

[Shri K. R. Ganesh]

ing other preliminaries. During 1971-72 the outlay on development programmes in the Calcutta Metropolitan Area is likely to be of the order of about Rs. 50 crores. This includes Rs. 5 crores for Bustee Improvement which would be financed entirely by Central grants and Rs. 9.54 crores earmarked for such schemes in the State Annual Plan. In addition, the Calcutta Metropolitan Development Authority would also get resources from market borrowings, loan assistance from the Government of India and as its share in the income from octroi.

10. The Central and State Plans are all steps towards increasing investment in the key sectors of the economy. West Bengal already possesses a large industrial base and has adequate potential for further industrialisation. Though the law and order situation should improve for reviving the investment climate, it is also true that economic regeneration of West Bengal resulting in expansion of employment opportunities will have impact on the situation. A new Industrial Reconstruction Corporation with headquarters at Calcutta has been set up. This Corporation is expected to play an active role in reviving sick and closed industries. Haldia is going to be a major Port and an oil refinery is being established by the Central Government at Haldia. The rural employment programmes initiated in the Central Budget of 1970-71 have also been taken up for implementation in West Bengal. New employment oriented schemes fully financed by the Centre are also being started in the State. I fervently hope that Hon'ble Members belonging to all sections of the House will extend their cooperation in bringing back a climate of peace and security in West Bengal and regenerating its economy.

16.08 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS,
1971-72—Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

SHRI UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara) :

Sir, at the outset, I want to tell Prof. Hiren Mukerjee that the trust with destiny to which Mrs. Indira Gandhi had been summoned will be fulfilled, as also the commitments we

have given to our people. I am glad that this House has got an opportunity to discuss our foreign policy at a crucial and critical juncture of our existence and that of this sub-continent and the world. The face of this sub-continent today has changed considerably with a dictator Committing a massive genocide never heard of or seen in the pages of history. But this kind of genocide, as my hon. friend, Shri Amrit Nahata, who spoke before me has said, is bound to meet with the doom that the previous attempts at genocides have in history. History has seen the fate of several such tin-pot dictators, and the fate of Yahya Khan cannot be and need not be different.

I beg to submit Sir, that an entirely new element has crept into the situation and that is the attempt at detente that the military industrial complex ruling the United States is trying with Peking warlords I see in this some positive kind of gain in the sense that we have always been trying towards this end for years together. I submit that this is of tremendous consequence to the future of this sub-continent. It may be too early to say whether the existing patterns of multi-alignments in international relations might get dissolved and new Bi-alignments would take shape; of this one cannot be certain, but I want to say that this is not just normalisation of relations between the two countries; it is an attempt at re-shaping the entire international relations on the basis of a new power equation. We have reasons to be concerned about this and I hope our diplomacy will be alerted to grapple with the meaning and significance of this development.

Apart from the prospects of personal fortunes of President Nixon, the military industrial complex that is behind the presidency has reasons to acquire this new posture. Only today I was reading that Senator Wilburt Mills has said that domestic considerations will weigh more in the next United States' presidential contest, and he emphasized that the real problems were of inflation in the American economy and the growing unemployment figures. It is known to all that United States has been defeated by the great heroic people of the Vietnam, and there is a great ferment of the younger generation in the United States and the non-conformist youth of U.S.A. are refusing to be subdued by the complex that is ruling the United States and President Nixon can

hardly afford to ignore that. The empire of dollar is cracking today and the entire structure of the industrial complex is facing a crisis in the United States.

The timing of the announcement may have something to do with the SALT talks that have been progressing and may have been intended as a warning to the Soviet Union, but there were clear indications in the United States' home front to suggest this change. As my hon. friend, Shri Amrit Nahata has pointed out, we are not surprised at this change; may be about the timing of the change because Chairman Mao with his Mona Lisa smile has been moving about for quite some time and he was ever willing to oblige. It has also been known after the famous journalist Edgar Snow went to Peking, I think in December last, that this was coming. But this is only of academic interest. What is of interest is the accomplished fact. The attempt at detente has now become an accomplished fact and this country has to be concerned about it.

Non-alignment, about which some reference was made in this House, was never conceived as a kind of mantra. Whatever the critics of our foreign policy might say, it was certainly a positive policy, it was a lively policy and it was a vigorous policy. It has helped us and I assert it has helped the world at a critical juncture of human existence. In a bi-polar world it has always helped to soothe the wounds. But the world has changed since then and new problems and possibilities have arisen. So, a vigorous diplomacy has to acquire new initiatives.

Only today I was reading the great editor Frank Moraes writing about 'realpolitik' coming into play. He is sorry that the United States has fallen into a trap. He says he is sorry his friend Nixon was going to be made a monkey out of the situation. But realpolitik, as Professor Mukherjee has referred to, is in Bangla Desh.

Seventy five million people of Bangla Desh, Sir, have been put in chains by a massive kind of dictatorship. They are helped in this by Washington. With every new diplomatic initiative that is going on it is becoming clearer and clearer as to who is behind this enslavement of the people of Bangla Desh. Pakistan, Sir, has always been a geographical absurdity. I remember

Prof. Gunnar Myrdal writing in his 'Asian Drama' that such a nation has never existed and cannot exist because Pakistan is a geographical and ethnic absurdity and this clique that is ruling Pakistan is trying to save its face and trying to save the unity of Pakistan. But it has already cracked and it can never be put into pieces again.

Sir, now coming to the problem posed, that is, of China I am of the opinion that a new initiative is called for from our side for normalising our relations with China. China cannot be wished away. Because of geographical and historical reasons she will continue to be our neighbour and no amount of allergy can wish away this fact; no amount of temperamental or emotional likes and dislikes can wish away the fact of China being a powerful, and a great neighbouring country with 750 million people. Looking back, I feel, Sir, it was a wrong decision we had taken earlier to reduce the level of diplomatic relations that we had in Peking. I hope, Sir, our Government will seriously consider and there is no loss of face in this to raise this to Ambassadorial level. We need not to be afraid of anything if we resume dialogue with China and, I feel, time is well past when we should have taken such an initiative.

Our one and only true friend in the world, Sir, over the last decade or more has been the Soviet Union and they have stood by us in all our trials and tribulations and, I hope, our relations will get strengthened. Apart from this, Sir, there are other powers—though not so big as the Soviet Union—like the G.D.R. with whom we have a trade of more than Rs. 50.55 crores but still I am amazed to find that the South Block is refusing to recognise this fact and that our Government is toeing the line of some officers of our foreign service. I hope the G.D.R. will be recognised soon and also the Provisional Government of South Vietnam.

Sir, a reference has been made about our relations with Arab States. I do not suggest that we can take it for granted our friendship with Arabs nor should they but at the same time what we were grappling with in West Asia was the forces of Arab nationalism. It is true that certain new elements have arisen in the Arab world which we should be concerned about but that does not mean that we should break

[Shri Unnikrishnan]

off our friendship with those Arab elements which have been friendly to us and those countries which have been friendly to us.

