

1976, and do communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

The motion was adopted.

12.38 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1976-77

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No. 32 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which six hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House who desire to move their Cut Motions may send slips to the Table

within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the Cut Motions they would like to move.

Motion moved:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1977, in respect of the head of demand entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 32 relating to Ministry of External Affairs."

Demand for Grant, 1976-77 in respect of Ministry of External Affairs

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 23-3-1976		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue	Capital	Revenue	Capital
1	2	3	4	5	6
32	Ministry of External Affairs	15,85,19,000	1,79,17,000	79,25,95,000	8,95,63,000

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, since we discussed Foreign Affairs last time, big developments have taken place on an international scale and a most significant development has taken place in South-East Asia—the complete routing of American imperialism from Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia throwing them into a difficult predicament. That has created an absolutely new situation in South-East Asia where the correlation of forces has changed in favour of the people and the people's struggle against neo-colonialism and for a democratic advance which has got tremendously strengthened. This is being reflected in various ways. But this does not mean that American imperialism has learnt the lesson from

their Vietnam debacle. They want to retain their hold in this whole region as they are after retaining their position of world domination. That is why they are hectically trying to penetrate through various forms into the economic and political life of the countries, particularly in areas of South-East Asia. So, the importance of India has increased to American imperialism after their debacle in South-East Asia. Their new conspiracies are aimed at subverting the democratic advancement of the people towards progress. In Bangladesh and various other countries the hands are quite clear and apparent and serious developments have taken place particularly in Bangladesh through the murder of Mujibur Rehman and his associates.

[Shri Samar Mukherjee.]

Now, in order to make their presence felt and also in order to gain a position to intervene with positions of domination they are creating tensions among the countries particularly among the non-aligned third-world countries and they are organising various provocations to create an atmosphere of war.

Now, the barrage of anti-Indian propaganda in Bangladesh and Pakistan has its background and you cannot isolate American imperialism from this barrage, of anti-Indian propaganda because the reactionary forces are being mobilised by American imperialism to create tension among the neighbouring countries so that imperialism gets the advantage to meddle in these matters and they are in a position to sell arms both to Pakistan and Bangladesh and they can even put pressure on India to become more dependent on American aid and help not only in the economic sphere but also in various other spheres

Very recently we have seen that after elections in Australia the new Australian Government declared openly that they want Australia to be the new base of America. The old policy of Australia is now completely reversed and in today's papers the hon Members might have noticed that Thailand's election results have come out and the new Prime Minister has already made the statement that all those 4,000 American army men should come back and have their base here. This shows that American imperialism is very active in this whole region.

Now, I have got a statement of the Foreign Ministry of North Korea. The statement says:

"Recently the United States increased the number of US troops in South Korea by over 4,000 men and provided in large quantities most destructive weapons and latest military equipment including nuclear

weapons and guided missiles. The US imperialists reached agreement with Japanese Imperialists on using Japanese bases including Okhinawa as operational bases for the provocation of a war of aggression against Korea and US Airforce units in Okhinawa are conducting terrain familiarisation, flight exercises and also exercises for dropping nuclear bombs for a surprise attack on areas in the northern half. Owing to the war-provoking manoeuvres of the United States today tension is being heightened all the more and the danger of a new war breaking out at any moment is increasing in Korea."

In Korea, war may break out any moment and that is the situation. We have seen the statement of Kissinger threatening Cuba and the report has appeared in the papers that American imperialism is preparing for attacking Cuba. All this shows that imperialism is very active and after his visit to China, Ford visited Japan and there he issued a joint statement which contains his policy called the Pacific Doctrine. It clearly states that America is not at all prepared to withdraw its forces from Asia, particularly South-East Asia. There is full scale preparation to develop Diego Garcia as a nuclear military base. It shows how they are prepared to defy international opinion and also the opinion of India and other littoral countries. Even the UN Resolution was for making Indian Ocean a zone of peace. Defying all this they are proceeding with their work of developing Diego-Garcia as a nuclear military base. What is the purpose? They want to blackmail others with their huge fleet and nuclear weapons and tempt by offers of aid and economic collaboration and various other means. They want to influence various governments who are not behind them. The Government of India are now favouring American monopolists and multinational

corporations and we hear about new Indo-American agreements and economic commissions. We repeatedly warn them that this is a serious danger to our independence, democracy and sovereignty. You know what roles the multinationals play, it is no secret now. All credit goes to the American public opinion; they have forced them to disclose those things. Conscientiously and heinously they are using all their agencies and the CIA to subvert democracy and topple the governments and bribe political parties and political figures and change the policies of the governments. If any government is not prepared to change the policy they work to change that government. President Ford had declared publicly that this was part of their strategy part of their foreign policy. This is no secret. But our government is unfortunately dependent upon more and more of American aid and American collaboration. Unfortunately the report about the Ministry of Foreign Affairs says that it was a big landmark in this year's development that our Foreign Minister visited America and he was cordially received. No. When you allowed the multinational corporations to invest money here to influence our policies here both internal and foreign policies it means that you are bound to help them to act against the democracy. You are suppressing the working class movement here only to appease them and they are giving certificates that conditions in India are far more favourable for the investment of multinational corporations. The working class movement has been completely suppressed and cheap labour is available here and money can be repatriated huge profit can be repatriated without any restrictions. This is the political logic. But, we find in this report—it has been stated—that both the big powers are interested to create their influence in Angola, in some other Asian and African countries, in Portugal, etc. This parity between the American Imperialism and the Soviet

Union, equating together, is wrong. What does it show? What is the role played by the Soviets in Angola? The Soviets supported the liberation movement of Angola, and American people totally opposed this liberation movement with the help of White regimes. But our report says that both are interested in creating influence there. So, we are neutral. What role American Imperialism played in Vietnam and what role Soviet Union played in Vietnam? The Soviets helped the liberation movement in Vietnam and the Americans did the worst job of the aggressor and became enemy of the people, not only the people of Vietnam but whole of the world. But if we consider America and Soviet Union as equals both are interested in creating their influence. This shows that we are creating a position whereby we want to avoid any irritation to American Imperialism because our economy is tied with the American aid. In the Report, it has been stated that we have given recognition to the South Vietnam Government in April 1975. After the complete rout out of American Imperialism from the soil of Vietnam our Government came forward to give recognition to the South Vietnam Revolutionary Government and Mr Bipinil Das issued a statement. I remember that statement. Does it go to your credit? When others have given recognition long before your recognition came when there is no other Government excepting the Revolutionary Government on the soil of Vietnam. So to whom are you going to give recognition? And you tell that our Prime Minister has a great instinct as regards the choice of time. How the instinct acted here in case of South Vietnam? Is it because of the class character of the Government and because of our ties with American aid? That is why India stood the last to give recognition to the South Vietnam Revolutionary Government. We must have to give serious thought to it but what policy we are pursuing in relation to American Imperialism? The provocation is being engineered. What Esp-

[Shri Samar Mukherjee.]

pened in Bangladesh? Grenades were placed in the Embassy. Then Mr. Samar Sen was attacked. Fortunately, he escaped. But had there been a calamity, heat would have been generated between India and Bangladesh and American Imperialism was ready to take full advantage. Already there is rumour that the demolition of the road-side houses of the shop-keepers is only to make the roads ready for military march. So, Government of India is becoming ready for sending army into Bangladesh, though personally we have contradicted that. But that goes against the interest of the Government of India, apart from the Indian people. But this propaganda is going on.

We have also no explanation to give as to why within six to twelve hours notice, all houses should be demolished without giving alternative accommodation to the lakhs and lakhs of families who have been thrown into the streets. It cannot be the action of any democratic government. This can be the action only of a government which is anti-people, but this is happening

We saw how in the UN the Government of India voted against a motion sponsored by non-aligned countries to ask Indonesia to withdraw from military intervention in East Timor. I do not know why the Government of India opposed this. Indonesia is now under military rule, though they claim that they have a democratic rule. Lakhs of communists, democrats and their supporters have been butchered by the Suharto regime. They want to grab East Timor. The only fault of the people there was that they wanted self-determination. They were under Portuguese rule. Indonesia wanted to grab them. A majority of the UN Members wanted to prevent that. But the Government of India did not support them. Instead, they voted along with the American and some other western countries. Why? Is it an isolated fact? No. It is stated in this report that in the case of the UN Resolu-

tion sponsored by socialist and other non-aligned countries demanding the immediate withdrawal of American forces from South Korea, India abstained on the basis of a principle. What is that principle? The Minister should explain it.

Some of these actions indicate that you do not want to be in the bad books of American Imperialists. That is why you behave in such a way, so that you may get some certificate. Now you are very much pleased with the economic cooperation. But you know what roles the multinationals have played. Their role in Chile is well known. Lockheed and other scandals are daily coming in the papers. Despite that, you are in love with the multinational corporations. You have formed a statutory body with American monopolists and Indian big business. Now they will decide which type of industries will be started here, where the money will be invested, etc

Already you have given more and more concessions to them. Immediately after the declaration of the emergency, in the very first statement of the Prime Minister, the multinationals and big business in India have been assured that there will be no nationalisation. For this assurance, they fought for a long time. More and more workers, trade unions and the Indian people have been demanding nationalisation. Even from the floor of this House, demands have been raised by both sides that the jute, textile and sugar industries should be nationalised and foreign companies should not be given concessions. But immediately after the emergency, it was announced that there will be no nationalisation, that there will be liberalisation in the issue of licences and majority equity participation by foreign companies. They have been given full scope, all in the name of encouraging exports. Even in off-shore drilling they will get majority participation. By putting further pressure, they are confident now that they will be in a position to force the Government to

India to soften its policy towards American imperialism in relation to foreign affairs as well as internally. A demand has been raised that the Foreign Exchange Act should be revised. This is a very serious danger about which sufficient warning must be given and the entire people of India must be made vigilant. The Government of India must take appropriate lessons from the activities of the multinational corporations throughout the world.

13.00 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sir, I want to draw the attention of the Minister to one or two points more. We welcome the move by the Government of India in giving recognition to Angola Government and also in expressing their desire to give material help to Mozambique for their re-construction. We also want the Government of India to extend their material help to South Vietnam for helping their full re-construction. We want that Government of India should take a policy decision to improve relations not only with Pakistan and Bangladesh but also with China. As regards China, this was my suggestion long before that the custom ban on Chinese literature should be withdrawn immediately. This will be a good gesture and Government of India should send an Ambassador to China of their own and create an atmosphere so that some dialogue can be started with China and relations can be improved.

Improvement in relations with the people of Bangladesh, with the people of Pakistan and with the people of China must be our constant effort. The situation not only in Asia, particularly in South-East Asia but throughout the world is changing in favour of the people and of democratic forces.

Government of India must take up this issue of Diego Garcia base. Government of India must take full initiative to have immediately an inter-

national conference which has been stated in the resolution of the UNO so that U.S. imperialist efforts must be totally upset. In all these anti-imperialist actions, we want that the Government of India should remain in the fore-front.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jainagar): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to snap links with the Commonwealth (1)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to declare as hostile the American action in developing Diego Garcia as a base equipped with nuclear and other destructive weapons (2).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100" -

[Need to provide early and effective assistance for the reconstruction of the war-ravaged countries like Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Angola(3)]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take initiative in respect of Asian collective security(4).]

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Tellicherry): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to put an end to extravagant spending of public funds by the Indian Embassies abroad(5).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re 1."

[Failure in creating a new diplomatic cadre who have a firm commitment

[Shri C. K. Chandrapan]

to the national policies of socialism, non-alignment, peace, friendship and solidarity(6).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Re. 1."

[Failure to take prompt action against those U.S. diplomats working in the American Embassy who are alleged to be CIA agents(7).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100 "

[Need to take concrete initiative to further strengthen the bonds of friendship between India, Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Republic of South Vietnam by developing cooperation in various spheres(8).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs 100."

[Need for taking diplomatic initiative for isolating the US imperialist policy of "operation destabilisation" (9).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100 "

[Need for further developing the cooperation between India and the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea (10)]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for taking steps to provide positive help and assistance to the struggle of the Palestinian people of their struggle for national liberation (11).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for providing greater help and assistance to the countries and people of Africa in the struggle against apartheid and racism and for the

liberation of South Africa and South ern Rhodesia(12).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

" [Need for taking more positive diplomatic initiative in Africa(13).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Rs. 100."

[Need for having an Asian collective security system to ensure peace and security in Asia(14).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Rs. 100."

[Need for taking more initiative both officially and non-officially to mobilise world public opinion in favour of keeping Indian Ocean an area of peace and against the Anglo-American attempt to set up a nuclear military base at Diego Garcia(15).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Rs. 100."

[Need to take a stand against the inhuman treatment of the Chilean military junta against political prisoners (16)]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Rs. 100."

[Need for India using her influence for the release of Luis Corvalan, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, who is languishing in a concentration camp in Chile, and join the world public opinion (17).]

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI
(Patna): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re 1."

[Failure to declare the action of USA in building a nuclear base at Diego Garcia as an unfriendly act (18).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to sever ties with the Commonwealth(19).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to adopt a definite policy towards Asian Security and to take initiative therefore (20).]

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to ally with Socialist countries in their war against imperialism (21)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for a strong rebuttal of anti-India propaganda by Bangladesh (22)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to make continued efforts for maintaining friendship with Pakistan in the spirit of the Simla Agreement despite her anti-India propaganda (23)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to continue the efforts to establish friendship with China despite her anti-India stance (24)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for greater efforts for propagation of Hindi in foreign countries (25)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to open a passport office at Patna (26)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to convene a conference of littoral countries against the U.S. nuclear base at Diego Garcia (27)].

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to eliminate abnormal delay in the grant of passports (28)].

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The cut motions are also before the House.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the turbulent times that have intervened between the time we discussed India's external relations and now when we are discussing it again, have brought about many changes. There have been changes in men who dominated the international arena and there have been changes in the policies that they propagated. President Nixon and Willy Brandt went out of the arena because they resigned. Premier Chou En-lai is no longer with us. We lost also a dear friend during this period Mujibur Rahman, President of Bangladesh. Mr. Harold Wilson has just opted out. But we are not concerned with men alone but with the trends they set and the trends that the future now has before us. I think, some of these trends have been very rightly incorporated in the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs and I would begin with the first point that they have taken, i.e., Helsinki Declaration.

The Helsinki Declaration does mark the turning point in the relations between us and West Europe. Not only does it make it easier for the countries of East Europe and

[Shri Dinesh Singh.]

West Europe to cooperate with one another, to trade with one another, it is not only a historical development but also a result of the dictates of the stages of economic growth. It sets certain trends and one of the important trends that would effect us is that it would give much greater capacity to West Europe to act on the international scene.

As far as we are concerned, we have very good relations with the countries of East Europe; our trade is growing and our cooperation is multiplying. With West Europe also, our relations are good. But they are now generating new capacities, which will require a greater effort to coordinate with the European Community as a whole and with the individual countries of Western Europe. The Helsinki Declaration also marks the peak of *detente*. It is possible that we may now drift towards the valley; and this is also highlighted in the Report of the Ministry, and is equally significant for us, because should there be a competition between the two Super Powers—and I know my friend the professor does not like the word Super Powers i.e., should there be a competition between the two most powerful countries in the world, it will undoubtedly affect us.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Allahpore): There is nothing wrong with peaceful competition.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: No; I am not against competition; and the word 'peaceful' is certainly inkeeping with the policy of our own party; but we have to find our place in a competition between two major countries with which we are very gratefully connected, in one way or the other; and that is what I have been venturing to say, viz., that despite the Apollo, the Soyuz and the rendezvous in space and a peaceful breakthrough in SALT, there can be a trend towards competition, in which

the non-aligned countries, the developing countries could be seriously affected; and we have to see how we are going to work in an area where conflict may develop. Fortunately, our relations with the Soviet Union are not only good, but very close; and this is not only a historic development, but is so because we have been able to identify the national interests of the two countries. Soviet Union and we are deeply interested in the maintenance of peace in the cooperation between the socialist countries and the developing countries; and in working together in the international field. And, therefore, the development of relations between Soviet Union and India is both historical, born out of the realities of today, as also something which has tremendous possibilities in the future. Unfortunately, our relations with the United States have not been on the same basis, largely because we have not been able to identify common interests. And, therefore, it is my hope that in times to come, we shall make an effort, not on the basis of personalities or individuals who may be in Washington or in New Delhi; but on the basis of identifying the interests of the two countries, i.e. of seeing where they converge and on seeing whether there can be a working together both on a bilateral basis and on the basis of working in the international field. As the hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke just now (Interruptions)—I did not realize that an hon. gentleman could not be a Member—I mean Prof. Samar Mukherjee... (Interruptions)—Professor does not mean a teacher in a university. That is something which is added to people who might not deserve the qualification.

Anyway, the point that Shri Samar Mukherjee made about South East Asia is a very valid point. There have been tremendous changes in South East Asia. The emergence of Viet Nam as an independent country is not limited only to Viet Nam, or

to the former States of Indo-China. It is my feeling that Viet Nam represents the dynamic feeling of freedom in Asia, and this spirit has come out now to manifest itself, not only in the sense of war of liberation but also in shaping the Asian identity. Therefore, it is necessary for us to co-operate closely with Viet Nam, which is a country which has fought against aggression, which is a country which has fought many wars of liberation in the course of its history. It would not submerge its identity, or weaken its sovereignty, for any country, however close or powerful it may be. Therefore, it is in a position in which a new Asian Arrangement could be very greatly strengthened by Viet Nam, by Cambodia, by Laos, the countries which have just emerged from the wars of liberation. It has been my hope that it would be possible to work out a close relationship with these countries, not only for the mutual interest of India and the country concerned but for setting up new trends in Asia, following the decolonisation that has now almost completed itself in South and South East Asia.

You may have also noticed, Mr Deputy-Speaker, that the countries which were members of the SEATO have already decided to phase it out. The economic grouping of ASEAN is not in the same position as it was a couple of years ago. Therefore, there is need for a new Asian identity to emerge, and India has to play its role. We should not be afraid of playing our role, only because some country may feel that we are too big or we may wish to dominate. India's record of co-operation free from domination, India's adherence to the five principles of Panch Sheel are too well-known and too well-established for other countries to be afraid of India seeking a new Asian arrangement.

In this context, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you may be aware of the effort that has been made some time back to worm the Asian Council of Ministers. It is still there on pa-

per; I do not think it has been dissolved. But it has held, so far as I recollect, just one meeting in the last 8 or 10 years that it has been established. These new countries which have emerged could also find a place and a new Asian Council of Ministers under what was then the ECAFE should now be re-considered, as it could lead to greater co-operation between the Asian countries.

In this respect, I would emphasise again the need to try to evolve an economic community in South Asia. A South Asian Economic Community would not be in confrontation with any other grouping that may exist. There has been a plan formulated by India some time back, in which a working arrangement between South Asian countries could emerge on the basis of sharing all surplus. I would commend that to the Government again, to see whether that could be revived, and whether we could not make it a more effective organisation to deal with all the countries of South Asia, not only on a bilateral basis but on a multilateral basis.

Moving from South Asia, we see that the war in West Asia still continues. Asia has had the misfortune of having wars since the world war began, and the wars of Asia have not ended. The Powers which controlled the destinies of Asia in the days of colonialism fought and ended their wars more than two decades ago, but the legacy and the interests they left behind continue the flames of war in Asia. Fortunately we are free of war in Southeast Asia, but the war in West Asia continues, and it is a war which affects not only us, but all the developing countries as a whole because it defiects the new attitude of colonialism, the new garb of colonialism, neo-colonialism, economic colonialism and therefore, it is necessary for us to play an active role. I am glad to see that there has been a special reference to it in the Report of the Ministry, and I am quite sure that the

[Shri Dinesh Singh.]

Minister of External Affairs is taking a keen interest in what is happening in West Asia, but I think it would be useful to think in terms of some kind of an Asian solution of what is going on in West Asia. We have depended far too long on the Europeans or the major Powers to solve our problems. Perhaps the time has come when we can think of an initiative to bring together the countries of Asia which could attempt to find a solution of this problem. I am aware of the realities in the sense that a purely Asian solution does not necessarily mean an immediate end of the war, because there are interests beyond Asia in this region, but I do believe that if the Asian countries can get together to find a solution, it would have its impact even on those countries which might be interested in inflaming wars in Asia.

We have seen the silver lining broadening in Africa. The liberation that had taken place some time back is now more or less coming to an end. Colonialism has been wiped out of Africa, but a more dangerous form of colonialism as racialism still exists and does not only exist, but threatens to trouble not only Africa, but the rest of the world. And, therefore, we should not back out of whatever efforts we can make to try to find a peaceful solution to this problem. Obviously, if a peaceful solution is not possible, some other solution will emerge, as it did in Angola, and I would not wish to comment on it, but since our policy is a policy of peaceful changes, a policy which wants to bring about changes by dialogue, we should leave no stone unturned to see that there is a possibility of these changes. I think we have depended in many ways on the British Government alone to bring about peaceful changes, and I am not quite sure of the efforts the British Government made in this regard, but I think that it should be possible for us to involve not only the African countries which are already involved

in trying to find a peaceful solution, but other countries which could have an influence on the racist regimes both in Rhodesia and South Africa, because I am quite confident that once there is a firm decision by countries like the USA, UK and their allies in Western Europe to force these countries into a dialogue, they cannot keep away from it for long, but the difficulty has been that the will to force these countries into a dialogue has been lacking on the part of the Western countries, and it should be our effort in these countries to try to bring pressure on these two regimes to bring about a settlement.

Another heartening feature is the recognition of the possibility of a new economic order.

More and more people, I think, are beginning to appreciate that like peace, prosperity is also indivisible. Nobody wants to lose one's prosperity, and therefore, there is still some reluctances and hesitation in taking the action which could bring about a new economic order. But I think there is certainly a recognition as is marked by several Special Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations on international economic cooperation and also the Paris Ministerial Conference on international economic co-operation.

These are steps which are in the direction of finding a solution, although these directions may be terribly motivated in favour of the rich wanting to pressure their riches. But at least there are trends towards which we must try to push, as hard as possible, the international community for a solution. Unfortunately, as these conferences take place, as we debate these subjects in various forums, the disparity between the rich and the poor continues to grow and it is growing at a rate at which it can pose a very serious danger to the peace and the security of the world as a whole.

Our own effort in this direction has been a laudable one. I wish to congratulate the Government and particularly the Ministry of External Affairs and others connected with it in the effort they have made towards a peaceful transfer. Some of the issues brought forward by them, some of the points raised in the international community have been ones which have made an impact. Even the rich countries have found it difficult to refute it or to oppose it. There is a growing concern that something has to be done to bring up the poor countries at least to the point at which a conflict could be avoided. In this regard, I would wish to make a suggestion that perhaps it would be better if we could think in terms of some institutional arrangement in the Government of India where the activities of various Ministries in this regard could be co-ordinated.

At the moment, a number of Ministries are concerned, dealing with the international organisations involved with this problem. Obviously, there will be a number of Ministries, because in the Government of India, it is spread out in different departments. But that is there. Some kind of coordinating agency located either in the Ministry of External Affairs or at any other appropriate Ministry should be created to see that the total action is towards specific points that we may have in our mind. It is not only a question of generalised moving forward but certain specific points have to be picked up, highlighted and pressed so that the movement could be more rapid instead of trying to carry the entire gamut of international co-operation.

Sir, now I think they have been very well summed up in the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs, which says on page 9 of the Report, after it has talked on India's foreign relations:—

"In sum, during the year under report, India showed active interest in the need for a new international economic order based on equality and justice and the necessity for cooperation among the developing countries and unity among the non-aligned countries to meet the economic and political challenges confronting the world community."

Unfortunately, this is a very long sentence and perhaps some of the points are lost in that, but the idea is there in sum and substance. We attempt the economic diplomacy and as such, there would be need for greater specialisation, both area specialisation and discipline specialisation. I hope that the Minister of External Affairs would see that there is an emphasis on specialisation so that our members of the Foreign Service have the necessary equipment to deal with this subject in the international community. Now that we have a Foreign Secretary from the Foreign Service, it is my hope that—and also that he was once the Head of the Policy Planning Division of the Ministry—it would be possible for him to concentrate the effort in specialisation, both, as I said, area-wise as well as in discipline so that there could be a more coordinated effort and effective functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs.

With these words, I support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is a little unusual, that we are having this discussion with my hon. friend, Mr. Bipinpal Das, deputising for the Foreign Minister and this absence appears to me to be nearly a record in the budgetary history. Of course, I know, perhaps, our Foreign Minister has got an engagement and has gone along with the Prime Minister....

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): May I say for the information of the House that the Foreign Minister is perhaps held up at the airport where he had gone long with the Prime Minister to receive Dr. Tulsi Giri?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already said so.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I have no grouse. I was only making a statement in regard to what was noticeable a little too conspicuously and I myself said that, very probably, the Foreign Minister has got an engagement. I am glad my hon. friend, Mr. Bipinpal Das is deputising for him.

Sir, when I was listening to my hon. friend who has just spoken, in the beginning, I have shut my eyes and I seemed to hear the tones of someone speaking from the Treasury Benches. I had a premonition that, perhaps, all being well and weather permitting, he would make a journey back.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: May be, old habits die hard also.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Yes, old habits die hard. But in the case of my good friend, I have said something with genuine conviction and, I do hope, he would make his journey back.

I must say that the Government of India has in recent months taken some positive steps and I wish I could begin with a few good words for the Government in this regard... (*Interruptions*) I do not know if some astral influences are at work to anticipate what I am going to say. I am happy that the Foreign Minister has come. I welcome the presence of my good friend, the Foreign Minister. I was going to say that I could say a few good words about the positive steps taken by the Government in this regard. On the eve of Budget discussion, they always circulate a report which is

this time more than the usual painful reading. But in the conditions in which we live today, I fear that apart from the virtues and vices of our political leadership, the foreign service cadre is perhaps still largely Indo-Anglian, uncommitted to national policies of non-alignment, peace, socialism, solidarity and all the rest of that sort of thing.

