

लगा है, लेकिन इन सब बातों के होने हुए भी अन्य क्षेत्रों में जिन तरह की सुविधाएँ दी जा रही हैं, उस तरह की सुविधाएँ आज भी किसानों को नहीं मिल रही हैं। जिस का परिणाम मैं यह देख रहा हूँ कि खेती के काम के लिये, चाहे पढ़े-लिखे लोग हों या गैर-पढ़े-लिखे लोग हों, जाना नहीं चाहते हैं। पढ़े-लिखे लोग खेती को छोड़ कर शहर की तरफ नौकरों के लिये भागे जा रहे हैं। इतना ही होता तो भी कुछ समय में आ जाता, लेकिन जो गैर-पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं वे भी खेती में काम करना पसन्द नहीं कर रहे हैं। जो नौजवान हैं वे शहरों में जाकर शिक्षा चलाना पसन्द करते हैं, लेकिन खेती में काम करना पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। पढ़े लिखे लोग चपरासीगिरी पसन्द करेंगे, प्रादमरी की अव्यापकी पसन्द करेंगे, लेकिन खेती में काम करना पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि खेती पर आज या तो बूढ़े जो नौकरी से रिटायर हो गये हैं कमजोर लोग लगडे लग, विधवा औरतें, जिनके पास कोई महारा नहीं है वे लोग ही खेती में काम करने के लिये रह गये हैं। आज जिन चीजों पर मांग देश का दायीमदार है, उन की इस तरह से उपेक्षा हो यह विचारणीय विषय है। जब हम खेती पर दतना निर्भर करते हैं तो उसकी तरफ विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये, जिससे लोगों की प्रवृत्ति खेती की तरफ जाय, पढ़े लिखे लोग खेती में रुचि लें—इस तरह की स्थिति सरकार को पैदा करनी चाहिये।

दूसरी बात गन्ने के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। किसान गन्ना पैदा करता है, लेकिन कीमत बहुत कम मिलती है। सूखी लकड़ी की कीमत ज्यादा है लेकिन गन्ने की कीमत बहुत कम है। इससे किसानों में निरुत्साह उत्पन्न होता है। इससे संबंधित पचायत विभाग है लेकिन उसके मामले में बड़ी उपेक्षा हो रही है। जिस विकेन्द्रीयकरण की भावना को लेकर हमने पचायतों का निर्माण किया था लेकिन धीरे धीरे हम देखते हैं कि पचायत सेक्रेटरी और पचायत इस्पेक्टर के हाथ की वह चीज हो गई है और इसलिए पचायतों का महत्व घटता जा रहा है।

अगर वास्तव में हमें लोकतन्त्र को कायम करना है तो पचायतों को मजबूत करना होगा और इसकी तरफ सरकार का ध्यान अवश्य जाना चाहिए।

15.31 hrs

COMMITTEE OF PRIVATE MEMBERS'
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FOURTH REPORT

श्री रामाव र शारस्त्री (पटना) मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि यह मन्त्र गैर सरकारी सदस्यों के विधेयका तथा सक्न्पी सम्बन्धी समिति के चौथे प्रतिवेदन में, जो 14 जुलाई, 1971 को मन्त्रों में प्रस्तुत किया गया था सहमत है।

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER The ques-
tion is

'That this House do agree with the Fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th July 1971

The motion was adopted

15.31 hrs

RESOLUTIONS RE COGNITION TO
PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY
GOVERNMENTS OF SOUTH
VIETNAM, ETC—Contd

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER We shall now take up further discussion on the resolution moved by SHRI A K Gopalan on the 2nd July 1971. Two hours were allotted, 10 minutes were taken. One hour and 50 minutes are left. Mr Gopalan has not finished his speech.

SHRI A K GOPALAN (Palghat) I had only just begun that day I will not take more than 10 minutes or so

15.32 hrs.

[SHRI K. N TIWARY in the Chair]

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Sir, I was speaking about the recent revelations made by the American papers about the conduct of the Vietnam war and it has put American imperialism in the dock, as the worst criminal before the peoples of the world, and never before has international prestige of the United States imperialism sunk so low. The publications of the secret documents have put a slap on the face of those who compare American imperialism and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on a par as far as the question of the national liberation struggle is concerned.

I do not know what is the ICC doing. But the documents have clearly put the responsibility on American imperialism for conducting not only the war in Vietnam but also subsequently its escalation to the other two Indo-China States, Laos and Cambodia. It is stated in the document that in 1954 the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, fought hard but unsuccessfully at the Geneva conference on Indo-China agreement to prevent the re-scheduling of elections in Vietnam because he thought that these elections 'might eventually mean the unification of Vietnam under Ho Chi-Minh.' But the subsequent events have shown that American imperialism has sabotaged the whole thing, the Geneva agreement, and this American imperialism is responsible for what has happened, and it is they that are responsible for having entered and perpetuated the war against Vietnam.

I have no time to go into the details of these reports that have lately come and also to refer to the United States document, because the documents have shown that it has carried out a whole spectrum of the under-cover activities, "an elaborate programme of covert military operations against the State of North Vietnam," begun under the Code name of Oppression Plan 34 A. These activities included U-2 flights over Laos, raids of North Vietnam and the naval bombardment along the North Vietnamese coast-line. Also the Pentagon outlined many steps because they wanted to provoke North Vietnam by military action which could have provided them an opportunity and a cover for sustaining their attacks. From then onwards up to the presidential election, The Pentagon and the White House were already thinking in terms of sustained bombing of North Vietnam at a time when Johnson in

his administration was hypocritically camouflaging himself as a candidate of peace and restraint. They wanted to keep the American public in the dark about the under-cover activities against North Vietnam and use the August 1964 Gulf of Tonkin incident to get a Congress resolution passed empowering the President to act in any manner he deemed fit to conduct the war. From then onwards, there was steady escalation according to the wishes of the Pentagon specialists. Even the bombing pause in 1966 and later according to McNamara was meant only to prepare world opinion for further entries of troops and widening the war.

These are some of the points from the Pentagon papers prepared as an official study of how the US went to the war in Indo-China, consisting of 3000 pages of analysis and 7000 pages of supporting documents. It is revealed in these papers that the general consensus for air attacks against North Vietnam was arrived at by Johnson administrator on September 7, 1964. But due to the elections, the public was kept in the dark. These tactical considerations were summed up by the Assistant Secretary of Defence in a memorandum to Robert McNamara and these are some of the words in that memorandum.

"Special considerations during the next two months. The relevant audiences U.S. actions are the Communists (who must feel strong pressures), the South Vietnamese (whose morale must be buoyed up), our allies (who must trust us as 'underwriters') and the US public (which must support our risk taking with the US lives and prestige). During the next two months, because of the lack of 'rebuttal time' before elections to justify particular actions which may be distorted to the US public, we must act with special care—signalling to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam that initiatives are being taken, to the Government of South Vietnam that we are behaving energetically despite the restraints of our political season and to the US public that we are behaving with good purpose and restraint."

These documents make it very clear that the escalation of war into Laos and Cambodia is a part of American policy of carrying on its colonial war in Indo-China.