Now I come to the problems regarding our foreign service. I know there is lot of discontent in the foreign service particularly at the younger level which we can hardly ill-afford at this juncture and, I hope, Sardar Swaran Singh Ji will take note of this. There have been all kinds of people getting into the foreign service and getting promotions and at this juncture of our history when it calls for vigorous diplomatic initiatives it should be understood that "cocktail mixers" alone are not fixed into this service. It has become too exclusive a service and in many areas hostile to new ideas. Unless closer collaboration is achieved with universities and different academic circles and other intellectual circles in this country we cannot afford to give a new look to the policy.

As to the problems of the Foreign Service, I would suggest some kind of a Commission as they had in the United Kingdom—the Duncan Commission—to enquire into the whole range of the problems of the service including a pay rise. Even in most of our public sector undertakings, boys begin their life with Rs. 1200 and Rs. 1,000 whereas apart from the foreign allowance, a beginner here gets only Rs. 400. So, the whole pay structure has to be revised and it should be possible to do so.

Now, that the whole basis of power equations in world is changing it calls for a vigorous diplomatic initiative, which I hope will come from this Government. It cannot be a kind of non-alignment that has so far been understood to be some kind of a *mithaiwalla's* business, but in the present context it has to acquire a new meaning and purpose. We must have vigorous implementation of our policy. There can be no purpose in foreign policy unless we have internal cohesion and unless it is backed by real economic strength. I don't say that the leadership that we have alone can guarantee this.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Hear, hear !

SHRI UNNIKRISHNAN : I am sure, this Government alone can redeem these pledges and also give a new look to our foreign policy.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर) : सभापति जी, विदेश नीति का उद्देश्य राष्ट्र के उदात्त हितों का संरक्षण और संवर्धन करना होता है। ये हित स्थायी होते हैं। किन्तु विश्व की बदलती हुई परिस्थिति के अनुसार इन हितों की रक्षा करने का उपकरण जो विदेश नीति होती है उसे लचीला होना चाहिए। मुझे यह कहने में कोई सकोच नहीं है कि हमारी नीति हमारे व्यापक हितों का रक्षण नहीं कर सकी है।

स्वाधीनता के बाद हमें चार प्राक्रमणों का निशाना बनाया गया। हमारे दोनों पड़ोसी हमारे विशाल भूभाग पर कब्जा जमाने में सफल हुए हैं। पुरानी संमद ने जिसका वह सदन उत्तराधिकारी है वह शपथ ली थी चीनी आक्रमण के पश्चात् स्वर्गीय पंडित नेहरू के जन्म दिवस के पुण्य अवसर पर कि यह देश तथा सदन तब तक चैन से नहीं बैठेगा जब तक हम प्राक्रमणकारी के चंगुल में गयी हुई भूमि को मुक्त नहीं करा लेंगे। प्राज तो उस शपथ की कोई चर्चा नहीं करता। जो भूमि लची गयी है उसे वापस लेने का कोई उपाय, योजना नहीं दिखाई देती। यह स्वीकार करना होगा कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति को, भारत को शक्तिशाली बनाने का, अपनी सीमाओं को सुरक्षित रखने का और संसार में भारत को एक महा शक्ति के रूप में स्थापित करने का साधन नहीं बना सके।

सभापति जी, विश्व शान्ति, पंचशील, सहप्रतिष्ठ, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भाई चारा, अष्टौ भावनाएँ हैं। इनके साथ हमारा प्रतिबद्ध नाता है। लेकिन यह सुहावने प्राकृतिक शब्द किसी राष्ट्र की सुविचारित विदेश नीति का स्थान नहीं ले सकते। हम जैसी दुनिया चाहते हैं वैसी प्राप्त नहीं है। और जैसी दुनिया आज है उसको समझ कर हमें विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करना होगा।

हमने पञ्चशील का समझौता किया कम्युनिस्ट चीन के साथ, और कम्युनिस्ट चीन के

हमारी पीठ में छुरा भोक दिया । हमने पाकिस्तान के साथ मित्रता के सम्बन्धों का विकास करने की कोशिश की । लेकिन उसका प्रत्युत्तर हमें आक्रमण में मिला आज अमरीका और कम्युनिस्ट चीन निकट घा रहे हैं । अतः हीनी बात हो रही है । यह दुनिया की बदलती हुई परिस्थिति का एक प्रमाण है । जब हमने विदेश नीति का निर्धारण किया तो चीन तस्वीर में नहीं था, रूस और अमरीका के बीच में शीत युद्ध चल रहा था । हम उस युद्ध में नहीं पड़ना चाहते थे । दोनों गुटों से अलग रहने की हमारी नीति उस हद तक ठीक थी । लेकिन जब विश्व की परिस्थिति बदल गयी, और विश्व के दो केन्द्र नहीं, अनेक केन्द्र पैदा हो गये, फ्रांस अलग चला गया, पीकिंग एक आरक्षण का केन्द्र बन गया, रूस और अमरीका में शीत युद्ध समाप्त हो गया, दोनों निकट आने लगे तब भी हम ने अपनी विदेश नीति में लचीलापन नहीं लाया, हमने परिवर्तन नहीं किया । हम नान-एलाइनमेंट को मन्त्र मान कर उसका जाप करते रहे । अगर नान-एलाइनमेंट का अर्थ यह है कि भारत स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति पर चले तो उससे कोई विरोध नहीं हो सकता । लेकिन अगर नान-एलाइनमेंट का अर्थ यह है कि हम बारी-बारी से किसी एक देश के साथ अपने को एलाइन करते जायें हम पहले अमरीका के साथ कर रहे थे, अब रूस के साथ कर रहे हैं और हम एक दूसरे दर्जे की घटिया दर्जे की ताकत बन कर रह जायें तो फिर यह गुट निरपेक्ष की नीति न तो हमारे राष्ट्रीय हितों का संरक्षण कर सकती है और न यह विदेश नीति के जो उद्देश्य होते हैं उनको पूरा कर सकती है ।

समापति जी, बंगला देश के मामले ने यह बात फिर से सिद्ध कर दी है कि 23 सालों में हम मित्र नहीं जुटा सके । आज हम अपने को मित्रबिहीन पाते हैं । बड़ी मात्रा में विस्थापित

घा रहे हैं भारत में शरण लेने के लिये । यह सरकार मानती नहीं थी, मुश्किल से माना 30 लाख से ऊपर संख्या जायगी । अब पुनर्वास मन्त्री कह रहे हैं कि संख्या इससे भी ज्यादा जा सकती है । अब वहाँ अकाल की स्थिति है । पाकिस्तान सरकार उन्हें अन्न नहीं दे सकती, देना भी नहीं चाहेगी । लाखों की संख्या में विस्थापित भारत आने वाले हैं । पूर्वी बंगाल का मामला केवल लोकतंत्र का मामला नहीं है । भारत के लोकतंत्र का भविष्य पूर्वी बंगाल के साथ जुड़ गया है ।

