

pany Limited for the year 1969-70 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon. [*Placed on Library. See No. LT-688/71.*]

- (2) (i) Review (Hindi and English versions) of the National Industrial Development Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1969-70 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.
- (ii) Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the National Industrial Development Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1969-70 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon. [*Pleased in Library, see No. Lt-689/71.*]

REPORT OF PERMANENT INDUS
COMMISSION, 1971

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO): I beg to lay on the Table a copy (Hindi and English versions) of the Annual Report of the Permanent Indus Commission for the year ended the 31st March, 1971. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-690/71.*]

12.25 hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

FIRST REPORT AND MINUTES

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Sir, I beg to present the following Report and Minutes of the Estimates Committee:

- (1) First Report on the Ministry of Shipping and Transport—Visakhapatnam Port.
- (2) Minutes of the sittings of the Estimates Committee relating to First and Second Reports on the Ministry of Shipping and Transport.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, the report is very bulky!

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF MEMBERS FROM THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

FIRST REPORT

SHRI S. C. SAMANTA (Tamluk): Sir, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Have you included Shri Jharkhande Rai in it? . . . Yes.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT

SHRI JAGANATH RAO (Chatrapur): Sir, I beg to move:—

“That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on amendments to election law upto the last day of first week of the next session.”

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

“That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on amendments to election law upto the last day of the first week of the next session.”

The motion was adopted.

12.26 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1971-72—Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: We will now take up further consideration of the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): May I make a submission? We have already tabled Call Attention Notices on two important matters pertaining to these Demands. One is about the war-threat of Yahya Khan and the other is about the reported news that there is a possibility of death sentence to Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. I would only request you to ask the hon. Minister to cover

these two matters in his reply to the discussion on these Demands. We are very anxious about it.

MR. SPEAKER: I very much wanted to allow that Call Attention Notice but I was faced with one difficulty because the Demands of External Affairs Ministry are already under discussion. . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Kindly allow the second one about Sheikh Mujibur Rehman.

MR. SPEAKER: I would request the hon. Minister that when he replies to the debate, he will take up both these points to the satisfaction of hon. Members.

Now, Shri Kadar is to continue his speech—he is absent. Shri Aga.

SHRI AHMED AGA (Baramulla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday, the hon. Member, Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee in his speech criticised our foreign policy and, more particularly, our policy of non-alignment. First I would like to answer his points before I go to make my own points.

In his criticism, he indirectly and in an oblique manner suggested or attempted to suggest that we should have some sort of alliance or alignment with the United States, perhaps, in the same manner as that of Israel. Perhaps, Israel is a model for him and he wants to follow in their footsteps.

He suggested that our foreign policy and the policy of non-alignment was out of date because that was evolved at the time when there was cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States. I would like to tell him that it is not so. Our policy of non-alignment is based on our desire for global peace because we see that the third world countries cannot develop, cannot go-ahead, cannot prosper, unless there is world peace all around. Unless there is peace in different regions of the world, the third world countries cannot develop and prosper which the U. S. imperialists are not allowing.

If we really see what is happening in the third world, we will find that these imperialist powers have not allowed the third world to be without trouble anywhere. If you see the

South-East Asia, you will find that the United States started war in Korea, then in Vietnam, in Cambodia and in Laos, and they have also started trouble in the Middle-East by planting Israelis, the European Jews, on the Arab world and then they have allowed them arms to the extent that they could occupy part of the Arab land. Why? Because they want to create tensions there. They have created the Palestine refugees problem which has become perpetual and endless. This is what the imperialist powers are doing.

If you look at Africa, what have they done? They are denying them their own rule in South Africa, Angola, in Mozambique, in Guinea and all that. They imposed sanctions on Rhodesia, on the Smith minority regime, just to tell the world but they left a way out through South Africa and Portuguese to enable Smith to draw supplies and to enable him to have help and assistance through South Africa and Portugal. All this was happening. I would like to quote in this respect, from the article of Shri J. D. Singy in the *Times of India* dated 16th July:

“Is the British Government actually preparing the ground for climb-down? Mr. Smith's remarks about the British attitude are significant. On the question of majority rule (the most important of the five principles) the Rhodesian Prime Minister says it has been difficult to pin the British Government to its exact meaning. “If you confront representatives of the British Government—and this doesn't only go for this Tory Government, it also went for Mr. Wilson's Government—and any to them: do you actually mean one man one vote? Is that the sort of majority rule you wish to adopt?” They have, in every instance said, “Oh No, we wouldn't ask you to accept that.”

Now this very clearly shows how the imperialist powers are creating trouble all over the world and how they want to perpetuate colonial rule. It shows that the super-powers want to impose their own form of government and not allow smaller nations to choose their own way of socio-political system.

Sir, we stand for elimination of colonialism and disarmament. We are against interference by super-powers in the affairs of other

[Shri Ahmed Aga]

countries. I would here like to quote my Prime Minister's concluding words in the United Nations. I can say with confidence that she is the only Head of the Government who talked as a world citizen. Other powers, e.g. USA said that if the United States and the Soviet Union can bring about adjustment, they could avoid a global war. Every other country talked from its own point of view. I found my Prime Minister talking as a world citizen for global peace. I want to quote the last words of her speech. It is a prayer:

Common be your prayer, Common be your desires;

Common be your end, Unified be your hearts;

Common be your purpose; United be your intentions;

Common be your deliberation; Perfect be the Union among you.

This shows the difference between the two approaches of the imperialist powers and of India.

Mr. Vajpayee said that India had no friends meaning thereby that we should also line up with the United States and get arms and ammunitions from them. He told us yesterday that Yahya Khan had friends. I want to tell him—he is not here now, I am sorry—it is another shock to me. Yahya Khan has no friends. He is a stooge of the United States imperialists. Yahya Khan's regime has followed Ayub who was installed by Iskander Mirza and ever since that day, the unfortunate West Pakistanis also have been under the heels of the military dictatorship and if you go and ask any West Pakistani and if you read their books and if you meet the young men, they are also wanting to go ahead with progress but they have no voice. They have no freedom of speech or expression. After all things mature and a rebellion against oppression had to take place and it has taken place in Bangla Desh. I would also want to tell Vajpayeeji that India is not going to follow in the footsteps of Chengis Khan or Halako Khan. That does not belong to our tradition. We have been for peace; we want peace because we want the world to go ahead. I am reminded of a persian verse.

سہمان و کہسارو واغ آفریدی
خہایان و گلزار و باغ آفریدم

It says: It was given to man to have the audacity to tell God Almighty that You created the mountains and the barren lands and I created the meadows and gardens and flowers out of it.

We are not war-mongers. We are not only for non-alignment but we are for a policy of peace.

Having said this, I want to go to my next point.

The Sino-US parleys that are going on is a matter of importance and consequence Mr. Kissinger has been enabled to go to Peking from Rawalpindi. Yahya regime and his stooges enabled Kissinger to go to Peking and bring about this kind of parleys. It is not a very simple event. I don't know whether experts here have really studied this point in greater depth, and whether they have seen all its implications. There can be only one bright side of it namely that he is recognising People's Republic of China. But Hanoi is not very happy about it. Of course Madam Bih said Peking is not going to let us down. But Hanoi is not very optimistic about it. They say that perhaps this combine between great powers may achieve a compromise between big powers in an attempt to make smaller countries bow to their arrangements. I am afraid this is a move by US to remain in Indo China in some other form. We saw in papers that the meeting between Kissinger and Peking was business like and without the rhetoric of ideologies; have they given up their principles and ideologies. They wanted to be business like. Hanoi is therefore not wrong. Again if this combine means encouragement to China whose only enemy is Soviet Union and if the confrontation between China and Soviet Union takes place, it may be the end of Asia. I would like that the Minister examines this aspect also in far more greater depth than what has already been done. It is not something which can be looked at in a superficial manner.

I come to my last point about Bangla Desh. I read in papers the other day that Yahya was hoping to get another 118 million

dollars. Rogers tried to give him 20 million dollars secretly. All this can cause certain amount of anxiety. If they are really going to give more money to Yahya, he may be enabled to go on prolonging the war in Bangla Desh. And the efforts of the Mukti Fauj to liberate Bangla Desh will become a little more difficult and a little more long-drawn out. I completely agree with our Government in regard to their present policy *vis-a-vis* Bangla Desh. I am in total agreement with that, namely, that it is a war between the liberators of Bangla Desh, the Mukti Fauj and Sheikh Mujibur Rehman's followers on the one side and the Yahya regime on the other. I agree there, but my point is that it should not become so long-drawn out that it goes on indefinitely, because in that case the refugee burden or the war evacuee burden will be on us and that will go on. Therefore, I would like the hon. Minister to have it examined and decide what type of action we should take in order to bring some amount of pressure on world opinion and see that this type of war stops there.

I would again like to stress that it is in our larger interest that Bangla Desh should become a separate country, because it was a geographical absurdity that the two parts of Pakistan were clubbed together. Even after having created that absurdity, those people could not maintain that absurdity also. So, we must see that the Bangla Desh problem is solved as quickly as possible because it is in our interest that Bangla Desh must be liberated because this will be one country in our neighbourhood which will be a predominantly Muslim country with whom we shall have friendly relations and those good relations with Bangla Desh will have their effect on the Western part of Pakistan, and I am hoping that that effect will be that they might be able to have a similar liberation from the military dictatorship that is there.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras North): It is with a deep sense of mental anguish and horror that I am participating in this discussion. The reasons are well known to the Members of Parliament. Day in and day out, we are receiving disturbing information from several quarters of the world, disturbing the peace of not only the sub-continent but of the entire world, and even

threatening the democratic existence of the countries of the world.