In this House, we have raised many times the question of the role of American imperialism in creating tensions, in starting local wars, in suppressing the national liberation movements and in enforcing the neocolonial rule. We could find a common language with some of the people sitting on the treasury benches. But perhaps because of its further dependence on American aid, we could not convince the Government about the righteous cause. But now when imperialism has been thoroughly exposed, when the actions of US imperialism are being condemned by various people and the countries in the world, what is the difficulty in our taking a position in the front ranks of people fighting against imperialism? What is the confusion about it? Is there any doubt as to who is the aggressor, who is responsible for genocide in Vietnam, whose armies are protecting the puppet regimes of South Korea and South Vietnam and who is in the way of unification of these States? But I am sorry to say that even after his visit to USA, our Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, paid compliments to American imperialists and expressed satisfaction on his visit. Why can't we join the States of Africa, Latin America and Asia in condemning in unequivocal terms the aggression in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia? How long will we continue to cover our failure to take a stand against imperialism on the plea that we are members of the ICC? What is the ICC doing there? It has allowed the escalation of war into Laos and Cambodia. Our foreign policy is on test today. Our position of neutrality and nonalignment could be judged on the basis of our attitude towards aggression. I know even some of my friends sitting on the treasury benches feel like me and they raised the same questions in the AICC session held at Patna. My hon. friend Shri B. R. Bhagat, moving an amendment to the foreign policy resolution had said :

"that the futility and inadvisability of trying to settle issues through armed intervention had been amply demonstrated in relation to American imperialism in Vietnam. During the past seven years, American opinion itself was strongly divided on the American role in South East Asia."

Moving an amendment Shri K. R. Ganesh said :

"that the source of trouble in South East Asia basically was armed American presence."

But my friend, Sardar Swaran Singh, who has got the capacity to explain everything in every situation in a way which can be interpreted in different ways by different people and who was responsible for the resolution on foreign affairs did not accept these amendments. But he agreed to mention the escalation of the war in Indo China, such as its extension to Cambodia, but would refuse to lay the responsibility for this on American imperialism. How long the government intends to play the trick of hoodwinking the public opinion? At least now when we know the real role and attitude of American imperialism towards not only Indo-China but also Bangladesh we should strongly condemn their stand.

I now come to the third point raised in my resolution. It was two years ago that the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Vietnam was formed. It was formed on the soil of South Vietnam. It has provided that it enjoys full confidence of the people of South Vietnam and is capable of fighting and defeating a powerful imperialist power like USA and its puppets. This government has been recognised by so many countries. Do we not feel confident even after 24 years of independence to call a thief a thief? Why are we lagging behind even the African countries, whose economies are much backward than ours? More than 50 countries have entertained relations with PRG, including 27 countries which have officially recognised PRG, and five others have agreed to the establishment of information bureau of PRG. In India there is not even a mission of PRG. Last year when Madame Binh, the Foreign Minister of PRG and the leader of the heroic people of South Vietnam visited our country, the Government was showing a lot of vacillation.

Coming to the question of full recognition to the government of Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea and German Democratic Republic, the government is playing the same role of surrender to imperialist pressure. In the report of the Ministry of External Affairs for 1969-70 the government stated that :

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

"...the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has expressed its desire to establish closer relations with the Government of India in the political, economic, scientific, technological and cultural fields. Their request is being examined to see how best it should be met, including possible upgrading of level of representation between the two countries."

Now more than one year is over and the Ministry of External Affairs found it proper not to make any mention of this question in its report for 1970-71. I would like to know the reason behind it, because one year is over. Is it not the American pressure which is cowering in the way? Otherwise, how is it when a request has been made by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Government a year back was considering the possible upgrading of the mission, nothing has been done so far? What has happened in the meanwhile? Why is it that government has not been able to decide it even after one year?

Similarly, about the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, in the Report of External Affairs Ministry 1969-70 the Government had mentioned:—

"with continuing tense relations between the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, the situation in Korea remained unhappy. The Government of India's policy is to look forward to a peaceful unification of Korea by maintaining friendly relations both with the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea."

I want to know who stands in the way of unification of Korea. Why can the Government of India not demand the withdrawal of the American army from South Korea? Why can we not give full recognition to the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea in our country?

I want to point out that a reactionary regime was overthrown some time back in Chile and a new progressive government came into existence. It has not only established trade relations with the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea but has declared with pride

that the new government will establish diplomatic relations also with Korea. So, what is the difficulty in giving full recognition to the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea except—I can understand—that it would be to the dislike of the American imperialists as well as the Japanese imperialists?

The next question I wanted to point out is the German Democratic Republic. In the report of 1969-70 the cat is out of the bag. It is stated in the report that the Federal Republic of Germany has "requested friendly governments to withhold international recognition of the German Democratic Republic." Is that the reason why we have not recognised it? No doubt, we have raised the status of the Trade Commission to Consul General, but why are we not having ambassadorial relations with the Democratic Republic of Germany? The German Democratic Republic is also helping very much as far as developing our economy is concerned. As far as the existence of two Germanies is concerned, it is a reality and nobody in the world can ignore that reality. GDR has been recognised by 30 countries in the world. Why are we not coming forth in giving full status to the diplomatic mission of the German Democratic Republic?

The demand for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic is being ever more strongly raised in many countries. It is an important political factor as far as anti-imperialist struggle is concerned. In the long run we will also have to recognise it. So, why delay? Why do we want to be the last in recognising and in accepting this reality? If there is no West German and American pressure obstructing it, what else is there?

All these policies combined together are leading to our isolation from the main current of national liberation movements and the countries struggling against imperialism and for salvation. We are continuously losing our prestige. After the thorough exposure of US imperialism and its game, it is high time that we take a firm stand against it and join the people of the world in supporting the cause of freedom, peace and progress. From that point of view I demand from the Government to take a firm stand in support of the national liberation movements going on today in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Government should actively support the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against the aggression of US imperialism and strongly call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of US troops from Vietnam and the whole area of Indo-China for respecting the sacred right of the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian peoples to liberty and territorial integrity, national independence and unity. We should forthwith give recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. We must immediately give full recognition to the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea and German Democratic Republic, and be in line with the countries of the world fighting against imperialism.

I do not want to speak more. I have only to point out to the Minister that the West Bengal Assembly has unanimously passed a resolution some months ago requesting the Government of India to recognise the above-mentioned countries.

AN HON. MEMBER : Twice.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : They have passed resolutions twice.

I hope, my Resolution will get the maximum support of the House because it represents the aspirations and demands of the people of this country. I hope, the Government, considering the position today in the country and the international situation today, will certainly inform the House that these countries will be recognised and full diplomatic relations will be established and also, as far as Vietnam and the position of US imperialism is concerned, that it is US imperialism that is responsible for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Resolution moved : "This House is of the opinion that the Government should take firm line of supporting the National Liberation movements and condemn in unequivocal terms the American aggression in three Indo-Chinese States, give recognition to Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and full recognition to the Government of Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Korean People's Democratic Republic and German Democratic Republic."

Now, there are some amendments to the Resolution moved by Shri A. K. Gopalan. Amendment Nos. 1, 2 and 5 standing in the name of Shri Bibhuti Mishra, Shri K. M. Madhukar and Dr. Ranen Sen are ruled out of order. They are beyond the scope of the Resolution.

There are some other amendments which may be moved, if the hon. Members want to move them.