मैं दुनिया के अन्य देशों को दोष नहीं देता शायद वह अपने हितों की रक्षा कर रहे हैं । अरब देशों से हमने मित्रता निभायी इजराल को नाराज करके, जिसके जन्म में अमरीका के साथ सोवियत रूस का भी हाथ था । हम ने अरब देशों का साथ दिया । आज वे मोन बँठे हुए हैं । उनका मोन उनकी बाणी से भी अधिक मुखर है । सम्भव है वे अपनी कठिनाइयों में फंसे हों । वह हमारी मदद के लिये नहीं आ रहे हैं । वह पूर्वी बंगाल के तरु मेघ की निंदा करने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं है ।

सोवियत रूस हमारा मित्र है । यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में कश्मीर के सवाल पर उसने जो हमारा साथ दिया उसके लिये हम उसके आभारी हैं । लेकिन सोवियत रूस भी अपने हितों में ऐसे काम करता रहा है जो हमें पसन्द नहीं है, और जो किसी औचित्य की कसौटी पर खरे नहीं सिद्ध किये जा सकते । पाकिस्तान को हथियार देना क्या सोवियत रूस के नेता या उनके नेता या उनके कोई समर्थक जो इस सदन में और बाहर बैठे हुए हैं यह बात दिल पर हाथ रख कर कह सकते हैं कि सोवियत रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को दिये गये हथियार बंगला देश में काम में नहीं आ रहे हैं ? आ रहे हैं । मगर सोवियत रूस के नेताओं ने हथियार दिये पाकिस्तान को इस आधार पर कि पाकिस्तान

[श्री छटल बिहारी बाजपेयी]

कहीं चीन के बंगुल में न चला जाय। और अमरीका पाकिस्तान को हथियार देता था इस घाघार पर कि कहीं पाकिस्तान रूस के बंगुल में न चला जाय। और हम इस संकट में फंसे।

हर एक देश अपने स्वार्थ के अनुसार चल रहा है। हमारा भी कोई स्वार्थ है या नहीं? लोकतंत्र की दुहाई देने वाले मोडियन रूम ने चेकोस्लोवाकिया में फौजे भेज दी। दुनिया में किमी ने उंगली नहीं उठायी।

अमरीका चीननाम में जो कुछ करना चाहता है कर रहा है। निन्दा करने के अलावा उसके हाथ रोकने वाला कोई नहीं है। अगर स्वाधीनता के बाद हमने शक्ति की साधना की होती, विदेश नीति को हमने अपनी औद्योगिक, अपनी सैनिक और अपनी सामाजिक शक्ति को बढ़ाने का साधन बनाया होता, अगर भारत के 50 करोड़ लोगों में हमने यह मनीषा जगाई होती कि या तो भारत महा राष्ट्र के रूप में जीवित रहेगा—महा राष्ट्र में मेरा मतलब महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश में नहीं है—महान राष्ट्र के रूप में जीवित रहेगा, नहीं तो तीसरे दर्जे की शक्ति बन कर दुनिया के किमी कोने में दुबका रहेगा तो आज यह स्थिति न होनी। श्री अमृत नाहटा इस समय सदन में नहीं हैं, वे कहते हैं कि दुनिया के पाम एटम बम हैं, इसका कोई असर नहीं हुआ, चीन की जन संख्या इतनी ज्यादा है, इसका भी कोई परिणाम नहीं हुआ, किस बान का परिणाम हुआ है? प्रेमीडेंट निकसन के जो कम्युनिकेशन्स डाइरेक्टर हैं, उनके वक्तव्य का एक अंश मैं पढ़कर मुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"It was China's possession of nuclear power and her huge Population which made Mr Nixon anxious to improve relations with that country."

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : यानी हम लोग पापुलेशन बढ़ाएँ।

श्री छटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : सैर, आप

तो बढा ही रहे हैं मेरे बिना कहे हुए। (व्यवधान)

सभापति जी चीन की उपेक्षा नहीं की जा सकती। काश यह शब्द भारत के लिए भी कहे जा सकने कि 50 करोड़ लोगों का देश, प्राकृतिक साधनों से भरपूर घरती, एक भौगोलिक महत्व का स्थान, आज कोई भारत की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकता। मगर मास्को जब चाहता है हमारी उपेक्षा कर देता है, पाकिस्तान के प्रति वाशिंगटन का रवैया छुपा हुआ नहीं है, चीन हम पर आक्रमण कर चुका है। हम दुनिया के नक्शे पर कहाँ है? हमारी विदेश नीति ने कहाँ खड़ा किया है? क्या इसी विदेश नीति को सफल माना जा सकता है?

सभापति जी भारत एक स्वतन्त्र विदेश नीति पर चले यह आवश्यक है, लेकिन विदेश नीति लचीली होनी चाहिए, जड़ नहीं। भारत की विदेश नीति यथार्थवादी होनी चाहिए, कल्पना के लोक में निचरगण करने वाली नहीं। 1962 में जब कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने हम पर हमला किया तो हमारी आँखें खुली और हमने शक्ति बटोरी और 1965 में उस शक्ति का थोड़ा प्रदर्शन भी किया मगर श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री चले गये और देश फिर जड़ना की स्थिति में आ गया।

श्री पीलू मोदी : श्रीर, ये सब रह गये।

श्री छटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : आज हम इस स्थिति में नहीं हैं कि बंगला देश के बारे में कोई प्रभावी कार्यवाही कर सके। मैं थक गया हूँ विदेश मंत्री जी का यह ब्यान सुनते-सुनते कि जब समय आयेगा तब मान्यता दी जाएगी। वह समय कब आयेगा? वह समय आनेवाला है या समय बीत रहा है। आखिर बंगला देश के नेता इस बात को ज्यादा जानते हैं कि मान्यता देना उन के लाभ के लिए है या नहीं? मगर हमारी सरकार बंगला देश के नेताओं से भी ज्यादा भला चाहती है। हम कहते हैं कि बंगला

देश को मान्यता देना बंगला देश के हित में नहीं है। मुझे याद है कि नेहरू जी भी यही कहा करते थे तिब्बत के बारे में। जब हम ने मदन में यह मामला उठाया कि तिब्बत का मामला संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठाया जाए और तिब्बत को स्वाधीन करो का प्रयत्न किया जाए तो नेहरू जी कहा करते थे कि तिब्बत का मामला वहां उठाना तिब्बतियों के हक में नहीं है। भेरे पास शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान के एक निकटतम सहयोगी डा० मञ्ज-उल-इस्लाम का एक वक्तव्य है। उसको मैं पढ़ कर मुनाना चाहता हूँ :

He urged India to recognise the Bangla Desh soon. Lack of *de jure* recognition was hampering the efforts of the freedom fighters to obtain arms from abroad.