In the name of so-called maturity, I find that this report gives a catalogic idea and, as my hon. friend, Mr. Samar Mukherjee, pointed out, appears to make no distinction, so to speak, between South Korea and North Korea, they do not seem to know that Indonesia and Cuba are two very different difference between our approach to Iraq or to Saudi Arabia. We profess in this report a sort of vapid friendship with all the countries of the world. It may be noised about but nobody would ever believe it. It is better we shed this catalogic habit of enumeration at public expense. This is a document which, I am sure, foreign representatives would look forward to reading and finding something in it. Maybe, it is to hoodwink them that it is produced. But it is unnecessary, it is a complete waste of public money.

I also find that there are philosophical observations in this report by implication. Vietnam is referred to as if it was only a nationalist victory. They would never understand the glory of Vietnam. Possibly the Foreign Service does not care to know the name of a man called La Duan who is Secretary of the Vietnam Workers' Party Central Committee. He made a statement wherein he said:

"Our victory is a vivid demonstration of the greatest truth of our time namely national independence, democracy and socialism being inseparable".

This is the one thing which makes Vietnam a shining example. It is no good your merely praising Vietnam, Mr. Dinesh Singh or anybody else; it is important to learn why it is that

Vietnam has succeeded in writing with a sun-beam in the scrolls of history. They could do so because they could combine these three elements and it is exactly that and not merely a stress on nationalism that is important. Nationalism is important enough for national liberation, but national liberation should lead to its fulfilment in socialism. If you forget all that, then, for Heaven's sake let us not go on talking unnecessarily about the one or the other.

Now I must turn to say something good about the Government also because I must be fair. I have read in some of the words uttered by the Prime Minister something in which, I can say, is capsuled the current politics of India. I don't mind paying her this compliment because, quite frequently in this House, I have criticised her whenever I thought she warranted it. She has warned this country over and over again—at the Pugwash Conference in Madras in Calcutta, Kharagpur and elsewhere, at public meetings and at the Chandigarh meeting of the Congress, and as stated by Shri Samar Mukherjee Government seems to have disregarded the warnings. She has warned the people of the atmosphere of danger around us. The Prime Minister of India never talks of an atmosphere of danger all around unless it is pretty serious. Yesterday even the Defence Minister said something about the atmosphere of danger around. She said at Chandigarh, for example—

“When I first raised the question of foreign intervention at the Delhi A.I.C.C. some M.Ps. and other leaders and the press made fun... you will find them revealing how they overthrew governments in other countries, how they penetrated among journalists, how they infiltrated among intellectuals and how they carried on their propaganda. They wanted to remove governments, they wanted other things, they wanted policies to be changed, and they carried on their propaganda and got what they wanted”.

She went on to say that instigation comes from these foreign sources strength is derived from them and they put up some stooges. She said that we had to see that in our own country there were no such stooges. She talks about dangers around and she actually identifies the sources from which danger comes. She 'thanked those foreign countries who helped us to grow strong industrially' making her position very clear. Her accusing finger was definitely turned to USA which had cut off all aid in 1971 during the Bangladesh liberation war. I could go on quoting so many things, but here are statements in which you will find the quintessence of the evidence on which you base your foreign and economic and other national policies. Therefore, this is a matter to which I wish attention is seriously drawn and action follows accordingly.

Both my friends who spoke before me have referred to the question of economic independence. So far as this goes, my impression is—and I shall be happy to be corrected—that most of the commercial counsellors in the Indian Embassies and Missions abroad are a waste of money. They do nothing at all in so far as our economic policies or the organisation of exhibitions abroad or the purchase of stores and our other requirements abroad are concerned. They don't even have the economic information which is very necessary in order to process the matter and help the Administration in this country. They do initially nothing at all. When the Americans sent *Dhatura* seeds mixed in the milo that we imported from them, nothing was done by our own people at the other end, so much so that the Americans say openly that the developing countries can never find out these things as they have not got the mechanism to discover these discrepancies.

About economic independence, as early as September 1973, in Algiers, the Prime Minister had said at the Non-Aligned Conference—I am quoting her words:

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

"As the economic struggle becomes more acute, the long suppressed voices of the people sharpen, but with every step forward, the resistance of entrenched groups, often aligned with foreign interests, specially the faceless multinational corporations, becomes more vehement, unscrupulous and at the same time more subtle. In India we see these constraints every day."

* The Foreign Minister himself, on 2nd September, 1975, told the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly that it was both irrational and harmful to the interests of the developing countries to draw investments in resources and technology through the trans-national firms.

Mr. Samar Mukherjee referred to the trans-national corporations and said that nothing was being done against them. It is a wonderful under-statement to say that nothing is being done. On the contrary, they are being assisted in spite of all that we know about them.

We should know, therefore, by this time who are our friends and who are our enemies. I do not mean that we should not, therefore have normal co-operative relations with those who are not our friends. Whether it is the United States of America or the fraternity of China and Pakistan and whoever else it may be, we know their intentions, they have unmasked themselves. I do not mean that you should not have relations with those countries. Do have cooperative, friendly, normal, civilized, international relations. But let us know who are our friends and who are not our friends. Let us know where exactly we stand. We are not a boneless wonder of a country, pathetically trying to be friendly to all but being snubbed by everybody whenever they have an opportunity to do so.

In so far as our friends are concerned, I think, nobody should grudge it if I quote the words of the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, at the 25th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party where he had stated:

"Some regimes and political organisations that have proclaimed socialist aims and carry out progressive changes have come under strong pressure from internal and foreign reaction. The recent rightist campaign against the government of Indira Gandhi... are examples of this course of events."

Then he added:

"We attach special importance to friendship with that great country..."

That is, India.

"In the past five years, Soviet-Indian relations have risen to a new level. And even this short period has clearly shown its tremendous significance for our bilateral ties, and its role as a stabilising factor in South Asia and the continent as a whole.

"Close political and economic co-operation with the Republic of India is our constant policy.

"The Soviet people appreciate and more, are in solidarity with India's peace-loving foreign policy and the courageous efforts of her progressive forces to solve her difficult socio-economic problems."

Let us not bedevil the relationship which we all applaud by equating, so to speak, what we call 'the big powers' over and over again in this report of the Ministry. Even in relation to the Indian Ocean region and Diego Garcia, it says that the 'big power rivalry' would make relaxation of tension in this area very difficult and, therefore, we are concerned. No, our liberation prospects are endangered, which is why we are concerned. Thank Heavens, the Soviet Union is a powerful State, but it is not a super power, it is a class socialist power, with a policy which gives assistance to national liberation because national liberation in the twentieth century leads, automatically, in a socialist direction, because without socialism, fulfilment of freedom cannot

come. Therefore, this sort of political education should come to our people in power, in Government or in the administration.

I find, for instance,—and this is something really stupendous—when we are told by as highly-praised a person as Gerald Ford—he spoke at Washington on the 27th November announcing generously and I am quoting his words—

“I have issued specific instructions to US Intelligence Services to avoid any attempts to assassinate foreign leaders in the future’

In his generosity, the President of United States—may his tribe increase, they are also liable to assassination themselves—said that he had given specific instructions that foreign leaders should not be sought to be assassinated. Perhaps the blood of Mujib was on his hands, or may be in his dreams, astral-influences are there perhaps also at work and possibly he got some premonition. This is the kind of world where we live in and where the American President, after all that has come out in the revelations in his own country says that he had now given instructions that CIA and others should desist from assassinating foreign leaders

We find these people arriving on machinations in the Middle East. I do not expect anything in this Report, but I would like the Foreign Minister, when he replies, to tell us a little more about the Middle-East situation. I think, it is a great pity that Egypt—the Egypt—of Zaghul Pasha long ago, and the Egypt of Nasser, not so very long ago, is now playing a role which seems to be a betrayal of the aspirations of the Arab world for the achievement of the kind of freedom that they need from neo-imperialism.

The protagonists of the point of view of the United States and all its friends and auxiliaries are saying that they have lost a pawn in Angola and they have gained an ace in Egypt! It is a good thing that Government of India

did recognise Angola, I wish they did it a little while earlier. I wish they did not need the visit of President Nyerere to our country and very sustained talks with him before they could make up their mind

Before I forget, I would like the Government of India, particularly the Foreign Minister, to invite Agostinho Neto, who is a poet *he'lás*, in Portuguese. He is a poet as also a patriot. He could come here, and could give the Nehru memorial lectures, or you could give him the Nehru award or something like that. You could likewise give an award to Madame Binh and to Fidel Castro, but perhaps you would not.

They say that they have lost a pawn in Angola and got an ace in Egypt. I cannot believe that Egypt can continue to be untrue to her traditions. I know that in Egypt they have started doing things, like the CIA character assassination of Gamal Abdel Nasser in line with what happened in Bangladesh and elsewhere. Character assassination of Jawaharlal Nehru was also a part of that game, a long-standing game in order to reestablish the ideas of people, the loyalties of people, the convictions of people and aspirations of the people in the former colonial world.

The Americans have their bases ringing the world. The Soviets never had one single soldier stationed anywhere abroad and John Foster Dulles once wondered how it was that without a single Soviet soldier anywhere else in the world, they got the support of people from different parts of the globe. The world is not merely composed of stooges and mercenaries but the world is composed of warm-hearted people, who only if they are not misled, can change the pattern of our life nearer to the heart's desire of the common man. That is something for which we should go ahead. You just cannot imagine how much can be done by people when they truly rise and awake.

I find a statement here by Fidel Castro, Mr. Chavan, I know, likes

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Fidel Castro and I think, it is a mutual feeling. He said the other day at Conakry, the capital of Guinea, I think:

"We can never forget Patrice Lumumba, we can never forget the shameful role of the white mercenaries in Zaire, we can never forget the shameful role of the white mercenaries in Nigeria, we can never forget the crimes of the white mercenaries on this continent."

And these are the people whom we have to bring to book and they have as their weapon only such things as the Lockheed and the others have in their chest—Lockheeds, Boeing, IBMs, Bechtels and who else? The Goodyear Tyre and Rubber Company, Abbott Laboratories, the General Telephones and all the rest buying up the consort of the Dutch Queen or political big-wigs in Japan and Italy and all the rest of them. It would be all futile, in the long run it would be all futile, but in the long run we shall all be dead. And in the short run they are doing damage to the world around us and therefore, we have to be a great deal more careful than we have been in regard to these matters.

I said earlier that with the United States we must have a correct relationship and we must have a friendly relationship to the extent possible, but we must make them know what is what. As the late Krishna Menon used to say, "You have to kick them to get something out of them." I do not mean that we do it in a vulgar fashion. But we are not a country which is going to be pushed about. The Prime Minister has said over and over again that we are not going to be shoved about in the world and that we shall follow our own policy.

In regard to China, of course, it seems that there is no response. But, even if there is no response, let us try, to the extent possible, to have normal relationship. They have succeeded to flaw somewhat our friendship with

Bangladesh. It is a tragedy which some of us feel a little too keenly for expression, but we shall not allow this flaw in our friendship to be continued. On the contrary, we shall revive the real friendship by harping upon what Mr. Dinesh Singh also said, namely, the contacts which we should form with our neighbours and other countries in Asia, in particular even though there may be ideological differences. We can have bilateral and multilateral relationships with those countries near to us and also those who are far away. Then if you do not like—expressions like the Asian Collective Security System or such other highfalutin designations, let us go ahead at any rate with bilateral and multilateral understandings. And, in so far as that goes, the Nepalese Prime Minister is here. Naturally you will have talks with Sri Lanka whose relationship with us has recently found expression in a rather pleasant form. With Burma and with Afghanistan we can easily have our friendship consolidated and we are perhaps doing it. With Bangladesh we can go ahead and, of course, Nepal and Bhutan are part of the same family, so to speak. So we can go ahead in this manner and bring about something which would mean a genuine approach towards liberation. By liberation, I mean the fulfilment of liberation in so far as our advance towards socialism is concerned.

We were glad to hear the other day Mr. Das saying that Mozambique is going to be assisted. Perhaps, in fact, to all the newly liberated countries we are going to give as much assistance as we can. But let us not send them footling little presents of book packets or a few lakhs of rupees—how many lakhs of dollars for Mozambique he has announced, I forget it—but was it something to write home about? Let us go ahead and help these countries not in the spirit that America tries to help and takes it back by the backdoor a hundredfold, not in a spirit of patronisation but almost in a spirit of paying our debt to history, a debt to our

own brothers and sisters who have been fighting for freedom against imperialism which is a world phenomenon and as long as it lasts, it would also impinge on our freedom and make it impossible for our freedom to flower.

I am glad the Prime Minister has thought it fit to send a personal representative like Mr. Yunus to go around from country to country. He is a sharp-spoken, frank-thinking sort of person and I am sure he would be able to put across what Indian policy naturally and necessarily means and not with a diplomatic flair which sometimes these people in Africa are not very easily capable of understanding.

Therefore, I am glad that certain things are being done about our assistance to the newly liberated countries. In this regard the work of our external publicity must improve. They do not seem to know at all as to what exactly is happening in these countries. They do not report back and in this connection I refer to the talk of Julius Nyerere, before the Government of India could make up its mind. It was a good thing because he is a very sensible and insightful person. But at the same time we should have our own insights, and we do not often happen to have those insights largely because our diplomatic representation is inadequate and our external publicity is incompetent and the result is that we do not know what to do.

I do not wish to end on a note of pessimism. We have no fear in so far as the West is concerned. The decline of the West about which books were written in the 20's is now such a patent fact of life and this patent fact came to my notice rather amusingly. The other day in Parliament Library where I looked up a copy of Political Quarterly—October—December, 1975, a prestigious journal run largely by the intellectuals of the British Labour Party—a peculiar conglomeration which Harold Wilson and that kind of tricky people of all sorts led. I saw an editorial commentary with the caption

289 L. S.—6

'Lament for India'. They are lamenting for India because India, the largest democracy in the world has opted for dictatorship and it goes on to add—India is now going in for *coup d'état* after *coup d'état* in an African manner. Of course the 'burr sahib' are superior. We in Asia and Africa are not up to their mark. We are of "the lesser breed without the law. So, India is going to have *coup d'état* after *coup d'état* because dictatorship is installed here. The "Political Quarterly" adds that ironically, this dictatorship has been set up "under the leadership of the daughter of the Mahatma Gandhi".

You can find it from the Parliament Library's copy of the journal. I take it as the latest illustration of the decline and deterioration of the so-called 'West' which so vounts of its power that it tries to cling to its authority in Zimbabwe and elsewhere. They will be pushed out of the forum of history. The imperialism which has come along with western dominance would be absolutely pushed out of this slate of history, and the whole world including our country in particular which has a shining role in contemporary history, will have a new kind of life. But how far we are truly and really preparing for it, is a matter which raises so many questions and misgivings in my mind. It is better that you have rung the bell. So, I need not say anything more.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER It is my unpleasant duty again to draw the attention of the members of the Congress Party to the limitation of time to their speeches. There is a balance of three hours and thirteen minutes to their party. If the Minister takes about 45 minutes and there are twenty other speakers according to that it will be seven minutes each. But all the same I will allow ten minutes to each. They may kindly bear that in mind.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooh-Behar): Prof. H. N. Mukerjee has given both bouquets and brickbats to the Government in regard to External Affairs as the foreign policy pro-

[Shri B. K. Daschowdhury]

ceed, along. The point has been rightly emphasised by my senior friend Shri Dinesh Singh that there is approach in this international policy and the foreign policy before the world. There was a time when the foreign policy was to be determined by the military strength of a nation, but the events in the last two decades have brought a dramatic change. It is true that most of the areas which had not been liberated earlier have been liberated now and the remaining areas are going to be liberated soon. In view of this context, the main approach, the philosophy to maintain cordial relations in this international atmosphere and to have better international relations, must be maintained on the basis of the international economic order. I have been hearing Shri Dinesh Singh for the last two or three years. The one singular point that Mr. Dinesh Singh has been emphasising is that we must have a sort of Asian Economic Comity particularly with the South East Asian Region.

We have seen how these approaches have taken definite shapes. Regarding the policy of non-alignment, our first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, was the architect. Although this was seriously questioned and rather ridiculed at one time, today, what do we see? We see today that even half of the world nations or even more have become members of the non-aligned. There was a Non-aligned Conference at Lima and if you read the reports of this Conference published in newspapers you will find that they recommended some sort of New International Economic Order, to allow all liberated areas and freedom-loving people to have freedom coupled with peace. Freedom and peace are indivisible things. They must have economic development. Economic development in this world of interdependence will have to come through a New International Economic Order.

. Of course, a right direction has been given by the Government. I would

say about the immediate danger which we have to face. No doubt, the danger is known to all of us. The axis is formed by USA, China and Pakistan. Pakistan is also penetrating into the affairs of Bangla Desh. The USA has not only taken the Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean but it has taken Gwadar in the Arabian Sea. What it has done is against the Resolutions passed by the United Nations. Military base is formed in Diego Garcia after the inhabitants were forced to vacate that island. They have also taken the Gwadar port from Pakistan in the Arabian Sea. In this way, the USA is building up its military bases encircling India.

China is the country which has recognised Bangla Desh immediately after the assassination of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the father and founder of Bangla Desh. They have started penetrating into the internal affairs of Bangla Desh. They have taken responsibility for developing the Chittagong Port. Further in the North-Eastern region of India, they are no doubt trying to create trouble. If I remember aright it was last year, on the 4th October 1975, that the Chinese fired upon and killed four of our jawans. This was strongly and appropriately protested by the Government of India. The reply of the Chinese came however that those soldiers were within the Chinese territory.

Therefore, all these four points which I have mentioned, Diego Garcia, Gwadar bases which they are using as military bases, the trouble in the eastern area, the fact that they are coming into the scene of Bangla Desh, all these factors face a big question before us. The question is this: How are we to preserve ourselves and also maintain our national security? This point has to be seriously viewed. Notwithstanding the steps

taken by the Govt. of India to create a sort of consciousness and awareness among other littoral States in the Indian Ocean, regarding military base at Diego Garcia, what we feel is that necessary consciousness has not yet been aroused among them. I would say this that there seems to be a sort of failure on the part of the Government of India.

14.00 hrs.

Although it is not a total failure, they ought to have aroused a serious consciousness and awareness against military build-up, that sort of emotional feelings among the countries has not been aroused so far. I would urge upon the hon. Minister to do something and take some positive steps either by the process of persuasion of littoral states or by having a joint conference or by having some conferences which are of interest to both or by having bilateral agreements with these countries as far as possible. Some awareness must be there in a vigorous manner.

Now, I would like to mention the new developments that are taking place in these African countries. By now, almost all those areas excepting two or three—small areas in the continent—have become States. If I am not wrong, their numbers are roughly about 45 or 46—practically one-third of the total world States. Now, this is a new area in which we must exercise our influence—not in the sense of creating any sort of influence that we are superior to these small nations, but, in the matter of influencing of friendship which will automatically develop between friends and friends to our mutual benefit, so that we have a sort of new order before the whole world and before the inter-national scene that this new society is coming up and this new society along with the society of Asia and South-East Asia region including the West Asian Region, will be no less powerful than any others.

If we are in a position to take the entire African continent as our friends minus one or two—not South African regime, the black regime—and, if we are in a position to cement our friendship with the non-aligned countries which we do try—Shri Nehru was the originator—then the total population will roughly be 3/5th of the population of the whole world, then we would certainly be in a position to give a new direction, a new social and economic international order where all countries will live peacefully with their peace, freedom and self-respect.

My last point—I am finishing within a minute—is this. It is a strange thing that in 1945 when the United Nations Organisation was born, there were five nations as permanent members of the Security Council. India being the largest democracy and second largest in relation to the world population, I do not know why, in a strange logic, India has not been given a permanent seat in the Security Council; I know that there are certain vested interests which are working against it. I would simply urge upon the hon. Minister to seriously consider measures to change the U.N. Charter, and, if it is necessary, with all like-minded forces and non-aligned countries who are also Members of the United Nations, a powerful debate should take place—the matter has been debated upon long ago to see that the entire United Nations Charter is re-drafted and the UNO is reconstituted in a manner that India being the largest democracy and the second largest populated country in the world, should be given a permanent seat in the Security Council.

Lastly, Sir, there was a threat given by Dr. Kissinger after the Lima Conference that if any country does not toe the line of the U.S.A., it will be deprived of all sorts of economic aid. In the next session either in the Non-aligned conference like the Lima Conference or in the next session of the United Nations, this point should be raised that this statement made by

[Shri B. K. Daschowdhury]

Dr. Kissinger goes against the very principle of the United Nations Charter. As a matter of fact, in the year 1970, the U.N. General Assembly passed a Resolution that no threat of stopping all sorts of economic aids should be made in order to subjugate the aid-receiving States. We should be careful about this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with these words, I support the Budget Demands of Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA (Marmagoa): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with the former Minister of External Affairs sitting together with the present hon. Minister for External Affairs, may I begin by expressing a hope that out of a meeting of their minds, we shall advance from the indications in this Report to a better and collective wisdom in the conduct of our External Affairs in future?

Situated as we are, it is the developments on this sub-continent that are of major, and indeed of vital importance, to us in India. It was not long ago that all of us were both hopeful and expectant that at last we had reached a stage, where peace and collaboration, rather than confrontation and strife, would be the tune of the future. This, Sir, was in a large measure due to the fact that not long ago, to add to the democracy in India, we had at last a democracy in Pakistan and in Bangladesh, and we expected that representative governments would concentrate on development rather than on defence. But since then we have had that tragic events in Bangladesh, and I must say that I am very sorry to see that the lesson of these events—the lesson that the response to autocracy eventually does become extremism—is being lost on our Government. I would strongly urge the Government to give this a thought.

With the changes in Bangladesh, and with what has happened in our own country—and Pakistan seeming to go the same way—it looks like relations

are getting colder and we seem to be entering into a new arms race.

Particularly, Sir, in the relations with Pakistan we seem to be going back to the days when Pakistan blamed us for all manner of small things and we reciprocated in full measure. I will try to illustrate my point from the Report. I would like to ask the Minister whether it was really necessary to mention in this Report—as an adverse factor—the fact that Pakistan filed a candidature in April for election to the Security Council after India had announced her own candidature. Whether it was necessary to mention this fact when the whole unhappy incident had ended, and not only had it ended but it had ended with declaration by Pakistan of “the sincere appreciation for the spirit of accommodation,” and also Pakistan regarded India’s decision to withdraw as “not only clearing the way for the election of Pakistan, but also strengthening the unity of the Asian group.” This is the attitude we must get out of. If we keep on picking at each other, there is no way in which we can improve our relations.

With things sliding back as they are, to my mind, this would have been the right time for the Government of India to take an initiative to enlarge the scope of relations on this sub-continent from merely bilateral, to multi-lateral, with an initiative for the formation of a common market, among the countries of this sub-continent. But, Sir, as our Government insists on ruling beyond its term, unfortunately, to my mind, this initiative will have to wait.

What I am trying to demonstrate is that the refusal to hold elections that are due, does have effect, even in external affairs, which to my mind is against the interests of this country, and I would appeal to the Government to go to the elections as soon as possible, and let us have a representative Government.

Having said this much, I would also like to compliment this Govern-

ment for having been able—in the developments in Bangladesh—to treat them strictly as internal affairs of Bangladesh, notwithstanding the pressure there was on us, to do otherwise, from a friendly super-power.

Recently, Asia and the world have lost a great statesman, Mr. Chou En-lai, and across the coldness of the Himalayas I would like to pay to his memory the tribute it deserves. With the emergence of Viet Nam, and with the development of the internal situation in China, I wonder whether it is not time for us to make yet another attempt to stretch the hand of friendship to China. I should like to leave this as a suggestion with the government, for early consideration.

In international economic relations, it is a welcome thing that the world has realised the need for a new economic order, and I particularly welcome the declaration and plan of action that came out of the second general UNIDO conference at Lima. It is accepted in this declaration that by the year 2000 the developing countries should have a share of at least 25 per cent of the world industrial production. This is something which will be a major change in the order of today, where we provide raw materials, and they sell us very expensive finished products in return, also, this should not be merely by sale, but very much by transfer, of technology.

I would like to congratulate the people and the government of Sweden for having been the first country to achieve the target of one per cent of the gross national product as aid commitment. I hope that all the other countries, especially the developed countries, and we also, will soon move as far as we can towards this goal. I would like to thank Britain for the announcement that aid will henceforth come, not as a loan, but as a grant. To the Soviet Union our thanks are due, for the ready and speedy way in which they helped us in the Chasnala tragedy.

Much has been said about multinationals and I agree that what is coming out today in the American investigations, is startling.

I am sure that the government has already got an investigation of its own, into the question whether anything is happening in our country as well. The only thing that I would request the government is, that when examining the multinationals, it should also have a close look at whether anything is happening with local agencies, with regard to rupee payment trade.

There are two matters in trade, which I think require speedy attention. I was happy to read in the report, that considerable success was achieved in October 1975 with Jute International. This is something that requires to be finalised as soon as possible. I hope Mr. Chavan will see that something is done. The Association of Iron Ore Exporting Countries, of which we are the repository of the treaties for the first time, is also something which must not remain on paper. I notice that since the first flush, things are not moving; this is something again where the government must see that it does not remain on paper, and that it becomes quite an effective institution.

Following the events in Angola, we must congratulate the people and Mr. Neto's government. Though they have achieved and consolidated their freedom, there is talk of a possibility of a racial war in Africa. Nobody among the developing countries wants a racial war, and I am sure that our government will do whatever it can to prevent it. God forbid, if it does take place, I hope that the Government will not hesitate to help, even physically, to ensure total freedom in Africa.

The unhappy experience of the elections to the Security Council gives us an opportunity to see naked the success and failures of our foreign policy. I hope the Government is looking at it. I trust that it will decide to change from a policy of automatically support-

[Ehri Erasmo De Sequeira]

ting any country or group, which does not guarantee automatic support in return to a policy which examines issues as they arise and where India's support is actively sought in each case and selectively given.

And may I end by praising Mr. Harold Wilson for setting an example worthy of being emulated?