I have been watching and listening to the speeches made by Members belonging to the ruling party since yesterday. The opening batsman of the ruling party, Shri Amrit Nahata has agreed that the foreign policy of the Government of India needs reorientation and reappraisal. Another young friend Shri Unnikrishnan went to the extent of requesting the Government of India to have a dialogue with Peking. As such, the consensus has been emerging since yesterday that the foreign policy of India needs drastic change and needs reappraisal, or if I were to quote the ruling party Members of Parliament, it requires some more dynamism.

So for as I and my Party are concerned, we think that the basis of any foreign policy should, and must, be enlightened self-interest and not altruistic absurdities and nonsense. For the past 20-22 years we have been following a policy which I would call as a lamentable legacy bequeathed by certain Prime Ministers of this country. Still the Government is carrying on with that legacy without any sense of shame, urgency or direction.

I have already said that disturbing news are coming from different quarters of the world. Today we have news containing a threat of war against India from Yahya if any area of Bangla Desh were seized. My line of thinking is that our foreign policy needs immediate change. We must adopt ourselves to the changing conditions and patterns of international relations and politics. We have heard of Nixon's proposed visit to China. It has created tensions all over the world. Reactions of world capitals are already on record. Certain of them have expressed jubilation, certain others have expressed shock about it, still certain others have said nothing while some others are definitely bewildered. So far as India is concerned, our External Affairs Minister has said it is a good thing. The reaction of the top officials in the Ministry was also recorded. I do not know his name; he styles himself as the top official spokesman of the Ministry. Different countries have taken this one-line news of Nixon's proposed visit to China with a sense of responsibility, fear and what not. But very mildly, very indifferently, the official spokesman of the Ministry has charac-

[Shri K. Monoharan]

terised this news, according to newspaper reports of what he said, as a wedding between Nixon and Chou-En-lai; he has gone to the extent of describing Yahya Khan as a *purohit* in this marriage. Not being satisfied, he has gone further and said: 'We know the fate of the *purohit* after the wedding is over. He is forgotten. The marriage goes on merrily.' So saying he seems to have solved the whole issue and asked everybody else to be well and sleep well.

But I can sense a sensible change in the minds of members on the ruling benches. The Minister of External Affairs said that this matter must be viewed with great concern and all that. The reasons for Nixon's proposed visit are many. These can be invented or aduced according to the whims and fancies of the reacting countries. I think the reason is to keep up the tension between two of the Super powers, namely, China and Soviet Russia. Then only can the U.S. another Super power have its own hold in the sub-continent, in south-east Asia.

Recent Chinese diplomacy, popularly known as ping-pong diplomacy, seems to have born in the thick forest of some ideological exuberance. Mao Tse-tung is a believer in theory of contradictions. He might have thought that only by moving into a hostile quarter could he maintain peace throughout the countries of the world. I do not know what his view is, but one thing is clear, that these two countries come closer, come nearer. My simple question to the hon. Minister is this. Are we going to draw any lessons from this historic change in the histories and diplomacies of the world?

This ping pong diplomacy pays, this ping pong diplomacy creates, this ping pong diplomacy produces. Hence I call it productive diplomacy. But what about our diplomacy? I can call our diplomacy as dilly-dally diplomacy. It never creates, it negates, it is unproductive. What have we achieved through our diplomacy so far?

A country like China which has been systematically opposing the United States for the past so many years, a country which has been systematically criticising the Prime Minister of this country and our leaders as

running dogs of American imperialism and stooges of British and Western capitalism, opens its doors and Nixon is merrily going to enter. It is a radical change to which we should not shut our eyes. Are we going to change, review, reappraise our foreign policy or not? That is the main question today.

I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to one thing more, in regard to Bangla Desh. All the countries of the world were watching for more than 15 days with rapt attention, they gave you ample opportunity to act. They thought India would emerge successful, that India would immediately act and establish herself. But, contrary to their expectations, India once again was allowed to be humbled and humiliated. For the past 20 years this has happened again and again.

Pakistan attacked India thrice. In 1947 Kashmir was attacked. What happened? The gainer was Pakistan and India was a terrible loser. The second time Pakistan attacked in the Rann of Kutch. The gainer was Pakistan and India lost miserably. The third time Pakistan attacked us in connection with Bangla Desh. The gainer is Pakistan, and you have lost. For 20 years you have lost and allowed yourself to be humbled in the eyes of the world.

What has been the attitude of the Arab countries in regard to Bangla Desh? I am not going to say that blood is thicker than water. I do not say that our diplomatic and friendly relations must be severed immediately. We must maintain our relations with the Arab countries wonderfully well, I have no objection to that, but are we going to learn any lesson from the fact that not a single country has come out openly and condemned the atrocities and the carnage of the military junta of Pakistan. On the contrary, they have highlighted the problem of refugee influx. They never said that Pakistan was wrong, they never said that Pakistan aggressed, they never said that it was nothing but genocide on the part of Pakistan. On the contrary, whenever our so-called emissaries went to the Capitals of the world, they said they understood that it was really a human problem, that the refugees must be helped. That is all. I want to ask the External Affairs Minister whether any country openly or

secretly told him that Pakistan had unleashed genocide. Did any country come out with such a statement? No. So, what lesson are we going to draw from this newly changed situation of the world?

What prevents him, I ask the Minister, from straightaway granting recognition to GDR? At least they helped us in a way through a joint communique. What prevents you from recognising North Viet Nam? What prevents you from recognising North Korea? I can ask you another question. What prevents you from recognising Israel? I am asking this after studying the attitude of the Arab countries. I am not saying this as a sort of retaliatory measure to be undertaken. As somebody said yesterday, it is an oft-quoted expression—no country has permanent friends; no country has permanent enemies; there are only permanent interests. I think we have got permanent interests. If that is true, why should we unnecessarily continue not to recognise certain countries? What harm Israel has committed as far as we are concerned? Why don't you give a small place in the diplomatic en-lave of Chanakyapuri for having its own embassy? What prevents you from doing that?

My humble submission to the Minister of External Affairs is that at least from now on, try to change your mental attitude and try to reappraise the foreign policy of this country. I may be excused if I say that for 20 years, systematically we have been devalued in the eyes of the world; systematically we have been dwarfed into insignificance; systematically we have been relegated to the background. Mr. Speaker, we are nobody in the world, and that announcement is not becoming of us. If our inactivity and our inaction continues like that, I am sure, among the comity of nations, we may be declared *persona non-grata*. That is what they are doing. You keep on your diplomatic activities in the world like this. We have already sent a notice to the United Nations; we have approached so many friendly countries. But unless and until you stand on your own legs, no country is going to recognise you. Again, I want to submit one important point. The other countries thought that India would stand up. But what about tiny, small Pakistan? Pakistan proved itself, and all the world is now thinking that Pakistan is something; that Pakistan can be considered in the

politics of Southeast Asia. So far as India is concerned, India is nobody. India is a cipher; a magnificent zero. That has been created not by anybody else. That has been created by our own sins of commission and omission. So, I request my hon. friend the Minister of External Affairs to consider this particular aspect of the issue.

Another complex from which we are suffering is this. This is our complex. We treat everything very lightly. I have got a quotation here from Lal Bahadur Shastri who was our Prime Minister. It seems he said after the Chinese attack in October, 1962 that "we are the ones who in fact introduced Prime Minister Chou En-lai to the non-aligned powers in Bandung." This is a sort of satisfaction he got by saying that "I introduced this fellow to the other countries." He said it very lightly. But then what happened? Chou En-lai had given his comment on it. He has reportedly observed that he was "surprised at the affrontery of a third-rate power like India claiming to introduce to the world the Prime Minister of a first-rate power like China." China has established herself as a first-rate super-power in the world. There are three super-powers in the world; one is the United States; the next is the USSR, and the third is China. From the list of major powers, I am sure India is sliding out and India will never come to that position; it seems to me that that is the real position of our country today. I would request the hon. Minister of External Affairs to consider this.

13 hr.