एक बात उन्होंने और कही है। उसको भी मैं पढ़ कर मुना दूँ।

He welcomed the proposed campaign of the Jana Sangh for recognition of Bangla Desh.

यह कोई गरीबिकेट नहीं है (व्यवधान)।

सभापति जी, बंगला देश के सवान पर हमें अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना पड़ेगा। यह कोई नहीं कहता कि हम पाकिस्तान से युद्ध करें, कोई नहीं कहता कि बंगला देश में भारतीय सेनाएं भेजी जायें लेकिन बंगला देश की स्वाधीन सरकार को मान्यता दे कर उसको हर तरह की सहायता देना यह हमारा कर्तव्य है, केवल लोकतन्त्र की रक्षा के लिए नहीं, अपने हितों की रक्षा के लिए और राष्ट्रीय हितों का यह तकाजा है कि बंगला देश की सरकार को मान्यता दी जाए। हमारे राष्ट्रीय हितों का तकाजा है कि पाकिस्तान टूटे, बिखरे और यह प्रक्रिया जो प्रारम्भ हो गई है, हमें इसे बल प्रदान करना चाहिए। दुनिया के देशों में रिपब्लिक नहीं जा रहे हैं, दुनिया के देशों को चिन्ता नहीं है कि बंगला देश में क्या हो रहा है। वे तो घातंज पर अपनी गोटे बिछाने की

कोशिश कर रहे हैं। मुझे ताज्जुब हुआ जब अभी हमारे मार्क्ससिस्ट कम्युनिस्ट के नेता भाषण कर रहे थे और कह रहे थे कि चीन के साथ सभी ने अपने सम्बन्ध सुधारे हैं लेकिन हमने नहीं सुधारे। चीन ने हमारे सिवा और किसी पर हमला किया है? हाँ, रूस के साथ भी यह छेड़ छाड़ कर रहा है।

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : तिब्बत पर किया है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : तिब्बत तो हमारा साथी ही है। जब हम अपने पर आक्रमण की बात कहते हैं तो उम में तिब्बत पर आक्रमण भी शामिल है। लेकिन चीन ने अमेरिका पर हमला नहीं किया, चीन ने ब्रिटेन के साथ भी अतिक्रमण नहीं किया। चीन के शिकार तो हम हैं। हमने और देशों के साथ मित्रता करने की कोशिश की है और सरकार ने भी की थी। जब माओ त्से तुंग मुसकराये थे तो नई दिल्ली की कली थोड़ी थोड़ी खिलने लगी थी मगर बाद में उम पर तृपारपात हो गया। अगर चीन हमारी भूमि वापस करने के लिए तैयार हो, अगर चीन सभ्य देश के नाने हमारी सीमाओं को अनुत्तन्धनीय मानता हो और अगर चीन हमारी प्रभुमत्ता का समादर करे तो चीन के साथ भी सम्बन्ध सुधारे जा सकते हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रेमीडेंट निक्शन और कम्युनिस्ट चीन के नेताओं की जो मुलाकात होने जा रही है, उस में भारत अगर कोई भूमिका निर्वाह कर सकता है तो वह भूमिका यही है कि हम इस मिलन को थोड़ा व्यापक बनाने का प्रयत्न करें। अभी कुछ अमरीकी सिनेटर्स ने कहा है, जो डेमोक्रेटिक पार्टी के हैं कि प्रेसीडेंट निक्सन को सोवियत रूस भी जाना चाहिए। यह धारणा दूर करना आवश्यक है कि चीन, पाकिस्तान और अमेरिका का जो त्रिकोण बन रहा है, इसका एक कोण हमारी छाती पर और दूसरा कोण सोवियत रूस की छाती पर होगा।

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : प्रांड एलायन्स होगा।

श्री घटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : यह त्रिकोण अगर विश्व की सुरक्षा के हितों में व्यापक बनता है या चीन के युद्ध की अनिवार्यता के सिद्धांत का परित्याग कर के सही रास्ते पर घाता है तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ। अगर चीन मित्रता चाहता है तो उसे मित्रता का सबूत देना होगा और मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ जो यह मानते हैं कि निम्न घोर मामलों-स्तै-तुंग की मुलाकात हुई तो मारी समस्याएँ हल हो जाएगी। ऐसा होने वाला नहीं है। समस्याएँ जटिल हैं, समस्याएँ पेचीदा हैं। हाँ उनको खोलने के लिए दरवाजा खटखटाया जा सकता है, खिड़की खुल सकती है, लेकिन एक बात स्पष्ट है कि त्रिगुट हमारे निये चिन्ना का कारण बन सकता है और इस का हल यह नहीं है कि हम रूस की गोद में जा कर बैठ जाएँ। इस का हल एक ही है कि हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े रहें और स्वावलम्बी बनें और एटम बम का निर्माण करें। हमें 24 मान हूँ, 1947 में आजाद हुए और चीन की क्रायि दो मान बाद 1949 में हुई और आज उन दो मान की देरी के बाद भी कम्युनिस्ट चीन इस स्थिति में आ सकता है कि चीन के सब देश उस की मित्रता की याचना करें, तो हमें विचार करना होगा कि हमारी नीति कहाँ चलती थी जिससे आज हम विश्व के आकर्षण के केन्द्र नहीं बन सके और आज तो छोटा सा पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान भी हमको मान देते हुए दिखाई देता है (व्यवधान) उस ने हमें तो ज़रूर बेबेकूफ बनाया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि विश्व के बदलते हुए संदर्भ में हम अपनी विदेश नीति पर पुनर्विचार करें। हम देखें कि परिस्थिति के बदलने के साथ हमारी विदेश नीति का लक्ष्यलापन कायम रहता है या नहीं। हम यह देखें कि हमारी विदेश नीति हमें मित्रों को जुटाने में सहायक होती है या नहीं।

बड़े-बड़े देशों को छोड़ दीजिए; जो पड़ोसी देश है, उनके साथ भी हम मित्रता के सम्बन्ध कायम नहीं रख सकते। बर्मा की सरकार ने हमारे पी० टी० आई० के स्पेशल कारिसपाइंट को तो घंटे का नोटिस दे कर निकाल दिया। रगून में एक ही भारतीय सवाददाता था—पी० टी० आई० का। उसे इम्मीग्रेशन आफिस में 2 बजे बुलाया गया और कहा गया कि रात के 2 बजे अपनी बीबी के साथ वापिस चले जाओ। फिर उसे अपनी बीबी से मिलने नहीं दिया गया, उसे घर नहीं जाने दिया गया। क्या किसी देश के सवाददाता के साथ कोई मित्र देश इस तरह व्यवहार कर सकता है? मुझे नहीं मालूम कि इस बारे में विदेश मंत्री ने क्या किया। मुझे नहीं मालूम कि यह मामला उठाया गया या नहीं। बर्मा में हमारे साथ यह व्यवहार हो रहा है।