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the main test of the success of the foreign policy of a country is its ability to decide each issue on merits and the ability to resist the imposition of the will of another country on its own policy. Sir, viewed in this context and tested on the anvil of this assessment, I would say that the foreign policy of India has been a success and particularly so in recent years. Sir, Mr. Sequeira, my colleague, has sought to survey the developments of our foreign policy in our sub-continent. We know that every country will have to pass against certain assets and liabilities. The fact that we are a great country in terms of population and size is itself an asset as well as liability. For example, as a case study, let us take the case of Nepal. Ethnically and for many other reasons, there are so many things in common. It is a fact that in the minds of the people of Nepal, our country is a colossus to the south of Nepal. So the size of our country really creates problems for them. But how can we help it. This militates against developing good relations. Same is the case with Sri Lanka. Although, for many reasons we have many things in common, they feel that the colossus of the north is a menace to them. So, we have to take this aspect into consideration when we think of developing healthy relations with that country. In spite of these handicaps, India has been able to build up rather a healthy relationship with Nepal. Our Foreign Minister, without wasting time, took pains to visit Nepal to normalise the relations between the two countries which yielded rich dividends. Today the Prime Minister of Nepal, Mr. Tulsi

Giri, is in India. I am sure that his meeting with our leaders will yield fruitful results.

Again take the situation of China. Let us have a frank discussion. A student of Chinese history knows that China always believes in a messianic role. In a way there is some justification in this assumption in that there is so much of homogeneity in the body politic in terms of race or language and so many things. Obsessed with their notion they have assumed that they have a right to be the arbiter of the policy of Asia, perhaps the world. They seem to have developed hegemonic aspirations. India with its own right to a role in international field, particularly in Asia, has to contend against the Chinese postures and attitudes. So, in developing our foreign policy towards that country, we have to take into account this aspect—national personality and national behaviour pattern. Against this background we have to assess the success or the failure of our relationship with China. We know that they had imposed a war on us at a time when we were trying to consolidate our freedom after our liberation struggle. But we exercised maximum restraint. They are still occupying our nation's territory. We are trying to avoid confrontation but they are trying to build up tension and they themselves are in trouble now. Read today's newspaper. Succession question is there and let us see how they stabilise themselves. We are watching the development there and as and when the right time comes, I am sure we will extend the hand of friendship with China and in the years to come, they will also realise that the future of Asia lies not in confrontation between her brothers and sisters in Asia but in mutual understanding, trust and confidence. I am sure our foreign policy will rise to the occasion, at the appropriate time to normalise our relation with China.

About Bangladesh, everyone knows it is facing still a tragic situation. We have done our best. When we were

ourselves facing a severe economic crisis after repeated years of drought, when our own people were hungry, we sent supplies to them. We fed 10 million refugees from there. But international conspiracies and many other factors have created the present situation. Our posture today is that by and large it is their internal matter. But at the same time, we are not oblivious of the international conspiracies hatching, taking advantage of the fluid situation there. I am sure our foreign policy will take care of the situation. In the meantime, there is at least an element of outward normalcy and in spite of some hostile press, they know India's attitude to them. So, I do not think we have to worry for the moment.

Coming to Pakistan, which other country except India in the long history of the world has stopped a war which it was about to win? We had occupied the whole of the then East Pakistan. We captured large chunks of West Pakistani territory. If we had waited for a few weeks, we could have captured the whole of West Pakistan if we wanted, but it militated against our concept or international relations. We never sent our soldiers outside our country. That is our history. We would not do that with Pakistan. Once we have accepted that India should be divided, we wanted them to live in peace and harmony. We withdrew from the territory we occupied. We could have bargained with them in regard to Kashmir territory under their illegal occupation from a position of strength at that time, but we did not do it. We released one lakh Pakistani soldiers without any *quid pro quo*. We fed them and spent a large amount of money on them. If was in tune with our foreign policy to cultivate our neighbour and generate goodwill. Historic reasons created a mood of hostility, but we wanted to mitigate it and melt it over the years. That is why we gave up their territory which we had occupied, released their soldiers and signed the Simla Agreement. But the national psychosis of Pakistan is something different. It is out of tune with our concept of foreign policy.

They want to ensure their security not by cultivating India but by cultivating the imperialist powers and finding security in cultivating friendship with America, China and other countries. That is why Pakistan is sinking and their economy is not in good shape. It is becoming very difficult for them to maintain internal stability. Instead of improving their relations with India in the light of the Simla Agreement, they are seeking security by building up armaments and having alliance with Turkey and Iran. We are aware of these moves. They have to get themselves out of this psychosis of fear. It is to study these trends perhaps that our Foreign Minister recently made visits to that area. We are trying to cultivate Pakistan by assuring them that we have no aggressive intentions towards them.

With Afghanistan, we have developed healthy relations. With Burma also, our relations are pretty good. Whether it is South-East Asia or West Asia or Africa, these areas are of immediate and vital concern to us. We are projecting our image within the framework of our foreign policy in South East Asia. We know in Vietnam the irrepressible spirit of humanity unfolded itself by almost a quarter century of undaunted fight against imperialism. The Vietnamese people have become the very symbol of the free spirit of man. Now that the situation has normalised, they will see that for the economic development of their region, they will require the help of India. I am sure we would be able to develop healthy economic relations in that region because our natural attraction is first towards the east. I am sure we would be able to have a healthy economic relationship with that region. To that extent, our foreign policy is already devoting time and energy.

We have helped the African countries against racialism. In Angola, we have helped them and in Mozambique, we are extending material help. I am sure, if a war breaks out against racism, we will exercise maximum restraint but at least our sympathies will be with those countries who are fight-

(Dr. Henry Austin)

ing against this menace. Whatever may be the difficulties, my own view is—I am not reflecting the view of my Party—that we should support African countries against Minority Rule in Rhodesia & South Africa; there is no place for racialism in the world. Regarding South Africa and Rhodesia, whatever may be the consequences, we must send our moral sympathies to the African people who are struggling for Majority Rule.

We have developed healthy relations with the Soviet Union and that was reflected in the speech of the Soviet leader Breznev at the 25th Communist Party Congress when he said that the relations with India were very friendly and cordial and that Indo-Soviet relations were of a special nature.

The Western countries have now come to understand that in India, there is a strong leadership under our Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and nobody can impose his views on it. We decide each and every issue on merits and this is the achievement of our foreign policy. This has been possible because of the deft handling of our foreign affairs by our able leaders, particularly Shri Y. B. Chavan.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this is the time to analyse the successes as well as failures of our foreign policy. When I entered in this House about a decade ago, I had my own reservations about the policy of non-alignment. I think, we have to admit that by and large, the policy of non-alignment has succeeded and we can now proudly announce it to the world. The credit must go to the successive Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers and particularly to the present Foreign Minister, Mr. Y. B. Chavan who carries a tradition of moderation and his wide experience has really enthused the greatest degree of realism in our foreign policy.

After Emergency, I think, the country is now poised for gaining economic

strength. Once we are economically strong, our voice will be heard, we will be recognised and we will be respected in the international arena.

Let me take up the neighbouring countries. After the take over of the Ministry by Mr. Y. B. Chavan, we are glad that our neighbouring countries are becoming more friendly, at least in the southern part of India. Treaties with Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Burma and Indonesia have been concluded and I am happy to say that without hitch all agreements have been concluded. Our relations with Nepal are improving. They have agreed to the establishment of hydel projects. The Prime Minister of Nepal is here. I think, our relations will improve further after he talks to our leaders.

There is a change for the better in our relations with Iran, Turkey and Afghanistan. We have already a good friend in Iraq.

After the murder of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, there is some deterioration in our relations with Bangladesh. Unfortunately some people are trying to internationalise the issue of Farakka Barrage which is a bilateral issue. I think, Bangladesh will also come to understand that it is a question which has to be dealt with separately and it should not be a stumbling block in our cordial relations. I am happy that Government of India has taken a unilateral decision in reducing the water which we were drawing from the Ganga to Farakka Barrage. It will help in normalising completely our relations with Bangladesh.

At present, Pakistan is headed by a very un-predictable gentleman. It is very difficult to understand him. After the 1971 war, we entered into a very great agreement, which is hailed all over the world viz. the Simla Agreement; and certain things were agreed upon there, e.g. road and rail links, telecommunications, trade, travel, cultural exchanges etc. No follow-up ac-

tion has been taken on those things which have already been agreed upon; but he writes to the Prime Minister asking for a summit conference, so that the world might think: "here is a reasonable man who is asking for a summit meeting; and here is the other obstinate government which does not agree to it." There must be follow-up action on those things which have already been agreed upon. And there is a provision for a summit meeting in the Simla Agreement. The London 'Times' wrote at the time of the Simla Agreement, in 1972:

"Mr Bhutto might recognise the value of a final settlement and might genuinely seek it; but he must play for time."

I do not know whether there was need for playing for time in 1972. But why should that need be there in 1976? Pakistan must also understand now that normalisation of its relations with India would help both the countries—India, as well as Pakistan.

Our desire to have normal relations with China has not met with any response. Their reaction is almost 'Nil'. No doubt we want to have cordial relations with China also; but they consider that India is a friend of the Soviet Union—whom they now consider as their enemy number one. I don't visualize any possibility, in the near future, for good relations, unless there is a change in their hearts and in the leadership of that country. In Soviet Union, we have a real friend. They are not only a friend in need. They supply us whenever and whatever we want. For example, the satellite which we prepared, was launched with Soviet help; and the entire people of India are very happy. At the same time, we have the other super power—whom other friends also dealt with—viz the United States. There, the pro-Pakistan lobby seems still to be quite powerful with the Administration. Even though the people of the United States and a number of Senators and Congressmen would like to have friendly relations

with India, the pro-Pak lobby is still a stumbling block in our relations with the United States. Lifting of the embargo and the supply of arms to Pakistan is really a hitch in our relations. Again, we want that the Indian Ocean area should be a zone of peace. It is disturbed by the United States by its having not only a naval base, but a full-fledged military base in Diego Garcia. Not only that. The U.S. was thinking that it was a world policeman. At least now, they seem to realize that they are no longer so. Very recently, I read a speech of the Secretary of State of the United States, Dr. Kissinger. He has attacked the entire Third World, the non-aligned countries. In a Boston speech, he has attacked almost everybody in the world. I quote:

"Dr. Henry Kissinger has charged the non aligned countries with forming a 'rigid, confrontationist coalition of their own' against the industrial democracies and attempting to 'extort what has been freely offered'."

In his speech,

"He challenged the Republican as well as Democrat Presidential candidates,...."

"He attacked Congress...."

"He chastised America's West European allies .."

"Dr. Kissinger accused the Soviet Union...."

Except China, he has castigated every country. I do not understand why, instead of understanding the people of the non-aligned countries, the U.S. Administration is trying to accuse them. I think that the people of the United States hereafter will elect a government or an Administration which will understand the people of the Third World, the non-aligned world. They were thinking that they can change any government they wanted to. Chile was their last testing ground. U.S. must now put an end to the forces of destabilization and to the activities of the CIA. As regards West Asia the

[Shri G. Viewanathan.]

situation in Labanon is very disturbing. As Mr. Dinesh Singh has pointed out, India must also play a vital role in bringing about peace in Labanon. Already, countries like Syria and Egypt would like to interfere. So, it will further complicate the problems.

In West Asia, we support the Palastinean cause, not because of a particular religion, not because they are opposed to a particular religion. Still, we notice that religion seems to plague the politics of West Asia. This was exposed to the world when a voting was taken in the India versus Pakistan contest for a seat in the Security Council.

Our support to the Arabs or the Palastineans is based on principles. Because the cause is just, we support them. It is not based on any religion.

If there is any place where our attention is urgently required, it is Africa. I am happy that the Government is giving its fullest attention to African problems. We notice that policies of racism and apartheid are still going on unabated. We have to support the freedom-fighters of South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia. The racialist regimes should be completely wiped out and in that fight we should give them all possible help.

I had an opportunity to visit some of the Embassies along with other members. We noticed that the staff in the Embassies have problem with regard to the education of their children. Especially in some of the countries where they do not have English medium schools, they find it very difficult to give education to their children. In fact, most of them represented to us in the matter. I would request the Government to go into this problem and see that our employees are enabled to give proper education to their children.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Bada-para): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I welcome the opportunity provided by the

debate on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs; because I would say with a certain amount of regret that the discussion on the conduct of foreign affairs has become a rare thing in this House, and it is unfortunately so. Therefore, the opportunity provided has to be utilised and we should be content with it!

The year under review has been a year of considerable gains, gains which if not spectacular, are still far-reaching and substantial. It has been a year of quiet and principled diplomacy and significant achievements. I would like to congratulate our Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister, Shri Chavan, for these achievements, because these achievements have to be viewed in the context of the many challenges that we faced at home, and I would say, viewed in this context, these gains have been substantial. They were also in consonance with our own principles, principles not merely of the policy of non-alignment and the foreign policy that we have pursued since independence, but also these in terms of our quick response to the rapidly changing trends in the international scene and also to the demands of the situation.

I would particularly congratulate the Minister on the quick response his Ministry showed in the case of recognition of Angola, and earlier Mozambique. This is in contrast with our own performance earlier, when we faced similar situations, may be on account of certain difficulties. I am glad that after a demand was made in this House and outside by some of us a number of times, regarding the recognition of PRG, it has been done. All this shows that the responses have been quicker during the last few months than earlier, and also in consonance with our own principles, principles that we have adhered to since independence, in our conduct of foreign policy, and also the principle held aloft by the national movement before independence.

I refer particularly to Angola because Africa has ceased to be a dark continent. It is now a continent of hope. What went on in Angola, according to some, might have been the establishment of "a beach-head for communism" facing the Atlantic, but we did not take such a view. It was very important from the point of view of our foreign policy that we did not get pressurised by various speeches or threatening and menacing postures adopted by some of the statesmen of the Western world. What we have done, in the context of developments in Africa, was to help the process of national liberation and democratisation. This is also in continuation of what we began in 1961 with the liberation of Goa which was, even according to Dr. Neto and various other leaders of the then Portuguese Colonies, a great inspiration to them. So, I congratulate the hon. Minister and say that we expect similar creative gestures or initiatives with regard to Africa which are opposed to the interests of imperialism or the racist regimes of Rhodesia or South Africa. I would expect the hon. Minister, Yeshwant-raoji, who is not only a Foreign Minister and administrator but also a great freedom fighter, to continue with similar initiatives in Africa.

Similarly, I am very happy to note our policy of supporting the Arab cause, the cause of a hundred million people, a vast chunk of humanity, inhabiting an area of crucial strategic importance, important not only politically but also in terms of resources. We have been following a policy of supporting the Palestinian cause. It is also because of the national bonds and emotional affinities and our own moral commitments that we continue to support the Palestinian cause, and it further strengthened the concept of non-alignment.

The world has seen many challenging tasks before it. The way anti-imperialist forces have got strengthened during the last few years; which was, in a remarkable way, manifested in the

great liberation struggle of Viet Nam. Our relationship with Viet Nam must be further strengthened. It is not merely in terms of paying our tribute to a heroic people, but because a new power centre has emerged in Southeast Asia which is not merely the result of an anti-imperialist struggle and a certain amount of self-confidence and self-respect with which they fought and carried on their struggle. Also, it is worthwhile to note that here is an independent country which has struggled and sacrifice for independence and it is a country which would also fight for its independence even if there are further threats to it from north, south, west or east.

Some time ago, I had a talk with a Vietnamese friend and I was told that they had sought certain assistance, small assistance, like coconut seedlings, power tillers etc., but we were not, I was told, quick in our response. I do not know if it has since been rectified. They do not want many more sophisticated things because they are acutely short of hard currency. There is no reason why we should not go in a big way to assist Viet Nam because it is in our own vital national interests to do so.

Similarly, I am very happy that our Foreign Minister has further strengthened our relationships with our neighbouring countries. He has himself paid a visit to Afghanistan and so on, but unfortunately certain developments have taken place in a neighbouring country to whose liberation we contributed with men and material. I do not want to go into details, but I am sure everybody in this House will not merely agree but would say that the events in that country were a great shock to us. It was not, as suggested in certain Western mass media, a setback for our foreign policy, but it was undoubtedly a setback as far as that country was concerned, for certain commitments which we thought will be honoured, which were the corner-stone of Independence not only of this country but the entire sub-continent, that

[Shri K. P. Ummakrishnan.]

is, secularism and democracy; that undoubtedly received a shocking set back when the Father of the Nation himself became a martyr. He (Banaganahthu) became a martyr for the same cause, and I am sure, the cause will triumph, whatever might happen or whatever certain vested interests might say or do in Bangladesh or elsewhere.

Similarly, we have pursued a principled policy with regard to Pakistan and I would like only to point out something. There is not just a question of our age-old differences, as is made out by the Western commentators, of the two-nation theory; it is not merely a question of conflict between the Islamic system and a secular system, but there is something fundamental and contemporaneous to what is happening in Pakistan. That is a question that is also linked up with the question of the problem of the Indian ocean area. As long as imperialism continues its present policy, as long as it continues to operate—and they are allowed to operate by certain regimes like that of Pakistan—newly independent countries and regions are not safe, sub-continents are not safe and Indian sub-continent can be no exception.

I do not want to take much time of the House. As long as these forces are hostile, we will continue to have this problem, because this is based on certain fundamental objectives of imperialistic policy and that of neo-colonialism. I would only refer to a very pertinent passage from Sir Olaf Caroe, who, as you know, was very important in terms of British colonial strategy and subsequently, I am told, he exercised a profound influence even on the thinking of the American State Department! Why is the Indian Ocean important? Why is Pakistan important? It is not merely that some of us do not like some faces or they do not like our faces. Here is what Sir Olaf Caroe says:

“The Mesopotamia campaign of the first world war and the strategic movements of the allies in the second

war were made possible from the Indian bases. At present the establishment of independent States on the Indian peninsula entails a new approach to old problems. In this quarter, as on the north-west frontier, Pakistan has succeeded to much of India's responsibility, for the Gulf opens directly on Karachi, in a real sense its terminus. . . . The importance of the Gulf grows greater, not less, as the need for fuel expands, the world contracts, and the shadow lengthens from the north. Its stability can be assured only by the closest accord between the states which surround this Muslim lake, an accord which is underwritten by the great powers whose interests are engaged.”

These are strategic and tactical considerations which weigh with the United States and it has some effect on our relationship with the United States; with whom I have no quarrel, because they are a great and creative people who have made great contribution to our civilisation.

But as long as the military industrial complex continues to dominate the thinking and the actions of the United States, there will be a certain amount of contradictions. I am surprised that the Report says that there are no contradictions between India and the United States! I am not saying that there should be conflicts but there are contradictions. We can try to resolve them on States-to-State basis. Undoubtedly, we must develop cordial relations and I am all for it. But to shut our eyes and ears and say something, that our relations have deteriorated because somebody spoke here something, will be purely childish.

Similarly, I would say that our relationship with China must be viewed in mature terms and not merely in terms of somebody wanting to do something. These relationships between these major powers—and I understand that India is a major power—are not determined by anything other than vital national interests. These are conditioned by forces of history also. So

long as they remain so, I don't think there are any chances of improving our relations further. Well, we may try to continue to have a dialogue if there is a need and we should undoubtedly do so.

So, what I would like to say is while we should pursue a policy, whether in terms of *detente* or disarmament that we have pursued, we can certainly be more active in the field of disarmament. As long as the *detente* is in our national interest, we must support it.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I am concluding. There has been certain unjustified criticism regarding our foreign service because I saw some *cum gratia* motions also on that. While there might be some black sheep here and there, there might be people who do not adhere to certain norms, I can say, by and large, we have a very fine set of people in our foreign service. Not merely the question of their pay revision and various other things should be gone into but also the question of foreign allowances....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER You have made your point. Please conclude Shri Hari Kishore Singh.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Pupri): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the hon. Foreign Minister on his successful trip to Turkey and I welcome him back in the country and in this House.

It is always a pleasure to hear Prof. Hiren Mukerjee. We always look forward to hear him in this House. But today, it seemed, it was not his professional self and it was a different Hiren Mukerjee. The criticism of our foreign service was not very fair. I think, the foreign service contains a dedicated cadre and they have implemented, by and large, the foreign policy of this country with dedication, wisdom and dynamism.

Similarly, his criticism of President Sadat was something very uncharitable and very unfair. I think, he lacked objectivity. President Sadat is a good friend of this country and he is not, in any way, betraying the Arab cause.

I was most interested to hear the concluding remark of my hon. friend, Shri Sequelra, when he appreciated the retirement of Prime Minister Wilson at the age of 60. I hope, the leader of his party, at the age of 75, will take due note of this.

With the emergence of 1976 we have entered into the fourth and final quarter of this century. The preceding decade, particularly in the last few years, has fully, totally and completely vindicated the basic premises on which the foreign policy of our country was built up. The foreign policy of our country is based on the principle of consensus and cooperation in place of conflict and confrontation. The greatest achievement and the tribute to the framers of our foreign policy, specially the great Prime Minister Nehru, was the achievement of the Helsinki Conference in 1975. I think, that Conference vindicated the stand taken by the framers and policy-makers of the foreign policy of India.

Right from the beginning we tried to project an image of our country which is interested in world peace. We are trying to promote world peace not as a policy of convenience but as a policy of conviction. It is because we as a newly independent nation felt the necessity of world peace for the development and prosperity of the people of newly developing countries and, for that, the policy of peace and cooperation throughout the world was necessary. It was also necessary for the developed nations because in the post-war period the world had experienced a holocaust. For the European countries also, the policy of peace and friendship was necessary.

[Shri Hari Kishore Singh]

In this context, in the post-war period, just after independence the greatest achievement of India's foreign policy has been the projection of the personalities of the newly independent nations on the world stage. It was necessary to project the personalities of these nations on the international stage because these countries were suppressed and oppressed by developed nations, the superior nations, the industrially forward nations, for centuries. Therefore, a period came in the life of the world when the Indian struggle for national independence paved the way for the independence of almost all the Afro-Asian people. This is something of which we should be proud.

The first phase of India's foreign policy was devoted to this cause, and the second phase has been rightly devoted to the case of developmental activities of the developing nations. In this context, the role played by our countries at international forums like the UNCTAD, Asian Development Banks, ECAFE etc., is really something to be proud of. But, here also, in the powers also, but we cannot be dictated to have been put, especially by some of the big powers; and here I quote the reaction of some of the American politicians towards the efforts made by Asian and African countries and other developing countries. There is nothing wrong in the efforts of the people who are trying to develop their countries with their natural resources and with mutual cooperation. If, in this, they were not to be dictated to by the super powers, it is not our fault. We have to live in this world and we have to cooperate with the super powers also, but we cannot be dictated to and we cannot be forced to be dictated to just because we are developing. In this context, I quote a recent statement of Senator Jacob Javits, a republican of the United States. He said, while addressing foreign students:

"The era of massive aid such as the Marshall Plan is drawing to an

end. We are growing tired of giving out money. Future American military and economic aid may depend on the willingness of developing nations to allow the United States access to their natural resources".

This is a most distressing statement from an American Senator and politician. I hope it is not representative of the United States' Government's thinking because it reflects the money-lenders' approach—that unless one mortgages something, one will not be given aid. This approach must be denounced outright.

We have also seen that there is a kind of uneasiness and open criticism of the approach of our country, in the United States of America. It is true however, that we do not mind that uneasiness. India is a great country and we are courageous enough to take certain stands which may not be to their liking. This is the kind of approach that would have to be adopted by our country for exercising our due role in international affairs, and I am glad that the Government has withstood all pressures from all sides.

Now, the framers or those responsible for the conduct of our national policy should realise that times have changed and no power, small, medium, big or super, can hope to dictate to others in the closing decades of the present century. This has been a century which has witnessed not only two great revolutions—the Russian and the Chinese—but also the greatest revolution in history, namely the liberation movement of the former colonial countries, in which India has been in the lead.

15.00 hrs.

Since the time is limited, I will confine myself to only one or two points more.

We have rightly stressed the necessity of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. It is necessary for us not only for the security of our country but also from the point of view of the vast sea wealth that it has. The Indian Ocean should serve as the international waterways; there are no differences on that; it should be open to the shipping of every country. But the wealth of the Indian Ocean should be controlled by the littoral countries only and by nobody else.

I welcome the Prime Minister of Nepal who has just arrived in our country. India and Nepal have very close relations of historical and cultural importance. Our country has a long border with Nepal, particularly my Constituency has a long border with Nepal. From that point of view also, I welcome Dr. Tulsi Giri, who was educated in India, in the Dharbanga College. I hope, his visit will prove very fruitful for all of us.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Calcutta-South). Mr. Chairman, Sir, every year when the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs are discussed, all the Members from the ruling Party as well as from the Opposition try their best to see that the interests of the country are safeguarded and the foreign policy of our country is framed in that light. I would like to congratulate the Minister of External Affairs as well as the entire Government for taking a very realistic approach in the recent international situation, and specially in the context of our country, in the context of the situation in the subcontinent.

Before I come to the main content of my speech, I would like to raise one important issue, for the last three years, in the entire world, except in two or three countries, there has been a serious crisis of leadership—from West Germany to the U.S.A. from Willy Brandt to the present Government of West Germany, from De Gaulle to Pompidou, from Pompidou to Valéry Giscard d'Estaing in France, from Nixon

to Ford in the USA and from Heath to Wilson and from Wilson to Callaghan in the U.K.; equally in the East in that country which is trying to dominate the whole world, which is not politically clear of its ideology but is known to be a great ally of the United States, in China, the leadership crisis was not acute till Premier Chou-En-lai was there, but after his death, the same situation which is obtaining in other countries, the leadership crisis, is prevailing there. In this entire situation, we have seen that, in the whole world, there are only three leaders who have emerged out of all chaos and problems, both internally and externally: one is Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi in our country, another is Leonid Brezhnev in the Soviet Union and the third is Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. The reason why the leadership of these three nations has emerged out of all problems, fighting all the evils, is not only because they have been supported by the people but also because they have tried to evolve a policy, both domestic and external, which really gives a new direction to the other countries and at the same time protects their own interests and views. The leadership of these countries, by their practical views, are trying to foster the possibilities of world peace in a much more practical way, evading all sorts of slogans and illusions.