SHRI K. M. MADHUKAR (Kesaria) : I beg to move :

"That in the resolution,—

after "full", insert "immediate" (3)

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : I beg to move :

"That in the resolution,—

after "States," insert—

"demand the withdrawal of American Army and their satellite forces forthwith" (6)

"That in the resolution,—

after "give" insert—

"full diplomatic" (7)

"That in the resolution,—

omit "full recognition" (8)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have moved these amendments to strengthen the Resolution because I fully endorse the main idea contained in the Resolution.

The idea is that throughout the world, the National Liberation movement must find support from India. We are wedded to the policy of anti-imperialism. This has been our tradition. Secondly, from this House, it is our duty to demand the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam, from Indo-China and from many other places. It must be noted in this House that there are about 3500 military bases of American imperialism all over the world. Outside USA, they maintain about 3500 military basis. Therefore, one of the tasks of this House would be

[Dr. Ranen Sen]

to demand withdrawal of American army and their satellite forces from Indo-China.

I say, full diplomatic recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, the Government of Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Korean People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic should be given by the Government of India here and now. It is known, today, that American imperialism stands exposed as a main bulwark of reaction. Its only task has been to help counter revolutionary forces, suppress the National Liberation movement, set up quisling Government in South Korea, Saigon, Cambodia, Laos, etc. or help in its efforts to suppress the National Liberation movement in many parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. And the latest example is Bangla Desh.

Sir, countless atrocities are being committed by the American imperialism throughout the world and, particularly, in Vietnam. Those sordid tales are known to our Foreign Minister. Those sordid tales are known to the American public. Now, even the newspapers like *New York Times* are coming out with those sordid stories exposing the real nature of the American imperialism. Homes and hearths, villages and towns, have been razed to the ground. Men, women and children have been killed in a very cold-blooded manner.

This has been done by the American imperialism in Vietnam. In spite of that, Vietnam could not be suppressed by the American imperialism. I remember, 3 or 4 or 5 years back, Mr. Krishna Menon made a speech from that side, when he was a Member of the Congress Party—I remember his speech—and he said that the American imperialism could not suppress Vietnam in 9 years. Vietnam cannot be suppressed in 900 years by any imperialism, American or any other. Vietnam has been a source of inspiration to all freedom fighters throughout the world. I may quote the speech made by Mr. AHM Kamaruzzaman, a Minister of Bangla Desh Government in front of the cadres of the Mukti Foj, somewhere in Bangla Desh.

He said :

"Written in blood before our eyes today is the epic of small Vietnam. She is not

insignificant any more. Commanding infinite power, she had inflicted the worst possible crisis on American Imperialism armed with the most modern weapons and equipment."

"The victory of Vietnam is certain It will be no exception for us either."

The fight in Vietnam is a fight not for establishing Communism. Their leaders can never be said to be supporters of Communism. So far as our country is concerned, India is committed to the position of supporting the National Liberation Movements. Therefore, there is no ground for our Government not to give recognition to these two Vietnam States. The Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam is a democratic country controlling 4/5 of the territory. I quote *Washington Post*. They say that they control 4/5 of the territory. They have 44 provinces, 6 cities and 1500 villages under the Government. This is under total occupation of this Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. Our foreign policy is based on panchsheel. We are supposed to follow panchsheel. There is a book, *Vietnamese studies* in which their Government have stated about their policy. I quote what they say :

"To pursue a foreign policy of peace, non-alignment, with any camp or bloc, and non-participation in any military alliance. To establish diplomatic relations with all States regardless of their political systems and on the principles of equality..." etc. etc.

Now, Sir, why can't we recognise this Government and give it full diplomatic recognition ?

Even the US Government gave it practically *defacto* recognition. They meet the representatives of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and of the Government of Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The Democratic Republic of Vietnam is commonly known as North Vietnam. It is a socialist country, a democratic country ; they are trying to build up their own State against the onslaughts from the American Imperialism. I have no time and I don't want to go into the details. We have discussed this several times in this House

for the last 10 years. We have discussed the role of American imperialism in North Vietnam. It is a gallant tribute to Soviet Government that they are supporting Governments of North Vietnam and South Vietnam, against American imperialism. This country has been recognised by 32 countries. Their leader Ho-Chi Minh visited India and was widely acclaimed by the people of India. He was invited by the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

16 hrs.

Among the countries recognising the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam are capitalistic countries, and countries which are not within the orbit of the socialist system, Sweden, Norway and other countries. Our next door neighbour Ceylon has not been afraid of recognising this Government. But we are afraid to recognise the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

Now, I come to the question of the German Democratic Republic. It is a country or a State built up on the ashes of German fascism. It is a State wedded to the principles of democracy, peace and socialism, and it has pledged openly and publicly never to allow fascism to grow on the soil of Germany. We were anti-fascist in those days when during the Spanish civil war, the Indian National Congress supported the Republican Spain against Franco's fascism, and supported the Czechoslovak Government against the Munich betrayal by Chamberlain, Daladier and others and condemned Hitler's invasion of Europe. It is the same Indian National Congress which is now in Government here. The German Democratic Republic is one of the first-rate industrial countries in the world, having trade and good relations with any number of countries all over the world. This country is probably the only advanced country that has supported during 1965 when India was attacked by Pakistan. Even today, it is one of these countries which has supported us during this crisis in our country.

Dr. Karan Singh visited the German Democratic Republic, and a joint statement was issued to which the signatories were our Minister Dr. Karan Singh and the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of German Democratic Republic. I shall read out just one or two sentences from that joint statement :

"Both the Governments also agreed that conditions should be created to guarantee the safe return of the refugees in the near future. This could only be done after a solution to basic political problems was found with the agreement of the people of East Bengal and in consultation with their elected representatives."

The statement declared that the refugee problem had taken very serious proportions and so on. Ultimately it says that both the Government have a common viewpoint in regard to the Bangla Desh crisis. Here is a country which has stood by us during the time of crisis. Therefore, I say that this country should immediately be recognised

There is the bugbear of the Holstein doctrine that if we recognise the German Democratic Republic then there will be difficulty from the side of the Federal Republic of Germany which is known as West Germany. The Holstein doctrine is dead and gone. We need not be afraid of it. There are countries in the world which have recognised both the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. Why do we not have courage and stand on our own feet? Why should we be brow-beaten by other countries? Let us take our stand on the correct position.

Then, I come to the Democratic Republic of Korea. This is another democratic and socialist State enjoying the confidence of both Koreas. South and North Korea unitedly held an election under the auspices of the UN long years back and the Government had been formed. Later on, American imperialism betrayed the Korean people and established hegemony in South Korea, imported its troops and then a quisling puppet government was formed.

These are the countries which should be recognised by the Government of India. Today India has a position in the world. We enjoy prestige and we have the support of people all over India, of all shades of opinion. Shri Gopalan was saying that in the West Bengal Assembly last year when the UF Government was in power, Prof Ila Mitra of the CPI moved a resolution which was unanimously accepted by all, including the Congress Opposition. This time another resolution was moved by Shrimati Gita Mukerjee of the CPI

[Dr. Ranen Sen]

on the floor of the House. It was accepted by the Chief Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and all sections of the House.