नेपाल के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध जितने मुट्टे होने चाहिए, उनसे नहीं है। लका की चर्चा अभी मेरे मित्र श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी कर रहे थे। हमने लका को महायत्ना दी, लेकिन लका ने पाकिस्तानी फौजों को बंगला देश जाने में नहीं रोका।

कौन हमारे साथ है? कौन हमारा मित्र है? इस विदेश नीति ने हमको मित्र विहीन बना दिया है। यह विदेश नीति राष्ट्रीय हितों का संरक्षण करने में विफल रही है। इस विदेश नीति पर पुनर्विचार होना चाहिए। हम किसी गुट में मिले, इनसे छोटे हम नहीं हैं। मगर हम यह मान कर तो चले कि जब सघर्ष होगा, तो हमें मित्रों की आवश्यकता होगी। वे मित्र सिद्धांत के आधार पर नहीं बनेंगे। वे मित्र स्वार्थों के सम्बन्धों के आधार पर बनेंगे। किसके साथ हमारे स्वार्थ जुड़ते हैं, किसके साथ टकराते हैं, इस आधार पर, कल्पना के लोक से उगार कर, हम अपनी विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करें, इस बात की आवश्यकता है। तभी विदेश नीति अपने उद्देश्य में सफल हो सकती है, अन्यथा नहीं। बन्धवाद।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha) : We have been treated to two tremendous and powerful orations by two of our friends from the Opposition, one by Shri I. N. Mukherjee and the other by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Their approach to the problem has been from two different angles. And their effort, however, has been to show that the foreign policy of the Government of India has been a failure, that it lacks dynamism and purpose and the result is that India stands bypassed by all the other nations and we are not getting any recognition from any friends in the world.

The main attack has been by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, namely that the non-alignment policy that our country has been pursuing has been a failure and the gravamen of his attack is that whereas Pakistan has friends, India does not have any, friends. The question immediately arises what exactly the purpose of the foreign policy is. Is it the purpose of the foreign policy that we must have some friends to back us up as and when events need it? Or is it the purpose of the foreign policy to project the domestic policy of India on the international front and to find friends throughout the world not in terms of the Government of this country or of that country but in terms of the popular will throughout the world?

Let us recall for a moment the circumstances under which the non-alignment policy was evolved. India became independent and it became independent in the context of or as part of an international movement of independence. At that time, imperialism was strong, and neo-colonialism was strong, and an attempt was being made to exploit even the independent countries, and an attempt was made in that direction by the formation of military blocs. The newly emerging countries had no alternative but to go to one bloc or the other and to hang on to one bloc or the other. Counsels were made in India that we might also hang on to America; some other friends said that we might hang on to Soviet Russia. The new countries were joining one bloc or the other, because they had no other alternative. Under those circumstances, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru evolved this new idea that the newly emerging countries might remain non-aligned, that they might gather together and that there

was a third way, the way of independence, absolute independence, without any obligation to any military bloc.

It is thus that the non-alignment policy was born. The three architects of non-alignment policy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Marshall Tito and Nasser evolved it and there have been three non-alignment conferences since then. The question is whether that served any purpose. It cannot be disputed, Sir, that it did serve the purpose and the events have shown that it served a very major purpose. What are the things that we have been asking. We have been asking for the disarmament, ban of nuclear weapons, control on arm proliferation. We have been asking for cultural and economic help to the under-developed countries. We have been asking for the universalisation of United Nations. We have been asking for admission of China international community and we have been stressing that the sanction for world peace is not military blocs, but understanding with the another and respect for the integrity of one another. Many years have gone by and the world has been spared a total war.

I would submit that non-alignment policy that India has evolved has yielded many benefits. If Nixon is going to Peking for a meeting. I would certainly lay the blame with the compulsion of circumstances. It is this tremendous international opinion that the non-alignment forces have built up throughout the country, even in America, that is forcing the detente between America and China. That is not a matter for which anybody should have any regrets at all. My only point is non-alignment policy is not something anybody has to mock at. What is tremendously important is that the world opinion has got to be built up in favour of anti-imperialism, in favour of anti-colonialism, in favour of independence and self-determination and in favour of non-aggression. This purpose is now being served completely, Sir.

We are now faced with certain other situations. The situation is, as far as we are concerned, the question of Bangla Desh. I must say that Prof. Mukherjee was rather uncharitable in his comments about the policy of the Government of India. Self-contradictions were apparent in his arguments. He was saying that the Government of India did not go to world capitals and did not tell them as to what stand of the..

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

Government of India is and in the next sentence he was mocking that the ministers of the Government of India were going to different capitals and calling it ridiculous. I am surprised that he was not able to know his self-contradiction between the two propositions. He wants recognition of Bangla Desh straightaway. He does not tell us how the recognition will help their cause. The question is whether the cause will be served or not. How the recognition will serve the cause is a matter to be explained. The position now is and as it has been amply explained in the debates in this House that the recognition is not a material thing.

An aggression has been committed on India through the cover of the refugees influx. The aggression has got to be vacated. We have got the right of intervention and to intervene it is not necessary that we must recognise Bangla Desh. Intervention is not the only method either. There are other methods also and the method in the first place is to build up the public opinion throughout the world. That public opinion is being built up.

In the course of these years, we had two confrontations. Would it be correct to say that when we had a confrontation we were left completely friendless in this world. We have had a confrontation with Pakistan. Could we say that we were left friendless in this world. Now there is no confrontation. If the confrontation comes, we rely not on the Governments, not on the military junta, but we rely on the millions of people throughout the country who have got the non-alignment policy accepted as their philosophy, and who are wedded to the basic policies of freedom, independence, non-aggression and that sort of things. If that has got to be built up, the position is clear, Sir. That has built up in America. That is why, the United States find it difficult to give aid to Pakistan without defying the public opinion. Public opinion is coming up against Nixon. Nixon has got to bow to it. Let us not forget that public opinion is being built up in favour of our stand. The Consortium is refusing aid to Pakistan. Where does that inspiration come from? It is from the moral stature India has built up as a country wedded to certain principles and fundamental theses. This is the way we are going forward. Sabrerattling will not take us anywhere; it does not lead to the

solution of any problem, Adventurist postures will not do the trick.

India while framing its policy cannot forget the fact that she is trying to be a socialist country. We have accepted socialism as our aim, we swear by secularism as our aim. We will find as friends only those who accept that socialism as their aim. It is not a matter of alignment with Soviet Russia. If Soviet Russia is socialist, we will certainly seek out and find their heart throbbing—in unison with us. If some other country is wedded to a similar policy as ours, we will find their heart also throbbing in unison with ours. This is projection of the domestic policy of India on the international plane. Socialism being our domestic policy, you cannot expect the capitalist country's heart throbbing in unison with ours.

Hence it is inevitable that the foreign policy being a projection of the domestic policy and the domestic policy being socialism and secularism, we will certainly find as friends those countries belonging to a particular camp. There is no question of apologising about it. International opinion can certainly be brought round. That is the direction in which we should go.