Today, I would like to concentrate only one one point, which is the burning question in India, specially among the intellectuals, academicians, politicians and patriots of the country and that is, whether it is not a fact that India's relation with United States is not improving further because India is friendly to the Soviet Union. We may ask, whether the Indo-Soviet Treaty has become an obstacle in the way of United States becoming friendly with us, though it is a fact that the United States officials have stated on many occasions that they are not interested in it. In that light I would like to quote two things from the Report for 1974-75

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsi.]

of the Ministry of External Affairs
On page 70, it is stated:

"Speaking at Press Conference on 30th October the Secretary of State said that the United States did not consider Indo-Soviet Treaty for peace and friendship as an obstacle to improve relations with the United States. He stated that the United States was not engaged, directly or indirectly, in any attempt to influence the domestic situation in India. He also said that the United States was not trying to link up the question of food and the policy on the energy crisis."

Similarly at the end of the Report, it is mentioned:

"On 26th February, it was announced that under the present circumstances, Minister of External Affairs would not be able to attend the meeting of the Indo-US Joint Commission in Washington due to be held on 13-14 March 1975."

After the statement of the Secretary of States that they were not interested in influencing our politics and our domestic situation in the light of Indo-Soviet Treaty, we got a very good response from the United States. Indo-US Joint Commission was set up, but immediately thereafter we found that they lifted the embargo on supplying arms to Pakistan and, therefore, our Foreign Minister had no alternative, but to announce that he would not be able to attend the meeting of the Indo-US Joint Commission in Washington to be held on 13-14th March, 1975.

After that, we have been telling frequently 'inside the country and outside that we are agerly waiting and we want to develop very healthy and friendly relations with United States for mutual interest. While initiating the debate from our side, Shri Dinesh Singh, ex-External Affairs Minister of

the country tried to emphasise on one point that India and United States should find out some common points whereby they can coordinate their activities. What are these points? Points are economic cooperation and economic development. But as you know, in the modern world, the temple obviously say that the common dency of the imperialist powers and the colonial powers is not merely political interest in abstract terms, but essentially economic interest in economic terms. When the emergency was declared in this country, it was announced very clearly to the people of this country and outside that it is absolutely an internal matters and we want to resist the right reactionary forces of the country, who had a very peculiar economic interest and economic base in our country through the multi-national corporation monopoly houses and various other means and methods. Similarly, the emergency announced in Bangla Desh also. You might have witnessed two interesting things. When India announced emergency and when Bangla Desh announced emergency, that was supported by all the socialist and other democratic countries and developing nations; some of them supported, some of them kept quiet. But it is the western powers, specially the United States of America, which not only criticised it but also tried to find some evils behind it. This happened when Sheikh Mujibur Dehman announced emergency in Bangla Desh and when Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad announced emergency in India because of the serious situation in the country.

To refresh our memories, I would like to go back. When Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru was alive, and he was dreaming to develop the country on the basis of Panch Sheel with mutual cooperation of United States, China and other countries on the basis of non-alignment, you might have witnessed that the entire plan prospect of the country was curtailed and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru had to say with

tears in his eyes that he could not just provide all the opportunities to the people of this country through the planning, since India was facing great problems with China. That was in 1962. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru died in 1964. After that from 1967 to 1971, in the streets of India, only one party was parading and that was the party of frustrated youth who did not have any economic opportunities. That frustration led to anger and anger amounted to extreme violence. At that time, we found that Radio Peking was extremely vocal with regard to the internal developments of India. Similar was the situation when Bangla Desh declared emergency in 1971 and after 1972 when Shri Indira Gandhi tried to lead the country in a new direction. In 1974 and 1975, there were drought, flood, recession in economy and shortage of foodgrains.

The discontent of the people of this country started getting shape and a few political forces tried to generate that. In their voice, we found in 1967-71 Radio Peking was vocal in the frustration of the Indian people and in 1973-75 Voice of America became vocal in the frustration of the Indian people. This is the main problem of the country. While India is very sensitive to solve its own problem, additional unwanted sympathy comes from Radio Peking. While India is sensitive to solve its own problem with the help of democratic system, additional advice comes from the Voice of America to distort it without any interference and without any reference. This gives us a peculiar symptom whether our foreign policy should move in the same line as we have been moving in earlier? Our foreign policy is all right. Our approach is all right. But we must be very much courageous. Now-a-days we are not that India of 1947, we are not India under the First Five Year Plan, we are not India under the Second Five Year Plan, but we are that India with the mighty millions of people of the country, with all support to the Government. Government tried to define and educate the people who are their friends

and who are enemies. Yesterday, in his speech the Defence Minister tried to define the countries in two terms where hostilities are there and where friendly relations are there. I do not like to define what I mean by hostility and hostile attitude towards the nation. But is it not a fact that while Mrs. Gandhi tries to support Shikh Mujibur Rehman, signs the Indo-Bangla Desh treaty, at the same time signs the Simla treaty with Bhutto, at the same time making for some mutual arrangement between Shri Bhutto and Sheikh Mujibur Rehman for the repatriation of all the prisoners of war. A very very healthy situation was generated in the sub-continent—friendly situation between India and Pakistan and Bangla Desh? Please look at the angle with which the Western Powers tried to interpret Simla Agreement. They tried to interpret visit of Bhutto, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman's attempt to settle things with Pakistan in a context which did not promote friendship between the nations, which did not promote peace in this sub-continent. I do feel that the countries who think that because our relations with some friendly countries are still existing not in a casual term but in practical terms, unless that is weakened or threatened, they will not come forward. We must take a positive stand very clearly that we cannot make friendship with the nation at our cost. This should be the basic policy of the country. I do not like to plead for the country on the floor of the House but I should carry a gospel of truth. India in the very beginning got support from all the countries after its liberation, but both politically and economically, we got support from only those countries which believed in the value of democracy which believed in the value of secularism, which believed in the value of socialism. Now, I feel India is in a position to say that our democracy is safe. India is in a position to say that our things are all right, India is in a position to say that people are prepared to protect its sovereignty. But India will have to take one step further to say that the entire forces of the country are preparing a ground by which the final thing will

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi.]

come i.e. socialism. If socialism is the domestic will of the country, then external policy of the country cannot be reflected in a manner opposed to socialism, opposed to justice to the poor. That should be the lesson from this time. Otherwise, I feel, we will be simply in illusion and people will not understand who are our real friends and who are not our real friends.

I come to the Arab cause and the Middle East problem. It is from Gandhiji's time. From Gandhiji to C. R. Das, from C. R. Das to Moti Lal Nehru and from Moti Lal Nehru to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we all supported the cause of the Palestine people since those days. We all supported the cause of the Palestinian people of course at that time we were not independent, I think we should tell to the Arabs that the Arab cause and the Palestinian cause is the same. The Arab cause is the Palestinian cause; so also the Palestinian cause is the Arab cause. They are not separate but they are the same thing. There is an attempt being made by western powers to try to identify the Arab cause with something and the Palestinian cause with something else, trying to deal with these two as two separate things. This is not correct. We have seen that this sort of view is being held by western diplomats, by the USA and others. But they should try to understand that the Arab cause and the Palestinian cause is one and the same things; it is not a separate thing, but one and the same thing. We hope that the problems of the Arab nations and the problems of the Palestinian people will be ended one day with the hope that there are other nations which stand solidly behind them.

The concept of non-alignment is not a new thing. This concept of non-alignment was evolved by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, out of his wisdom. He was the architect of this entire concept. This was equally supported by Marshal Tito. What we found was that this concept of non-alignment had been misused and misinterpreted by certain imperialist, western, powers. Unless the non-align-

ed nations themselves come forward for their mutual help and economic co-operation without much dependence upon the colonial and imperialist powers, the concept of non-alignment would not be fruitful and successful. There are Middle-East countries and the newly emerging liberated nations and if you go and visit these countries you will see the position. They fought against colonialism. They fought against imperialism. After their liberation, even for putting up or building their Parliament House, or Assembly building, they seek cooperation from them and the western powers are intelligent enough and clever enough to twist the situation in their favour and they try to diffuse their political and moral fervour. The fight against imperialism and colonialism should go on within the ambit of non-alignment.

There is the conference of non-aligned developing nations to be held shortly in Sri Lanka. Our Government should make a new effort in this conference to create sort of guild I am not saying any bloc. This sort of guild can be thought of and I am sure India can give a helping hand and all support in this matter. India can give all cooperation to the newly developing countries. If India can give such help, what is the use of their going to USA or UK. etc? I feel if this help is given without any motive, this concept of non-alignment would be protected and fully safeguarded. We have seen the efforts of western powers (especially the USA to make agreements, treaties, etc. with smaller nations, with developing nations, in a manner which is the very contradiction of the concept of non-alignment, so as to weaken the base of non-alignment. I feel that we should take a lesson in this respect and we should try to protect our interests in this regard.

श्री कृष्ण भूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) :
सभापति महोदय, मैं ने विदेश मंत्रालय की रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा है। मैं श्री बक्राण को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि जब से उन्होंने विदेश मंत्रालय का कार्य भार सम्भाला है, तब से वह उस को

प्रवृत्ति की ओर ले जा रहे हैं। आज हम जिस]
 जमाने में चल रहे हैं, उस में लॉग चारों तरफ]
 हथियारों की पहाड़ियां खड़ी कर रहे हैं। चीन ने हमारी सीमा पर तकरीबन पाच लाख सेना खड़ी कर रखी है। उस ने हमारी सीमा के पास न्युक्लियर बेस और मिमाइन्ज के भण्डे भी बनाये हुए है। हमारे पड़ोस में तिब्बत एक छोटा सा देश था। चीन ने उस को बिल्कुल एन्निमिनेट कर दिया है और वहां की माइनारिटी को समाप्त कर दिया है। उस ने अपने यहां की भांच और इधर मंगोलिया आदि की सभी माइनारिटीज को समाप्त कर दिया है, और हमारे पड़ोस में एक फागिण्ट स्टेट खड़ी हो गई है। हिटलर से ज्यादा खतरनाक है। हिटलर की जिननी ताकत नहीं थी उतनी आज चाइना की है। हिटलर तो नेशनल मोनोपली को सपोर्ट करता था, चीन इंटर नेशनल मोनोपली को सपोर्ट करता है और इंटरनेशनल इम्पीरिअलिज्म को सपोर्ट करता है। डिमो ग्राशिया में अमेरिकन्स और ब्रिटेन को सपोर्ट करना है। यही नहीं है इका में मजीबुर्रहमान की हत्या के संबंध में चाइनीज और अमेरिकन इंटेलिजन्स ने मिल कर काम किया। हत्यायें अमेरिका के लिए तो कोई नई बात नहीं है। लेकिन चाइना के लिये जितने हिन्दुस्तान में उस के सम्पर्क थे वह भी आज सोच रहे हैं कि उन्होंने बहुत गलत काम किया। जैसे बेस डिमो ग्राशिया में है उसी तरह का बेस वह बिटागांग में भी बना रहे हैं और वहां चाइनीज और अमेरिकन एक्स्पर्ट्स दोनों मिल कर काम कर रहे हैं। बर्मा में भी काफी बड़ी तादाद में चाइनीज किसी न किसी रूप में वहां के निवासी बन कर या और दूसरे रूप में आ गए हैं और इस तरह से हमारे बोर्डर पर काफी उन के सैनिक बहा आ कर बस गए हैं। बंगला देश में भी वे काफी दखल रखते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि अग्नेजों से तो हम दो सी साल लड़े लेकिन अगर चीन बर्मा और बंगला देश में अपने पैर मजबूत कर गया

तो हमें कई साल लग सकते हैं। इस के साथ साथ पाकिस्तान में भी जहाँ अमेरिका ने पहले बन्दुक् की थी कि उसको हथियार नहीं देंगे अब उस को हथियार देना शुरू किया है, ग्वादरा और मकरान में नये बेसेज बनाए जा रहे हैं और छोटे छोटे देशों को उस से बहुत खतरा है, अफगानिस्तान को और भी दूसरे पड़ोसी देशों को खतरा है। हमारे लिए पाकिस्तान कोई खतरा नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान बहुत बड़ा देश है और हमारी सेना भी बहुत मजबूत है। फिर हम लोग कोई जल्दबाजी भी नहीं करने किसी से छेड़खानी भी नहीं करते। इसलिए हमें कोई चिन्ता नहीं है और हमारी तरफ बड़े भ्रष्टे सीडर हैं। लेकिन छोटे छोटे और देशों के लिए बहुत खतरा एशिया में बढ़ना जा रहा है। यह जो अमेरिका और चीन का दोनों का मिला जुला प्रभाव हमारे क्षेत्र में है वह एशिया को जो नई ताकतें उन के लिए खतरा है। अब हम उस के लिए अपने देश में नैपारी करें और जो फासिस्ट ताकतें हैं उन को समझे कि आखिर इन फासिस्ट ताकतों से हम को मुकाबला करना है। कुछ हमारे लोग हाब नाब करने हैं कि चीन से भी हम कुछ बातचीत करें और कुछ समझना करें। कई बार तो ऐसी कांशिश भी की है कि जो यहां एक पार्टी है उन के पोलिटे ब्यूरो के मेम्बर से मिल कर बात करने की कांशिश करें। लेकिन एक बात बिलकुल सीधी है कि जब तक चीन के बराबर हमारे हिन्दुस्तान की ताकत नहीं हो जाती और जब तक हम बिलकुल अपने पैरों पर नहीं खड़े हो जाते तब तक चीन से हमारी दोस्ती नहीं हो सकती। चीन से दोस्ती चीन के बराबर जबाब में होगी। चीन में जो नेता मर जाते हैं सब रिएक्शनरी बहा हो जाते है चाहे लिन प्याओ—थ्यो—शाओ ची हों, अथवा चाऊ—एनलाई हों या दूसरे लोग कन फ्यूशस जै से हों, वह भाग्यशाली हैं जो मरने के बाद रिएक्शनरी हुए, लेकिन कुछ ऐसे भाग्यशाली है जो मरने के पहले ही रिएक्शनरी साबित होंगे जो आजकल बहा हो रहा है वह हम सब लोगों

[बी शक्ति प्रबंध]

के सामने है। बहरहाल मैं चीन के संबंध में ज्यादा डिटेल में नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन उस क्षतरे की खास तौर से सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

धब हम जो नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज हैं जिन की लीडरशिप हिन्दोस्तान ने हमेशा अपने हाथ में रखी है, वह कोई इसलिए नहीं कि बहुत बड़ा देश है या बहुत खूबसूरत देश है बल्कि कुछ हमारी बेसिक पालिसीज थी, जैसे बेसिक पालिसी गांधी जी ने इन्डायल के सबध में दी, उस वकत उन्होंने कहा था कि अरब देशों से किस तरह का संबंध रखना है और उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि आज तक हम उस पालिसी पर चलते रहे। अरब देशों में जिन के नेता बिल्कुल साम्राज्यवाद से बिके उन की बात मैं नहीं करता लेकिन अरब की जनता जहां आज नासिर भरे नहीं, [सारे अरब देश में जिनदा है, जहां बाशिर अरफात जैसे लीडर मौजूद हैं, वहां की जागरूक जनता हिन्दुस्तान के इसलिए साथ है कि हम ने हमेशा इन्डायल के सबध में उन की मदद की। इसी तरह माउथ अफ्रीका के सिलसिले में बात है। वह भी गांधी जी की एक बेन है। सब से पहले मन्थाप्रह उन्होंने वहां शुरू किया। आज अफ्रीका के लोग गांधी जी को याद करने हैं और हमें याद करते हैं। हमें फका है इस बात का कि हम ने भगोना में उनको जल्दी रेकग्नाइज करके एक अच्छा कदम उठाया। उस के लिए मैं मंत्री महादय को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ और जब तक हम साउथ अफ्रीका में रंगभेद के खिलाफ लड़ने रहेंगे अफ्रीका के लोग हमारे साथ रहेंगे। जब तक इन्डायल के खिलाफ और जियोनिज्म के खिलाफ हम लड़ते रहेंगे अरब देश हमारे साथ रहेंगे और इसी तरह एक बात और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, पोर्टरिफो का प्रश्न है जिसे कृष्णा मेनन ने अर्ली फिफटीज में यू एन को ने उठाया था, मैं लोग भी इतने ही सेंसिटीव हैं जैसे अरब के लोग इन्डायल के लिए और अफ्रीका के लोग साउथ अफ्रीका के लिए हैं। इसी तरह पोर्ट

रिफो के लिए जितने स्पैनिश स्वीकिंग मैटिब कमेरिकन कंट्रीज के लोग हैं वे सेंसिटीव हैं और वे पोर्टरिफो को धाज्जद देखना चाहते हैं। इन प्रश्नों पर जैसे हथ मजबूती के साथ उन के साथ हमेशा रहे हैं वैसे ही रहेंगे तो स्पैनिश स्वीकिंग कंट्रीज के लोग हमारे साथ रहेंगे और वहां के नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज के लोग खास तौर से कॅरेबियन सी के किनारे के लोग, क्यूबा और दूसरे देशों के लोग हमारे साथ हमेशा रहेंगे और अगर हम इन पालिसीज से कही भी हटे तो यह संभव नहीं होगा कि हम नानएलाइन्ड कंट्रीज को साथ रख सकें ख स तौर से जहां जहां अमेरिकन बेसेस हैं, चाहे साउथ कोरिया में हों चाहे डिप्लो गार्सिया में हों, चाहे जापान में हों या आस्ट्रेलिया के किसी हिस्से में हो, उनका हमने विरोध किया है। हम किसी फारेन पावर को, किसी फारेन पावर की फौज को या किसी विदेशी अड्डे को कही भी और किसी देश में नहीं देखना चाहते हैं - यह हमारी पुरानी पालिसी है। इस पानवी पर आप रहे तो नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज के लोग आप से साथ रहेंगे।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारे चव्हाण साहब ने नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज का एक नयी दिशा दी है - चाहे अकटाड का जरीए से या किसी और जरीए से कि हम लोग साम्राज्यवाद के एकोनामिक शोषण से युद्ध कर जो नये विकसित देश हैं उनकी सहायता कर सकें। इस दिशा में जिस तरह से यूरोप के देशों ने अपना एक संगठन बनाया है उसी तरह से एशिया के जो भाल निर्यात करने वाले देश हैं, उनका जो रान-मैटीरियल है या दूसरी चीजें बनाते हैं - ऐसे देशों के सम्बन्ध में भी अगर संगठन प्रयास करें तो उनको संगठित कर सकेंगे।

इसके साथ साथ इन देशों में जितनी न्यूज एजेंसीज हैं उनके एकीकरण का भी सवाल है क्योंकि अफ्रीका और एशिया की खबरें हम आज भी अमरीका और इन्डो या दूसरे साधक

अध्यायी देशों के अर्थ से लेते हैं। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ जो नान एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज के देश हैं हम उनकी पक्षकारिता को डेवलप करेंगे, उनके आपसी सम्बन्ध बनायेंगे। यह सब आज बहुत जरूरी है। साथ ही साथ हमारी ओट्टेड यूनियन्स हैं उनके नान एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज के साथ अयादा सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए अनिश्चित उन ताकतों के जो कि शोषक ताकतें रही हैं। तो इस दिशा में भी कदम उठाना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ जब आप कानवों जायेंगे तो इन प्रश्नों पर आप तौर से ध्यान रखेंगे।

इसके साथ साथ हम देखते हैं कि दुनिया में समाजवाद की बात तो लोग करते हैं लेकिन स्पूडों सोशलिस्ट। विली ब्राट और विल्सन जैसे लोगों ने समाजवाद को बदनाम किया है। हिन्दुस्तान में भी उनके जैसे जय-प्रकाश और दूसरे लोग हैं। ऐसे स्पूडों सोशलिस्ट जापान से लेकर बेल्जियम तक और जर्मनी से लेकर इंग्लैंड तक मिलेंगे। इनसे दुनिया को मुक्त करने के लिए, नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज में जो सोशलिज्म पर विश्वास करते हैं, जो साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ हैं उन देशों को इकट्ठा करें और एक नया सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल बनायें। अब्बास साहब इसको लीड दें और हमारे देश की नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जो कि सारे विश्व में सानी छात्री हैं, उनके अलावा अरेरे साहब हैं और दूसरे नेता हैं, उनके अलावा इंग्लैंड में भी आपको अच्छे सोशलिस्ट मिलेंगे, इटली और जापान में भी मिलेंगे, दूसरे नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज में मिलेंगे—सभी मिलकर एक सैकण्ड सोशलिस्ट इंटर-नेशनल की स्थापना करें—मैं समझता हूँ यह बहुत आवश्यक है। इस प्रकार से जो स्पूडों सोशलिस्ट हैं, जो सोशलिज्म के नाम पर समाजवाद और समाजवादी देशों का विरोध करते हैं और साम्राज्यवाद का समर्थन कर रहे हैं उनसे हम कम से कम मुक्ति पा सकेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ इसके लिए हमारा देश लीडरशिप

दे सकता है। अगर आपको नान-एलाइन्ड ही रहना है और दुनिया में जो समाजवादी हैं, जो प्रगतिशील हैं उनको भी साथ रखना है, उनको अगर आइडियोलॉजिकली साथ नहीं रख सकते तो और कोई रास्ता नहीं है। जहाँ पर आर्थिक लड़ाई के लिए लोग लड़ रहे हैं या जैसे इजरायल, साउथ अफ्रीका और पोर्टोरिका का प्रश्न है या फिर अमेरिकन फ्रीजी ब्रूडे का प्रश्न है—इनकी आप मुखालिफत करते रहे तो मुझे विश्वास है कि इसमें विदेशी नीति में आप कामयाब होंगे। जहाँ तक समाजवादी देशों का सम्बन्ध है, उनका हमें सहयोग रहा है और हम भी उनको हमेशा सहयोग देते आये हैं। मित्रता तभी होती है जब बराबर के देश एक दूसरे की बराबर इज्जत करें और एक दूसरे की साबरेन्टी का ब्याल रखें। हम देखते हैं समाजवादी देशों ने हमें हमेशा मदद दी है और हमने भी, जब उनके प्रश्न आये हैं तो उनकी मदद की है। यह मित्रता जब मजबूत होती जा रही तो कभी कभी देश में समाजवाद के विरुद्ध कुछ लोग हवा चला देते हैं लेकिन उसका मतलब सोवियत संघ या अन्य समाजवादी देशों का विरोध नहीं है बल्कि वह देश का अपना कंट्राडिक्शन है। इस कंट्राडिक्शन का जवाहर लाल नेहरू को भी मुकामला करना पड़ा था। सन् 1929 से लेकर श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के समय तक बराबर बड़ी बड़ी पर्सनैलिटीज समाजवाद का विरोध करती रही हैं। वे समाजवाद के शब्द को सांप बिच्छू की तरह समझते थे लेकिन इसके बाद भी समाजवाद का अभियान, समाजवाद का रथ आगे बढ़ता रहा। मैं नहीं समझता इस देश के समाजवाद के रथ को, समाजवाद, के अभियान को कोई पिण्डी (बौना) रोक सकेंगे, यह सम्भव नहीं है। इसलिए समाजवादी देशों के साथ मित्रता और मजबूत कीजिए। इस के अलावा जो समाजवादी देश हैं, नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज हैं, उनका "सैकण्ड सोशलिस्ट

[श्री शशि भूषण]

इन्टरनेशनल" बनायें। पहला तो फ़ेल हो गया, इसी लिए दूसरे की जरूरत है।

मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता था।

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) : We appreciate the varied and rich experience of our hon. Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Chavan. The hon. Deputy Minister Shri Bipinpal Das and the hon. Minister Shri Chavan are shaping the destiny of the External Affairs Ministry and directing it in the proper direction. I offer my congratulations to them.

When we look at the development of our foreign policy since 1946, we find that there is a degree of consistency and loyalty to the underlying principle. The foundation for our policy was laid down by the late Jawaharlal Nehru in 1946 and it is being consolidated under the able leadership of our Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Few countries in the world have followed this policy to the logical conclusion, I refer to the policy of non-alignment. In 1946 Shri Nehru said: We are from Asia and the people of Asia are nearer and closer to us than others. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi we gave shape to this principle. We built our relations with the Soviet Union, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal and other countries around us. Non-aligned policy is for a spirit of cooperation in the comity of nations. Our is one of the glaring examples, glorious examples of a nation devoted to this principle. In this connection, I want to refer to the conflict that took place between India and Pakistan. After that conflict, there was a magnanimous offer and the Simla summit took place. The Simla spirit was adhered to fully by our country. The Super Powers, the imperialist powers are creating difficult conditions and they want to see that the non-alignment policy is destroyed. Durable peace in the world is our goal, and not international conflicts. We want to create an atmosphere in which there can be durable peace in the world, not only in our sub-continent. We tell the super powers: here is

a country which has a policy of non-alignment and which has carried that policy to its logical conclusion. Therefore, I should like to say that Shrimati Indira Gandhi has forged national unity and also sound international relations with neighbours including Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The relationship with socialist countries had been strengthened. Our trade relations with them have developed and there is a growing atmosphere of understanding between the socialist countries and our country; through strengthening and consolidating the non alignment policy, so that there may be durable peace not only here but in other places like Middle East or Africa where conflicts had been created. This is the spirit in which the External Affairs Minister' has been working.

Our Prime Minister attended the Commonwealth countries Conference which was held in Belgrade. In the Belgrade Conference of non-aligned countries, there were 57 members. Now the membership has gone up to 83. Recently, in August 1975, the non-aligned countries' Conference was held in Lima. The views expressed by the members of the non-aligned countries in Lima Conference are more positive and stronger than those expressed at the Belgrade Conference. The grand work done by these non-aligned countries has helped in creating international peace. If Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the architect of the non-aligned policy. Shrimati Indira Gandhi would be considered by the historians in the future as the great consolidator of peace. This is how our Prime Minister has been creating an atmosphere for the establishment of durable peace. What happened to the forces of Imperialism? The forces are still working there. The belligerent activities of the imperialist forces are going on our borders and through the third country they are operating. Huge arms and ammunitions are supplied to Pakistan through other countries. We have not closed our eyes to these activities. Yesterday, our Defence Minister, Shri Bansi Lal, said

that we must be careful and watchful against the infiltrations into our country by air and sea. We must not lose sight of the foreign military base at Diego Garcia. It is a great threat to our country. This matter should be looked into by the External Affairs Ministry rather the Defence Ministry. The deliberations and conclusions reached in regard to the foreign policy of our country should reach the Litteral States of the World so that our policy and spirit of non-alignment and also the detente are respected. The spirit of cooperation and amity between the non-aligned countries should be respected.