Afford immediate recognition to Bangla Desh. We have been telling our External Affairs Minister. He has been constantly saying that this will receive "our constant review." How long you are going to review it constantly? How long are you going to keep it within the orbit of thinking without taking immediate action? How long are you going to keep it under consideration still? Unless and until you act, I am sure you cannot deliver the goods. It is high time for you to act. Will you please stop indulging in the so-called holier than thou attitude? Please stop sermonizing and stop giving sermons to the countries of the world, because the world is expecting that India may act or would act. The countries of the world are terribly disappointed that we are not acting. We

[Shri K. Manoharan]

are not at all moving. We are static and not at all dynamic. On the contrary, Pakistan is dynamic; China is dynamic and so many other countries are dynamic. When some hon. member suggested that we have lost friends, Sardar Swaran Singh was angry. I ask him politely, have you got any friends? No permanent friends, no permanent foe. So, where is the friend? Gradually, you are losing the association of so many neighbouring countries. Today there was a calling attention notice. We are losing our friendship with Nepal. What about Bhutan, Burma and other countries like Indonesia, Ceylon, Singapore, Japan and China? Don't hesitate to have your own association with all the countries of the world. What prevents you to have a dialogue with China? What is the harm in that? At least try to learn from their diplomacy. Can't you? They have proved themselves. Why not you? This is the feeling not only of the people outside and the opposition parties but of your own party. You should try to convene a meeting of your own and reveal the foreign policy of your Government. We are stuck up somewhere. Somewhere something is wrong. Find out where we have gone wrong and find out what is the remedy. If you want the help of all the opposition parties, we are with you. We want to safeguard the honour, interest, suzerainty, sovereignty and integrity of this nation. This country should not be allowed to go to dogs. It should have its own position in the comity of nations. Through your weak-kneed policy, don't pull down this great country from its highest pedestal, of reputation, fame and image.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I heard Mr. Manoharan speak, I experienced a sense of sorrow. Nobody could have run down this country more than he did. According to him, everything is wrong with this country. Its foreign policy is no good; the foreign policies of several other countries are brilliant; they are dynamic and the opposition promised to cooperate with us in anything we do for the honour and good of this country. I would beseech the opposition to do the first thing first, i.e. not to treat this country lightly and not to talk about it in these terms.

I sat here throughout yesterday listening to every word that has been uttered. I am

sorry to say that the most important fact that has happened in this part of the world, something of utmost significance, to us, has not been properly pointed out and discussed. For us the most important thing that has happened is that Pakistan which was born in August 1947 is dead. This is a fact which has to be taken into account and pondered seriously. The policy of not only this country but several other countries have to be shaped bearing in mind this fact of Pakistan having been killed or murdered by Gen. Yahya Khan. No matter how much arms his Government may receive from the United States or any amount of subtle diplomatic assistance from China, that Pakistan will never again be. The country that is coming to birth is one of the largest nations—the eight—in the world. Bangladesh will also be the second largest Muslim country. We hope in Bangladesh will emerge a country which will be secular, democratic and progressive.

If the nations of the world suffer from myopia of a kind the fault is not ours. We never wanted Pakistan to die. We never did anything that would be injurious or harmful to them. Pakistan followed a policy which has been praised sky high by the opposition in this House for twenty years: that there was no country like Pakistan which received assistance from America, assistance from Western Europe, arms from China, Russia, Iran and Turkey; Bhutto was admired; Ayub Khan was envied and Yahya Khan was made a great hero. They were all praised for the way they guided their country—a country that does not exist now! If this is the policy that my friends would advocate for this country, God save my country from ever being in their hands.

What we have to learn from Pakistan is that if you do not attend to the needs of the people, if all the time you are busy hating another country, if your policy is based on vindictiveness, if you are prepared to reformulate your policies according to the whims of super-powers, if you are prepared to buy obsolete arms, you end by killing yourselves. A Harvard study shows that all the armaments supplied to Pakistan have mainly been used against the people of Pakistan, apart from the three occasions when it has transgressed into our territory. This is the fate of Pakistan; a country which was

born in the name of Islam; the only Islamic Republic known to modern history has killed more Muslims than has ever been known in Islamic history.

AN HON. MEMBER: Islamic country; not Republic.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH: Yes, I stand corrected. It was never a democratic Republic. Pakistan has never had, even for one day, a genuinely elected government. Anyway, according to our friends on the other side, it has been a great success, at least so far as external policy is concerned. I do not think they will try to say that it has been a great success internally.

Now, from Pakistan they moved to another country which was also praised so much, namely, United States. Let us look at the United States itself. It has great scholars, great thinkers Kissengers and others. What is the achievement of the foreign policy of America? After spending billions of dollars, after killing millions of people, what does Nixon do today than to self-invite himself to shake hands with the 'yellow devil' himself? That is the great success of American foreign policy.

China—where lives Mao, the great saviour of the socialist world—has also been a country which has been praised. I know there are lots of people who look upon China with great admiration. I think today even Shri Piloo Mody may find himself eager to praise Mao Tse-Tung and Chou En-lai. What has exactly happened to Chinese foreign policy? We see a complete *volte face* there—a socialist power like China is shaking hands with imperialist United States. If that is taking place, it is not because the United States is frightened of China, it is not because China has capacity to harm the Americans. What the Americans have bargained for is that China can no longer proclaim itself to be in forefront of the Marxist radical humanist struggle any longer. So, China has made this peace at the cost of all that it has fought for and all that it has proclaimed for the last 25 years.

So much for the brilliance of the foreign policies of Pakistan, America and China. Let us not get too worried if some people in the press, or some people on the other

side proclaim their own ignorance by saying that the Government of India has not been aware of what it has been doing. If the Government of India has not had to change its policy; if the Government of India has merely had to adjust it is because our policy has always been on the right lines. Our policies have been the policies of peaceful co-existence and we never had to change because we had always gone on the right path. I would wish some people would stand up and place their stand-point much more clearly rather than merely saying this is wrong with you. The trouble with this House is—it is a trouble with our press also—we do not have a debate on tangible issues. Even Prof. H. N. Mukerjee making so impassioned a speech yesterday and talking of Bangla Desh shirked when it came to using the word confrontation. Nobody would dare use the word 'war'. We had never discussed what recognition would mean. We have to make a clear analysis as to what recognition would mean for Bangla Desh. Would India's recognising Bangla Desh alone mean much? Can liberation come through recognition by any other power however friendly it may be?

This Parliament has solemnly resolved that all our sympathy and support go out for the people of Bangla Desh but when people want us to do something more let them come with clear calculations. This is the first time that a Government is asking for recognition which till the other day technically was part of another Government. It is not a case exactly that of Algeria. I do not say anyone on this side of the House has less sympathy for Bangla Desh than people on the other side but on us is the solemn responsibility. The world would love to make the struggle in Bangla Desh into an Indo-Pakistani struggle. Yahya Khan has repeatedly said that he would like to meet the Prime Minister of India. The Prime Minister of India is not going to be caught into a manoeuvre where the super-Powers would succeed in producing an Indo-Pakistani conflict. If the assistance of the Prime Minister of India is sought in this connection it will always be available when the right people want to talk to the really elected representatives of Bangla Desh.

While Mr. Nixon and Mr. Chou En-lai are going to meet let us be clear that all kinds of arrangements have been made in this part of the world for an intensification of con-

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

flict. There are bases right from the coast of Africa to Japan with nuclear possibilities, Deigo Garcia, etc. These things are being done so that Anglo-American imperialism's presence might continue on this side. This is not an extenuating circumstance and even the presence of Soviet flotillas is something we need to notice. America, Russia and China are going to act and inter-act on our borders. However if we continue to attend to the needs of our own people, if we continue to grow strong and healthy we need not have fear or obsession of what the super-Powers do.

I would merely take the instance of a country which my party has often supported and been criticized for supporting, that is, of North Vietnam. We said that North Vietnam was going to be an independent country; it was going to be nobody's tool. If two of the healthiest statements have come up in the last two days, they have been from Madam Binh and North Vietnam, namely, that nobody was going to make peace above their heads and that if Nixon realised the folly of his policies, he has gone to the wrong place. Vietnam's future will be decided in Vietnam and India's future will be decided by India.

I would repeat what I have urged earlier. It is important that this country goes nuclear so that we contribute to world peace. I remember, I met Louis Fischer on the day the Soviet Union exploded its first bomb and I asked him for his reaction. He said, war was not going to be. What has happened? Consequent to China making the bomb it has become essential for the Americans to go and talk to the Chinese.

I know, it will be a terrible cost, but this is a cost that is necessary for the sake of the world. If this is a cost that puts strength into the people, our people will bear it. Was there any calculation for the amount of money that we have to spend for the number of Pakistani citizens that have come to this country in millions? This is a cost worth while, because through this the voice of sane India, the voice of India which exists outside super-power blocs, which exists outside the play of power, will become a voice of strength. It will give strength to all other smaller countries which want to decide their own future themselves.

For years I have spoken for the Arab cause in this Parliament. What is happening in the Arab world today is a cause of great sorrow. Forces of reaction and communalism are ever increasing. While I would not advocate that we change our policies towards the Arab world, because essentially they are correct, I do think that it would be right and proper for India to consider exchanging ambassadors with Israel. If sensitivities are pricked, let them be pricked on both sides; it will not change our policies. It will be the right thing to do because Arab friends even forget that in the creation of Bangla Dsh they will be supporting the Islamic cause much more. Tunku Abdul Rahman, who claims to be Secretary General of the Islamic Secretariat, goes to puny little West Pakistan and forgets the 75 million people of Bangla Dsh.

In the end, again I would beseech my friends on the Opposition to rethink their views on foreign policies, to reorient their vision and not to run down this country because of their lack of understanding but to stand up and suggest constructive things and to explain to us how the policies of the countries they have taken their inspiration from have so miserably misfired.

SHRI C. C. DESAI (Sabarkantha): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall say what I have to say on the subject of foreign affairs in two parts: one dealing with Bangla Dsh and the other with foreign policy in general.

In so far as Bangla Dsh is concerned, so much has been written and said that there is hardly anything more that one can add in this debate. All I have to say is that the time is fast running out. Refugees are still pouring in. Sooner rather than later all the 10 million Hindus, minus those who have been decimated, will be pushed into India and will become our liability. In addition, there will be a sizable Muslim population who will be coming to this country or who will be driven to this country for fear of political victimisation.