Now we find that the era of regional military bloc systems is vanishing. In its place, an era of spheres of influence is coming up. That is the new eventuality facing the world. We have to remain out of these spheres of influence. We have to lay the foundation for the existence of independent nations. For that a philosophy has got to be built up. If at all anything has to be said on the foreign policy of the Government of India, it is not that it may be abandoned, but that it may be vivified and made more dynamic. Let us come out as champions of this great idea which has been seeping throughout the world. Let us not forget that we have got a historic mission to fulfil.

We were among the first to be independent in the postwar period. That has cast an obligation, a duty and right on us. The obligation is to voice the sentiments of people who are being oppressed and suppressed. We have got to play that role, come what may. India with 550 million people can certainly stand out without the aid of anybody, if it comes to that. China could do that. When Vietnam could do that, when it could stand on its own feet with all the

American aid against it, India, even if it comes to that, without any aid from anybody must be able to stand on its own, provided we do not abandon the fundamental principles on which our foreign policy has been footed, tested and proved to be completely correct and unimpeachable.

On this basis, I support the foreign policy of the Government of India with one request only, namely, that it be more dynamic, more determined. Let us give a lead to the peoples of the world. Let us not forget that whatever governments may say, the peoples throughout the world are with us, that our voice is being heard throughout the world and there is a reverberation throughout the world of that voice.

I support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karinanagar) : So many hon. members have spoken on this subject as to what is the foreign policy. I think Government may be thinking that foreign policy means the policy formulated by the foreigners. The policy is only for the foreign countries, not for our country. When I consider our own problems, I think that the Government is not at all interested in safeguarding the interests of our country. After all, there is a saying which must be kept in mind in international politics or any other politics, namely that there are no permanent friends and no permanent foes, only permanent interests. Whether we are safeguarding our permanent interests or not is the question that has to be considered.

When I was a student, I used to discuss the foreign policy with my colleagues. In 1954 the non-aligned foreign policy appeared to me to be very good. My colleagues used to oppose it, but I used to support it because the situation at that time was different. There were two blocs, the Soviet Union and the U.S.A., and we did not want to get involved unnecessarily because we wanted to concentrate on the economic development of our country. But now the situation has completely changed.

As the time at my disposal is short, I shall concentrate on Bangla Desh and the Arab countries. I am very much pained at the policy of the Arab countries. When China committed aggression against us, no country from the Arab world supported us.

When I was a student, Pandit Nehru came to Hyderabad and he was speaking at a public meeting on the day when France, U. K. and Israel attacked the U. A. R. He was roaring like anything as if aggression had been committed against India, because he was sincere and he wanted to help our friends.

But when aggression was committed against us, the Arab countries never spoke one word. No country came to help us. They are said to be socialist, Muslim countries. Where is their socialism or Muslim Religion gone? In Bangla Desh the majority are Muslims. When genocide is being committed, when people are being butchered and exterminated, nobody from the Arab countries condemns that. They think that will be acting against Pakistan and that is why they are silent. The test is whether we have any friend in the world at all. We have no friend at all. We did not intervene in Bangla Desh at the proper time. In 1947, when Pakistan invaded Kashmir and our army was ready to occupy the whole territory, unnecessarily we went to U.N.O. and a cease-fire was ordered. After that we have not been able to solve that problem till now. Similarly we have created this problem of Bangla Desh unnecessarily. As I said on an earlier occasion, had we intervened, within 24 hours it would have been solved. Unfortunately, the Government has failed. It was afraid.

Our Minister is not acting like a Sardarji. He must be bold enough, courageous enough. Whenever I see a Sardarji, I automatically think that he is a very courageous man, that he will be prepared for anything.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
Appearances can be disceptive.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO : I am really surprised that he has abundant patience and that it is not exhausted. I pray to God that it may be exhausted. I want him to remember the traditions of Sardarjis. He has forgotten the traditions of his ancestors. He should be bold enough at least now. The time has come when he should solve the problem. Unless, we are bold enough, we are not going to solve this problem or any problem at all.

[Shri Satvanarayan Rao]

This problem of Bangla Desh is also our problem. Ten million people have come to India. It is too great a burden on us. We are not in a position to feed our own people. Where is the question of feeding these people? We are spending crores of rupees on them. Do you know what the common people are saying about it? They are asking why unnecessarily we are paying for this. The taxpayers are worried about this. We are not in a position to develop our country. The whole plan will be up set. We shall have to spend a lot of money on these people. Although we have got sympathy for them. We will have to face that problem also.

17.00 hrs.

So many friends asked Sardar Swaran Singh to resign on that day. I do not say that he should resign. But I definitely say: if you are not serious of this problem at least to take leave for one week and make me Foreign Minister; I shall solve this problem within one week; I shall solve this problem permanently; I have got that courage; I shall show you the way how to solve this problem.

Why should you condemn other countries and say that they are giving economic aid and military aid to Pakistan? We are ourselves not acting. I think you must now at least rise to the occasion and solve this problem and unnecessarily not interfere with other countries. It is all past history now. Let us confine ourselves to our own problems and not meddle in the affairs of other countries. Previously we used to condemn every country and interfere in the affairs of other countries. That is why nobody supported us.

I was surprised when my friend Mr. Vajpayee made a plea for recognition. That is not sufficient now. What is the use of recognition alone? Let us recognise and let us send our army and drive them out. Even international law will not come in our way in our doing so. I request you to do this.

SHRI JAGANATH RAO (Chatrapur): The foreign policy of every country is based on the national security angle. We become independent in 1947 and at that time the whole world was divided into two blocs, East and West. So Panditji thought that we should not align ourselves with any

bloc and that we should follow an independent foreign policy, policy of non-alignment, non-intervention in the affairs of other countries, friendship with all nations and malice towards none.

That policy of 1947 is equally valid today. The two blocs are disappearing. The United States and the Soviet Union have come together and there is agreement in SALT. They are also coming together respect of space exploration. President Nixon is going to Peking and Moscow. The three Super Powers are coming together and it is good for the world. It will lessen international tensions.

Simply because the Super Powers have come together does it mean that we should align ourselves with any one of them? Mr. Vajpayee said that we should reassess our foreign policy. But he did not suggest anything further. Does he want us to join hands with China or the United States or Soviet Russia? Do we gain by that. Therefore our policy should be continued. I also agree that no policy, domestic or foreign, should be static. There should be no rigidity about it; it should be flexible. It would not help us to throw overboard our policy of non-alignment and align ourselves with any of these nations.

What is friendship in international affairs? Friends are only friends in name and not in deed. When we are in need no country comes to our aid. In 1962 at the time of Chinese aggression we know how many friends came to our rescue. In 1965 at the time of Pakistani conflict did any country come to our aid? What we gained in the conflict, we had to give up because some friends intervened and asked us to give up what we got.