Since the declaration of Emergency, certain foreign elements are still operating against our country. Today, our Embassies in foreign countries should be asked to handle their work properly in consonance with the spirit of the foreign policy of our country. I have visited various countries and I have had the opportunity to see how our officials in foreign Embassies are playing to the tunes of super-powers. That is very bad. Some members of our Embassies go here and there and they are making propaganda against our country. Necessary steps should be taken to see that this kind of propaganda by our Embassy officials is stopped immediately. Our External Affairs Ministry should take care of this activity and our foreign Embassies should have some guiding principles as to how they should function. The ideology of any nation today is based on its economic condition rather than political. Now, you can observe how the USA is trying to have its relationship with China. Now, the relationship between the developing countries is increasing and that is why they are interfering in the affairs of the developing nations too much. Our foreign policy is shaped by taking necessary action like recognition of Angola which is in the right spirit.

I appreciate the foreign policy shaped by the Prime Minister. She has taken proper decisions at the proper time and these have been appreciated. There are imperialist forces operating in this country whose aim is that our economic growth should be stopped, so that India is weakened and thereby Asia is weakened. That is why we say that even our Himalayan policy has to be formulated properly. It is in that right spirit that we have made Sikkim a State of India and the relationship around Asia has been strengthened.

It is not enough that we are politically strong. We have to see that economically also we are strong. After the emergency, the 20-point economic programme has to be implemented not only in the interests of internal growth but also to see that India stands out as a strong nation in Asia. We should also see that all the developing nations are also helped and their foreign policy shaped on the basis of the foreign policy enunciated by our country, which was laid down by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and followed by our present Prime Minister.

The economic relationship between our country and the socialist countries has to be strengthened and it should not have any strings. Our relationship with the Soviet Union, for example, is a great success and it is in the right spirit of cooperation and understanding. This will also help to minimise international tensions. In that spirit, I request the Ministry of External Affairs to see that our relations with the socialist countries in and around Asia are developed. We should be careful about pseudo-socialist countries who claim to be socialist but who under this garb try to nullify the independence and growth of other countries. The External Affairs Ministry must see to it that these international belligerent activities, either inside or outside, should be stopped. There are not only the multinational corporations, but other institutions who operate under the garb of religious institutions. The CIA activities are growing

[Shri K. Lakkappa]
by leaps and bounds all over the country, in Bihar and other places. There is another organisation—Brahma Kumaris—in Mt. Abu. These things have to be unearthed and their clandestine activities should be stopped. Consolidation inside is as important as consolidation outside so that India may grow. Once again, I congratulate the External Affairs Minister, Shri Chavan and his Deputy, Shri Bipinpal Das, for shaping our foreign policy properly.

श्री जगन्नाथ सिन्धु (मधुवनी) : सभापति महोदय, मैं विदेश मंत्री श्री चव्हाण और उप-विदेश मंत्री श्री विपिनपाल दास को अपने सुन्दर दायित्व का निर्वहण सक्षमता से और सक्रमतापूर्वक करने के कारण अभिवादन करता हूँ और स्वागत करता हूँ ।

श्रीमन्, किसी भी देश को अपनी स्थिति को कायम रखने के लिए एक नीति को अपनाना पड़ता है । जब हमारा देश स्वतन्त्र भी नहीं हुआ था, उस वक्त भी इन विषय पर सोचा गया था और नेहरू जी के भलाया और लोगों ने भी यह सोचा था कि जब हमारा देश स्वतन्त्र होगा, तो हमारी विदेश नीति नान-एलाइनमेंट की रहेगी ।

जब हमारा देश स्वतन्त्र हुआ तो उन्होंने इसी नीति को अपनाया और आज भी हमारा देश इसी नीति पर चल रहा है । इस नीति से हमारे देश को जो सक्रमतायें मिली हैं उनको भिन्नाने के बजाय एक शब्द में यही कहा जा सकता है कि हमारे देश के लिए यह नीति बड़ी सफल रही है और इसे विश्व में हमारी शक्ति बढी है । इस नीति के विरोधी अब नहीं हैं या पहले नहीं थे, ऐसी बात नहीं है । स्वतन्त्रता के पहले जब 1946 में बंकिम नेहरू ने इस विषय को रखा और नान एलाइनमेंट की बात कही तब सितम्बर 1946 में इन शर्तों में उन्होंने यह बात रखी :

As early as September 1946, even while India was preparing to get her independence, Nehru said: "We propose as far as possible to keep away from power blocs or groups aligned against one another which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disaster."

उसके बाद जब देश स्वतंत्र हुआ तो पहली नान-एलाइंड कंट्रीज की मीटिंग हुई तब उस में 25 देशों ने भाग लिया :

The first Non-aligned Conference took place in Belgrade in September, 1961. 25 Afro-Asian and one Central European State participated, three Latin American States came in as Observers.

उसके बाद दूसरी बैठक हुई ।

At the second meeting of the Non-aligned Nations, held in Cairo in October, 1964, the number of participating nations had increased to 47 and of Observers to 11, from all over the world. India's Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri then put forward a concrete programme for non-alignment. This consisted of five basic points which found acceptance by the Conference.

फिर तीसरी मीटिंग हुई :

The Third Non-alignment Summit in Lusaka in September 1970 drew 54 States as Members and 9 as Observers.

फिर जब चौथी बैठक हुई नान-एलाइंड कंट्रीज की संख्या में 1975 में बड़ा उस में देशों की संख्या बढ़ कर 83 हो गई । इसी से स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि हमारी नान-एलाइनमेंट की जो नीति है वह कितनी सुन्दर है, देश के लिए कितनी उपयोगी है ।

मैं कुछ राष्ट्र थे जो यह समझते थे कि भारत नया नया आजाब हुआ है वह बहुत सी बातों पर ठीक से और नहीं कर सकेगा और हमारी और मुखातिब होगा। उनको इससे बड़ा धक्का लगा। वे भीतर से हिन्दुस्तान के दुश्मन हो गए और ऊपर से दोस्त बने रहे। समय आया जब असल बात प्रकट हो गई। जो हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े पक्षधर कहलाते थे वे उनके नम्बर एक विरोधी हो गए।

पाकिस्तान की बात मैं नया कहूँ। जब से उसका जन्म हुआ है तब से वह हिन्दुस्तान का दुश्मन बना हुआ है। वह हिन्दुस्तान से दुश्मनी किस तरह में छोड़ सकता है इस पर बार बार हिन्दुस्तान की ओर से सोचा और विचार गया है। कई बार हमने दोस्ती का हाथ उनकी ओर बढ़ाया है लेकिन अभी तक हमें उस में सफलता नहीं मिल सकी है। 1972 में शिमला एग्रीमेंट हुआ था। तब बहुत सी बातों पर सहमति अर्जन की गई थी और समझौता किया गया है। लेकिन फिर भी पाकिस्तान को सन्तोष नहीं है। वहाँ के अखबार और वहाँ की सरकार ने अपनी रबैये को बदला नहीं है। पहले वाली नीति को छोड़ा नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ अभी भी वहाँ वे बिच बचव कर रहे हैं। पता नहीं कब वे हमका त्याग करेंगे।

वहाँ तक चीन का सम्बन्ध है चीन के साथ हमने दोस्ती करने की बड़ी कोशिश की थी। तब विश्व को हमने हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई का तारा भी दिया था। सारे विश्व में यह तारा पूजा भी था। हमने अपने सम्बन्धों को पंचशील के सिद्धांतों पर आधारित किया था। ये पांच सूत्र थे :

1. Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.
2. Non-aggression.

3. Non-interference in each other's internal affairs.
4. Equality and mutual benefit and
5. peaceful co-existence.

ये बड़े सुन्दर सिद्धांत थे। पंचशील बहुत व्यापक हुआ। जिस समय पंचशील का तारा दिया तो इसकी बड़ी प्रशंसा की गई। लेकिन पता नहीं चीन के हृदय में क्या था। जब वक्त आया उसने दण दिया, धोखा दिया हमें और हमारी बहुत सी जमीन को हड़प लिया और अब भी हड़पे हुए है। फिर भी हमने उसके माथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया है। लेकिन कोई लक्षण दिखाई देने नहीं देते हैं कि चीन चाहता हो कि हिन्दुस्तान से दोस्ती करे। चीन अपनी जगह पर है और हमारे देश की नीति और हमारा देश अपनी जगह पर है।

हमारे देश का यह सोभाग्य है कि हमारे देश को पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का नेतृत्व प्राप्त हुआ और उसके बाद भी हमें बहुत अच्छे प्रधान मंत्री मिले। वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में चल कर देश अग्रति बहुत तेजी से कर रहा है और सब काम ठीक चल रहे हैं। हमारा किसी देश से झगड़ा नहीं है। हम दूसरे देशों के मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करने में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं।

अभी हाल ही में दो बार दिन ही हुए हैं भारत और ईराक के बीच आर्थिक और तकनीकी मामलों में समझौता सम्पन्न हुआ है।

भारत-ब्रिटेन संयुक्त उपसमितियों की बैठक नहीं हो रही थी, अब वह अगले सप्ताह में लन्दन में होने जा रही है। उनमें भारत और ब्रिटेन के बीच व्यापार और आर्थिक सहयोग के विस्तार आदि पर विस्तार

[श्री जगन्नाथ मिश्र]

से बातें होंगी, ऐसी आशा है। इसी तरह से भारत-वैतसत्राना के राष्ट्रप्रतिष्ठानों ने अफ्रीका के रंगभेद को खत्म करने में विश्व के लोगों से सहयोग करने की अपील की है।

हमारे विदेश मंत्री अभी बहुत से देशों का दौरा कर के वापस लौटे हैं। इस तरह से हम देखते हैं कि ये सभी देश हमसे हिल-मिलकर हमारे साथ रहते हैं, और हम किसी से परे नहीं हैं। परे सिर्फ उन्हीं से हैं जो अपने को विशाल समझते हैं, विकसित समझते हैं या यह समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान उनकी खुशामद करे। मैं उनका नाम भी लेता हूँ, वह है अमरीका। अमरीका का यही कथन है कि अगर हमसे सहायता लेते हो तो हमारी नीति माननी होगी और उस पर चलना होगा। जो ऐसा नहीं करेगा, उन्हीं से साफ कहा है कि उनको सहायता नहीं देंगे। इसके जवाब में हमारी प्रधानमंत्री ने कहा है कि हम किसी के मातहत नहीं हैं, हम किसी से सहायता नहीं मांगेंगे, हम देखेंगे नहीं उसकी तरफ, क्योंकि हमें अपने पांवों पर खड़ा होना आ गया है। हमारे सभी किसान मजबूत हैं। जब देश में लड़ाई होती है तो जवान सीमा पर लड़ाई लड़ते हैं और किसान खेतों में उत्पादन करते हैं। हम झुकने वाले नहीं हैं, और किसी भी शर्त पर झुकेंगे नहीं। इस प्रकार से हमारा काम चल रहा है।

कुछ थोड़े से राष्ट्र क्या कर रहे हैं, वह पयूडल राष्ट्रों को विरोधी बनाने का प्रयास चला रहे हैं। उन्हींने ऐसा कर दिया है कि हमारी समुद्री और पर्वतीय सीमाओं को भी दुर्लवनीय नहीं रहने दिया है। इसीलिये प्रधान मंत्री ने अपनी अपील में थोड़ा दुःख के साथ कहा है कि हमारे देश पर चतुर्दिक् आक्रमण का खतरा है और हमें इसका सामना करने के लिये सतर्क रहना है। यह बड़ी सुन्दर और सामयिक बात है, और देश ने इसको गंभीरता से लिया है।

अभी एक बहुत प्रतिष्ठित और सम्मानित सदस्य इसी सदन में बोल रहे थे उन्हींने इस विषय में कुछ और कहा था। उन्हींने अपने ढंग से इस बात को समझा, खैर, उनकी अपनी समझ थी। हम समझते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री का यह कहना सामयिक और अच्छा था और इससे देश सतर्क होगा, जागृत रहेगा और एकता पैदा होगी।

जो मदद देने वाले देश हैं, वह पहले तो अपनी शर्त रखते हैं और फिर अपनी मदद देना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जब उनकी मदद के बिना भी कोई देश आगे बढ़ जाता है, तो वे उससे दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाते हैं। मुझे विश्वास है कि जिस तरह से आज हमारा देश बढ़ रहा है, जो देश आज हमारे दुश्मन हैं, वह भी आगे दोस्ती के हाथ बढ़ायेंगे और हमारा कोई भी दुश्मन नहीं रह जायेगा।

यह कहते हुए बड़ी प्रसन्नता होती है कि भारत में जो राष्ट्रियता की भावना जाग गई है, इसको निर्गट और समाजवादी देश अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं और उसमें किसी को कोई शंका नहीं है। हम समझते हैं कि जिस तरह से आज हम सावधान हैं, सभी तरह से खेतों और फार्मों में उत्पादन बढ़ने लग गया है, गत लड़ाई में जिस तरह से हमारे सैनिक तत्पर रहे और विजय हासिल कर सके और आज भी जिस तरह से तैयार उसी तरह से एकता कायम रही, उत्पादन बढ़ता रहा तो कोई भी हमारा बालबांका नहीं कर सकेगा। हमारी जो वैदेशिक नीति है, उसकी प्रशंसा न केवल हमारे देश में बल्कि सारे संसार में होगी। मैं अपने दोनों वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्रियों को बधाई देते हुए, इस मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री हरी सिंह (खुर्जा) : माननीय सभापति जी, विदेश मंत्रालय के अनुदानों

पर आज सदन में चर्चा चल रही है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति और राष्ट्रों के आपसी सम्बन्धों का मूल सिद्धान्त सह-अस्तित्व और एक दूसरे देशों के मामलात में दखलन्दाजी न करना है। हमारी नीति है—“लिव एंड लैट लिव, फ्रैंडशिप विद आल एंड एनीमिटी टुवर्ड्स नन”।

हमारी इस सह-अस्तित्व की नीति ने संसार के उन देशों को, जो बड़ी ताकतों के शिकार और चंगुल में फँसते चले आ रहे थे, बड़ी आशा और धैर्य दिया है और उन्हें नये मार्ग की ओर अग्रसर किया है। यही नहीं, अग्र पिछले दशक में आप देखें तो जो हमारी नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति है, उन देशों के लिये जिनको तीसरी दुनिया कहा जाता है, उनकी शक्ति और उनकी आवाज बुलन्द करने का एक बड़ा माध्यम बनी है। नान एलाइनमेंट के अर्थ यह नहीं है कि किसी देश पर अन्याय हो रहा हो तो भारत कुछ कह ही नहीं सकता है। नान-एलाइनमेंट का मतलब है खुद भारत एक पार्टी न बनते हुए शान्ति, अमन और देशों को युद्धों से बचाने के लिये सब कुछ करना। किन्तु भारत को देशों के आपसी झगड़े में पार्टी नहीं बनना है।

आज हमारी नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति को संसार में एक महत्वपूर्ण स्थान प्राप्त होता जा रहा है। कुछ समय पहले दुनिया के 83 मुल्कों ने लीमा में तटस्थ राष्ट्रों की कॉन्फ्रेंस में भाग लिया था, और जल्दी ही कोलम्बो में होने वाली नान-एलाइन्ड कंट्रीज की कॉन्फ्रेंस में 90 से ऊपर मुल्क भाग लेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि संसार के राष्ट्रों को अन्ततः नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति अपनाती पड़ेगी। भारत ने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं के समाधान और विभिन्न विवादों के निपटारे के लिए हमेशा इसी नीति के आधार पर अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं।

पाकिस्तान और भारत के युद्ध के बाद दोनों देशों में शिमला एग्रीमेंट हुआ, और भारत ने पिछले युद्ध में पाकिस्तान की जो जमीन जीत ली थी, उसने उसको खुशी से छोड़ दिया। शिमला समझौते के अनुसार यह तय किया गया कि बाकी मामलों को आपसी समझौते, बाइलेट्रल एग्रीमेंट, के द्वारा सुलझाया जायेगा। लेकिन खेद की बात है कि पाकिस्तान की नीयत और इरादे बदल गये हैं। इसकी वजह यह है कि साम्राज्यवादी देश यह सोचते हैं कि अगर दुनिया में शांति कायम हो गई, और विभिन्न देशों के बीच भाई-चारे के सम्बन्ध स्थापित हो गए, तो उन की इम्पीरियलिज्म और कालोनियलिज्म की पालिसी को भारी धक्का लगेगा, और इस लिए वे देश पाकिस्तान को भारत के प्रति एक शत्रुतापूर्ण रवैया अपनाने के लिए उकसाते हैं और पाकिस्तान भारत के आपसी सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं होने दे रहे हैं।

अमरीका की कालोनियलिज्म, एक्सप्लायटेशन, वार-सांगरिंग, एक्सपेंशन और हथियार बेचने की नीति हमारी बुनियादी विदेश नीति से मेल नहीं खाती है। अमरीका देशों को भिन्न नहीं बनाता है बल्कि क्लाइन्ट बनाता है। जहाँ तक भारत का सम्बन्ध है, वह पाकिस्तान, और संसार के सब देशों, के साथ भाई-चारे और दोस्ती के सम्बन्ध रखना चाहता है और वह इस तरफ कोशिश भी कर रहा है। अमरीका के साथ हमारे ताल्लुक तेजी से सुधरने चाहिए थे, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो पा रहा है, क्योंकि हमारी और अमरीका की विदेश नीति में बुनियादी फर्क है। दोनों देशों के आपसी सम्बन्धों में सुधार के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि अमरीका की विदेश नीति में आमूल-चूल परिवर्तन हो, क्योंकि सोशलिज्म और इम्पीरियलिज्म का कोई मेल नहीं बैठता है और एक्सप्लायटेशन तथा शत्रुता एक साथ नहीं रह सकते हैं। एक्सपेंशन और शांति एक साथ नहीं चल

[श्री हरी सिंह]

सकते हैं। यह एक तथ्य है कि दुनिया के अधिकतर देश अमरीका द्वारा प्रतिपादित नीतियों को अच्छी नजर से नहीं देखते हैं। अमरिका चाहता है कि संसार में उस को वह सम्मान मिले, जो एक महान राष्ट्र को भिन्नता है, तो उस को अपनी नीतियों में परिवर्तन करना होगा। अपने सोचने के ढंग में भी तबर्द, लौ लानी होगी।

अमरीका आज इंडियन ओशन में अपना प्रभुत्व जमाने के लिए अरबों रुपए खर्च कर रहा है, क्योंकि वह जानता है कि इंडियन ओशन को कंट्रोल करने वाला देश ही एशिया को कंट्रोल कर पायेगा। वह इंडियन ओशन में अपना बेस बना कर एशिया के मुल्कों को अपने प्रभाव क्षेत्र और आधिपत्य में लाना चाहता है।

विभिन्न अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्नों और समस्याओं के बारे में अपना पक्ष रखने के लिए विदेश-संज्ञालय का प्रचार-तन्त्र बड़ा कमजोर है। भारत अपनी समस्याओं को प्रचार के माध्यम से दुनिया के सामने रखने में पिछड़ा रहता है। आर्थिक तौर पर यह देखते हैं कि दुनिया के जो प्रेश बाले हैं, दुनिया के जो प्रचार के माध्यम हैं वह बड़े पावरफुल होते हैं। जैसे हुआय पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान है वह सीटो और लैंडो के पैक में शामिल है। सिन्हावा उन देशों को जो उस पैक में उसके साथी हैं, अपने प्रचार का माध्यम बना कर पाकिस्तान बड़ा भारी प्रचार करता है। एक तो पाकिस्तान की खुद की मशीनरी, उसकी जो एम्बसीज हैं वह और इन पैक में के उसके साथी सब उसके लिए प्रचार करते हैं। तो हमारी अपनी जो प्रतिपादित नीतियाँ हैं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में दुनियावी-सवालों पर उनके प्रचार के लिए हमको बहुत ही पावरफुल माध्यम बनाना चाहिए

और इस मय में अमर एनए की मॉव कल पकती है तो मैं विदेश संज्ञालय से आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ कि इस कार्य के लिए एक बड़ी धनराशि हमको रखनी चाहिए। और बड़ी धन राशि हमें स्वीकार करनी चाहिए क्योंकि आप देखते हैं कि बहुत सारे अखबार आए दिन तरह तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ प्रचार करते रहते हैं। विश्व में भारत की तस्वीर को गलत ढंग से रखते हैं।

16.00 hrs.

पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ हमारी जो नीतियाँ काम में लाई जाती है उसमें हम सिर्फ राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध ही बढ़ाने की बात नहीं करते हैं बल्कि आर्थिक तौर पर भी हम उन मुल्कों से अपनी ताल्लुकान बढ़ाने में बड़े सक्रिय रूप से और तेजी से कार्य कर रहे हैं। आज आप देखते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान ने पिछले चार पांच सालों के अन्दर दुनिया के बहुत सारे मुल्कों से आर्थिक समझौते, लेन देन और ध्यापार के समझौते किए हैं। यह इस बात का संकेत करता है कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति बाहर के मुल्कों में एक अच्छा रूख और विचार, भावना बनती चली जा रही है क्योंकि हमारी जो नीतियाँ हैं वह दुनियावी बसूलों पर आधारित हैं। जैसे अरब लोगों की स्वतंत्रता और उनकी सावरेनिटी का सवाल है, उस को लेकर हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान ने उनकी ध्याबाव को बुराब किया है हालाँकि दुनिया के जो बहुत शक्तिशाली मुल्क हैं वे इस बात से नाराज भी हुए लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान ने कभी भी अपनी मूल नीतियों से हटने का इरादा नहीं किया। यों तो आपसी ताल्लुकान में बहुत से उतार चढ़ाव आए, और बहुत से ट्रेकर करने की कोशिशें हुईं लेकिन हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने अपनी फर्मिस, दूरदर्शिता और पब्लिसिबिलिटी दिखा कर विश्व में एक अच्छा

उपाहारण प्रस्तुत किया है। समानता के आधार पर कदम बढ़ा कर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अर्थ में हिन्दुस्तान के विश्व को बहुत ही ऊंचा पेश किया है। यह हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी की नीति, और उनके अनुभव की खूबी है जिसके लिए मैं इस मीके पर इनको हार्दिक बधाई देना चाहता हूँ और यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि संसार में जो भी मुल्क आगे बढ़े हैं वह हमेशा अपनी बुनियादी नीतियों को लेकर आगे बढ़े हैं। आज पाकिस्तान के अन्दर हथियारों का ढेर चारों तरफ से चला आ रहा है लेकिन उसका आर्थिक ढाँचा भीतर से खोखला होता चला जा रहा है। आप जानते हैं कि दूसरों का सहारा लेने वाले मुल्क कभी आगे नहीं बढ़ पाते हैं। और एक टैक, बम, बन्दूक मिसाइल रखने वाला देश पाकिस्तान बिना आर्थिक मजबूती के घड़ाम से गिर पड़ेगा।

यूगांडा के ईदी अमीन हमारे लिए एक समस्या बने हुए थे। उन्होंने लाखों भारतीयों की सम्पत्ति को यूगांडा में ज्वत कर लिया था। विदेशियों का वरोडां रुपया वहा पड़ा हुआ था और ईदी अमीन साहब कभी उस रुपये को देने की वान नहीं सोचते थे। भारतीयों के लिए तो उनके दिल में एक बहुत अजीब भावना थी। लेकिन यह हमारी नीतियों की सफलता है कि हमारे देश के नागरिकों का रुपया उन्होंने कम्पेन्सेट किया और हमारे उप-विदेश मंत्री उसका चेक भी लेकर भारत आए है। ये जो बुनियादी सवाल है हमारे ताल्लुकात के और आपसी सम्बन्धों के उनमें हमें बड़ी कामयाबी मिली है। पड़ोसी देशों से जैसे अफगानिस्तान, बर्मा और सीलोन से हमारे ताल्लुकात सुधरे हैं और और भी मुल्कों से हमारे सम्बन्धों में सुधार की बात चल रही है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान को आगे जाना है और दुनिया को भी आगे ले जाना है तो अन्य देशों को भी जो भारत द्वारा प्रतिपादित

नान-एवाइन्मेंट की पालिसी है, दूसरे के मामलों में दखल न देने की और सहयोग की जो उसकी नीति है उस नीति को अपनाना होगा और अन्त में दुनिया के सभी राष्ट्रों को भारत द्वारा जो नीति अपनाई गई है उसी नीति पर चलना होगा। इन्हीं अल्फाड के साथ मैं विदेश मंत्रालय की मागों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to you for calling me, as I do welcome this opportunity of participating in the debate on Foreign Affairs, which comes to us because of the Ministry's Demands for Grants. When I say I welcome this debate I must also add quickly that I feel rather sad that the foreign affairs debates in recent years have been fewer and milder. In fact, quite often, we have allowed ourselves to be without any debate on foreign affairs, partly because there have been so many happenings in our country, and partly because I suppose, things in the foreign affairs, to an extent, are stabilised and the Parliament may feel that the debates are not necessary.

I remember distinctly the very stimulating debates that took place in this very august House 10 years back, 15 years back and 20 years back, especially when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, and I recall also, the country, through Parliamentary Debates, showed a tremendous interest in the dynamic initiative which India's Foreign Affairs Minister and Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru took and showed. From that point of view, I feel, and this is not in any way a reflection on the Prime Minister's absence, but I feel that on an important debate like this, it would have been better if the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, were also available in this

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

House not only to listen to the debate but also perhaps to intervene, to the extent possible for the Prime Minister to do so.

