्री: मधु लिखते यह उबाव है, उबाव ! सपना !

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): Only after the country has been destroyed.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: We must realise that in the final analysis the effectiveness of any such shield in the field of security would depend not on the spirit in which the protected power accepts such a shield but on the national and vital interest of the giver.

Shri M. E. Masani: Could she tell the House what has been done after April to follow up the initiative that she quite rightly took when Shri Jha

was sent along? What has happened since then?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I do not think it is for us to keep on taking the initiative. We have made our position clear. We have not really had any positive reply.

Shri Samar Guha: You will neither make an atom bomb, nor accept a nuclear shield. What is the positive policy followed?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: We should work towards certain objectives. Even if there is such a shield forthcoming for the non-nuclear powers, we should go a step further which would lead to the banning of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries, in the same way as the use of poison gas has been, by treaty, declared unlawful. That is the only way in which it would help.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Poison gas is not the monopoly of any nation.

श्री जे. बी. कृपालु : पायजन गैस के निषेध को न अमरीका ने माना और न चीन ने माना ।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: That is the whole point about the non-proliferation treaty, that it seeks to stick to the *status quo*. It tries to have a freeze. The *status quo* cannot exist once China is a nuclear power and would not anyhow be a party to such a treaty.

I was very sorry to hear that Shri Bal Raj Madhok made certain remarks regarding a lobby in the foreign office. There is only one lobby in any department of the Government, and that is the Indian lobby. Perhaps Shri Madhok is thinking of lobbies elsewhere.

In this connection, the name of one of our officers was also brought in. As you know, there are definite rules against naming officers in parliament

in this manner because they are not here to protect themselves. Once before, an hon. Member of the Opposition had made an unfounded allegation against this officer and at that time, my distinguished predecessor, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, stoutly defended him. Such statements, especially when we bring in religion, other such factors only help to weaken the fabric of our society. The officer mentioned is an able and experienced officer who has acquitted himself well in very difficult circumstances. There has been absolutely no occasion to doubt his loyalty, and I must tell the House that I have confidence in his integrity.

I have spoken rather generally about certain matters because I felt that this whole question of foreign policy has to be put in a certain perspective. I would have liked to go in greater detail into certain matters. But I am sure that my colleague, the External Affairs Minister, will do so ably, specially as he has been in very close touch with the leaders of the delegations from other nations at the UN and knows what has been happening there. But I should like to repeat that when it is a question of our security, when it is a question of defending ourselves—of course the Army is very important, it is the first defence—but the unity of the people, giving an impression that we are all solidly behind that Army, is equally important. I do not often agree with Dr. Lohia, but I do agree with what he said with regard to equating poverty, the conditions in the country, with defence and foreign policy. It is a very relevant point and that is why government policy in this or in other matters is directed towards taking things in a particular direction which makes it stronger, step by step. We are today not perhaps as strong as we would wish ourselves to be, but we are making every effort at the moment to gain that strength, both amongst the people and also in regard to the defence forces. It is this united

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

strength of the people, of the defence forces backed by a united and disciplined people, that will carry us through. I say this about discipline because although hon. Members opposite would like us to be strong, sometimes they are not equally keen on discipline. I do not think you can have strength unaccompanied by discipline. So if we take these things together, I think that we will march forward and we shall achieve the objectives of our foreign policy.

15.59 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT—
contd.

ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO ENSURE SECURITY FROM ATTACKS BY NAGA HOSTILES IN BORDER AREAS OF ASSAM AND MANIPUR—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody can make a speech in one minute. So we can start with the adjournment motion now.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): Sir, I move:

"That the House do now adjourn".

I have gone through the statement made by the hon. Home Minister on 15 July in this House with due care and caution. I congratulate him on the straight forwardness that he has imported into his statement. When the Home Minister gave an account of the diabolical killing of 23 armed constables of the Central Reserve Police and one more on the same day—that comes to 24—there was a shudder in this House. I would say that that shudder was very legitimate because there is one thing common amongst Indians, that is, patriotism. These 24 armed constables who died on the Tamenglong-Imphal Road are patriots, brave souls. We pay our homage to them because it is they who are holding high the banner of

Indian freedom in this difficult terrain, in these difficult mountainous regions. The Home Minister has said that the hon. Prime Minister has sent Rs. 24,000 to their families. I would say that that amount is very meagre—Rs. 24,000 for the families of 24 persons killed. I hope and trust that the hon. Home Minister would try to increase the amount.

16 hrs.

The statement of the hon. Home Minister pinpoints three basic things: (1) the extension of this agreement for the suspens of operations on the Naga hostiles called cease-fire agreement to areas in Manipur, the Tamenglong Division particularly, which was beyond the pale of Naga hostile activities before; (2) the use of automatic weapons by the Naga hostiles in this killing operation; and (3) that the Government takes a serious view of these developments in that part of the country. Added to these three basic points that have been pointed in his statement, I may draw your attention to the statement made by the hon. External Affairs Minister on 10th July on the floor of the House when he said that peace and order, law and order, are maintained in Nagaland.

My objection is this. This demand for a sovereign Nagaland was first adumbrated on 21st May, 1947 by the Naga National Council of which association or organisation Mr. Phizo was the President. And then the Naga hostiles rose in armed revolt against the Indian Government in 1954. Since 1954 there has been no incident in this area of Manipur. These areas of Manipur were comparatively calm and quiet. By extending this so-called cease-fire agreement to these areas of Manipur, the hon. Home Minister has allowed the fire of rebellion to burn there, as a result of which our personnel are killed. I do not know why this was allowed.