Now we are confronted with Bangla Desh issue. As I said before friendship in international affairs means friendship only in name, because any friendly country would first look its own self interest. Which country will come to our help in solving the Bangla Desh issue? We have done it because the people of Bangla Desh are our own kith and kin. It is our neighbouring country. We agreed; we endorsed their aspirations for self-determination and independence. That is why we were willing, willingly and ungrudgingly, to take the refugees into our country. Their number is increasing; as the Rehabilitation Minister

said, he has forewarned us—the number may go up to 10 million. It is likely to reach about that figure. But there may be a further wave of influx; people may come in larger numbers. But our policy is one of non-alignment. That is the basic policy which no country should give up, much less India.

But then the question arises. The United States also is a friendly country, but it has been following a policy of arming Pakistan right from 1954. When our good friend, Sardar Swaran Singh was there, they gave him all sorts of assurances, that they are not shipping arms and ammunition. But then we are confronted with the publication in the *New York Times* that two ships have sailed out, and the number became three, and later it was learnt that five more ships are on the way. Therefore, the United States wants Pakistan to be strong, and perhaps they wanted Pakistan to be strong, and perhaps they wanted Pakistan to use the arms against China to contain communism. And China became a friend of Pakistan. Therefore, the arms have to be used against somebody; so they have used them for the aggression in East Bengal.

Now, President Nixon is coming nearer to China and also to the Soviet Union. My fear is that China may infiltrate into Bangla Desh. Unless we take quick action, Bangla Desh may be faced with these infiltrators.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : What do you mean by quick action ?

SHRI JAGANATH RAO : I will come to that. I am spelling out what it is. Mujibur Rahman was arrested. But Maulana Bhashani who is an extremist is not arrested. Mujibur Rahman, before his arrest said, "Unless independence is granted to Bangla Desh, the extremists may take advantage of this." That is going to happen. Any further delay in Bangla Desh getting independence means infiltration of China and those extremists.

What should we do in the circumstances? I do not agree with those hon. Members who say that recognition *de jure* is the only solution. We have recognised the aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh. That is why we have taken large

numbers of the refugees into our country. When we agree with their aspirations, we have given them the moral support and we are fighting the cause of Bangla Desh in the world capitals. The diplomatic offensive that we have launched has paid us some dividends. We cannot expect greater dividends to come to us, because no country, however convinced it may be about the justice and the fairness of the cause, would like to come forward and ally itself with a small country which is fighting for its existence. It does not, therefore, mean that our diplomatic offensive has failed, that our foreign policy has failed. Our foreign policy is very good. Sardar Swaran Singh is a rough and tough person; not that he is not courageous. The former Foreign Minister of the Government of India is short and sweet. We now have got a tough person in Sardar Swaran Singh. The former Minister was following the same foreign policy; and the same policy is being followed by Sardar Swaran Singh. He is now coming up; he must rise, awake and act quickly.

What is the action? My friend Shri Manoharan wanted me to spell out what it is. I do not say invade Bangla Desh. What I would say is this. I would put just two questions to the Foreign Minister and expect an answer to those questions. This ship *Padma* is sailing to Karachi. Are you going to intercept that ship and prevent the arms and armaments from reaching Pakistan? The House will remember that in 1962 or so, when the Soviet Prime Minister, Khrushchev, sent a ship containing missiles to Cuba, President Kennedy said that United States would intercept the ship. The whole world for 48 hours watched with bated breath to see what would happen. Luckily, and fortunately for the world, the ship was withdrawn. Now, are we going to request our friendly countries to help us in intercepting the ship? I would like to have a categorical reply in simple language, not in any diplomatic language, from the Foreign Minister.

17.10 hrs.

[SHRI R. D. BHANDARE *in the Chair*]

Secondly, some areas in Bangla Desh have been liberated. But still, it is a battlefield and the fight is going on. Are we go-

[Shri Jaganath Rao]

ing to move a resolution in the Security Council to send a UN Observer Force to see that the liberated areas are occupied by the refugees and those people who are still afraid to stay in Bangla Desh do not come to India but continue to stay there? At least this we would do. Let us not depend on Sweden or other countries to move a resolution. It is not like moving a resolution for seating China in the UN. We never wanted to move it, but we used to support it. I had the privilege to go in that delegation, the leader of which was Mr. Krishna Menon, highly respected and equally feared at the UN. Therefore, the time has come for us when we have to stand on our own legs. No other country will come to our aid. When we are convinced about the righteousness of the cause of Bangla Desh, we have to move that resolution and see that further influx is stopped and also the people who have come here may go back with confidence and live there. I do not suggest we should occupy those areas, but something has to be done in the direction I have indicated, so that it prevents further influx.

I feel if we delay things further, it will become dangerous for us. West Pakistan clearly knows it cannot hold East Bengal any longer, because of the distance and also because of the united will of the people there to become independent. No country can hold another country or part of it if the people are fighting with a singleness of purpose to become independent. Pakistan may be concentrating on Azad Kashmir. We have to anticipate what is going to happen. May be China or some other superpower may come into Bangla Desh. My information is...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Not information but guess.

SHRI JAGANATH RAO : I have no official sources in information. But when I go to Calcutta, I hear, people say so many things. I understand that the people killed in Bangla Desh are mostly Muslims. The idea is, the Hindus will be terrorised and would automatically go away to India. Out of the 7 million refugees who have come, more than 6½ million are Hindus. The youth and intellectual Muslims in Bangla Desh have been ruthlessly massacred so that the Hindus may run away out of fear and they want to equalise the population there.

Bangla Desh will become independent and it may not be a part of Pakistan.

In these circumstances, we have to act quickly. Four months have already passed. We should take quick action on our own, not depending on super-powers. When we act, perhaps more countries may join us.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY (Kendrapara) : Sir, in the nineteenth century, a British Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, had said, there were no permanent friends nor permanent enemies but only permanent interests. According to our foreign policy experts, it seems that here are no permanent friends, no permanent interests but only permanent clichés, permanent slogans and permanent prejudices which should guide our foreign policy. One of those clichés is non-alignment. I am an admirer of non-alignment and during my tenure as Member of Parliament during the last decade, I have supported it on many an occasion. But a progressive and dynamic policy admits of no consistency for all times to come.

Therefore, when I speak on this occasion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs, I feel that the time has come when our foreign policy must have a new look and there must be an agonising reappraisal of the credits and debits of our non-aligned foreign policy.

India being a traditional power and having no extra-territorial interests, according to merits foreign policy objectives were very limited. Those foreign policy objectives were, (a) incorporation of the whole of Kashmir, (b) more constructive and responsive relations with Nepal, (c) maintaining the sovereignty of the Indian frontiers, and (d) promotion of strength and solidarity of the non-Western world. In all humility I ask the Foreign Minister to tell me which of these of our foreign policy objectives have been achieved, and in what measures, by our non-aligned foreign policy. And I am sure he will draw blank. Therefore, I feel time has come when there must be a new look on our foreign policy, and I will spell out presently what I mean by the new look.