In modern times, whether it is a democracy or a non-democracy, it has become the business either of the Prime Minister or the President, namely, the Head of the Government, to take a direct interest in the foreign affairs of the country, and no Prime Minister and no President can afford to leave the portfolio of Foreign Affairs entirely to his or her Foreign Minister only. It is from that angle also, I feel and wish that the Prime Minister's presence and participation would have contributed significantly to this debate.

Sir, Mr. Chavan, who is being known for his political sagacity and skill in various portfolios, has also shown tremendous sense of patience and diplomacy during his present Ministership of External Affairs, and we are happy that he is ably assisted by our good friend, Shri Bipinpal Das and both of them have been doing, whatever is possible, both through the official channels and through their own personal visits to various countries of the world from time to time. I think this is an opportunity for complimenting them both, for the good job they have been doing for our country.

Only two or three days back, we had the distinction of receiving in our country the President of Botswana, Sir Seretse Khama and his wife Lady Ruth Khama. We have also been receiving from today onwards the Prime Minister of Nepal Hon. Shri Tulsī Giri. That only shows—if anybody wanted an evidence—India's close interest in smaller countries and neighbours. India has advantages and disadvantages—if not disadvantages, at least a kind of handicap—in diplomatic dealing because of its big size and vast population. Therefore, smaller countries

with lesser size and lesser population would tend to look at us with a sense of awe, with a sense of suspicion and with a sense of difficulty. But if we are able to deal with these smaller countries, lesser in size and population, in terms of equality, and treating them with the same respect and honour as we do with major powers, then I am sure that is one good way of showing genuine friendship with smaller countries all over the world. Therefore, these personal visits do help and contribute to a dialogue, a thing which has become part and parcel of modern diplomacy, modern international politics, where personal and direct diplomacy plays such an important part. Peace and collective security are the aims of foreign policy of any country and more so of the major powers. But apart from these two aims, the major powers are also interested in power blocs.

In fact, one of the definitions of the major powers is that simultaneously they are interested in all countries. That is the definition of a major power. I don't think India wants to be a major power in that sense of the term. We are certainly interested in seeing that peace and collective security are brought about; but we are also interested in seeing that India begins to take an active initiative, which she has taken, and goes further in that direction in building up a vast reservoir of genuine co-operation among the third world countries which are neither in favour of the Eastern Bloc nor the Western Bloc but which are really interested in rapid economic development. From that point of view, one of the basic tenets of our foreign policy would always be peace, because unless peace is there which must be essential for our development, we cannot have rapid and healthy economic development.

- Sir, non-aligned in India, since Jawaharlal Nehru's time, to us, is not just being neutral; I don't think it is like that nor does it mean non-involved; it means a positive approach of taking an attitude of purposefully aiding with everybody who is for peace and progress, and being on the side of the just and fair, and trying to support those who are weak and oppressed.

We have been doing it in Africa, Asia, Latin America and in Europe both before Independence and, I am glad to say, even after Independence. If non-alignment is not a negative approach but a positive approach, then, to me, it means, a positive approach of saying to the world, beginning with ourselves, that we are interested not in domination but we are involved in genuine cooperation and friendship for all. If that is so, then our foreign policy has to be looked at from the point of view of our domestic policy, internal policy, as well.

No country's foreign policy can be successful if its internal policy, domestic policy, home policy, is on weak grounds. If a country is not internally strong, it cannot help to project its image better to various parts of the world. From that point of view, both foreign policy and home policy are the two sides of the same coin. You cannot have a strong home policy but a weak foreign policy or a better foreign policy but no good domestic policy. Both will have to go side by side and hand in hand together because both affect each other and influence each other. We do this because, we believe, our foreign policy is in tune with our strong home policy.... (Interruptions) I do not know why there should be any criticism of what I am saying. Emergency or no Emergency, the country must develop internally on strong economic, democratic, socialistic and egalitarian grounds. If you do that, if you are a strong country internally,

you can project your image better. For that, I do not think Emergency is necessary. What is necessary is a sense of dedication and a sense of discipline. That can come even without Emergency. We do not want to compromise our sovereignty, our self-respect and our sense of values and ideals for which our ancient land has stood for centuries.

Coming to India's relations with USSR and USA, I would like to ask: Why can't we have friendship with both these Super Powers? Some people argue and even want that because we have good relations with Russia, therefore necessarily, we must not have good relations with America. I cannot understand this logic. These two Super Powers are supposed to be fighting with each other but in reality the areas of cooperation between them are getting greater and closer. Now, Russia and America are having *detente*. If they can come together, why not a country like India have friendship with both these Super Powers?

With regard to the Commonwealth, I would like India to take still more positive steps for the development of the Commonwealth, particularly by helping the African and Asian member countries and the non-white member countries of the commonwealth.

About the normalcy and friendship between India and China I could not agree more than what the External Affairs Ministry's Annual Report says on p. 28:

"The Indian Government followed a consistent policy of seeking to normalise relations with China."

I would only say, with regard to China, we should be cautiously optimistic without trying to give an impression that we are the only persons interested in a shake-hand.

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

They must also be willing to shake hands with us.

With regard to Pakistan, the Ministry's Report is right when it talks of India's positive approach. I am sorry that President Bhutto's gimmicks and his political manoeuvres, his political interest, are coming in the way of normalisation of relations between our country and Pakistan.

Then, I would like to make a brief observation about the foreign service and the appointment of Ambassadors and the High Commissioners. We are glad that Indian Foreign Service has come of age. We are glad that from the first of this month the Foreign Secretary is one who has been recruited from the regular Indian Foreign Service. What I want to say is that younger people and more talented people who normally go to medical, engineering and other faculties should be attracted to foreign services and administrative services as well. We should recruit them and give them good training and absorb them.

Regarding appointments of Ambassadors and High Commissioners, I would like the career diplomats to be assisted and strengthened by appointments of eminent and experienced men from our public life. We should not forget the idea of appointing tall people, eminent men and women, from our public life to various parts of the world as our Ambassadors and High Commissioners. Pandit Nehru did that in his time. I cannot believe that today we are short of such tall, eminent men and women in our public life. We should send them to our Missions abroad. Certainly, the career diplomats are doing a good job. But we must have a good number of Ambassadors drawn from the public life of our country.

Finally, our Missions abroad are too many with too much bureaucracy and a lot of expenses. This must be reasonably curtailed.

श्री विश्वनाथ राव (देवरिया) : विश्व शांति का प्रवर्तक भारत, सत्ता से प्राचीन समय से ही अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सद्भावना के लिये प्रयास करता रहा है। अशोक के समय ही भारत का संदेश दूसरे देशों में पहुंचा था और वहां शांति के लिये, उन्नति के लिये और सद्भावना के लिये प्रचार किया गया था। उसके बाद महात्मा गांधी के नेतृत्व में नया युग आरम्भ होने के पहले ही अफ्रीका में जिस समय गांधी जी थे तब वहां के दबे हुए लोगों, पीड़ित लोगों के उद्धार के लिये उनके बचाव के लिये वहां पर उन्होंने आन्दोलन शुरू किया और इससे भारत की भावना, भारत का भाव अफ्रीका में 1920 के पहले ही पहुंचा। यह भारत की वैदेशिक नीति का या भारत की सद्भावना का प्रतीक है। उसके बाद पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने उमी को आगे बढ़ाया, उन्होंने पंचशील का नारा विश्व में दिया। इसमें बहुत से देश शामिल हुए, एक दूसरे के प्रति सद्भावना बढ़ी। यद्यपि चीन ने हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई का नाग लगाने के समय भी हम पर आक्रमण किया, उसमें एक कमी आयी, लेकिन उसके कारण वह पंचशील का नारा और कार्यक्रम तथा भाव दूषित नहीं हुआ बल्कि वह ज्यों का त्यों विश्व के लिये लाभदायक है। उससे न केवल दूसरे देशों से हमारी सद्भावना ही बढ़ी है बल्कि हमें भी लाभ हुआ है, और उसका प्रतिफल यह है कि हमारे सामने आज हमारे अडीस पडीस के जो देश हैं जिन में कुछ भारत के प्रति आशंका थी, कुछ सन्देह हम पर हो रहा था, उनमें भी हमारी सद्भावना बढ़ी है। इस तरह से दूसरे देशों से जो सहयोग करने की हमारी नीति रही है वह सासकर के ऐसे देशों के लिये लाभप्रद सिद्ध हो रही है जो अभी स्वतन्त्र

हुए हैं या जो विकास कर रहे हैं। जिन के विकास के लिये हमारा सहयोग प्राप्त किया जा रहा है, और उस विकास में न केवल हमें सद्भावना मिल रही है बल्कि आपसी आदान-प्रदान में एक दूसरे से पारस्परिक सद्भावना के लिये हम को आर्थिक लाभ भी हो रहा है। इस प्रकार भारतीय राष्ट्रीयता न केवल भारत के हित के लिये है, उद्धार, उन्नति और उत्थान के लिये है, बल्कि विश्व में ऐसे देशों की सहायता के लिये भी है, सद्भावना के लिये भी है, विकास के लिये भी है जो पिछड़े हुए हैं, जो अभी स्वतन्त्र हुए हैं या स्वतन्त्र होने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं। इस प्रकार भारतीय राष्ट्रीयता अन्तर्राष्ट्रीयता की सहायक है, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीयता की तरफ से जाती है। इस तरह से जो भी पाटियां हों, चाहे विरोधी पाटियां हों या दूसरे लोग हों वह यह समझ लें कि राष्ट्रीयता प्रगतिशील शक्तियों के मार्ग में बाधक नहीं होती है, बल्कि राष्ट्रीयता अन्तर्राष्ट्रीयता सद्भावना को बल देती है। भारतीय राष्ट्रीयता इस बात को सिद्ध करती है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत् में सब के उद्धार के लिये, सब की उन्नति के लिये जो भावना होनी चाहिये वह भारत में है, और ऐसे ही अन्य देशों को भारत को अनुसरण करना चाहिये ताकि विश्व में शान्ति रहे, विकास हो और जो पिछड़े हुए देश हैं उनमें उन्नति हो।

कभी कभी यह भी कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी सद्भावना चारों तरफ तो है तब भी चीन हम पर कुदृष्टि रखता है। लेकिन ऐसे समय में जब चीन और अमरीका में आपस में खेल बँट रहा है हम क्यों किसी से झगड़ने जायें, क्यों किसी के प्रति कटु भाव रखें। होना यह चाहिये कि उनकी नीति चाहे हमारे प्रति कटु हो, लेकिन हमारी सद्भावना इसमें है कि विश्व में जहाँ कुदृष्टि हो, उसकी उपेक्षा करके हम अपनी नीयत ठीक रखें, अपना विकास करें और विकासशील देशों के साथ

सहयोग करें ताकि उनमें भी उन्नति हो। ऐसी बधा में आप देखें कि जो हमारी नीति रही है, जो पंचशील या गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति रही है उससे हमें लाभ हुआ है और पड़ोसी देशों में भी लाभ हुआ है। श्रीलंका की बात आप लें। उसके साथ हमारा हर तरह का व्यवहार बढ़ रहा है, सहयोग बढ़ रहा है, कूरल टैक्नीक सेंटर कायम करने के लिये हमारी मशीनें वहाँ जा रही हैं, भेड़ और मवेशी जा रहे हैं। यही नहीं, अभी जो मछली मारने के सम्बन्ध में हाल में समझौता हुआ है उससे भी हमारी उनकी सद्भावना आपस में बढ़ी है।

भूटान को हम जें आर्थिक सहयोग दे रहे थे वह ज्यों का त्यों है, बल्कि और बढ़ता जा रहा है। बांग्ला देश में भ्रमण कुछ थोड़ी सी गलतफहमी पैदा हुई है, कुछ भ्रम पैदा हुआ है, लेकिन तब भी वहाँ से ट्रेड मिशन यहाँ पर आया और उसके साथ हमारा ट्रेड के बारे में समझौता हुआ। उसमें न केवल भारत और बांग्ला देश शामिल हुआ है बल्कि नेपाल भी उसमें सहयोग करने के लिये नैयार है।

नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ। एक भ्रमण पर, कुछ महीने पहले वर्तमान विदेश मन्त्रालय के मन्त्री को भी मैंने संकेत किया था कि हमारा ध्यान नेपाल की तरफ अधिक जाना चाहिये। उसके विकास में हम सहायता देना चाहते हैं और पहले जो थोड़ी सी गलतफहमी दोनों देशों के बीच में थी, मुझे इस बात की प्रमत्तता है कि उसको दूर करने का प्रयास किया गया है और हमारे विदेश मन्त्रालय के वर्तमान मन्त्री के वहाँ जाने से लाभ हुआ है। उनके सम्बन्ध में नेपाल के प्रधान मन्त्री ने जो बयान दिया है, उससे भी सिद्ध होता है कि हमारे मन्त्री जी का वहाँ जाना बहुत व्यवहारिक सिद्ध हुआ है और लाभदायक हुआ है। मैं डॉ॰ गिरि के बयान से पढ़ कर मुनाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा है :

[श्री विश्व नाथ राय]

"Today Nepal will never try to damage India's interests, notwithstanding any misunderstanding, accidental or incidental."

मतलब यह है कि जो कुछ भी भ्रम नेपाल में था वह दूर हुआ है। यों तो अपनी तरफ से हम सदा से उस के साथ सहयोग करने का प्रयत्न करते रहे हैं और न केवल सहयोग का प्रयत्न करते रहे हैं बल्कि उसके साथ दैनिक कार्य भी हमारा बढ़ रहा है जैसे गंडक योजना का काम, कोसी नदी की योजना का काम करीब करीब पूरा हो रहा है। जलकुंडी योजना के लिए उसको देना तय हुआ है। इस तरह से आप देखें कि हम हमेशा उसके सहायक रहे हैं और सन् 1951-52 से लेकर 1975 तक 113.06 करोड़ पया हमने नेपाल के विकास के लिए वहां पर लगाया है। इस प्रकार जहां तक नेपाल का सम्बन्ध है, हमारी जैसे पहले इच्छा थी, उसके साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध और भी ठोस होते जा रहे हैं।

एक और बात में इस सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं। वह यह है कि विदेश मन्त्रानय को उसको इस बात के लिए प्रभावित करना चाहिए कि चीन जैसे हमारे लिए सकट है, उससे अधिक वह संकट नेपाल के लिए है। हमें उसको यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहिए कि नेपाल के रास्ते तिब्बत की जो सड़क बनी है, वह सड़क हमारी सीमा तक आती है और वस्तुतः देवरिया और गोरखपुर तक आने में उसको कोई कठिनाई नहीं होगी। स्थिति यह पंदा हो गई है कि चीन के टैंक या जीप 36 घंटे में हमारी सीमा तक पहुंच सकते हैं। इसलिए संजीवनी से इसके बारे में सोचना चाहिए। इस समय कोई मन्त्री यहां पर नहीं है। मैं इस बात पर जोर देना चाहता हूं कि वे नेपाल से यह स्पष्ट कर दें कि हमारी रक्षा उनकी रक्षा है और उनकी रक्षा हमारी रक्षा है।

इसके साथ ही साथ इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहूंगा कि नेपाल की जनता और भारतीय जनता का जो दैनिक सम्पर्क होता है, उसको बढ़ाने के लिए जो ग्रामीण केन्द्र या बाजार बगैरह होते हैं, वहां पर हमको सामाजिक सहयोग के लिए, सामाजिक मेल-जोल के लिए कुछ काम करने चाहियें ताकि दैनिक जीवन में नागरिक के बीच सम्पर्क बढ़े और जो थोड़ी बहुत गलतफहमी आपस में हो जाती है, वह हमेशा के लिए दूर हो जाए।

इसी सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि गोरखपुर में गुरु गोरखनाथ का मन्दिर है जिस पर नेपाल के नागरिकों को बहुत श्रद्धा है और प्रेम है। इस तरह की भावना को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए और उन लोगों को वहां पर आकर्षित करने के लिए हमें कुछ ऐसे काम करने चाहिये जिससे कि नेपाल के नागरिकों की श्रद्धा बढ़े। ऐंमे म्यानों को विकसित करना चाहिए। यह न केवल हमारे देश के लिए अच्छा होता है बल्कि इसका अच्छा प्रभाव दूसरे देशों के नागरिकों पर पड़ता है। मैं तो यह चाहूंगा कि यह न केवल नेपाल क सम्बन्ध में ही होना चाहिए बल्कि बर्मा के सम्बन्ध में भी ऐसा ही होना चाहिए। वहां से तीर्थ यात्री हमारे यहां आते हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि लुम्बिनी, कपिलवस्तु और 'कुशीनगर' आदि जो तीर्थ स्थान हैं, जहां पर बर्मा के यात्री और दूसरे अनेक बौद्ध देशों के यात्री आते हैं, इन को हमें आकर्षक बनाना चाहिए, ताकि वे लोग हमारे यहां से एक सन्देश लेकर अपने देशों को जाए और हमारे देश के विकास से वे लोग प्रोत्साहित हों। इससे हमारे देश का लाभ होगा और साथ ही साथ उन लोगों को भी लाभ होगा। इस तरह से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में भारत की जो तस्वीर बनी हुई है, उस को सुदृढ़ करने में हमको सहायता मिलेगी।

बर्मा, श्रीलंका और नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में कहने के बाद, अब मैं कुछ शब्द अफगानिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। विदेश मन्त्रालय का सम्बन्ध उसके साथ सुधरा है। वैसे तो पहले से ही वह देश नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति का अवलम्बन कर रहा है जैसा कि हमारा देश कर रहा है। उसके और हमारे सम्बन्धों में पहले से ज्यादा निकटता आई है, यह बड़ी प्रमत्ता की बात है।

मैं योरोप और अमेरिका की बातों को छोड़कर एशिया और अफ्रीका के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार रखना चाहता हूँ। चाइना का खतरा हमारे ऊपर रहेगा। उसने बांगला देश को उकसाया। पाकिस्तान को वह तरह के हथियार दे रहा है—चाहे नेबो की बात हो, चाहे हवाई जहाज की बात हो, चाहे स्थल सेना की बात हो—वह सभी तरह से उसकी सहायता कर रहा है। उससे आने सम्बन्ध अच्छे बनाने के प्रयत्न में, उसे प्रमत्त करने के प्रयास में, हमें इस बात का ध्यान रखना है कि अन्य देशों से हमारा मतभूटाव न हो, मित्रता के सम्बन्ध न टूटे। पाकिस्तान के बारे में कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं कि उसमें हमें सजग, जागरूक और सतर्क रहने की जरूरत है।

अफ्रीकी देशों से हमारी सद्भावना बढ़ रही है, उनकी सद्भावना हमारे साथ हो रही है, उनका सहयोग हमें मिल रहा है, हमारा सहयोग उन्हें मिल रहा है। अफ्रीका में साम्राज्यवाद समाप्त हो रहा है, कोलो-नियलिज्म समाप्त हो रहा है। वहाँ पर नेशनल डेमोक्रेटिक रेवोल्यूशन हो रहे हैं। हमारे देश में जो नेशनल डेमोक्रेटिक रेवोल्यूशन हुआ, उसका असर भी उन देशों पर उसी तरह से पड़ा जिस तरह से रूसी क्रान्ति का असर संसार के देशों पर पड़ा। फ्रांसीसी क्रान्ति का असर अन्य देशों में लोकतन्त्र की स्थापना पर पड़ा। इसी तरह से जो हमारे देश में लोकतन्त्रारम्भ क्रान्ति चल रही है, उसका प्रभाव अफ्रीका के

देशों पर भी पड़ रहा है। उनसे हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हो रहे हैं, हमारी सद्भावना उन देशों में बढ़ रही है। वे देश भी मुटनिरपेक्षता के नीचे आ रहे हैं। आपकी जिम्मेदारी भी हो जाती है कि जो देश स्वतन्त्र होने जा रहे हैं, स्वाधीन होने जा रहे हैं, उन देशों को आप सहयोग दें, सहायता दें। संसार में परतन्त्र देशों को विदेशी शासन से स्वतन्त्र कराने के लिए आपको सक्रिय सहयोग देना चाहिए, उन्हें आर्थिक सहायता देनी चाहिए। अमेरिका और रूस तो करते ही हैं लेकिन अपने देश पर भी यह जिम्मेदारी है कि विश्व में जहाँ भी आवश्यकता हो, स्वाधीनता के लिए, लोकतन्त्र के लिए, डेमोक्रेटिक सोशलिज्म के लिए हम अवश्य सहयोग दें।

भारत का एक प्रयत्न यह होना चाहिए कि अफ्रीका के जो देश स्वतन्त्र हो रहे हैं, उनकी एकता बनी रहे। साम्राज्यवादी अमेरिका और दूसरे देश उनमें फूट डालने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं उन पर तरह तरह के दबाव डालते हैं। हमें प्रयत्नशील रहना चाहिए कि उन देशों में एकता बनी रहे और वे देश प्रगति करते रहें। आज अफ्रीका के सभी देशों में चाहे मोज़म्बिक हो, लीबिया हो, हाल ही में स्वतंत्र हुआ बोत्सवाना हो, हमारे देश की सद्भावना बढ़ रही है।

हमारे देश की सफल नीति को वजह से सोवियत रूस से हमारी अनिच्छता बढ़ रही है। हाल ही में हमारे मन्त्री जी तुर्की से वापस आये हैं, उससे भी और ईराक से भी हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे बने हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं मन्त्रालय की मांफों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): Sir, while supporting the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, I shall

[Shri B. V. Naik]

first quote Article 51 of our Constitution relating to Directive Principles of our State Policy:

"The State shall endeavour to—

- (a) promote international peace and security;
- (b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations;
- (c) foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another; and
- (d) encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration."

This is there in the Constitution for the last 25—30 years. This has given us a basic ground work for our principles of non-alignment as well as peaceful co-existence which we have followed. But before we lose sight of this Directive Principle of State Policy, as a first point I would urge upon our Minister for External Affairs, that when our Constitution is in the process of review, all these things can be incorporated. It was post atomic era, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki when we drafted this Constitution. The question of disarmament, particularly, the nuclear disarmament has reached such menacing proportions today that I think nuclear disarmament, ultimately aiming at total disarmament, should be incorporated in the Directive Principles of State Policy. I think this amendment should be taken up when we consider the major changes in our Constitution. I think it would be an ideal worthy of attempt.

16.22 hrs.

[SHRI G. VISWANATHAN in the Chair]

Yesterday, in the course of discussions in respect of Defence, there was something which was not said in so many words, but one could understand that the defence policy of this country, our armaments, our preparedness has some object, something which is haunting us. It looks as though Pakistan has been hanging very heavily on our minds. It is true as one of our friends said to-day that our experience in respect of Simla and subsequent pronouncements should keep us on the alert, but, try as I may to convince myself not only at the intellectual level, but on the basis of statistics, figures and investments, I do not think that for this country the principal challenge in the decades to come will be from the West. I am completely conscious of one fact that professing particularly in the sphere of international relations has been the graveyard of the great soul—the late Krishna Menon who over-estimated danger from Pakistan in the year 1962 as against that of China. It has been a graveyard of great intellects. But still the way in which the things have been shaping themselves in recent years, it looks that the Indian economy poised for a take off and, perhaps, the next five to 10 years proving to be the most crucial in our development, the challenge would come not from our neighbour in the West. Now that it has been split into two independent States, the challenge to the way of life, to the sort of polity that we have, to the type of socio-economy that we want to build, to the values that we are trying to cherish, will definitely come from North Western neighbour—China—rather than our blood cousins, near cousins or distant cousins—Pakistan—much less from Bangla Deah. I wonder, with the frame of reference in which we have to formulate our policy, within the broad frame work of the policy of non-alignment and

peaceful co-existence, the most important part according to my personal assessment is that India develops friendly relations with her neighbours as well as other countries in all parts of the world. There was, however, no change with China. China continued to misrepresent, and the rest of it is a part of the quite well-documented report of the External Affairs Ministry.

There is another thing which I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister. This is not only in regard to the word and the wording. I wonder, whether the word non-alignment has come to be something like non-vegetarian. There is no non-vegetarian as such because a non-vegetarian eats chapati, dal, etc. and he also takes mutton, chicken and things like that! I wonder therefore, whether non-alignment is not a negative concept. I am not trying to take it to its logical absurdity. But what I wish to say is whether we should not have a sort of selective alignment, that is to say, choosing our friends, identifying our enemies, trying to guard ourselves against our enemies, standing by our friends, standing up to enemies and taking action and ultimately taking the consequences, as it is well said. Yesterday we discussed about the expenditure of the People's Republic of China which is a story in itself. We have had the advantage of discussing in camera with our Minister for External Affairs Shri Chavan ji. With the expenditure running upto 10 to 11 billion dollars which is about Rs. 10 to Rs. 12 thousand crores plus the present imbalance being caused by the armaments being pushed into the market particularly the conventional armaments, with the equation reached in regard to what they call detente, between the super-powers, I was wondering, whether this country, without declaring any country in the world as an unfriendly nation, should not, by now itself, try to prepare and

equate itself to come to a stage of near-parity if not equality. For this I see no other way except that we have to enter into friendly alliances. I have been making the point at least at the sub-minimal level that it has begun to act. Egypt's Sadat has taken arms from USSR on a large scale. He has made a volte face; he has swapped partners overnight. Now that he has got Suez, the cross-routes of the entire world, which will limit the manoeuvrability of the Russian fleet in the Caspian, now that he wants to go in for financial assistance on a large scale from the West (which they can afford to give to him) he has swapped his partners all of a sudden. When we see the position in China, what we find is that 50 per cent of the most sophisticated navy of the Chinese is built by the Russians, while we have hardly about five or six submarines given by Russia to us. Now that there has been a breach between Russia and China, the Sino-Soviet conflict having become one of the realities of the last part of the twentieth century, has there been any real loss, suffered by China? Actually, they have become stronger in facing Russia. Well, have anybody bombed Cairo because Sadat has changed his postures? Therefore, what I wish to say is, abandoning this concept of non-alignment (which I consider is negative), if you go in for a positive concept of selective alignment, having right friends, making friends, influencing people etc., I think, we would have gained much.