It is impossible for this country to live with a refugee problem of this magnitude. If anyone thinks that Yahya Khan, Tikka Khan and company will restore democracy or elective rule in Bangla Dsh, enabling

these refugees to go back, he, I am afraid, is living in a fool's paradise. Equally, the super-powers are not going to pull the chestnuts of India out of the fire for us. In the final analysis that solution has to be made by ourselves. Particularly, the super powers will not compel military junta in Islamabad to listen to reason. That painful duty has to be discharged by us and us alone. Already, some people in the country feel that we have probably missed the bus and that we should have acted early in the first few days of the Pakistani crack-down on Bangla desh. When Bangla Desh had taken a position to offer stiff resistance, we could have acted and, probably, we could have achieved better and quicker results. But then the Prime Minister, pinning her faith on peace, except as a last resort, was rightly giving a chance to the world community to set matters right. The last hope was, however, dashed to the ground on June 28 when Yahya Khan made his statement from Islamabad re-affirming continuance of military and martial rule and refusing to handover reins of Government to the duly elected representatives of the people.

The time has now come for effective action, whatever it maybe, beginning, I think, with recognition of Bangla Desh and offering it aid to stabilise its position. Our objective should be limited to create conditions in Bangla Desh which would lead to the return of the refugees. We are not interested in the internal affairs of Pakistan. We are not interested in the disintegration of Pakistan. But we are interested in the return of these refugees to their country so that they can live there in peace, honour and safety. If as a result of our action war is thrust upon us by Pakistan, we should be prepared to accept the challenge and to defend our territory as we did in 1965. The responsibility for escalation in the circumstances will fall squarely on Pakistan.

We know that the Prime Minister is doing a remarkable, a superb job in relation to Bangla Desh problem and in the face of a most difficult situation and, naturally, we must leave it to her to decide what action to take, when to take, how far to go in the show or use of force, if any, and how to manage the affairs so that these millions of refugees are enabled to go back to their country, to their homes, and to live there peacefully, honourably and safely under a strong and

stable Government of their own people. She may be rest assured that in tackling this problem, the country is solidly behind her in this supreme hour of our test.

Now, I come to the general foreign policy. My hon. friend, Shri Manoharan, has explained how this country is friendless. The whole object of our foreign policy is to earn friends for us in the world community and to have a better understanding of our principles, actions and philosophy. Where do we stand? Let us take each country one by one. Let us take adjoining countries.

Take, for instance, Nepal, the only other Hindu country in the world. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Our is not a Hindu country.

SHRI C. C. DESAI: The only other country with a Hindu majority in the world. I hope, nobody will dispute that. This is also a country with a Hindu majority in the world. That country has not said a word against Pakistan, against genocide committed by Pakistan, or in appreciation of the vast problem that India is facing today in tackling this refugee problem. The relations between the two countries should have been much better.

Take the case of Iran where, the other day, the Foreign Secretary, made a dashing visit, with what result we do not know. But we do know that Shahenshah of Iran pleads with our Mr. R. K. Karanjia of *Blitz* that his heart is bleeding at the sight of tension between the two countries but is not able to prevent his Prime Minister, his Ministers and his Government, and his press and people from openly declaring that in the event of a conflict between the two countries, they will be fairly and squarely on the side of Pakistan. That is why even today you must have read in the statement of Yahya Khan that, if war is thrust, Pakistan will not be alone. They are counting on Iran.

Then, take the case of Afghanistan, a very friendly country, a country which has given asylum to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. But if you look to paper to see any sign of any expression of sympathy for us or any condemnation of Pakistan, you will have to go somewhere else. The Arab countries are,

[Shri C. C. Desai]

going further West, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iraq, all these countries, profess friendship in favour of Pakistan and have nothing to say in favour of India.

Cairo, the home of the Arab movement, even in the time of President Nasser, was, in case of a dispute between India and Pakistan, laconic and unhelpful and to-day even when our Jaya Prakash Narayan—it may be that he went there at a difficult time—went there, but it should not be difficult for President Sadat to give a few minutes of his time to a leading personality of this country, but he would not see him, for fear of repercussions in Pakistan. That is the situation on that side.

Ceylon is another friendly country, but Ceylon's hospitality was used by Pakistan to move military equipment and personnel which led to the crack-down of March 25 and even to-day Ceylon's ports and airports are being used by Pakistan for transportation of military hardware and personnel.

Burma, being, I suppose, under military rule, is more sympathetic towards Pakistan. But, we expected some word of sympathy from her, but nothing doing.

Sir, I forgot to say one thing. It is that in Cairo, in Egypt when our Minister for Industrial Development went there, he issued a statement saying that the United Arab Republic realised the importance and the difficulty of the Indian situation. I am afraid that is really no change in the attitude of the Arab countries at all and whether he saw any such signs, I don't know.

Now, Sir, take Malaysia. As my friend here said just now, the Malaysian Prime Minister also has said that Bangla Desh is an internal affair of Pakistan.

Which country, now, I want to ask, is your friend? It is said for me to say as an ex-Ambassador that if you survey the world to-day this country is singularly friendless in the whole world and particularly, in relation to the problem which is the burning topic of ours, that is, Bangla Desh. If it is an ordinary dispute then you have a number of countries shedding crocodile tears for us but

when a vital issue is concerned, you find that we have singularly failed in securing a single friendship.

Now, take the case of Pakistan. Pakistan is a small country. It is one-fourth of this country in size and resources and everything else and yet, Pakistan has a number of very staunch friends. China is one. Iran is another. Turkey is third. Saudi Arabia and Jordan and the Arab countries do not lag behind. All these countries are friends on whom Pakistan can count. Is there any country in the world today whom we can call as our friend? After all no country can fight on its own although we shall be prepared to do so?

We always want to have friends, but our foreign policy is such as to forfeit all friendship in the world. I leave it to the hon. Members to judge whether our foreign policy has been a success or a failure in the light of these remarks. Anyone who has seen that this country has no friend in times of need must inevitably attach the blame to the foreign policy for which the Foreign Minister and his charmed circle of Advisers in the Foreign Office must be held primarily responsible.

I don't suggest that Sardar Swaran Singh is responsible for all the ills of our foreign policy.

He has been Foreign Minister only for some time. But, the question is whether he is the right man for the present crisis involving the destiny of the nation. I have no doubt that so long as the Prime Minister does not change the Foreign Minister, there will be no improvement in the situation and this country will continue to suffer from a weak Foreign Minister and a bad foreign policy in spite of its having a perfectly good, sound and tenable base and I hope that before it is too late, the Prime Minister will give some other portfolio to Sardar Swaran Singh who is an expert in moving from portfolio to portfolio and give the charge of Foreign Office to a person who will carry weight with the counsels of the world and who will by use of his brains, diplomacy and dynamism earn us friends who will stand us in times of need. The testing time is now.

And then the other thing to do not do is this, namely, to place our foreign policy on self-interest. We base it wholly on fear-complex. We are afraid of the Arab reaction and we do not do the right thing by Israel. It was Israel's Foreign Minister who said the other day, in the Israel's Parliament (Knesset) that Pakistan was committing genocide and that India was facing the enormous problem of the evacuees and offering all kinds of aid to India. That country is treated as an un-touchable. The Arab countries should have no say about it. That is the policy which our Foreign Minister and his colleagues are pursuing. All this proves that we are basing our foreign policy on fear complex. We are afraid of China and we do not do the right thing by Taiwan. We are afraid of Arabs and we do not do the right thing by Israel. UK gave us notice terminating the Trade Agreement and yet a proposal which had been made by me and which has been in the Government and in the Foreign Office for several months, for introduction of reciprocal treatment in respect of Britishers entering our country and requiring every British who wants to take up employment in this country to take an employment permit is being stalled by the Foreign Minister. It has been cleared by the Minister of Industrial Development. It has been cleared by the Ministry of Foreign Trade. It has even been cleared by the Foreign Office itself. Somebody with a timid heart in the Foreign Office thinks that because we have got more Indians in England than they have Britishers in India our interests will suffer. They do not realise, that Indians who go to the United Kingdom are required to get employment permits after they have been cleared by the Labour Exchanges. Here they come and boss over more competent persons in charge of these jobs.

In our foreign policy, we should test who are really our friends and the acid test for this today is the Bangla Desh issue. We have to apply this test and only those who stand by us are our friends and in respect of those who do not—I would not call them foes, but, they are not the people who can be relied upon.

There is only one silver lining in this dark cloud. That is the fine work done by the External Publicity Division. My friend Mr. Manoharan referred to one *fauxpas* on their part. But if the case of India is well-known

throughout the world it is due to the fine publicity given by our External Publicity Division. I take this opportunity to compliment the head of the External Publicity Division for the fine work that they have been doing the interest of the country. Thank you, Sir.

13.33 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): Our foreign policy is one which has been mostly misunderstood by the nations abroad and in fact there has been certain misconceptions about this policy at home also. I feel that to make our foreign policy effective, it is high time, we should remove all these misconceptions.

The first misconception which is prevailing in our foreign policy and to which the Government is also to certain extent liable, is the introduction of an element of morality in our foreign policy, where there is, or there should be, none. There is a tendency on the part of the persons who speak about foreign policy to give it a role of moral or religious contents. I wish to make it clear and we should be clear of ourselves, that there is neither morality nor any religiosity in our foreign policy. It is a policy based on absolutely practical propositions, propositions based on historical reasons, economic reasons and political reasons.