Such is the position in India. Here and now let us stand up. Let us not allow ourselves to be browbeaten by the American imperialists. After all, what can they do? They may stop the PL 480 aid. But they are not giving it gratis. We have to pay for it in dollars. They have proved to be the enemies of India

Before I entered the House, I came across a very important international news. I shall relate it and then sit down. Mr. Kissinger who is the Adviser to President Nixon, who was here the other day, visited Peking, met Chou En-lai and through him, Chou En-lai invited President Nixon and Nixon is going to China. My first fear is that Bangla Desh will be stabbed in the back. My second fear is that Vietnam may be stabbed both by America and China. Therefore, the Government of India should at this juncture be bold and play a glorious role and give recognition to these Governments. I support the Resolution.

*SHRI R. P. ULAGANAMBI (Vellore) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan calling upon the Government to accord recognition to the Governments of East Germany, North Vietnam and North Korea and also to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam.

The Consulates-General of East Germany are functioning in New Delhi, Calcutta, Madras and Bombay North Vietnam has its Consulate in New Delhi. The Consulate of North Korea is in New Delhi.

Sir, all of us have read the biographical sketches of Kim Il-Sung, the President of North Korea, appearing in the Indian newspapers frequently. When the Revolutionary leader of South Vietnam, Madame Binh visited our country, she was received and welcomed by the Ministry of External Affairs as a State Guest. During last August, we raised the status of Consulates on reciprocal basis with East Germany. I would like to

give some statistics regarding the volume of trade between India and East Germany. In the period, January-October, 1969, the value of our imports from East Germany was to the tune of 1752 lakhs of rupees. In the corresponding period of the year 1970 it went upto Rs. 1844 lakhs. During the period, January to October, 1969, the value of our exports to East Germany was to the tune of Rs. 1636 lakhs. In the corresponding period in 1970, it rose upto Rs. 1956 lakhs. These figures clearly show, Sir, that our trade with East Germany is steadily increasing and our relations with them are becoming closer. As a matter of fact, even West Germany is moving fast in the direction of recognising East Germany.

Sir, we are all well aware that due to the blatant American interference, we have today two Germanys, East and West, two Vietnams, South and North and two Koreas, South and North. Even now, American arms and ammunition and the entire war machine are being supplied to Pakistan which is today engaged in the pillage and carnage of the freedom loving people of Bangla Desh. Our country has always lent its unstinted support to all the freedom movements throughout the world. It is true that we are not in a position today to help these movements with military hardware. But, certainly, Sir, we can help them by extending our moral support by way of recognising these countries.

We are greatly interested in improving and sustaining our trade relations with these countries. If we can raise the status of the trade representatives of these countries, I do not know what then stands in our way in according full recognition to these countries and in what way our country's interests would be affected by this recognition. The three essential pre-requisites for according recognition to a country are : there should be a well defined territory, there should be a Government representing the will of the people of that territory and there should be peaceful law and order situation obtaining there. The whole world knows that these countries certainly fulfil these requirements. We should, therefore, Sir, accord recognition to these countries.

Supporting the resolution moved by Shri A. K. Gopalan, I conclude.

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

श्री ज्ञानेश्वर प्रसाद यादव (कटिहार) : सभा-पति महोदय, भारत की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति के प्रश्न पर आज मैं अपने विचार यहाँ पर रखना चाहता हूँ तथा माननीय सदस्य श्री ए० के० गोपालब जी से, जो इस सदन के वरिष्ठ सदस्य हैं, जो संकल्प सदन में प्रस्तुत किया है, उसकी भावना से सहमत होते हुए ही अपने विचार प्रकट कर रहा हूँ।

भारत लोकतान्त्रिक मर्यादाओं को अक्षुण्ण रखने के लिये अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में संघर्षरत है। जब भी मानव-मूल्यों के ऊपर या जनतान्त्रिक मूल्यों पर कुठागघात हुआ है, चाहे वे अमरीका के द्वारा हुआ हो, चाहे चीन के द्वारा हुआ हो, चाहे रूस के द्वारा हुआ हो, भारत सरकार की यह चिर-परिचित नीति रही है और भारतीय जनता की यह चिर-परिचित भावना रही है कि उसने उनके खिलाफ आवाज बलन्द की है। इसी भावना से प्रेरित होकर जब 1956 में हंगरी पर रूस का हस्तक्षेप हुआ और वहाँ जनतान्त्रिक मूल्यों का ह्रास होने लगा, तो हमने उसका विरोध किया।

उसी तरह से जब 1968 में हमने देखा कि चैकोस्लोवेकिया के अन्दर जनतान्त्रिक भावना का सृजन हो रहा था और जब रशियन टैंकों ने उन की भावनाओं पर नुषारापात करना शुरू किया, उस समय भी भारत सरकार और देश के 55 करोड़ जन-मानस ने उस का विरोध किया। इस प्रकार, सभापति महोदय, आज उत्तर वियतनाम या दक्षिण वियतनाम या हिन्द चीन में अमरीका द्वारा जहाँ भी बमबारी का गई, हमने उसका विरोध किया है। भारतीय जन-मानस ने अमरीकानों के इस कार्य की निन्दा की है और भारत सरकार ने भी उत्तर वियतनाम पर बमबारी की निन्दा की है।

अब जहाँ तक उन के साथ हमारे दौत्य सम्बन्ध की बात है, उसके बारे में विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकृष्ट करते हुए मैं कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। आप ने इजराइल के साथ भी दौत्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित नहीं किये हैं, जब कि इजराइल भी एक राष्ट्र है—यह सैटिल्ड फ़ैक्ट

है। आपने वहाँ पर केवल वाणिज्य दूतावास रखा हुआ है। ईस्ट-जर्मनी में भी आप वाणिज्य दूतावास रखा है, उसके साथ भी दौत्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित नहीं हुआ है। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की यह नीति होनी चाहिये कि जहाँ तक हो सके जो सैटिल्ड फ़ैक्ट्स हैं, जो वास्तव में नवोदित राष्ट्र हैं, जिन्होंने राष्ट्रीयता का स्वरूप ग्रहण कर लिया है, उनको मान्यता देने में किसी प्रकार की हिचकिचाहट नहीं होनी चाहिये।

हम उत्तर वियतनाम पर बमबारी की निन्दा करते हैं, दक्षिण कोरिया, दक्षिण वियतनाम, लाओस, कम्बोडिया पर अमरीकन हस्तक्षेप की निन्दा करते हैं। साथ ही साथ अभी पूर्वी बंगाल में, जिस को हम बंगला देश कहते हैं, वहाँ पर मानव मूल्यों की रक्षा के लिये, लोकतन्त्र की रक्षा के लिये मान करोड़ जनता शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान के नेतृत्व में संघर्ष-रत है। आज सब में बड़ी आवश्यकता भारत के सामने इस बात की है कि हम बंगला देश को मान्यता दें। इसलिये, सभापति महोदय, सदन में भी काफी चर्चा हुई है। सदन के बाहर भी 55 करोड़ जन-मानस आज उद्वेलित हो रहा है। आज 55 करोड़ जनमानस के अन्दर एक ही भावना है, क्षोभ की भावना व्याप्त है कि भारत सरकार बंगला देश को मान्यता क्यों नहीं दे रही है, भारत सरकार इस में क्यों देरी कर रही है? जहाँ तक विश्व में छोटी-मोटी घटनायें घटती हैं, उसके बारे में भारत सरकार की अस्पष्ट नीति रही है। 1962 में स्वर्गीय पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने, जो उस समय भारत के प्रधान मंत्री थे, इन बात की घोषणा की थी कि हम स्वयं लोक में विचार रहे थे। वास्तव में धरातल पर खड़े होकर, यथार्थवादी नीति का अवलम्बन करके हमें अपने पैरों पर खड़े होना है स्वर्गीय नेहरू ने उस समय जो नेतावनी दी थी; उसी के फलस्वरूप 1965 में जब पाकिस्तान ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया तो अपनी राष्ट्रीयता की रक्षा के लिये, अपने राष्ट्र की एकात्मता को बचाने के लिये, पाकिस्तान को जो अमरीकी टैंक दिये बने थे, जिनके बल पर अय्यूब ख़ाँ चाहता