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA (Bara-mulla): Mr. Chairman. Sir, Pakistan is still talking about the U.N. Resolution which is long dead and it is just to defeat the normalisation of relations which we want in the sub-continent.

Then, again, setting up councils in the Pak. occupied Kashmir is only to sabotage our efforts to bring in normalisation in the sub-continent. It is again obstructing us in the construc-

[Shri Syed Ahmed Aga]

tion of a project known as 'Salal Project' and postponement of this project only hinders the development of Kashmir. All these things are done by it not in its own interest but to perpetuate a sort of a tension in the sub-continent. All that we want in the sub-continent is normalisation. Our Indian Government's policy may well be to continue to make an effort to see that Pakistan behaves. We want normalisation in the sub-continent.

The other point that I want to make is this. Under the dynamic leadership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, India has emerged as a power. India is leading the non-alignment movement. It has entered the nuclear field by the nuclear test at Pokhran; it has also launched Aryabhata. India is now self-reliant. Because of all these things, the imperialist forces do not like us and they want to weaken us

I am here reminded of what I had read in newspapers about two months ago. Ford said to *Times Magazine* on 19th January, 1976 This is what exactly Mr Ford had said. I quote him:

"I strongly believe in covert operations and have no hesitation to say so"

Then, again he said:

"I don't know how the President could conduct the foreign policy without a degree of covert operation".

This is something which nobody should ignore because we also see that there are 77 CIA agents according to Paris daily as 'Liberation' who are operating in the 22 countries of Africa. How disastrous they are we all know that. I would lay stress on one thing. Our Government will have to be very vigilant. We cannot be complacent. We have seen what happened in Bangladesh. They were complacent; but we cannot afford to

become complacent. Therefore, our Government will have to be very vigilant.

The other point that I want to make is about the policy of non-alignment. It is not a negative policy. Our policy in fact helped the liberation movement throughout the world. Non-alignment policy is for the just causes. We always stood by the Arabs. We stood by the African liberation movement. Our non-alignment policy is an anti-imperialistic policy. It is not a question of selecting some friends. The entire non-aligned countries are standing together and the non-alignment policy is going to stand the test of the whole world's future. We had stood against racialism, we had helped liberation movements in Africa. We had helped the Arabs.

I am reminded of what happened in the Arab world in spite of our efforts. What happened in the Arab world is something in which we need to be much interested. I know that what will happen in the Arab world—if there is anything wrong—is going to disturb peace. The Sinai Agreement has weakened the cause of the Arabs. It has brought the most powerful superpower America into that area, by giving it first information post in Sinai. The Sinai agreement gives port facilities to Israel. The US gives a huge aid to Israel and now perhaps also to Sadat.

So I do not think this attitude of Egypt today is helpful. It has divided the Arabs and weakened their cause. We also know that the imperialists started the trouble in Lebanon in Beirut. We have seen the trouble between the Falangists and the radicals. They have made it look as if it is a communal trouble. It was not a trouble between Christians and Muslims; it was a trouble between the forward looking people, the progressives, and the Falangists. Israel was also helping Phalangists. All these things are there. So we have to see that we take some positive steps to see

that we plead the cause of the Arabs at the Colombo Conference and for the return of their land and to the Palestinians, a home for them.

We have already seen in the papers—everybody must have read it—that Israel has 13 atom bombs which are of the same destructive power as the Hiroshima bomb. So I do not think that we can be complacent so far as West Asia is concerned. We must see that normalcy returns to West Asia and injustice is removed.

So far as the Colombo Conference is concerned, we are expecting some 90 countries to attend. At this Conference, what we should stress is that the imperialist powers are coming into Asia for exploitation. What is the exploitation? We have mineral wealth in Asia and in the Indian Ocean. They are coming for it. Here I am reminded of a verse of Iqbal. There is the story of a sea pirate. He was arrested and brought before Alexander. Now the conversation begins. The sea pirate stands in chains before Sikander. Sikander says:

सिला तेरा तेरो जजीर या शमशोर है मेरी
कि तेरो राहजनी से तंग हैं दरिया की सहनाई
[सले तूरा तेरी जजोर या शमशोर है
मेरी
के तेरी रोजनी से तंग है दरिया
की तलहानी]

'What should be your reward? Chains or my sword? Because of your piracy, everybody is tired'. Then Kazak says:

सिकन्दर हूँफ तू इसको जवाँमवीँ समझता है
मबारा इस तरह करते हैं हम चरमों को रुसवाई
तेरा पेशा है शफाकी मेरा पेशा है शफाकी
कि हम कजाक हैं दोनों तू मैदानी में दरियाई
[सिकन्दर हूँफ तू इसको जवाँमवीँ समझता है
मेरी समझता है]

कौला अस طرح کرتے ہوں ہم چشموں
کی رسوائی
تورا پوشہ ہے سفاکی مہرا پوشہ
ہے سفاکی
کہ ہم قزاق ہیں دونوں تو میدانی
میں دریائی]

'Oh, Alexander, shame on you! You consider it your bravery that I am in chains before you? Is it correct to degrade your own colleague? Your job is exploitation. My job is exploitation. You belong to the same tribe as mine'.

This is exactly what is the position of the imperialist powers in the Indian Ocean today. I would appeal to our dynamic Minister to see that what we must stress is that these resources which are in Asia, in the Indian Ocean, belong to us, to the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean. Diego Garcia is there to threaten. Then there are the threatened CENTO exercises which are going to take place on the 12th April, a few days hence. All these things are to threaten us. They are trying to use the Indian Ocean as a launching pad for their missiles which have a range of 2,500 miles. All these things are for threatening the Asian countries.

What is the answer to this? The answer is that we must forge a sort of unity of all Asian countries. The Asian countries must be united. The unity of the Asian countries must be the main plank. The main point to be stressed is that through Asian unity we can have a sort of Asian security and also peace in the Indian Ocean which all of us want. Here I am reminded of another verse. I am talking of the vast resources that are there in the Indian Ocean: oil, rubber, jute, tea, diamond, uranium, gold, copper, manganese, iron ore, silver, salt, cobalt, nickel and coal.

[Shri Syed Ahmed Aga]

मुझे बलुचों का गिला बुलबुले नावादा
नकर तू गिरफ्तार हुई अपनी सदा के वायस ।
گل و گلشن کا گلہ بلبل ناہاد
نہ کر
تو گرفتار ہوئی اپنی سدا کے باعث -

We have got minerals here and the imperialists like sea pirates and Alexander are coming to rob us of our riches and therefore all this trouble goes on. Otherwise we should be left alone and we will develop ourselves. They are using Pakistan as a satellite. Pakistan had said: Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace. But small powers cannot dictate to big powers. Pakistan for instance cannot dare talk to the United States; it is at the mercy of the United States. It is not independent in its views. In a moment I am concluding. I hope that Mr. Chavan as a dynamic person would plead the cause of Asian Unity and reassert Asian sovereignty over resources in Asia. With these words, I support the demands.

श्री जगन्नाथ विवेकी (मछलीपुर) :
माननीय समापति जी, मैं विदेश विभाग के अनुदानों की मांगों का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। स्वतंत्रता के तुरन्त बाद हमारे देश ने जिस विदेश नीति को अपनाया उस विदेशी नीति की सफलता हम आज अपने देश में और विश्व में बहुत अच्छी तरह से देख रहे हैं। हमारे देश में जो विदेश नीति अपनाई गई वह, स्वतंत्रता के आन्दोलन के समय में हमारे राष्ट्र के नेताओं ने जो विचार अपनाये थे जो सिद्धान्त अपनाये थे, उसी के अनुरूप है। हमारे देश ने मुटनिरपेक्षता की नीति अपनाई। द्वितीय महायुद्ध के बाद विश्व में एक तीसरा गुट पैदा हुआ वह, जो विश्व में राष्ट्रों के दो गुट हो गए थे उनमें किसी की तरफ न रहेकर, अपने स्वतंत्र विचार जो उचित लगते थे उस पर अपनी नीति निर्धारित करने के लिए स्थापित हुआ। इस नीति का यह परिणाम

हुआ कि प्रथम महायुद्ध, जो 1918 में बर्मे की लड़ाई के साथ समाप्त हुआ था, उस के बीस-बर्ष बीतते-बीतते, वे लड़ने वाली शक्तियाँ फिर से, एटामिक बमों का लेकर, लड़ाई के मैदान में कूब पड़ी। यह दूसरा विश्व महायुद्ध एटामिक बमों की लड़ाई से समाप्त हुआ, जब हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी पर वे बम गिराये गये। उस की समाप्ती के बाद अनेकों राष्ट्रों ने अपने यहां एटामिक शक्ति का अर्जन किया, बमों को बनाया। लेकिन भारत ने अपनी स्वतन्त्रता के बाद जिस नीति पर चलने का निश्चय किया यह उसी नीति का परिणाम है कि 30 वर्षों के बाद भी हम ने ये धानक हथियार नहीं बनाये। भारत के महान नेता पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने प्रारम्भ से ही गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति को अपनाया और वह उसी नीति का परिणाम है कि विश्व में एक-दो नहीं सान बार ऐसे मौके आये जब कि विश्व युद्ध की भांग भडक सकती थी, एटामिक शक्ति के उपयोग से विश्व का संहार हो सकता था, लेकिन भारत ने अपनी आवाज को बुलन्द किया और विश्व को उस भांग की तरफ जाने से रोका। आज भारत की इस नीति की सफलता का ही यह परिणाम है कि हम विश्व का विकास होते हुए देख रहे हैं, दुनिया के अन्दर शान्ति कायम है, जब कि दुनिया के अनेकों देशों के पास एटामिक शक्ति मौजूद है और ये देश भी आज शान्ति की ही बात कर रहे हैं।

हमारे देश की आजादी के पहले विश्व की हालत यह थी कि एक देश का राष्ट्राध्यक्ष दूसरे देश में खुल कर नहीं जा सकता था, सब एक दूसरे से डरते थे। हमें वह दिन अच्छी तरह से याद है जब दूसरा विश्व युद्ध चल रहा था, उस दरमियान जो मित्र राष्ट्र बने हुए थे—अमरीका, रूस और ब्रिटेन, उन के राष्ट्राध्यक्ष—कनेडेट, चर्चिल और

स्टालिन—किसी एक देश में नहीं मिले, यदि मिले तो प्रक्षान्त महासागर में एक जहाज पर मिले थे। लेकिन हमारे देश की स्वतन्त्रता के बाद पं० जवहारलाल नेहरू ने एक नई परम्परा का प्रारम्भ किया, उन्होंने दूसरे देशों में जाना शुरू किया और वह सन्देश दिया कि आज हम देख रहे हैं कि अमरीका और चीन, जो आपस में कभी दोस्त नहीं रहे, उन के नेता भी एक दूसरे के देशों में जा रहे हैं। दूसरे बड़े बड़े राष्ट्र भी एक दूसरे के नजदीक आने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, एक दूसरे को समझने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और परस्पर मिलने का एक अच्छा वातावरण पैदा हो रहा है। इससे आपस में भाई चाग पैदा होता है, आपस में कटुना कम होती है और विश्व में शक्ति का वातावरण बन रहा है। आज जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है—इसका श्रेय-अगर कोई इतिहासकार ईमानदारी से देगा, तो भारतीय नेताओं को मिलना चाहिये, जिन्होंने उसी नीति का अनुसरण किया है, उसी पद्धति को अपनाया है, जिसे अजादी के बाद पं० जवहार लाल नेहरू ने शुरू किया था।

श्रीमन, जब दूसरा विश्व युद्ध समाप्त हुआ, उस वक्त मित्र-राष्ट्र कहे जाने वाले देशों ने इजराइल नाम का एक नया राष्ट्र बनाया। दुनिया भर में जितने यहूदी थे, वे सब बिखरे हुए थे, उनका कोई राष्ट्र नहीं था, लेकिन इन मित्र राष्ट्रों ने उन यहूदियों के लिये इजराइल नाम के राष्ट्र को जन्म दिया। हमारे नेता शुरू से ही इसके विरुद्ध थे, फिनस्तीन के अस्तित्व को एक तरह से समाप्त करने का प्रयास किया गया, हम नहीं चाहते थे कि सम्प्रदाय या जाति के नाम पर कोई राष्ट्र बने, इसी लिये हमने उस समय भी उसका विरोध किया और आज भी उसका विरोध कर रहे हैं। अंग्रेजों ने भी उसी नीति के अनुसार हमारे देश को दो टुकड़ों में बांटा। जो लोग पाकिस्तान बनवाना चाहते थे, उन के सामने उस का

साम्प्रदायिक आधार था, वे उस को एक मुस्लिम राज्य बनाना चाहते थे और वे उस में कामयाब हो गये, लेकिन उसका परिणाम क्या हुआ—आज हमारे देश को अगर कोई खतरा है तो पाकिस्तान से है। चीन भी पाकिस्तान को हमारे विरुद्ध भड़काता है और अमरीका भी पाकिस्तान को हमारे विरुद्ध भड़काता है—इसी कारण आज पाकिस्तान हमारे लिये एक सकट का क्षण बना हुआ है। तीन-तीन बार उसने हमारे देश पर हमला किया, चाहे काश्मीर के बहाने, चाहे कच्छ के रन के लिये, चाहे बगला देश के बहाने। तीनों बार भारत ने उसको हराया। हमारे देश ने उसकी काफ़ी जमीन पर कब्जा किया, लेकिन फिर भी हमने उदारता का व्यवहार किया, उसकी तग़ मिवला का हाथ बढाया। शिमला समझौता हुआ। इतिहास में एक नई मिसाल पैदा की—उसकी 93 हजार फौजों ने हमारी फौज के सामने आत्म-समर्पण किया था, हमने उन फौजों को छोड़ दिया। यह भाग्य की महानता और शक्ति का प्रतीक था, ऐसा उदाहरण दुनिया के इतिहास में नहीं मिलता, जब कि किसी देश ने जीती हुई घर्ती को, आत्म-समर्पण की हुई फौजों को इस तरह से छोड़ा हो। पाकिस्तान अब फिर से जो हरकते कर रहा है—यह खतरा हमारे देश के नेता पहले भी समझते थे, लेकिन फिर भी हमारे देश ने अपनी सहनशीलता और उदारता का परिचय दिया। आज विश्व के अन्दर जो सकट पैदा हुए हैं—उसके दो उदाहरण हमारे सामने हैं—पहला उदाहरण इजराइल का है और दूसरा उदाहरण पाकिस्तान का है। इन दोनों देशों को यह मिल रही है—अमरीका से, चीन से। जहाँ तक अमरीका का सम्बन्ध है, आप जानते हैं उसके पास अपार धन है, उसने दुनिया के बाजारों पर कब्जा कर रखा है, अविकसित देशों का शोषण कर रहा है, अपने सी०आई०ए० के पैसाचिक कार्यों के द्वारा उन देशों के

[श्री नारोडकर द्विजेश्वरी]

नेताओं की हत्या कराने की कार्यवाही कर रहा है, जो उस की राय से सहमत नहीं है। और इस से वह चाहे अपनी धाक कुछ दिन भले ही जमा ले, लेकिन विश्व के इतिहास में उस का नाम कलंकित हो रहा है और वह दिन दूर नहीं हैं जब कि उस का नाम इतिहास के पन्नों से मिटने वाला है। अमरीका का साम्राज्यवाद ही बल सकेगा चाहे उस के पास कितनी ही सम्पत्ति हो। हम ने देखा जिस अंग्रेजी साम्राज्य में कभी सूर्य अस्त नहीं होता था उस की आज क्या हालत हो गई है। सूर्य उदय होने तक उस की स्थिति नहीं रह गई है। जो इसी तरह से अमरीका आज भले ही अपने धन दौलत के बल पर दुनिया पर अतंक जमाने तथा सी०आई०ए० के द्वारा दूसरे देशों के राष्ट्राध्यक्षों को गिराने की माजिग करें, दूसरे देशों पर अतंक जमाने की कोशिश करे, लेकिन यह अधिक दिन चलने वाला नहीं है।

17.00 hrs.

दूसरा राष्ट्र चीन है, जिस के लिये मैं क्या कहूँ, आज अमरीका को छोड़ दिया जाये तो उस का और कोई साथी नहीं है। उस की जो अतंक भरी नीति है, विश्व राजनीति में जिस प्रकार वह उपद्रव और गुंडागर्दी का सहारा लेता है, वही गुंडागर्दी आज हम देश में दिखाई पड़ रही है वह आज अमरीका का साथी बना हुआ है। बात साम्यवाद और समाजवाद की करता है, लेकिन जीपति देश के साथ गठबन्धन किये हुए है। ऐसे चीन का कोई पुरसाहाय नहीं होगा। हमें विश्वास है कि चीन की जो नीति माओ-त्से तुंग की है वह चीन में देर भरे परिवर्तन लायेगी और वह चीन, जिस का सदा भारत से सम्बन्ध रहा है, कभी भारत और चीन में लड़ाई नहीं हुई, उस में ऐसी स्थिति आयेगी कि उसे अपनी कुनीतियों का फल मिलेगा। एक समय था जब कि हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई का नारा लगाया गया लेकिन आज वही

चीन भारत के साथ इस तरह का व्यवहार कर रहा है जो निन्दनीय है। हमारे नेता चीन के प्रति मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाते हैं, लेकिन चीन अपना दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। उस की परिस्थितियाँ हैं। लेकिन हमें उम्मीद है कि चीन भी अपनी इस नीति में परिवर्तन लाने के काबिल किसी दिन बन जायेगा।

हमारा कहना तो सिर्फ अपने देश के बारे में है। हम ने अपनी पड़ोसी देशों के साथ, चाहे वह दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया के हों, चाहे अफ्रीका के राष्ट्र हों, चाहे दक्षिण अमरीका के राष्ट्र हों, ऐसा व्यवहार किया कि आज उस की प्राप्ति दुनिया व्यापक हो रही है कि दुनिया के जो मदनमिन्न राष्ट्र हैं, जो अभी थोड़े दिनों पहले ही स्वतंत्र हैं उन राष्ट्रों के नेतागण हमारे भारत की तरफ आ रहे हैं, दिवनी की तरफ दौड़ आ रहे हैं। उन को अरोगा हमारे देश की प्रधान मंत्री पर है जिस से मजदूर और सहायता लेने के लिये वह दिवनी की तरफ दौड़ रहे हैं। अब वह हमारे देशों की तरफ नहीं जा रहे हैं। इस बात से पता चलता है कि हमारे देश की नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की नीति में, हमारे भारत की उस पुरानी नीति में, कितनी शक्ति है।

हम इस बात को भी जानते हैं कि हमारे देश की आजादी के पहले स्वतन्त्र राष्ट्रों की संख्या 52 थी। और आज हमारे देश की आजादी के बाद उन की संख्या बढ़ कर 144 हो गई है। और जो राष्ट्र स्वतंत्र हुए हैं वह कोई युद्ध करके स्वतंत्र नहीं हुए हैं, बल्कि जिस तरह से भारत स्वतंत्र हुआ है उस का अनुसरण कर के उन में एक शक्ति आयी है, एक आत्म-बल आया है जिस के भरोसे वह इतने संगठित हो गये हैं कि आज स्वतंत्र राष्ट्रों की संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है।

इस के परिणामतः कुछ निरपेक्ष राष्ट्रों की संख्या भी बढ़ रही है, जिस का अनुभव भारत बना हुआ है, जिस के नेतृत्व में सब लोग एक ग्य हो कर के समय समय पर विचार करते हैं और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति पर प्रभाव डालते हैं। इस प्रकार हम देखते हैं कि हमारे देश की जो वैदेशिक नीति है उस का परिणाम न केवल हमारे देश के लिये बल्कि विश्व के लिये बड़ा शानिदायी और कल्याणकारी दिशाई पड रहा है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी विदेश नीति का पूरी तरह समर्थन करने हुए इन अनुदानों की मांग का समर्थन करना हूँ।

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI BIPINPAL DAS): Mr. Chairman, Sir, my senior colleagues will reply to the debate tomorrow and therefore, I would only touch on a few points. It is the unique feature of our foreign policy that over the years it has evolved as almost a national policy, which has general acceptance over the whole country.

This has evolved over the years and has matured over the years. But sometimes, I am surprised to find some small groups here and there who try to interpret our policy of non-alignment in one way and there are some others who try to interpret it in another way. It is also surprising that some small groups in the country tend to be the spokesmen of some other Countries and try to push us about sometimes push us in this direction or push us in that direction. This tendency is there in the country confined to some groups, as I have already said.

But I want to make it clear that we follow a policy of our own guided by two basic considerations. One consideration is that we are guided by certain ideals and certain principles

like world peace, principles of co-existence, liberation of colonial people, humanism, equality, justice and so on and so forth. These are certain ideals which we have acquired even during the freedom struggle under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi. And these ideals and principles guide our policy. This is one aspect. The other consideration which guides our foreign policy is our national interest. I think, there is no country in the world whose foreign policy is not guided by their own national interest. Therefore, these are the two major considerations which guide our foreign policy. I must make it clear that we are not pro-some body, pro-some country or anti-some country. If we are anything, we are pro-India. We have to serve the interest of this country in the international field consistent with the basic principles that we have accepted. That is one of the points I wanted to make clear because I see this tendency here and there.

My friend, Mr. Nank, who is not here, has propounded one new philosophy today. After practising non-alignment for 30 years, he now comes forward and says, have a policy of selective alignment. Honestly speaking, I have failed to understand this great philosophy. I do not want to enter into arguments but I want to say emphatically that non-alignment is not a negative policy. Gandhiji proved that non-violence was not a negative policy. It was a positive policy. It gave shape to a positive weapon with which the colonial people could win freedom. This has been shown. Similarly, over the last 28 years or so, we have shown it and it has been proved and establishment that non-alignment is not a negative policy. It is a positive policy; it is a dynamic policy; it is going forward, daily gaining strength and therefore, I do not understand why he is saying that it is a negative policy. At the same time, it is not neutralism or it is not something like pacifism. It is an active policy; it is a positive policy; it

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

aims at certain objectives like world peace through friendship and co-operation among nations based on equality and mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and all those principles. So much blood and flesh has been put into this whole philosophy of non-alignment over the years that I do not think it needs any further elucidation today.

Prof. Mukherjee has said that we do not know our friends and enemies. We do know. But how do we define it? Now, we follow certain principles and we adopt certain policies based on certain principles and guided by our national interest. Those who agree with us, certainly they are our friends and those who do not agree with us, they are just on the other side. That is true. But this is not a permanent feature in world politics. It never becomes a permanent feature. There are people who agree with us on certain matters, certainly we go together, we work together and we are friends. There are people who may not agree with us. We constantly and continuously try to win them over and to make them understand our point of view. So, this process goes on. It is an approach of cooperation. It is not an approach of hostility. We do not approach any country, even if we disagree with that country, with a spirit of hostility.

Even with respect to a single country, there are areas where we may agree, and areas where we may not. Where we agree, we cooperate. We go ahead. Where we do not agree, we try to understand each other's point of view. And this effort goes on. And this is the only way, we believe, to achieve world peace based on friendship and cooperation among nations, on the basis of equality and mutual respect.

I do not want to go into the question of our image abroad, because our Foreign Minister, in his speech while

intervening during the debate on the Presidential Address, made it clear that the image abroad would be as it was inside. If we are strong inside, socially and politically, if we are stable and strong politically certainly our image abroad will become quite bright. Therefore, this question need not be raised. If we can build up a stable political system, a strong economy and a nation of discipline and order, certainly automatically it will be projected outside. And our image will grow brighter and brighter.

Some people say that in view of the developments that have taken place in the world during the last 20 years or so, non-alignment perhaps is no longer a valid or relevant policy, and that its validity and relevance are over. Some people want to say that because the centres of power have cracked and are breaking up and new centres of power are emerging slowly in the world scene, non-alignment is no longer valid and relevant. But I do not agree with this. As long as military blocks exist, as long as military alliances exist and foreign military bases exist in other countries and such forces as colonialism and imperialism continue to operate, and also causes for the conflicts in the world exist in the context of great power rivalry, I think non-alignment will continue to be a valid and relevant policy to be pursued by those who want to build a new world order based on peace, freedom, economic cooperation, equality and mutual understanding. Of late, we have noticed that some dangers have appeared. Some attempts are being made to dilute the principles of non-alignment, the criteria on the basis of which the non-aligned movement was built up. They are trying to divide the non-aligned countries; and some forces are even trying to infiltrate into the non-aligned movement. In recent years, this danger has assumed quite an amount of seriousness. And we have to guard against it. Non-alignment not only continues to be a valid and relevant policy. Not only it is a positive policy, but it has a trans-

dous potentiality and it is a creative policy. This policy alone will ultimately be able to contribute towards world peace based on equality and justice. Therefore, any attempt from any quarter, trying to dilute the principles of non-alignment, trying to divide the non-aligned group and trying to weaken the group from inside by infiltration, must be combated and guarded against; and we hope that in the coming summit conference in Colombo, all non-aligned countries will be quite alive to this danger and will show sufficient unity and solidarity to guard against danger and not allow this movement to be diluted or weakened by any force.

I do not want to go into the factors that constitute a threat to world peace, like colonialism, imperialism, spheres of influence, military alliances and blocs. These have been the factors and some of them still remain. Colonialism perhaps is on its last legs. But in some form it still remains. But the most serious factor which still operates and which continues to be a serious threat to world peace, is the economic disparity among nations

Therefore, the non-aligned group has taken up this issue in all seriousness, and when the Foreign Ministers met at Lima last August, they made it very clear that they would strive for a new world order, based on economic equality, equality among the nations by narrowing down the disparity through co-operation among developing countries and also through co-operation between developing and developed countries. This was the approach adopted by the non-aligned group at the Lima Conference, and it has become a very important task before the non-aligned group to work for a new economic order, based on equality and justice.

Guided by these principles, we in India have also taken steps in recent years in this direction, particularly in the direction of developing more and more co-operation between us

and other developing countries. Co-operation between developing and developed countries is already there. It is now co-operation between developing countries themselves.