Historically, from the long past we have maintained relationship with South and East Asian countries including China, and in the present, we are having relationship with the Western countries to a great extent. Therefore, we have tried in this foreign policy to maintain a balance between both. Economically, we want to have the best of both the worlds. Politically, we admire the democratic traditions of the West. At the same time, we admire the planned economy of the Communist countries. Therefore, we have accepted a foreign policy by which we do not identify ourselves with any one of the two groups. These are the practical reasons for which we have accepted this foreign policy and it is high time that if any one in this House or outside has any feeling that our foreign policy is based either on the non-violent doctrine of Gandhiji or the pacifist doctrine of the Buddha, that sort of impression should be removed immediately.

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

We should also remember that the foreign policies of other countries are based not on moral grounds but absolutely on national interests. Take the case of Burma, for instance. Burma has followed an independent foreign policy because being in between the two powers, India and China, Burma does not want to antagonise any one. If Ceylon has followed an independent foreign policy, it is because the market of Ceylon is mainly based on tea and rubber and it exports one commodity to the Western countries and the other to the Eastern countries. Therefore, there is no moral precept or pacifist doctrine behind the foreign policy which the other countries of the world are following. Therefore, if we can get rid of attitudes which smack of moral religiosity, we can have a realistic approach to the problems of today.

I feel that so far as our foreign policy is concerned, we should note that this is a policy based absolutely on self-interest and every decision pertaining to our foreign policy must be dictated by the realism of facts as they are and not on the basis of their interpretation in terms of prejudices or wishful thinking. Also, I am in agreement with the Members on this side of the House as well as those on the other that we must review our policies in terms of the dynamics of world politics. Of course though that is necessary yet I shall not advocate the revision of policies on grounds which are opportunistic or which smack of unprincipled behaviour. We should remember that our policy is not idealistic. I would quote the words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in this connection. He said:

"I do not think it is purely idealistic; it is, if you like, opportunistic in the long run."

Also, we should make it a point to make it understandable and we should try to impress upon the other nations that the non-alignment policy which we have adopted is not a goal in itself. It is not a creed or dogma that we are following, but it is only a means for serving our national interests. We should be clear in our minds that if we find that at some point of time this policy is not serving the national interests, we should have no hesitation in revising or reviewing our foreign policy.

One of the matters affecting our foreign policy has been that whenever we have reassessed or reviewed our policies, we have done it on the basis of a single variable. The hon. Member who preceded me, namely Shri C. C. Desai said that we should make a reappraisal of our foreign policy on the issue of Bangla Desh alone. I feel that the foreign policy of a country cannot be judged or cannot be reviewed on the basis of a single variable. It must be reviewed, having the perspective of the total international situation in view. But, unfortunately, that has not been done by us so far. When there was aggression on our country from China, there was a clamour from all sides of the House that we should cut off all relationship with the communist world. Today, when we find that so far as Bangla Desh is concerned, the Western Powers particularly America are not acting in the manner that they should, it is being said that we should sever all relations with the West. This is not the attitude with which we can judge or review our foreign policies. A review of the foreign policy must be on the basis of a total perspective of the international situation. If we have a total perspective of the international situation, many a time we shall not be as indignant as we have been in the past or as we have been today on the issue of Bangla Desh. After all, we must remember that there are certain attitudes in the view of America and certain attitudes in the view of China and certain attitudes in the view of Russia; they will not follow what we say or they will not be dictated by what we want, but they will be dictated by their own national interests. Their Because of pursuit of imperialistic goal they are pursuing certain line of activities which may not be to our liking. We undoubtedly will condemn them, but we must be prepared to face the realities also. At the same time, I do not like that we should go about proclaiming to the world, as we have done in the past, that we are the custodians of democracy and liberty of the entire world. Such a sort of stance has always been misinterpreted abroad. After all, unless we can be a powerful force, our voice will not be heard by anyone. Here I would like to quote a remark made by Pandit Nehru in the Constituent Assembly in 1948:

"I have come more and more to the conclusion that the less we interfere in international politics unless our own in-

terests are involved, the better, for the simple reason that it is not in consonance with our dignity just to interfere without producing any effect. We should be either capable of producing some effect or not interfere at all."

Therefore we should make it a point to be strong because then only will we be able to make our voice heard in international forums. On this reasoning, I am in agreement with the previous speaker that it is time we revise our attitude in regard to the policy to be adopted on the nuclear power question.

I now come to some specific areas. On the question of Bangla Desh, I congratulate our External Affairs Minister on having adopted an attitude of self-restraint. It had been suggested here that within the first 15 days of the Bangla Desh crisis, we should have jumped into the fray, involved ourselves directly and marched our army. May I point out that if in those first few days any extreme steps had been taken, the entire democratic character and content of the Bangla Desh issue would have been submerged and in the world outside it would have projected as an Indo-Pak conflict. Since we did not do that, we have been able to focuss the attention of the outside world on the true character and content of the Bangla Desh issue. Every country in the world, both at the governmental and popular levels, now knows what the Bangla Desh issue is about. If some of them are not prepared to look at it as it should be seen, it is because of their own interest.

But if we now take some positive action, no country in the world will be able to say that this is an Indo-Pak conflict. But if we do not do that then the problem may get worsened and I am apprehensive that our interests will thereby suffer adversely. On the one hand, in Bangla Desh extreme elements may come to dominate the scene which will not be helpful to us; on the other, the importance at the popular level this issue now commands in the outside world will be diminished and lost.

Therefore, I would request the Minister to initiate some positive action. When I say this, I am not talking in terms of war, for I know that it can bring only a temporary solution, but is sure to produce many permanent problems. But positive actions of

other natures can be taken. Some of these were spelt out by Shri Jaganatha Rao in his speech yesterday. Government should not allow the character and content of this issue to be lost by lapse of time as the world may sleep over it. We should be prepared for drastic measures to see that our objectives are achieved.

With these words, I support the foreign policy and endorse the Demands for Grants of the Ministry.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As at present, we are to conclude the discussion at 4.15. How much time would the Minister need?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND
TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR):
I consulted him and he would need about
40-45 minutes.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhara): Saying
what?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What he
wants to say.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Coach-
Bihar): Let the Minister reply at 5 P.M.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: The Speaker
was kind enough to ask me what would be
Government's view in view of many members
wanting to speak still. We are agreeable to
any suggestion which will suit the conven-
ience of the House. In case the House is
inclined to have more time on this, the Min-
ister will reply at 5 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is the
proposal. What does the House want?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We agree.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: So, the Min-
ister will reply at 5 p.m. and take 40 or 45
minutes. By 6 we will conclude the debate
today. The extended time will be for the
Members.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): It is most
distressing that India which once spearheaded
the liberation movement in the world, which
ignited the spart of freedom in the hearts
of millions, has been a silent spectator of the
rape of Hungary, of the invasion of Czecho-

[Shri P. K. Deo]

slovakia, of the illegal occupation of Tibet by China. And now there is this exemplary inaction and complacency on the genocide and holocaust in Bangla Desh. When our kith and kin are bleeding by the million wounds, I see these guilty men sitting in the Treasury Benches, men who were a party to the partition of this country on the basis of religion, though they may swear by secularism today.

The persistent pursuit of wrong policies has brought this country to a terrible mess. We have been bogged in a morass of utter confusion. The so-called *Hindi-Chini bhai bhai* slogan boomeranged in Nehru's own life-time and we had the NEFA debacle. The scar of humiliation has not been wiped off from our forehead till today. Our only so-called friend Russia has been printing day in and day out in its official publications and in the Russian Encyclopaedia those parts of our country in Chinese occupation to be Chinese. The imperialism of the past has crumbled down, but a new imperialism of the communist type, which is more ruthless and more expansionist, has been raising its ugly head. We have seen its repercussions on its neighbouring countries.

The world has changed a great deal. The monolithic image of the communist bloc has been splintered into three groups, the camp of Kosygin, the camp of Mao and the camp of Tito. The recent ping pong diplomacy has culminated in the proposed visit of Mr. Nixon to Peking, and that is being channelised through Islamabad.

In this regard, I would like to ask a pertinent question of our External Affairs Minister. Is it a fact that 18 months ago the United States approached the Indira Gandhi Government to arrange for a dialogue between China and the United States, and is it a fact that under the pressure of Russia this gesture was refused?

In the context of the new balance of power which has been emerging in the world, to create a new check and balance, to create a new equilibrium between Russia and China, America has taken this new stance which has been evidenced by its disengagement in Viet Nam and its new approach to the Kuomintang Government in Taiwan. There is simul-

taneous talk on SALT with Russia and courtship of China. The Truman Doctrine of American dedication to resistance against any aggression or against expansion of communism no longer holds the field. It has been more or less rejected by American public opinion. Now the United States is more interested in keeping the check and balance in world power rather than in any legalistic or ideological purposes.