[श्री मानेश्वर प्रसाद यादव]

था कि हम दिल्ली पहुंच जायेंगे, उसके मनसूबों को हमारे जवानों ने चकनाचूर कर दिया। उसी स्थिति को दृष्टि में रख कर मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार और उस का परराष्ट्र विभाग एक यथार्थवादी नीति का अवलम्बन करके बंगला देश पर हो रहे नरसंहार और वहाँ पर अमरीकन हस्तक्षेप और अमरीका द्वारा याहया खाँ को जो शस्त्रास्त्र पहुंचाये जा रहे है, उस सन्दर्भ में मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जितना जल्दी हो, उतनी जल्दी हम बंगला देश को मान्यता दे। मान्यता देने में, सभापति महोदय, अगर हम थोड़ी सी देर करेंगे तो हो सकता है कि भारत को फिर से दूसरी तरफ जाने के लिये बाध्य होना पड़े। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार जल्द से जल्द बंगला देश की मान्यता देकर मान करोड़ जनता जो आज आत्म निर्णय के अधिकार के लिये संघर्षरत है, उसकी भावना का हम आदर करें।

इतनी ही नहीं विदेश विभाग और माननीय मंत्री महोदय, जो एक बहुत बड़े वरिष्ठ मंत्री है, मैं उन से आशा करता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में जब वह वक्तव्य देंगे तो इस विषय पर भी विशेष ध्यान देंगे। इसी भावना से प्रेरित होकर सभापति महोदय, सरकार पर दबाव डालने के लिये भारतीय जनसंघ ने पहली अगस्त से सत्याग्रह करने का निर्णय किया है कि बंगला देश को मान्यता दी जाय।

श्री शशि भूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : सभापति महोदय, मुझे इस बात की प्रसन्नता है कि अभी एक माननीय सदस्य ने मानव मृत्यों की बहुत अधिक चर्चा की और जो मूल विषय था उस पर उन्होंने धूल डालने की कोशिश की और दूसरी व्यर्थ की चीजों को उभारा।

जैसा डा० रनेन सेन ने अभी कहा और बाहर भी अखबारों में इस बात की सूचना मिली है कि किंसागर साहब अभी चाहना छिपकर गये थे और निक्सन भी वहाँ अगले वर्ष जाने वाले हैं। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि वियतनाम में अमरीकन

हथियार वहाँ की जनता को कुचल रहे हैं और वहाँ की जनता अपने पैरों पर खड़ी होकर लड़ रही है। पिछले दिनों जब मैडम-बिन हिन्दुस्तान आई थी, मुझे उन्हें अपने निवास स्थान पर बुलाने का अवसर मिला। काफी संसद सदस्य और मिनिस्टर उस समय वहाँ शामिल थे। उन से जब चर्चा हुई तो मुझे पता लगा कि वहाँ पर जो रेवोल्यूशनरी गवर्नमेंट है, वह अपने पैरों पर खड़ी हो कर इतनी बड़ी साम्राज्यवादी ताकत का मुकाबला कर रही है।

इतिफाक से मैं अभी बूडापेस्ट गया था। वहाँ मदाम-बिन एक बैंकवेट में फिर मिल गईं। मैंने उन से पूछा कि चाहना की जो पिंगपोंग पालिसी है, क्या आप से पूछ कर चाहना सरकार उगको चला रही है। इसका उत्तर वह क्या देती, लेकिन उनकी वेदना पूर्ण मुस्कराहट से और उनकी आंखों में जो हृदय था, उस से यह विश्वास होता था कि उन्हें किसी पर भरोसा नहीं है, अगर भरोसा है तो उनको अपने नौजवान लड़ाकू वियतनामी लोगों पर भरोसा है।

सभापति महोदय, आप खुद की क्रान्तिकारी रहे हैं और क्रान्तिकारी जहाँ भी अपने देश की स्वाधीनता के लिए लड़ते हैं, उनको मान्यता देना, उनको रक्त देना, उनकी मदद करना हमारे देश की नीति रही है। इसलिए, हमें उन्हें मान्यता देनी चाहिए—इसमें दो राय नहीं हो सकती है। अगर हम उन्हें मान्यता देते हैं तो कल निक्सन के जाने के बाद चाहना अगर उनको साथ न दे तो भी हिन्दुस्तान के मान्यता देने पर उनका आत्मविश्वास बढ़ेगा। इससे जापान की नीति भी बदलेगी और पूर्वी एशिया के दूसरे देशों की नीति भी बदलेगी। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान को अपने हाथ में बागडोर लेनी चाहिए क्योंकि जो बड़ी क्रान्ति का दम भरते थे, चीन के लोग वे मकाओं से मुलंगीज के साथ और साउथ अफ्रीका के साथ व्यापार करते हैं, इस तरह से आज जितने प्रति-क्रियावादी हैं, चीन उनके साथ सहयोग करता है निक्सन के साथ मिलकर चीन ने जो पाकिस्तान की मदद कर रहे हैं उससे हिन्दुस्तान के लिए एक बड़ा भारी खतरा पैदा कर दिया। ऐसी

दशा में पूर्वी एशिया के जो राज्य हैं उनकी हमें मदद करनी चाहिए जो कि आज अपने पैरों पर खड़े होकर अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद से लड़ रहे हैं और अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद आज उनके सामने लड़खड़ा रहा है। इसलिए हमें उनकी मान्यता देनी चाहिए और उनकी पूरी पूरी मदद करनी चाहिए।