In the past we were mostly at the receiving end in getting aid and assistance from others for our development. Even today we receive some aid and assistance from developed countries. Their co-operation continues to be necessary. But today we have emerged also as a country which can lend its co-operation to other developing countries for their development. This is a new development that has taken place. I should say that this economic co-operation has become a new component of our foreign policy. I must make it clear that by economic co-operation I do not mean commercial co-operation or trading co-operation. Because, trading co-operation has been a feature of foreign policy for centuries. This has been the basis of international relations for centuries.

In what form is our economic co-operation? One form of assistance is lending the services of our experts. The House would be glad to know that today India has the third largest reservoir of trained man-power. We require them for our own development. But when the other developing countries are asking for the assistance of experts, we are lending them as far as possible, subject to our own needs and requirements. So, lending the services of experts of developing countries is one form of assistance.

Then, there is consultancy services. Again, the House would be happy to know that although we are still backward, although we are still struggling very hard to develop ourselves, although we are still fighting poverty, we have been able to develop some of our consultancy services, whose competence today can be compared with any consultancy service anywhere in the world. And some-

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

of these consultancy services that we have built up over the years have been able to get contracts or business in other countries through open competition with developed countries. Though we have not made very good progress, still we have made some progress in this matter of lending our help and co-operation to other friendly countries.

Then, there are joint ventures, some industries, some paper mills, textile mills and things like that. Our private sector is co-operating with their private sector and our State sector is co-operating with their State sector and jointly, through collaboration, we are building up industries in friendly countries which have asked for this kind of co-operation.

Then, a new concept has come into existence, which is of recent origin, and that is joint ventures in third countries. Some countries have vast capital resources, some others large man-power and still some others plenty of raw materials. Those countries which have capital and man-power build up new ventures in a third country which has plenty of raw materials.

This is the pattern in which we are making progress, developing economic co-operation with friendly countries, developing countries and non-aligned countries, and this is a new component of our foreign policy.

Formerly the experts used to be directly recruited by the foreign Governments, but now we are trying to regulate this so that there is no brain drain. If any foreign Government wants doctors or engineers, they write to us. We have a register of these technical people. We call them for interview, and the foreign representatives select the people that they want on term and conditions agreeable to us.

Shri Dinesh Singh said very rightly that there is need to have more co-ordination among the different Ministries in the Government and that we have to build up some area specialists and discipline specialists. We are not blind to it. Now in the Foreign Ministry itself we have developed an exclusive division on economic co-operation, whose volume of work is expanding every day. We are certainly seeing how we should proceed further to meet the situation. We are quite alive to this need. We are in agreement with the suggestion and are trying to do our best in the matter, because in the coming years, I am quite clear in my mind, this particular function of our Government in maintaining relations with other friendly countries will increase in volume and intensity. Therefore, we have to pay enough attention to the question of co-ordinating the activities of various Ministries and building up specialists in different areas and disciplines.

We have also built up cultural co-operation with various countries in various ways. I do not want to take the time of the House, but I may give a rough idea of the fields in which we have done this. They are: exchange of visitors, cultural delegations and exhibitions, lectures, Nehru awards, orientation programmes, Indian Centre for Africa, essay competitions in foreign countries, presentation of books, chairs and centres of Indian studies abroad, Indian cultural centres abroad etc. These are the ways in which we are trying to develop cultural contracts and relations with other friendly countries under the auspices of the Indian Council of Cultural Relations.

Sir, we are giving some importance to Africa for various reasons. Firstly, it is a continent which is just waking up. Most of the countries in Africa have become independent within the last 15 years or so. They want to

build their countries, develop their countries. Secondly, continentwise, the African contingent is the largest in the U.N. There are 46 African Members already and when Angola also becomes a Member, it will be 47. And they are playing a very important role in the General Assembly and, other committees of the U.N. Thirdly, all these countries are non-aligned. They have an organisation called the Organisation of African Unity. This OAU in the charter itself has laid down that they are committed to the policy of non-alignment. This is the only continent where all the newly independent countries are committed to the policy of non-alignment.

This is also the continent where the last battles against colonialism are going to be fought. Although Mozambique, Angola and other Portuguese colonies are free, we can see very well that the last battles against colonialism operating in the form of racialism and apartheid are going to be fought on the soil of Africa. That is also a matter of importance to us. We have been consistently supporting these people against racialism and apartheid. We have also given assistance to the freedom struggles as far as possible. They have great regard for this country. After visiting some of these countries, I got the impression that they have tremendous regard for India firstly because of Mahatma Gandhi—almost everywhere people know Mahatma Gandhi, because he was the first man to raise the banner of revolt against racial discrimination; they remember it. Secondly, they know Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the great leader of non-alignment, the great leader of freedom struggles; and thirdly, they have a tremendous regard for our Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi. You will be happy to know that although there was some criticism against our emergency or internal affairs in some Western Press—nobody from the developing countries, non-aligned countries has criticised us. On

the contrary, at least those countries which I have visited, every one of them (also those countries which the Foreign Minister has visited) has supported us in the steps which the Prime Minister has taken to bring about order and discipline in the country. This only indicates the amount of faith they have in this country, in the leadership of this country and in the policy that we pursue in this country.

This continent is also important because it has tremendous potentialities—very rich countries but not yet developed fully. So, economically speaking it has tremendous potentiality; politically speaking, it has tremendous possibilities, and that is why, I said in the beginning, we give sufficient importance to this continent and we are trying to build our relations, as intimate as possible, with the countries of this continent.

Something was said about Angola. I think Prof. Mukerjee said that we had decided to recognise the Government of Angola only after the visit of President Nyerere. This is not true. President Nyerere's visit had nothing to do with our decision to recognise the Government of Angola. As a matter of fact, we recognised the independence of Angola immediately after they became independent. Then we took a little time for assessment. We had so many things to consider, and that naturally took little time. But I don't think we were very late; we were not too late. As a matter of fact, majority of the countries of the world followed us. And therefore, to say that we waited for somebody to advise us, to educate us is not fair on the part of a learned Member like Prof. Mukerjee. He also said that our diplomatic staff failed to report to us properly or they did not send us their assessment. They continued to send us their assessment and their reports regularly. The Government took a little time, because

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

we had to examine so many things, so many factors, and therefore, it is not correct to say that our diplomatic staff failed in this regard.

About Mozambique, Prof. Mukerjee made an unfortunate remark which naturally I did not relish. Most probably he has not gone through the statement which I made in the House. He said, "what is this? Only Rs. 9 lakhs?" Rs. 9 lakhs we offered as an immediate measure, as a token help to the Commonwealth fund. But I made it very clear in my statement that we were committed to give a larger assistance to Mozambique; we were only waiting for the reports of the Secretary-General, UN, Secretary General of the Commonwealth and also from the Government of Mozambique as regards priority of their requirements. Unless we know the priority requirements, unless we know what is the total requirement from the UN and the Commonwealth, naturally we cannot make an estimate of what amount of help we should give. And therefore to say that we gave only Rs. 9 lakhs—a very small help—he just laughed at it—is not fair. This was only a token contribution. We are yet to make a major contribution and we are waiting for necessary information from the sources concerned.

Some friends have made some adverse remarks about our diplomatic cadre not being very competent, not well trained, not doing their job very properly not tuned to the needs and aspirations of this country or the philosophy or conditions of this country. All kinds of things were said by people here. If you permit me, I would like to make a few remarks on this question, because this is a very important matter. The diplomatic cadre is the working machinery. If you run them down all the time, demigrate them and call them unpatriotic, I think, it is not fair. I think Mr. Mavalankar—he is not here

—objected to the absence of the Prime Minister in the House. But now after making his speech—he came here only to make his speech—he ran away. He did not have the patience to wait and listen to our reply about his remarks. It is not fair on the part of Mr. Mavalankar to have run down our diplomatic staff like this.

The Indian Foreign Service was created in 1946 as a specialised service for conduct of the whole range of India's foreign relations, political, consular, commercial, cultural, and has been functioning successfully for nearly three decades. As the diplomatic work of the Foreign Service forms the base for all its functional tasks, whether they be political, commercial or publicity, it is ensured that the Foreign Service officers are adequately trained with emphasis on (i) sound knowledge of our country, its institutions, its cultural heritage and the genius of its people; (ii) correct understanding of its problems, needs and objectives; (iii) correct appreciation of our basic policies and (iv) adaptability to foreign environment. An officer of the IFS is, through a series of training programmes, enabled to keep himself informed of all developments and current thinking in the Government.

17.31 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

This is the general outline that I have given. This is how we try to build up the cadre. As I said the other day, in the other house, it is not simply the UPSC examination and a little training at Mussoorie. There is a very elaborate programme of training in all aspects with which they should be acquainted so that they can function effectively in foreign countries. May be, one or two individuals may fail. That happens everywhere, in any community, in any service. That does not mean that we have not taken steps to properly build up this cadre.

I do not want to take the time of the house by reading out in detail the training programmes that we have taken up in order to build up the foreign service.

Regarding expenditure on our Missions abroad, some hon. Members have made remarks. I would like to place some facts before the House so that the House may know the correct position. Some people feel that our Missions abroad are very expensive, that we spend too much money on them and that we are not doing anything to economise expenditure. We have taken a number of steps to economise expenditure. But, at the same time, one should remember that there is a world-wide inflation. The cost of living has gone up everywhere tremendously. In spite of whatever steps we have taken to economise and cut down expenditure, the opposite factors appearing in other countries nullify these efforts and neutralise these efforts. Therefore, our efforts to economise and cut down expenditure may not have resulted in substantial savings. But even then, I think, we have been able to keep our expenditure on our Missions abroad at the absolute minimum.

That is all I would like to say. I do not think I should burden the House by reading out all these details, the facts and figures. I think, I have covered some of the points raised by the hon. Members.

Mr. Mavalankar, you were not here. I said, you criticised the Prime Minister's absence in the House, but you yourself came to the House to make a speech and left the House after making the speech.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): I never remain absent. I listen to practically all the speeches. But today, I had to attend the executive committee meeting of the Indian Parliamentary Group here. That is why I was absent.

259 L.S.—9

श्री राजबेब सिंह (जीनपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों पर विचार करते समय यह स्वाभाविक है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रंगमंच पर दुनिया के देशों की गतिविधियाँ सामने आ जाती हैं। इस सदन में आज दिन भर इस पर चर्चा हुई जिसमें पावर ब्लॉक्स की भी चर्चा की गई और दूसरी तथ्यात्मक चर्चाएँ हुई।

आज जो हमारी विदेश नीति है, मैं समझता हूँ कि आजादी की लड़ाई के समय जो हमारी नीति थी, उसी के समान है, उसी की नकली है। उस समय हमारे जो नेता थे, आजादी मिलने के बाद वे ही सरकार में आये और बड़ी पालिसी जो मंचर्स के समय थी, उसी पर उन्होंने चलने का प्रयास किया, दूसरे देशों के प्रति उसी नीति को कायम रखा।

यहाँ पर पावर-ब्लॉक्स की बान कही गई है। यह ठीक है दुनिया दो पावर ब्लॉक्स में बँटी हुई है—लेकिन मैं ऐसा नहीं मानना। आप इसको इस तरह से देखिये—एक तरफ सोवियत रशिया है, उसे एक पावर ब्लॉक का नेता माना जाता है। पूर्वी यूरोप के कुछ देश और दुनिया के कुछ अन्य देश उसके कहने में चलते हैं, उसकी आइडियोलोजी में विश्वास रखते हैं, उसकी आइडियोलोजी के साथ रिश्ता समझ कर चलने की कोशिश करते हैं, कुरबानी करते हैं—यह एक ब्लॉक है। दूसरा ब्लॉक पूँजीवादी देशों का है, जिसका नेता अमरीका कहा जाता है। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि आज अमरीका का वह सोलिड ब्लॉक नहीं है, जिस तरह का सोलिड ब्लॉक रशिया का है। ऐसी बड़न सी कन्स्ट्रिब हैं जो अमरीका के साथ हैं, लेकिन अमरीका का उतना प्रभाव उन पर नहीं है। उदाहरण के तौर पर पाकिस्तान को लीजिये—पाकिस्तान में चीन के कहने का ज्यादा असर

[श्री राजवैद्य सिंह]

होता है, अमरीका के कहने का कम असर होता है। यूरोप के देश, जैसे फ्रांस, बेस्ट बर्न, हालैंड—इन देशों पर अमरीका का कोई ज्यादा प्रभाव नहीं है। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि वे अमरीका के ही पीछे चलें। फ्रांस में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की ताकत बढ़ रही है और लोग समझते हैं कि आगे चल कर वे शासन में बैठेंगे। इसी तरह इटली में भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की ताकत बढ़ रही है। यह समय दूर नहीं है जब कि वहाँ के शासन का स्वल्प कम्युनिस्ट होया, इससे आज अमरीका बहुत चबरा रहा है। इसी तरह से कुछ आन्वीय सदस्यों ने बतलाया कि अफ्रीका में ऐसे अनेकों छोटे-छोटे देश हैं जो अपनी स्वतंत्र नीति के आधार पर चल रहे हैं। हमारे उप-विदेश मंत्री जी भी अभी बगता रहे थे—यू०एन०ओ० में अफ्रीकी देशों का काफी महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है। गूट-निरपेक्ष देशों की संख्या दुनिया में बढ़ती जा रही है।

मैं एक चीज जानता हूँ—आज से दस वर्ष पहले जो हमारी विदेश नीति थी, वह कमबोर मालूम होती थी, लेकिन आज मजबूत मालूम हो रही है। ऐसा क्यों है? ऐसा इसलिये है कि आज हमारे पास ताकत है। जिस समय मैं आपके सामने ऐसी बात कहता हूँ तो मुझे डी० बेल्लेरा की याद आती है—वह कहा करते थे—युष्मन के साथ हाथ बिलाते के लिये तैयार रहो, लेकिन हाथ बिलाते समय दूसरे हाथ की संयुक्तियाँ रिवाल्वर पर होनी चाहियें, ताकत के साथ हाथ बिलाना चाहिए। जहाँ तक ताकत का सम्बन्ध है, हमारा देश प्रधान मंत्री के नेतृत्व में बंगला देश की लड़ाई के समय अपनी ताकत दिखाता चुका है, 14 दिनों के अन्दर इतना बड़ा देश आबाद हुआ, दुनिया में ऐसी बिसाल आपकी नहीं मिलेगी। 94 हजार प्रीजियों के आत्म-समर्पण की बिसाल आपकी नहीं मिलेगी। इतना ही नहीं, उनकी जीती हुई अर्ध-न हम ने उनको बुला कर बापक डॅ.,

उन्होंने हम से प्रार्थना नहीं की, लेकिन हम ने बिना किसी मुद्दाबन्ध के उनके लोगों को छोड़ दिया। यह हमारे उदारता और ताकत की निशानि है। दुनिया ने देखा है—हम ने अहितकारक, एंटाभिक एक्सप्लोजन किया—लेकिन उसके पीछे हमारा उद्देश्य स्पष्ट था, मानवजाति के लाभ के लिये हम उसका उपयोग करना चाहते थे। अगर हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे विदेश नीति कामयाब हो तो हमें अपनी ताकत को बनाना होगा। ताकत आती है—अनुशासन से, प्रीडक्शन से—कल-मार्कवालों की पैदावार से, खेती की पैदावार से, अगर हमारी ताकत बढ़ेगी तो दुनिया हमारी बातों को सुनेगी, हमारी बातें दुनिया को मीठी लगेंगी।

हमारी विदेश नीति के दो पाये हैं— एक नान-एलाइन्मेंट की पालिसी और दूसरे—की-एक्विस्टेन्स की पालिसी। बोड़े दिन पहले यह अच्छी नहीं लगती थी, लेकिन आज स्थिति बदल रही है और बड़ी खुशी की बात यह है कि नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज बहुत तेजी के साथ एक जुट हो कर आगे बढ़ रहे हैं, और यह बड़ा मजबूत लक्षण है कि हमारे ही देश में बोड़े दिनों के बाद एक कानफ्रेंस होने जा रही है। नान-एलाइन्ड कन्ट्रीज जितने हैं उनके म्यूज मीडिया का कोऑर्डिनेशन बन जाय, हम विशा में हमारे नेताओं ने जो काम किया है वह बड़ा ही मराहनीय है।

चीन की शुरू में हम से दोस्ती थी, लेकिन पता नहीं कौन सी बात ही गई जो हमने हमारे ऊपर हमला कर दिया। कोई बिबा पड़ी नहीं हुई, कोई बाद-बिबाद नहीं हुआ और न ही यह कहा कि आपकी और हमारी बातचीत खराब है। इस तरह की कोई बात नहीं हुई। कानफ्रेंस कोई होती, बिल कर बैठते कोई बात होती और अगर कोई सरकार होती तो उनका हमला समझ में आ सकता था। लेकिन बिना किसी प्रीडक्शन के उसने

हमला किया। उसकी भी एक वजह है और वह है उसकी ऐक्सपैक्निस्ट की भावना। चीन के पश्चिम और उत्तर में रूस पड़ना है और दक्षिण में हिन्दुस्तान पड़ता है और पूर्व में पेरसिक फ़ोशन है। चीन फैलना चाहता है। लेकिन कितना जाय? उसके सामने कबने का सवाल है। थोड़ी सी पाकिस्तान की वाउन्ट्री पड़ती है। पाकिस्तान से उसने जमीन ले ली है जो कि पाकिस्तान की नहीं है बल्कि श्रीनूपाइड काश्मीर की है और एक दिन उन्हें वह छोड़नी पड़ेगी। तो चीन क्या करेगा? वह तो हम से इसलिये दुश्मनी करता है कि हम उसके लिये दीवार बन कर खड़े हैं, उसको धामे नहीं बढ़ने देते। रूस से भी इसीलिये दुश्मनी है कि वह दीवार की तरह खड़ा है और उसको बढ़ने नहीं देता। मैं तो यह फ़ील करता हूँ कि जो हमारे नेता बार-बार कहते हैं कि हम तो चीन से बात करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन वह हम से नहीं करना चाहता, यह सब हमें कुछ अच्छा नहीं लगता। कुछ नेशनल इंग्लिट सी मालूम होती है इसमें। वह हम से बात नहीं करता और हम बार-बार कहते हैं कि हम उससे दोस्ती चाहते हैं। आज भी वह हमारे बीचों और नागा विद्रोहियों को ट्रेनिंग दे रहा है, उन्हें हथियार दे रहा है। और बंगला देश में भी कूराक़ात में उसने हाथ बटाया है। तो इन सब बातों को देख कर भी हम बार-बार यह कहें कि हम उससे दास्ती करना चाहते हैं, इसमें मुझे कुछ नेशनल इ्यूमिलियेशन सा मालूम होता है। मैं अपने नेताओं से अनुरोध करता कि वह इस मामले में चुप रहें तो ज्यादा अच्छा है क्योंकि देश इसे पसन्द नहीं करता।

थोड़ी सी डिप्लोमेटिक सर्विसेज की बात आई। पंडित नेहरू जिस समय विदेश नीति के बारे में बोलते थे, उस समय मैं हाउस में था, उन्होंने कहा था कि वह जो डिप्लोमेट्स होते हैं और इनकी जो खूबसूरत बीजियां होती हैं वह देशों में बड़ा अच्छा काम करती हैं।

अगर इस तरह से हम सोचते हैं तब तो हमारे देश में दो, तीन जातियाँ ही हैं जिनको डिप्लोमेटिक सर्विसेज में रखना पड़ेगा। हमें इसको रिवाइज करना पड़ेगा। यह अपोइंटमेंट्स मिशनरी जील के लोगों को मिलने चाहिये, पोलिटिकल अपोइंटमेंट्स होने चाहिए, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ। चीने की सर्विसेज तो रहेंगी, जैसे क़स्ट्रै सेक्रेटरी, सेक्रेण्ड सेक्रेटरी। लेकिन जहाँ तक ऐम्बेसेडर्स का सवाल है वह अपोइंटमेंट पोलिटिकल होना चाहिए। कई दफ़ा यह भी सवाल आया, मैं उस देश का नाम भूल रहा हूँ, जहाँ कू हुआ, लेकिन हमारे राजदूत महोदय यहाँ उस बात की कोई खबर नहीं भेज सके इसलिये कि वह हंटिंग पर गये हुए थे। उनको हंटिंग में ज्यादा शौक है, और उस देश की पोलिसी में कम इंटररेस्ट था।

वेस्ट एशिया के मुल्कों के सम्बन्ध में मेरा कहना है कि वह देश हमारे साथ हैं इसलिये कि हमारी क्रोरेज पोलिसी कंसिस्टेंट रही है, उसमें कोई बदलाव समय समय पर नहीं हुआ है। इसलिये उन्हें यकीन हो गया है, वेस्ट एशिया के देशों को, जहाँ कि पाकिस्तान दिन रात कोशिश कर रहा है, ईरान में काफ़ी कोशिश कर रहा है, लेकिन तब भी ईरान से हमारी दोस्ती है। ईराक और सीरिया की बात दूसरी है, वह सोगलिस्ट कन्ट्री हैं उनसे हमारी दोस्ती है। लेकिन और कन्ट्री भी हैं जिनको सोशलिज्म से कोई मतलब नहीं है और वह कभी धमरीका के साथ थे, आज पाकिस्तान के कहने पर हमारे खिलाफ़ जा सकते थे, लेकिन हमारी बैदेशिक नीति को देख कर के वह हमारे साथ रहे हैं और हमें नुकसान पहुंचाना नहीं चाहते हैं।

अन्त में मैं एक चीज और कह देना चाहता हूँ। जिस तरह से पेट्रोलियम कन्ट्री ने, जोकि कूड प्रायल एक्सपोर्ट करते हैं,

[श्री राजशेखर सिंह]

एक प्रागेनाइजेशन बनाया है और इससे बहुत से डिप्लोमेटिक मूब सीक करते रहते हैं, उसी तरह से मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हमारा देश जो चीनी पैदा करता है, आइरन-ओर पैदा करता है और इसी तरह से बहुत से दूसरे देश जो आइरन-ओर और चीनी पैदा करते हैं वे आपस में मिल कर एक प्रागेनाइजेशन बनाएं और दुनिया के दूसरे देशों पर डिप्लोमेटिक प्रेसर डालें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA (Banarach): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the policy of non-alignment and co-existence has paid rich dividends in the past. It is increasingly paying rich dividend in the present and it has stood the test of time. Those who advocate the creation of a third bloc to which India should be a party or creation of an international socialist forum are ignoring the facts of international life. Things do not move in an ideological group or rut. China is a socialist country claiming its adherence to Leninism and Marxism. So is the USSR. But they are diametrically opposed to each other, posing for confrontation. Therefore, as expounded by Shri B. B. Das, policy of non-alignment is not a policy of international isolation. It is not a political or international sanyas. It is a dynamic concept which reserves the right of choice to decide every question on its merits and demerits, make practical adjustment, of course, subject to or within the framework of the basic policy of India, as it stands for anti-colonialism, anti-racialism and for the creation of an international society which should be free from exploitation, free from imperialism and free from economic domination.

Now, without going into these ideological aspects of the foreign policy, I would like to submit what has been achieved and what has been lost during the year 1975. Our ties with our friends have become stronger. Those who were hostile, they have become less hostile. Those who were neutral, they have tilted their attitude towards us. Take the case of Nepal. It is a country which is our immediate neighbour. It is governed by a system of monarchy. If we follow the ideological affiliation, then probably there would be fear and anxiety in the minds of the people of Nepal and we would not gain anything thereby. The way in which outstanding problems between India and Nepal had been successfully solved gives credit to our Foreign Minister. Mr. Chavan, who always has put the stamp of his strong commonsense and sense of pragmatism. Whatever he has touched, he has adorned.

Now take the case of West and East Asian countries. They have different systems. They have different ideologies but by our persistent adherence to the policy of non-alignment, which means non-interference in their internal system, we have built up a base where our industrial goods can be consumed and that will promote their interest and that will promote our interest.

Take the case of the African countries. We have constantly stood by them. We have supported them in their fight against racialism, colonialism and against imperialism. Certain countries headed by US imperialism are against us. There is a couplet in Hindi which says:

ऊँच निवास नीच करतूनी
देख न सकी पराई विभूति ॥

This is because India is an emerging developing country. It is going to be the sixth or the seventh industrial country in the whole world. Therefore, they are afraid that their goods will

not be taken. They fear that they will not have their old sphere of influence in the world. Therefore, they are trying to de-stabilise the Government duly established in this country by the support of the mass of the people. We all know what the situation in 1975 after the proclamation of emergency has been. There was terrific pressure from these countries who claim themselves to be champions of democracy! They started mourning over what they called the demise of democracy in India! Their President and the Secretary did not hesitate to shake hands with China which is a totalitarian regime. They are arming Pakistan where dictatorship has only changed a bit by adopting Mr. Bhutto as its head. Our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister have by their statements tried to remove the misgivings of these so-called champions of democracy. There is a better understanding, a better climate now in USA and other European countries. They have come to understand that our proclamation of emergency was justified by the internal circumstances of the country. China is cracking under the internal weight of its own contradictions. Regarding Bangla Desh, we are sorry that though it has emerged as full-fledged sovereign State, it has again fallen into a regime which neither people of Bangla Desh like nor we like but certainly it is their internal affairs and we in this House should not go into details of such matter which concern them most.

Take the case of Sri Lanka. We have entered into bilateral agreement with Sri Lanka. We have entered

into bilateral agreement with Pakistan and this is known as the Simla Accord. If certain undesirable posture and attitude are adopted by Pakistan, certainly, our foreign policy is not responsible for those things. We have got enough strength to give a severe deathblow to them if they ever try to raise their finger or fist against us. We have no expansionist design in the world. We want to live; we want others to live. This is to be within the concept of international understanding and cooperation.

Regarding Nepal, I would submit, a bright future awaits both the countries. The Prime Minister of Nepal is on a visit to our country. A treaty is to be negotiated for construction of various dams on various Himalayan rivers like Rapti, Ghagra, Karnali and Bagmati. These will generate tremendous power and energy and provide water for irrigation. This will be of benefit for millions of Nepalese people and also of this country. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I must say that ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You may continue tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

17.58 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, April 8, 1976/Chaitra 19, 1898 (Saka).