On the contrary, our foreign policy is static. It has got little relevance to reality. I would like to know what steps have been taken to deal with the repression in Bangla Desh, a repression of the majority by a microscopic minority, a microscopic military clique of Pakistan, which has beaten hollow the repression in South Africa or Angola or Rhodesia, which is unprecedented in history and which we never heard of even in the days of Chenghis Khan. It is a matter of great concern that the life of Bangla Bandhu, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, is at stake today. That concern is not being shown by this country or by Russia, the concern they showed at one time in the Congo crisis regarding the life of late Lumumba. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, with his massive mandate, who was once called by Yahya Khan as the next Premier of Pakistan, is now standing on the gallows on a charge of treason. Seven million refugees have come to this country. They are not going to go back. They have posed a hazard to the economy, to the health and to the law and order situation of this country. If our Government have been thinking that they will go back, they are only seeing the midsummer night's dream.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your time is up.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The time has been extended.

SHRI P. K. DEO: The time has been extended.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have given him the extended time also.

SHRI P. K. DEO: Kindly permit me two minutes. What steps have been taken in the Security Council? Not even a humanitarian resolution has been passed in the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations.

India has been ridiculed, the other day, when there was a discussion in Geneva. U Thant has remained silent unlike his predecessor, Mr. Hammarskjold who intervened in the Congo crisis taking great personal risk. Our big shorts have trotted all over the world capitals; they have failed to press India's difficulties and failed to rouse the world conscience and their duties and obligations to bring peace to Bangla Desh.

Even after Shri Swaran Singh visited Washington, in spite of the precise assurance given and the much-publicised success of the talks, shiploads of lethal military hardware are on the high seas. Can you not intercept them?

I would like to point out one thing; and that is our responsibility towards Bangla Desh. If China could provide an arsenal for the Vietcongs and others for the civil war in Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos, if Pakistan could train the hostile Nagas and Mizos, why should we shirk the responsibility of giving all possible aid to the *Mukti Vahini* in Bangla Desh?

I shall conclude with one sentence. Lastly, so far as the *de jure* recognition is concerned, to the Swantanta party it is of no significance because it is imbecile. We feel it should depend on our national preparedness. We feel that it should depend on the Government to decide if we are prepared to have a military showdown. I submit that we will give all possible help to Bangla Desh movement as it is emerging from the pangs of birth, and *de facto* it will become an independent nation in no time.

Lastly, I say that our foreign policy should be more independent and more pragmatic and more determined; we should take a lesson from Israel. I would like to point out to Mr. Indrajit Gupta, who quoted Mr. Chester Bowles and felt secure that India's security depends on the Russian supply of arms, that the more we depend on Russia, the closer will it bring the collusion of Pakistan with China and the USA.

SHRI C. C. GOHAIN (Nominated—North-East Frontier Tract of Assam): Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. I come from a region which hit the world headlines at the

time of the Chinese invasion in 1962. This area is NEFA which is on the border between India and China. This is a buffer zone. The moment you think of relations between India and China, you cannot escape from thinking about NEFA. The External Affairs Ministry, therefore, cannot afford to neglect this vital region.

NEFA was till the other day under the External Affairs Ministry. Though technically it has now been passed on to the Home Ministry, for all practical purposes, the External Affairs Ministry will have to take serious note of the problems of this strategic area. NEFA was the worst sufferer at the time of the Chinese aggression in 1962. a lot of casualties resulted as the Chinese aggression started, sudden and unexpected. We must be on our guard and should no more neglect this vital region and avoid any mishap in future. The recent decision of President Nixon to visit Peking some-time next year provides a new dimension to international affairs in general and to India-China relations in particular. Since Washington is coming closer to Peking, we cannot expect USA to come to our rescue in case China again resorts to aggressive activities on the NEFA border. As a matter of fact, there is complete identity of views among the Governments of Pakistan, China and USA over the question of keeping the territorial integrity of Pakistan. This will make Pakistan even more indifferent to the aspiration of the people of Bangladesh and their demands for complete independence. Thus, India is now faced with double danger from China and Pakistan. In the face of these new international developments, it becomes all the more necessary for the External Affairs Ministry to do some re-thinking on the problems of the people of NEFA, so that the people of that area may muster up the required strength to face any aggression from China in future.

14 hrs.

The population of NEFA is about 5 lakhs and the area is more than 40,000 square miles. Its area is much more than that of Meghalaya, which has already attained statehood. The people of NEFA have become politically conscious and they want speedy development of their area. They think that this will be possible only when NEFA is converted into a State. About 84 per cent of the people of

[Shri C. C. Gohain]

NEFA are engaged in agriculture. There is no industry worth the name in NEFA. Even water is not available in adequate quantities. There is only one degree college and there is no science college. Educated people are facing unemployment even in NEFA. Ever since its establishment NEFA has not been receiving much attention so far as development is concerned. The remedy lies in providing facilities for agriculture, setting up new industries to provide avenues of employment, opening of science college, granting scholarships to NEFA students for foreign studies, helping NEFA students seeking admission in colleges and universities outside NEFA, improving and developing tourist spots, withdrawing restrictions on the entry of outsiders into NEFA and building roads right up to the border. The Border Roads Organisation has built some roads in the interior but none in the border. This is standing in the way of development of NEFA. In the light of all these, I suggest very strongly that a team of Members of Parliament, Pressmen and technical experts should be sent to NEFA to make a study of this important area of our country.

In conclusion I would reiterate the demand of the people of NEFA for statehood. This will enable them to make the fullest contribution for defence of the strategic border area standing between India and China. With these words, I support the Demands.

SHRI M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL (Manjeri): Sir, before I refer to the foreign policy, I want to say a few words about a matter that is relevant and which pertains to the External Affairs Ministry, and that is the tax on foreign travel imposed by this year's budget.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What has that got to do with the present Demands?

SHRI M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL: This tax affects pilgrimage to foreign countries, and that is the concern of the External Affairs Ministry. A levy of 20 per cent *ad valorem* is proposed on all tickets purchased in rupees. That will severely curtail tourism. Apart from that, the gain of the Finance Ministry will be the loss of the Civil Aviation Ministry. But the people who will be undeservedly hit hard by this new impost are those who

go on Hajj in performance of their compulsory religious duty. These people undertake this travel not for profit or pleasure but as a duty enjoined upon them. The means of transport, whether steamers or other which the pilgrims are obliged to use for this journey are of the third or fourth class variety and are not known for the comfort provided to the passengers. Yet the pilgrims do not mind such conditions; because they are anxious to perform their duty somehow. Moreover; most of the people who go on this pilgrimage are very poor; and they save money for this voyage over a number of years so that they may have the mental and spiritual satisfaction of discharging their obligator religious duty. The proposed increase of 20 per cent in their fare will be a grave hardship and handicap especially on such poor and helpless people and may even prevent very many of them from fulfilling their life-long ambition of discharging their duty. I make, therefore, an earnest appeal that the Hajj pilgrims may be exempted from the new tax.

Now, Sir, the one thing that claims the attention of the whole country more than anything else is the influx of refugees into our country from East Pakistan, that is, Bangla Desh. This engrossing attitude is only natural when such a huge human tragedy is being enacted before our eyes. The disconcerting exodus of people into our country has not yet ceased. The continuing flow of the refugee flood with an irksome monotony is an undoubtable index to show that the situation in East Bengal has not yet changed for good. It will not be a matter of surprise if the present deluge of seven million refugees reach the astounding 10 million mark sooner than one may expect. Human calamity of such a nature and dimension is unprecedented in the world history of flight of people from one country to another under any circumstances. This mass of distressed humanity on our soil is a crushing burden on our economy in its present stage of none too strong economic vitality and condition. Under these circumstances, the Government of India has done the right thing in asking the nations of the world to take substantial share in meeting the tremendous responsibility of relieving mass human suffering. This suffering is not of our making. Our Prime Minister has said that the internal problem of Pakistan has created internal problems

for us. Our problem is the direct result of the human tragedy enacted over our borders by another country. The relief of such stupendous human suffering is really the responsibility of the world and of the United Nations. It is regrettable that though some nations have offered aid such aids have not come up anywhere near the realistic need of the hour. Now, rather than approaching individual countries, we must make the United Nations to accept the responsibility of maintaining and taking care of the refugees.

As a remedy some parties advocate recognition of Bangla Desh and some others even carry on a propaganda for declaring war. But the position has not been made clear how recognition or war would help. In the present situation, there is not much gap between recognition and war. If the honour and interest of our country demands war, then there must be war. If there be a war, I am sure we shall win. The people of the whole country will stand as one man behind the Government even as they did in 1962 and 1965. There can absolutely be no doubt about it and there can be no two opinions about the matter.

What I want to say is that recognition under the present circumstances is not much different from war and the Government must decide that matter, because war is not undertaken or declared by public meetings and propaganda in the bazar and other places. It is the Government that must make the decision taking into consideration every data that is with them. We do not know much about them. Even what the Government knows, they are not prepared to place before us because of public interest. The Government are the best judges to say whether there is to be war or not. If there is to be a war, if our honour, justice and interest demand that there must be a war, let them declare the war today and they will find that every single man in the country is behind the Government without any doubt whatever. It must be the responsibility of the Government in the interest of the country to declare such a thing as that. Their hands must not be forced by propaganda. That is what I want to impress upon our friends. Everybody will be behind the Government if they take the decision either for war or for recognition or for anything else.

I wanted to say many other things, but you will be ringing the bell and telling me that my time is up. I wanted to say something about the policy of non-alignment. The policy of non-alignment is valid even today. It has really done good for our country. It has achieved things. It is not good for the people to run down such a policy of the Government. It has really done good not only to our country but also to some other countries of the world.