उत्तरी वियतनाम है, उसको हमने जो कांग्रेस का दर्जा दिया है उस दर्जा को ऊँचा कर के पूरे राजदूत का दर्जा देना चाहिए। जहाँ तक जी० डी० आर० का मवाल है, अभी डा० रानेनसेन ने कहा कि बंगला देश के प्रश्न पर भारतीय जनता की जो मशा है उसके साथ उन का पूरा पूरा सहयोग रहा है तो हमें उनको मान्यता देनी चाहिए। इससे पहले हमारे व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध और मित्रता के सम्बन्ध उनसे काफी हैं। और आज पश्चिम जर्मनी है जिसकी सरकार सेन्टों और नाटो की एक मेम्बर है, वे तो पाकिस्तान को हथियार देंगे ही, चाहे ईरान के जरिए दें या और किसी के जरिये से दें। उन के साथ तो आज हमने इतनी अधिक मित्रता बढ़ाई है। जी० डी० आर० उनके साथ तो आज से नहीं बरसों से, जो हमारे राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण है वे काफी मिलते हैं। इसी तरह से कोरिया का प्रश्न है। उसने अपने देश की काफी प्रगति की है और अपने पैरों पर खड़े होकर अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद का मुकाबला किया है। उनसे भी हमारे अच्छे सामान्य दौल्य सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए। आज की राजनीतिक स्थिति का यह तकाजा है कि जिनके भी समाजवादी देश हैं जिनके सामने आज अमरीका और चाइना का चैलेन्ज है उनका हम साथ दें। हमारा देश भी समाजवाद की तरफ बढ़ रहा है इसलिए हम सभी को मिलकर उनका मुकाबला डट कर करना चाहिए जोकि समाजवादी देशों में फूट डालना चाहते हैं जो भारत और समाजवादी देशों के अच्छे सम्बन्धों के बीच में फूट डालना चाहते हैं तथा भारत में मानोपोलिस्ट्स के जरिये से जनता का शोषण करते हैं, और समाजवाद का विरोध स्वार्थवश करते हैं तथा यह कोशिश करते हैं कि अमरीकी साम्राज्यवादियों पर किसी

तरह की आंच न आने पाये उनसे सनकें रहना चाहिए। मैं आपके जरिये से सरकार से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि ये तीनों जो क्रान्तिकारी राष्ट्र वियतनाम, जी० डी० आर०, कोरिया हैं उनको हमें फौरन मान्यता देनी चाहिए।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Sir, I had requested you to give me a couple of minutes because I wanted to elicit one or two replies from the minister when he finally replies, particularly in view of this rather sensational development, news of which has come a short while ago and which has been referred to by some hon. members. I think this debate would be quite meaningless if the Government of India's reaction to this latest development is not spelt out by the minister, because it has a vital and direct bearing on the subject we are discussing.

I want to know whether the Government of India does not attach the highest significance to the fact of this top secret move by the US Government, which has been revealed only now, to come to some sort of direct dialogue and understanding with China, which has been revealed through Mr. Kissinger's secret visit last week to Peking. At a time when we were told that he was recuperating his health at some hill station near Islamabad, it seems—the dates also tally—he was making a secret flight to Peking to meet Chou En-lai. It has now been officially disclosed that President Nixon has said that he is now prepared to undertake what he describes as a journey of peace, a visit to Peking sometime before next May. I want to know from the minister what in his view is the implication of this for the Vietnam question and the question of our doing something to expedite the process towards and early ending of the war by at least now extending our recognition to the two Vietnams. This is my main question, because it is quite obvious from this news that it is a confession of defeat, it is a confession of total collapse, utter collapse of United States' misadventure in Vietnam, in Laos, in Cambodia etc. They have realised the writing on the wall, that they have got to pull out from Vietnam today, tomorrow or six months hence. But somehow they must save their face. So, they are out on a face-saving mission. With the help of China—that is now they calculate; whether they will succeed or not, I do not know—

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

with the help of China, perhaps by using Chinese influence on Vietnam, they can get hold of some sort of formula which will enable the Americans to get out of Vietnam without telling the whole world, admitting before the whole world, that they have suffered the most ignominious defeat.

There are other aspects which I cannot go into because I have no time. But I would like to know whether the hon. Minister shares at least our sense of satisfaction and pleasure that the superiority of the Vietnamese peoples' struggle has been decisively established now, thanks to the combination of the brilliant feats on arms on the battle field and brilliant moves at the conference table. At Paris one after the other many proposals were put forward to which the Americans had got no answer. Madame Binh, who was Sardar Swaran Singh's personal guest here not so long ago, who has been the leader of her country's delegation managed the negotiations so well, agreeing with every positive proposal that the Americans cannot now go back on them, proposals like ceasefire, release of American prisoners of war and free elections in the whole of Vietnam; they are even prepared to have a composite government which will include the earlier Ministers except two or three discredited ministers who have functioned as puppets of the Americans. These proposals are so effective that we have already seen, according to newspapers, a split in South Vietnam with the Prime Minister at the President at Loggerheads, and Mr. Ky saying that he is prepared to accept the proposals. In other words, the settlement of the war has come within sight; it is within our grasp, the end of this bloody and dreadful war which has ravaged that part of the world for so many years.

Are we still to content ourselves by just standing on the sidelines as passive onlookers, or should we try to hasten the process today by doing something positive, by India coming forward to give recognition to two Vietnams, who have defeated the mightiest imperialism in the world. Now that the imperialist power is desperately seeking a formula, some way in which it can save its prestige and pull its troops out, it is a historic moment, a historic turning point in what had been happening there for the last few years. I would like to know whether we are going to wait for the

situation when the last American soldier gets out of Vietnam and then one day Shri Swaran Singh will come here and say very proudly "now we have decided to recognise the two Vietnamese, or perhaps when Shri Pilo Mody boards a plane to Peking in the footsteps of President Nixon? After that perhaps, the Indian Government will be prepared to make a decision on recognition, or what? We want to know it.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Shri Mody has already gone.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: But you are still here.

So, kindly show some enterprise, some courage and initiative. Here I am not going into Bangladesh and other relevant aspects because I have no time. Even on the question of the seating of China in the United Nations, now that the General Assembly of the United Nations is due to meet, perhaps Mr. Nixon has got that aspect also in view. We have always consistently supported the case for seating China in the United Nations. Now the Americans also have got to get out of the theory of two Chinas because I am sure the Peking regime would not agree to the policy that the two Chinas should be seated there. So, this sort of deal will be negotiated perhaps, I do not know, it may succeed or fail. But as far as Vietnam is concerned, now we know that the Americans can no longer conceal their position, their defeat has become inevitable and they have to pull out and they are seeking desperately for a face-saving formula, this is the time when India should come forward and put her moral and diplomatic strength and show courage and initiative by extending recognition to the two governments thus hastening the end of the war and thereby get some credit in the eyes of the international community.

श्री एम० रामगोपाल रेड्डी (निजामाबाद) :
सभापति महोदय, भारत वर्ष की जो मुसीबतें हैं
के इस लिए हैं कि हम हमेशा दूसरों के मामले में
दखल करते रहते हैं। बियतनाम को मान्यता
देने से हमारा क्या फायदा होने वाला है इसको
हम नहीं सोचते। क्योंकि नार्थ बियतनाम ने एक
वक्त भी बंगला देश के बास्ते एक शब्द नहीं

कहा। तो फिर हम वियतनाम के बारे में क्यों परेशान हों? अमरीका और चाइना दोनों एक रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं, दोनों पाकिस्तान को मदद दे रहे हैं। तो दोनों जब दोस्त है फिर हम इसमें क्यों घुसें। आज अमरीका और चाइना के दुनिया में दो ही दुश्मन हैं, एक रूस और दूसरा भारत। इस वास्ते इन दोनों, अमरीका और चाइना, के भूत से हम को होशियार रहना चाहिए।

"The motivations of the two powers may not be entirely identical. But they are not two dissimilar either. Each regards the Soviet Union as its principal rival."