There is another thing to which I wish to make a reference. Our foreign policy, being riddled by bureaucratic immobility and unimaginativeness, lacks that manoeuvrability, that flexibility which we find in

the foreign policy of Pakistan. The ping pong diplomacy is an old story.

Ping pong diplomacy has given way to diplomacy of the James Bond type. In this fast-moving spectrum where ping pong diplomacy has given way to James Bond type of diplomacy, where Kissinger moves with an alibi, where his arrival, departure and movements are kept a very secret schedule, I would like to know from the Foreign Minister: is our foreign policy that flexible, is our foreign policy that manoeuvrable?

It is no good chanting like a mantra non-alignment or *panch sheel*. As we all know, we Hindus chant mantras without understanding the meaning thereof. Similarly, in that manner, chanting of non-alignment and the *panch sheel* is meaningless. If we were really non-aligned, when we condemned interference in the case of Suez, why were we silent on Hungary? Why were we equivocal when it came to Czechoslovakia?

SHRI PILOO MODY: No guts.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: Why did we not support Lumumba in the Congo crisis but followed obediently the United Nations Secretary-General Mr. Hammarskjöld? Therefore, without mincing words and without going into these aspects I would only submit that the time has come when our ambivalent foreign policy is changed, and spelt out more correctly. With China emerging in a very big way after decades of isolation, with USA returning to her natural area of influence and trying to change her profile in Asia, Japan and USSR evincing increasing interest in South-East Asia after the retirement of Britain, and the new *entente cordiale* between United States and China, the time has come when we have to think very seriously of our foreign policy, a foreign policy not wedded to the role of international go-between, which has been our role so far, but to subserve our own national interest, our own foreign policy objectives.

Non-alignment had been conceived at a time when the world had been divided between two power blocs. Today both the blocs have developed fissures; the Western bloc is not that Western, nor the Communist block that megalith. With this profile of

world blocs what we should have is not non-alignment but polyalignment.

There should be a flexibility. There should be a choice, an option should always be open and we should not go about chanting non-alignment as a mantra, valid for all times and all ages.

There is another aspect to which I wish to invite the attention to this House—the new look to which I had referred to earlier. One of the important aspects of that new look will be de-freezing the relations with China. Sir, it is no good keeping a sore-running over some areas like Aksai Chin which we are never going to reclaim back. I do concede it was Chinese perfidy. But what gave edge to Chinese perfidy was India's military unpreparedness and never we can restore Aksai Chin in the foreseeable future. So, over that limited issue I do not think it will be advisable to keep our relationship with China frozen.

Sir, in retrospect it could be recalled that after we had lost many opportunities, Nehru, towards the end, had insisted on acceptance by China of the Colombo Powers proposals which according to him was the *sine qua non* for de-freezing relations with China. But the proposals of the Colombo Powers are as dead as mutton and have no relevance to the present context. The, Sir, on the 1st December, 1964 late Prime Minister, Shri Shastri, had said that India was prepared for talks with China consistent with our self-respect though he did not enlarge upon his concept of self-respect. On the 16th September, 1966 the present Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, while making a statement on border incursions by the Chinese had said: India was prepared to talk with China should proper conditions arise. Even the present Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, is on record to have stated: "We are always prepared to settle all matters with our neighbours, including China, peacefully through bilateral negotiations on the basis of self-respect for our territorial integrity and sovereignty." Sir, from this it will appear successive Prime Ministers—three generations of Prime Ministers—have consistently emphasised that relationship with China should be de-frozen. I ask, in all humility, of the Foreign Minister what steps his Ministry has taken to retrieve the situation. We have got a junior Charge-de-Affairs in Peking. Why

[Shri Surendra Mohanty]

can't we send a senior officer of the rank of Ambassador there.

Sir, if you look at the Annual Report immobility and *status quo* are hunting the activities of the External Affairs Ministry. It has perhaps left no scope for the Foreign Minister to operate with flexibility. If you look at page 2 of the Report in this fastly changing world of increasing tempo what have we done: "In Asia and Africa too the outstanding characteristic of the year, it may be, is the fresh emphasis on cooperation for mutual benefit." What was that mutual cooperation? What was the quality and valve of that cooperation when in the Afro-Asian Conference not a single voice had been raised in favour of India on the issue of Bangla Desh? Regarding South East Asia the Report says there is increasing measure of understanding with the powers of the South East Asian countries. What is that measure of understanding? Who has supported you on the Bangla Desh issue. Now Malaysia's ex-Prime Minister, as Secretary of the Islamic Powers, is making pilgrimage to Islamabad. Ceylon is silent. Indonesia is ambivalent. What measure of understanding have you achieved?

About China, we are in the habit of wringing our hands in despair and talking of platitudes which take us neither here nor there.

In conclusion I would only say what my hon. friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, has so eloquently emphasized. A nation of beggars can have no independent foreign policy. The only image that we have cast across the international scene is that of rosary beads and a begging bowl. But this will not carry us any further. You have to develop nuclear power; you have to develop your military striking power and you have to be self-sufficient economically and militarily before you can have a voice which can count anything in foreign affairs.

With these words, though it is meaningless to support or oppose these Demands—it is merely formalistic—I beg of the House and of the Foreign Minister to consider dispassionately and satisfy the House whether the policy of non-alignment has served any foreign policy objective and any of our national interests and whether it is going to lead us anywhere.

[SHRI KADAR (Bombay-Central South):

Mr. Chairman, I am thankful to you for giving me this time but I wonder whether I will be able to do justice in half a minute or two minutes which are left.

17.29 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

I would like to say only one thing that we should not ignore the areas which are still in Africa and other places where there should be continuous contact by us. As we know, recently they have achieved their independence, although it may not be called complete independence. Recently when I was in Africa I had seen that the people there are desiring and are looking forward to cooperation and guidance from our country. So far as the diplomatic level is concerned there are diplomatic contacts but I would suggest that there should be political contacts also. That could be done by sending missions to different countries at different levels.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

17.30 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION *Re* : LAY-OFF OF WORKERS OF GANESH FLOUR MILLS, DELHI

श्री कश्मि मूबरा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : सभा-पति महोदय, प्राज मैं गणेश फ्लाअर मिल, जो दिल्ली में बहुत पुराना कम्पन है और 1891 में दिल्ली में चल रहा है, उसके बारे में चर्चा उठा रहा हूँ।

इस कम्पनी ने सबसे पहले मजदूरों को बोनस दिया और जो इसके शेयर होल्डर्स हैं उनको काफी फायदा यह देती रही। इसी बीच में इस कम्पनी के मालिकों ने एक पंखा बनाने का और एक साबुन (सली से तेल निकालने का) प्लांट लगाया। उसमें कुछ बाटा होने लगा। उन्होंने एन० आई० सी० से 16 लाख रु० का लोन लिया। महाराष्ट्र स्टेट फ़ाइनेंस कार-पोरेशन से लोन लिया। बहुत ही जगह से लोन