Before I conclude I must say that some gentleman said something disparaging about the Foreign Minister. The Foreign affairs Minister does not represent himself. He represents the Government and the country. I know, there are many people who will agree with my view that we could not find a better man than the present External Affairs Minister. He is suave, subtle and sober; at the same time, unbending where principles and the country's interests are concerned. He has his own manners. But he is the best politician, statesman and diplomatic representative of our country in the present circumstances.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Pupri): Sir, I stand to support the Demands of the Ministry. Basically the foreign policy of a country is projection of its internal polity. In 1967 when there was fragmentation of the political life of this country, even the most sympathetic and liberal commentators abroad had expressed doubts not only about our country playing a part in international affairs but also about the existence of India as a political entity. But the recent elections have shown the maturity of our people in giving the massive mandate to the leadership of our Prime Minister. It is in this context of the growing maturity of our people and the strength that they have given to our Government that we have to review the performance of our foreign policy and examine whether we can play any part in international politics or not.

The changing landscape of international politics is both interesting and distressing. It is an interesting and a very welcome development because the super-powers are trying to come closer and there is lessening of tension between America and Russia. But it is distressing for us. Specially the 1960s were a very sad period for us in the sense

[Shri Hari Kishore Singh]

that we were victim of two attacks from our neighbouring nations. It is in the context of the Chinese and Pakistani aggression that we have to judge how far our international policy has been evolved to create friendly relations for ourselves in the world at large. And the result is slightly disappointing. But the world politics is ever-changing. Now, this coming together of hostile enemies for two decades, China and America, is a very significant development and we should draw a lesson from it. I do not know how authentic is the statement made by my hon. friend, Shri P. K. Deo. If there is any truth in that or if there is any gesture from the United Government that we should play some part in creating some sort of understanding between America and China, then even now we can play that part and we should explore that possibility.

In this context, I may also plead for defreezing of Sino-Indian relationship. I am not among those who wish to have this relationship at the cost of our national dignity or self-respect. But we should try to explore the possibility as to whether we can have some sort of a less-hostile relationship with China or not.

In the growing context of Washington-Islamabad-Peking axis, I have a fear that this axis might make an effort to isolate India from her neighbours and South-East Asia would be their immediate target. They may try to isolate us from our South-East Asian neighbours. Whatever may be the course of American policy after their withdrawal from Vietnam, because they are going to withdraw from Vietnam, they will try to operate from other bases in South-East Asia and they will also give massive economic and military aid to South-East Asian countries. Still, the South-East Asian countries will grow apprehensive of American designs. In this context, we shall have to play a very useful part in South-East Asia and there our approach should be guarded and positive, and we should not try to demoralise them that, as they are allied to America, we cannot have any relationship with them.

Another interesting development in international politics is the emergence of Western Europe as a new economic and political entity. We should try to develop the closest possible

relationship with this new emerging force because it will not only be an economic necessity for us but also a political imperative. We are well-appreciated there and there are strong possibilities of favourable response to our intentions, to our policies to our system of Government and to our internal politics from these countries. We have already seen in the context of Bangla Desh that it is the Western European countries which have made a positive response to our policies.

Another thing which I would like to say is that the Government should have closer relationship with Latin American countries. This region has been completely neglected by our Government so far. It is true, in 1968, our Prime Minister made a visit to this region. I think, she was the first Prime Minister of India to make any visit to that region. Our former Foreign Minister, Shri Dinesh Singh, also visited these Latin American countries. But very little has been done by way of follow-up action.

I learn the role of the Council of Cultural Relations is very limited. I think, the scope of the activities of this Council should be extended and it be activated, and its branches should be established in other parts of the world, especially in Afro-Asian countries. In this context of Latin America, I am rather disappointed to see only one sentence mentioned about the Caribbean countries. I think South Block does realise that with this region we have close ethnic links and historical ties and with their help and co-operation we can play a useful part in world affairs.

Coming to West Asia, our policy in this region has long been primarily guided by the United Arab Republic. I have nothing to say about the past performance of our foreign policy in this area. Now President Sadat is in power in UAR and a new type of Government is emerging there. We should also try to assess whether the UAR should continue to be the central focus of our policy and whether we should continue to be guided by it. Because in this country there is a lot of criticism about the role and attitude of the UAR in the context where our vital national interests are concerned. I think our policy towards West Asia needs a reappraisal and a reassessment.

Finally, a word about the Bangla Desh. Here, I regret to say that whatever the government will do and I am sure the Government is doing quite well, will not be fully appreciated because we want to have a quick solution of the Bangla Desh problem and unless we are able to provide a quick solution to this problem, it is going to tax us a lot and shall entail a heavy burden and misery for the whole nation and even may impair the whole democratic and secular policy of the country. Therefore, India must see that the Bangla Desh issue is solved sooner, the sooner the better.

Lastly, about our nuclear policy.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That relates to the Ministry of Defence, not External Affairs.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: Since we are discussing foreign affairs and it has a co-relation with Defence, I want to say a word about it.

The Afro-Asian countries are quite apprehensive of China's designs, especially in the new context of Washington —Peking—Islamabad axis. I have no doubt that they would prefer to have another strong Asian power to protect their interests and a strong Asian power means a strong India. There is no other power in this part of the world which can play that role and a strong India means a nuclear India. India has got a strong industrial base and nuclear know-how of its own. Unless we are able to produce nuclear weapons and create a stronger industrial base, no country will take us seriously and even we will not be able to play that role which we were able to play during the days of Prime Minister Nehru.

SHRI TRIDIB CHAUDHURI (Berhampur): For a person of my temperament it is always rather unpleasant to be compelled to find faults with a Ministry which is presided over by so fine and suave a gentleman as our friend, Sardar Swaran Singh. But, we are faced with a circumstance today which leaves no other alternative. But before I come to that, I must also join issue with hon. Shri C. C. Desai who made Sardar Swaran Singh personally responsible for all the failings of our foreign policy. I think it is not

his personal failing. He has been in charge of the External Affairs Department not once, but several times and he has discharged his duty by the country quite creditably and competently. Of course, it is not for me to defend him; he can very well defend himself. But, if I have any criticism, it is not against Sardar Swaran Singh personally, but against the confounded and confused policies of the present Government. It would, however, be unfair to blame him personally for these policies. We defined our policy as non-alignment in the context of a bipartisan power block world in the fifties but that context is gone now. At that time under the leadership of Pandit Nehru, we had managed to raise our world stature and played some part. That was what I call a dynamic part. But, somehow or other our External Affairs Ministry seems to have forgotten that the world has changed and they have settled down comfortably to convention, orthodoxy, protocol and diplomatic rectitude and nothing else. As a result, we find ourselves confronted with two big problems, one nearer home, the Bangla Desh problem, and the other, on a bigger canvas, on the larger world plane, the Peking-Islamabad-Washington axis. But it is not as if these things have just come on us as a bolt from the blue. Sir, we failed miserably to keep a watch over the developments that were taking place. I would give one instance and I would like the Government to correct me if I am wrong. When President Yahya Khan was having his talks with Sheikh Mujibur Rehman in Dacca before the fateful 25th of March, the talks were continuing for days, I don't want to identify him, but the most important official who ought to have been present in Dacca on that occasion was not present, he was somewhere else. And, if my information is correct, in spite of every effort made by informed people to get exact information as to what was passing that was not available because that gentleman happened to be elsewhere and nobody from New Delhi told him that his place at that fateful moment was in Dacca itself to keep a watch over the things that were happening there.

Similarly, with regard to this Peking-Islamabad-Washington axis, I wish to say this. Somebody said that ping-pong diplomacy has been transferred into James Bond Dip-

[Shri Tridib Chaudhuri]

lomacy. It was not so sudden. For the last 2 years, the Government of the United States of America have been re-thinking about their global policies. I have here a string of statements by the Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers and also by President Nixon himself which indicate that they were very eager to open dialogues with People's China and the culmination of that policy has come. It is of very little or secondary importance whether that was done secretly by Mr. Kissinger by faking illness and trying to rest at Nathiagali and then going secretly to Peking to have this dialogue or otherwise. The secretiveness of what happened is secondary. This thing was coming. Did we keep proper watch over these things?

One hon. Member has suggested that we should on our own unfreeze our relations with People's China. It would look very odd if in the wake of this development, Sino-American detente, we now rush to make friends with China. It would be absolutely out of place and make us ridiculous. But did we on our own take sufficient steps to find out earlier through our diplomatic sources or through such other sources as are available and open to us whether we could start to negotiate with China over our unsettled disputes with that country. We have been telling the USA and the whole world over decades that they cannot neglect five hundred million people in East Asia in mainland China and that they must have some kind of relation with them and bring them into the world comity of nations. We have been trying to do that, but so far as we are concerned, we did not do anything to open up a dialogue with China on our own. That ought to have been done. I would like to stand corrected, but if my information is correct, about one and a half years back, in Cairo, some prominent Chinese leaders who had come to attend an international conference then sought an exchange of ideas with Indian representatives there; I do not know whether the wide opening provided by that exchange of ideas was utilised or not.