तो यह उन की पौलिमी है।

"America has largely met Peking's two major demands—withdrawal of the Seventh Fleet from the South China Sea and of US troops from Formosa."

और अमरीका की टैत्रिल टैनिंस टीम चाइना में गयी हुई है, अमरीका के प्रोफेसर्स और न्यूज-मैन वहां चाइना जा रहे हैं। तो ये दोनों दोस्त हैं। वह जो चाहे उन को करने देना चाहिए। और जबरदस्ती हम लोगों को नहीं घुसना चाहिए।

हमारी फौरन पौलिसी बदकिस्मती से दूसरों के मामले में दखल देने की है। तिब्बत के मामले में जाकर हम ने लामा साहब को अपने यहां बुला लिया। दूसरी जगह अमरीका को गाली देकर अपने से नाराज कर लिया। पहले के फौरन मिनिस्टर इसीलिए बदनाम हो गये है। हमारे जो वर्तमान विदेश मंत्री हैं वह किसी को नाराज नहीं करते हैं। इसलिए दूसरों के मामले में दखल देने से पहले अपना सामला सुधारना चाहिए। जो सरकार बंगला देश को मान्यता देती हैं उस को हमें भी मान लेना चाहिए।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Sir, during this short period hon. Members have raised several questions and I will try to deal with as many of them as possible within the short time at my disposal. I have no intention of making a long speech. I will try to touch upon some important aspects of the debate.

I agree with Shri Indrajit Gupta that the news that has come today—a reference to it has been made by several hon. Members—is a very important item of news. I would, therefore, like to give some reaction about this event because the situation will definitely change as a result of this event.

The news that Dr. Henry Kissinger, while on a visit to Pakistan, paid a secret visit to China has come both from Peking and also from the United States of America. We do not have details of what transpired at Henry Kissinger's meeting with the Chinese Prime Minister. It has, however, been announced that arrangements have been made for the American President to pay a visit to China. We have noted President Nixon's acknowledgement that there could be no stable peace in the world without the participation of the People's Republic of China and its 750 million people. It seems USA is on the verge of a re-discovery of China and its importance to the world.

We have always welcomed the normalisation of relations between all countries and peoples and, in particular, the great powers. We will, therefore, welcome any steps towards normalisation of relations between USA and the People's Republic of China as would be a step leading towards reduction of tensions. We also hope that such a normalisation would help in bringing about a speedy peaceful and political settlement of the problems of Indo-China, that is, the problems of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. At the same time, we hope that the normalisation of relations between USA and China is not conceived within the framework of power politics or *real-politik*. This provides fresh evidence, if evidence was necessary, of the correctness of India's consistent efforts, irrespective of changing circumstances to support entry into the UN of the People's Republic of China.

I would not like to say anything more at this stage because we should watch carefully the developments and then we can assess in the light of the new situation as to what are the implications of it in this region and on peace in the world.

Some parties may have jitters and many parties which had been urging that the only safety for India is to seek the help of a country like USA to meet our situation might feel

[Shri Swaran Singh]

disappointed. But we have consistently pursued a policy which in the light of these developments is quite obviously the best policy, the wisest policy, from the point of view of our own national interest.

What are the implications of this development on the Vietnam situation? Some observations have been made by Shri Indrajit Gupta. I would not like to enter into a debate on that aspect at the moment. But whatever may be the motive, the development is significant and, I think, this will pave the way for a satisfactory settlement of the difficult and complicated problem of Indo-China.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why don't you help it ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : So far as our own stand is concerned, we have consistently taken the view that the problem of Vietnam is the central problem and a solution of the problems of Vietnam will provide a key to the solution of the problems of Cambodia and Laos. With regard to the solution of the Vietnam problem, we have consistently taken the view, as late as in the last General Assembly session, when we clearly enunciated our stand with regard to the possible lines on which a solution of the Vietnam problem is possible. This was a complete withdrawal all troops and, in this process, the United States should make the start. We have also said that a stage should be fixed for complete withdrawal of troops and, thereafter, we have said that the solution should be such as is acceptable to the people of Vietnam without any interference from any quarter whatsoever. This continues to be our stand and I would also like to say that the latest proposal,—the 7-point proposal,—made by Madam Bin in Paris is according to our view the best proposal that has been put forward so far. We feel that these proposals can be the basis of a satisfactory negotiated settlement which might bring to an end the war-like situation in Vietnam and might form the basis for a negotiated settlement. We do regard that these proposals are an advance on all previous proposals and it is hoped that in this background, the war-like situation in Vietnam would speedily come to an end.

DR. RANEN SEN : Actual war is going on. Why do say, 'war-like' ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I thought, when war is going on, the activities or the situation would be war-like. That is why I am saying that and war-like is not less than war. I do not know why he should object to the use of that expression.

Therefore, Sir, we have to view the situation in this background, as to whether this has come about because militarily the victory which South Vietnam or the Americans sought, they have not been able to achieve, or whatever else may be the reason, these developments according to our assessment, are positive developments, and we should, therefore, do everything possible to help in the speedy ending of war in that area and for facilitating in a satisfactory manner the progress of the talks in Paris.

In view of this, any other historical discussion about the Vietnam situation, its origin, etc. would, at the present moment, appear to be unreal.

I have mentioned this before and I would like to repeat this, namely, that both in Laos and in Cambodia, it is the extension of the situation that has gripped Vietnam—particularly the situation in South Vietnam. On the other side, although they gave different emphasis, ultimately, the whole thing is traced to the situation in Vietnam.

Therefore, we have always taken the view that a settlement of Vietnam is very essential before we can think of satisfactory settlement either in Laos or in Cambodia and it is in this background that I would like to say that our attitude in this respect has been consistent and I would like to say that these developments are in line with our own thinking and we hope that as a result of these developments the Paris talk will now make satisfactory progress.

There has been some talk of a press conference and whether the solution can be found in the Paris talk itself or whether a separate conference is to be held. I think, it is yet too premature to make any comment on that. But, we had always welcomed the holding of a conference in which the problem relating to Indo-China may be satisfactorily solved.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Please come to the Resolution.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Having said that, now we are left with this question of these Governments. On that also, I would like to state our position very precisely, instead of taking long over it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Include Bangla Desh also as an amendment.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : So far as the question of recognising the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet Nam is concerned, this can be considered only in the overall context of a peaceful political settlement of the Viet Nam question. Government have *de facto* relations which both North and South Viet Nams through consulates-general at present. Government hope that as soon as peacefully negotiated political settlement of the Viet Nam question is arrived at, Government will be in a position to accord full recognition to a duly elected representative Government in South Viet Nam ..

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : After the Americans have departed.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Our relations with the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam are developing satisfactorily. The question of giving full recognition to that government continues to be under Government's consideration and action in this regard will be taken at the appropriate time. Government have also *de facto* relations with both North as well as South Korea through consulates-general.

DR. RANEN SEN : South Korea has an American puppet government. North Korea has an independent socialist government. They are not the same.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : In the international field, we have to deal with both socialist governments and capitalistic governments.

DR. RANEN SEN : It is not capitalist, but a puppet government.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Recognition does not depend upon the internal set-up in any country.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Are we going to be always like a political pendulum ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The question of granting full diplomatic recognition to the two Koreas cannot be considered at the present moment and this can be considered only in the overall context of a peaceful political settlement of the Korean question when it takes place. We are dealing with both South and North Korea in a *de facto* manner. Both of them have consulates-general here and we have also consulates-general in the two Koreas.

As far as the German Democratic Republic is concerned, I would like to acknowledge with appreciation the stand that the German Democratic Republic have taken in 1965 and also on the question of Bangla Desh, and I would like to share the satisfaction that has been expressed by several hon. Members about the outcome of Dr. Karan Singh's visit to the German Democratic Republic, and the joint communique that has been issued is a good communique and it is on the same lines as we want this question of Bangla Desh to be satisfactorily resolved.

Our relations with the German Democratic Republic have been developing in a very satisfactory manner. The House would no doubt be aware that for the first time we established an office of the State Trading Corporation in the German Democratic Republic in the year 1967. Then, we established a trade mission in October, 1969. Then, we established a consulate-general in September 1970. I think it is a satisfactory development of relations between us and the German Democratic Republic both in the commercial field as well as in the political field, because we have a consulate-general here.

DR. RANEN SEN : Since Government are treating both Koreas at the same level, why should they not treat both Germanys also at the same level ? Why this discrimination between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I recognise the force of the argument but this is what I have inherited from history and I cannot undo the whole of it in one stroke. Therefore, I have tried to strengthen these relations. We established first an office of the STC, then we have established a trade mission, and only last September, we have established a consulate-general which as hon. Members know amounts to *de facto* recognition. We have also noted

[Shri Swaran Singh]

with satisfaction the negotiations and talk that are taking place between the Federal Republic of Germany and GDR. I have already made statements welcoming the Moscow Treaty and the general detente that has emerged as a result of that treaty between East Europe and West Europe. Things are proceeding in a highly satisfactory manner. We have supported the admission of GDR to the various UN organs on the principle of universality of UN membership. We have supported their admission to Unesco when the question came under consideration. We will do so when this question comes up for their admission into other organs of the UN because we have always supported the principle of universality so far as UN organisations are concerned.

This process of development is in the right direction and I would appeal to the hon. member not to hasten the pace. We are seized of the problem and we are proceeding in that direction in recognising the realities of the situation, and we will continue to pursue this line.

SHRI S M BANERJEE : Has he fixed a timelimit ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : In considering all these questions, Government have to bear in mind first and foremost the national interest of India, the interest of peace as well as the possibility of reunification of the divided countries. It seems, however, that reunification of divided Germany, Korea and Vietnam is not an immediate possibility. Government have therefore stated that on the principle of universality of membership of the UN, they would be willing to support not only the entry of GDR but also North Korea, South Korea, North Vietnam and South Vietnam to various UN organisations. This at the present moment is the policy. In view of this policy, I would request the hon. Member not to press his Resolution to a vote because it is only a question of time.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : When he will change the policy ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Depending on the change in the position, we will do the needful. I would therefore request him not to press his Resolution.

DR. RANAN SEN : Shall we live to see the day when there will be recognition ?

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : My Resolution is very clear. His reply is that with the process of time, there will be Resolution. The first part of my Resolution seeks to condemn unequivocally American aggression in the Indo-China States. He has said nothing about it. There is no condemnation forthcoming. About Vietnam, though he said something about it, he has not replied to the point I had made. I explained what has happened there, who is responsible for it. The Pentagon papers disclose revealing things about it. I quoted from them. At least he should have referred to them. The role of American imperialism as the aggressor and provocator is there for all to see. He has said nothing on that. He only said the problem is there and Vietnam is the main problem.

As far as Laos and Cambodia, what is the Government doing as a member of the ICC ? Is it only speaking as he has done ? The answer to the second part is very unsatisfactory. As for the first portion, in view of our attitude to recognition of Bangla Desh, I can understand it. If the India Government even today, in spite of the discussion in Parliament and outside and the universal demand in the country for recognition and help to Bangla Desh, they are hesitating and do not even condemn American imperialism after breaking the promise to us not to send any arms to Pakistan by opening shipping arms to Pakistan, if there is no condemnation of that, I cannot expect that as far as the Indo-China problem is concerned, even after the disclosures in the Pentagon papers, they will do it.

As far as the second part of the Resolution is concerned, the hon. Minister has stated that GDR can be recognised if a peaceful settlement is reached. If a peaceful settlement is reached, what is the necessity of recognition ? After a peaceful settlement, you may or may not recognise them. The question is not of a peaceful settlement, but of your role.

As far as Viet Nam is concerned, unlike other countries India has got a role to play because she is in the International Control Commission. After understanding the role of American imperialism, what action is the

Government of India taking ? Nothing has been said about that except using pious words.

What is the difficulty about recognition ? The difficulty is that we will be offending American imperialism and German imperialism. We want aid from them and without their aid we will not be able to develop. That is the only reason. There is no other reason. I quoted from the Reports of the External Affairs Ministry of 1969-70 and 1970-71 in which it has been specifically stated that recognition was being considered. What is the difference between that and the present reply that it is a process ? How many years will the process continue and when will be the termination of the process ? I pointed out that 27 countries have extended recognition to GDR and asked what the difficulty was in the way of Government in following them. But in the reply not one word has been said explaining the difficulty before the Government of India. The only difficulty is that the foreign policy of the Government of India depends not on their own independent action, but on the wishes of American imperialism. That difficulty cannot be admitted openly.

Even if I press my Resolution to a vote, I know it will be defeated because you have got a majority, but I also know that the difficulty in recognition will remain as long as the present foreign policy of the Government continues, as long as the present economic policy of the Government continues, as long as the present Government continues.

17. hrs.

One thing is clear that so far as recognising these countries is concerned, it is only in words that the Government of India shows its sympathy. In action, they are not going to recognise it, and so, I do not want that to happen. In 1969-70, they had taken a stand. As far as the report in 1969-70 is concerned, there is a stand taken. More than one year has passed. I want to know if there is any difference now, and know whether the same position, same process, is continuing, or, taking into account the international situation, will the hon. Minister say that they will think over the matter and within a short time take a decision as far as this question is concerned ? Let me know what reply he has got to this question.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, with your permission, let me take just one minute to reply to him. For obvious reasons, I did not elaborate this point about our stand on Vietnam. I made a clear statement in the last United Nations General Assembly session. We clearly enunciated our stand on this, and if the hon. Member is interested he can go through that. He asks what is our difficulty. There is no question of our difficulty. It is unfair when he says that it is our difficulty in not recognising it. After having assessed the situation, we do not feel that we should go ahead in the manner which suggests, because, the very fact that he has mentioned it, namely, our chairmanship of the International Control Commission, that also puts a certain curb on the action that we have to take— an attitude of impartiality. Therefore, he cannot cite that as a point for the recognition which he is asking us to give.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall put all the amendments—3, 6, 7 and 8— to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 3, 6, 7 and 8 were put and negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, are you withdrawing your resolution ?

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are not withdrawing. Now, I shall put the resolution of Mr. Gopalan to the vote. The question is :

“This House is of the opinion that the Government should take firm line of supporting the National Liberation movements and condemn in unequivocal terms the American aggression in three Indo-Chinese States, give recognition to provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, and full recognition to the Governments of Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Korean People's Democratic Republic and German Democratic Republic.”

The motion was negatived.