Government must try to understand the discontent and the impatience of the House in the face of the situation that we are confronted with today. I do not know what Government are going to do over the Bangla Desh problem. We have on our hands a

sort of unwanted orphan child whose face even we do not seem to recognise, namely the Bangla Desh Government. We have also on our hands nearly 10 million refugees, and competent observers have said that more will be coming. Famine conditions are raging there, and again a huge Muslim influx has started, because the Muslim peasantry are crossing the borders for want of food. What are we going to do? How are we going to maintain these people and provide relief to them? We have appealed to the world conscience. That is all right. But in the meantime, the paltry sum of Rs. 60 crores that we had provided in our Budget has been wiped out. Shri Y. B. Chavan is reported to have told his party members that he is coming before Parliament with more Demands for Grants. But where is the money in our coffers? So far as international help is concerned, that has been very poor and niggardly. So, how can we provide for these people? I do not know what Government is going to do in the face of this human aggression forced on us by Pakistan. Yahya has threatened that, if necessary, he would go to war with us. I am not a very excitable person, but I say with all sense of responsibility that we must be bold enough to say that if it is war, we are prepared for it and we will fight it out in the fields of Bangla Desh and elsewhere to help free the people of Bangla Desh to come into their own.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Shahabad): The occasion for discussing the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry is hardly the occasion for indulging in personalities or picking out certain officials of the Ministry for apportioning blame for the alleged failure of our foreign policy. It is rather the occasion to highlight the broad national interests, the policy we are pursuing and offer criticism, where necessary. In that light, I regret certain remarks made by some hon. members, particularly the hon. member to whom the preceding speaker, Shri Tridib Chaudhuri, referred. It is very unfortunate that this has come from an experienced member of this House who had knowledge of the work of the External Affairs Ministry and the pursuit of our foreign policy because he had occupied two distinguished posts, of High Commissioner for Ceylon and for Pakistan earlier. Therefore, to pick out either the Foreign Minister or somebody

else in the Ministry and say that the whole picture will change if he is removed is, to say the least, a very facile way of treating this rather serious subject.

We all know how tirelessly Shri Swaran Singh has worked, how painstakingly he has recently been pursuing the national foreign policy to the best of his capacity. The House knows he is not a new man; he is the most objective person we can find in our present-day politics. He has no axe to grind except the heavy duties and responsibilities resting on his shoulders. I think we will be detracting from the importance and seriousness of the subject if we try to oversimplify the issue by picking him out for the alleged failure of policy.

What is the failure of the policy, as alleged? It is said that we are friendless. Someone said yesterday that we have not been able to achieve the advancement of our national interest in the pursuit of our foreign policy, as if this is done in a day or even over a period of a year or two. There are certain elements in every country's foreign policy, certain basic objectives. That applies to all countries including our own. The basic objective is to secure our national interest. In the present-day complicated world, this interest varies from country to country; it is determined by geopolitical, geophysical and geo-economic considerations. It varies from the concept of a country being a super power, then the balance of power which is now converted into the balance of terror in the nuclear age. In this complicated situation, we have to secure our national interests. We have to develop the capacity to further our national interest in this situation. If we have not done that capacity and therefore are not able to achieve our national interest at certain times—that applies to the country as a whole—we make the mistake of identifying certain persons connected with our foreign policy based on subjective considerations and put the blame on them. Finally, every country tries to create world public opinion in favour of its policies. That is the operation and the role of diplomacy in securing agreement and understanding of world opinion to the policies that a country tries to pursue.

So far as our country is concerned, if I may say so, since independence basically we have been pursuing a foreign policy with

three noteworthy aspects. The first is non-alignment. It has been criticised earlier. It was criticised yesterday and today also that it does not hold, good now because it was conceived in the 'fifties when the world saw the phenomenon of military alliances and a cold war situation. India then determined to pursue a policy of independence and not align herself with any power bloc. That was the reason why India has not entered into any military alliance with any country. This is the key note of our policy.'

The second aspect of our policy emerges from our culture, from our traditions, that whatever may be the provocation. . .

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: No change.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: . . . whatever may be the immediate passion, we will follow the right means to achieve the right ends. It stems from our national movement, and this aspect has to be understood if we are trying to save the line of our foreign policy.

Finally, we have emphasized the importance or increasing potentialities of negotiations, achieving agreements with other countries through negotiations. That is what we call emphasis on a peaceful settlement.

These are the three keynotes of our foreign policy. You may apply it, in the context of the world, to any, country, whether it is the Super Powers like the United States or the Soviet Union or the under-developed countries, the Afro-Asian countries or our immediate neighbours. To all these countries have applied this principle.

AN HON. MEMBER: What have you achieved?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am coming to that.

Of course, it varies. Our attitude with other countries is friendly although we may have sharp differences over the policies they may be pursuing guided by their own national interests. The United States is a case in point. They have given arms to Pakistan to achieve a balance of power in this part of the world or to achieve a certain foothold. They failed earlier, but they are pursuing this policy even today, and it is going to have the opposite effect. We have strongly protested against

[Shri R. B. Bhagat]

this, we have said that their policy is wrong because it is not going to achieve any results. But our attitude to the United States remains friendly, and we have tried to seek agreements and co-operation in spheres where we can.

Similarly, you see this policy in relation to our neighbours. Countries like Nepal, Burma and Ceylon are all following the policy of non-alignment. Our relations with them have been excellent.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Very excellent: Your appeal has been responded to by not one of them.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We have the friendliest of relations with Burma. We signed the border agreement. We have solved our outstanding problem with Ceylon. Of course in a dynamic world, when you solve one problem, particularly in international affairs, another set of problems come up. But the main thing is the approach, the line of policy the countries follow. I can say that our policy has succeeded. Whether it is Nepal or Burma or Ceylon, there may be occasional differences but we have followed a policy of friendship and there is no animosity or hostility towards our neighbours.

I cannot say the same thing about Pakistan or China. We have had the very bitter experiences with these two countries. But there has not been a change in our policy; we continue to be friendly and if an occasion arises to settle all our outstanding problems through negotiations and arrive at just and honourable settlements with China or Pakistan, we shall certainly follow that policy.

The situation in Pakistan is so much aggravated today because Pakistan has continued and is continuing a wrong policy. Their policy has created for them a serious problem in Bangla Desh: it is a greater problem for us. Naturally the whole country and the House is exercised over it. Even in this problem which affects us directly, which affects us in every manner, let us not be swayed by emotions or passions and get into the wrong track.

The solution for the Bangla Desh problem is obvious. With the experience the people of Bangla Desh have gone through, they are not going to have any truck with Pakistan.

The largescale murders and violence and almost every kind of brutality and atrocity perpetrated on the people of Bangla Desh has kindled such hatred in them. I have seen young people and they are not going to be inhibited any more. This is the creation of Yahya Khan. Now he is in a desperate situation. You should realise that we have nothing to worry about, if we keep our patience and firmness. Yahya Khan is in a desperate situation.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: We are in a happy situation!

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am not saying so; do not put words in my mouth. He is saying: let us negotiate and settle the problems. We are not going to fall into their trap. He has also said that he would declare war on India. Whatever he may do, we shall follow the right course so that the people of Bangla Desh could get their democratic rights. They are fighting for it and the Mukti Vahini forces will liberate Bangla Desh; they have the support and the sympathy of the people and the Government of this country.

Pakistan wants to convert this into an Indo-Pak war; that is why he has declared war. We are not going to declare war on Pakistan. War does not solve any problem. But if Pakistan declares war, we are prepared to meet them, if the trouble could not be solved by other methods. We shall keep our restraint till the last because that is the correct policy. If Pakistan has decided to declare war on India, India will face Pakistan and deal with it adequately.

Now we have seen the situation created by the announcement of the proposed visit of President Nixon to China. The Foreign Minister rightly welcomed it, because it is the confirmation and proof, if proof is needed, of the success, the truth or the correctness of the Indian policy. Even during the worst days of our relations with China we have not said that China should be isolated. It is a country with 750 million people and they are trying to find their destiny. Neither in the United Nations nor anywhere else should they be isolated. We have been pursuing that policy despite the worsening of our relations with China. Now, if Mr. Nixon has realised this,

that instead of containing China they have come to negotiate and try to solve the major problems of war and peace, it is a good thing. But if they mean that they should strike another balance of power in Asia, he will be mistaken. If it is either to contain the Soviet Union or to create a new power balance here, trying to placate China, I think that will be the worst of things to happen. But we have to keep our watch over the situation and see that we follow the line of peaceful settlement or the line of peaceful solution to the ultimate problems of the world.

If you see the situation in this light, the final assessment of our foreign policy, I would say, is that we are neither friendless on all issues, for, there is hardly any country which can claim credit. Whether it is a major problem of war or peace, whether it is the question of threat to peace of the world, whether it is disarmament, whether it is racialism, whether it is colonialism, whether it is the right of Afro-Asian countries, whether it is the question of increasing participation in the under-developed countries, whether it is fighting colonialism in any form, the neo-colonialism or racialism or any other type, India's policy has not been found correct but more and more people have come to accept it not only in the developing world but even in the European and other parts of the world.

That is the reason why in the non-aligned conference, not only we found that it gave a positive content to non-alignment. Some people say that non-alignment is no longer valid today. It is more valid today, and it will always be valid, because it gives the right to every country to decide its own problems. 54 nations attended that conference, and it found a way of having more economic co-operation. Therefore, if you see the balance-sheet, the balance-sheet is in favour of India's foreign policy.

There are some unresolved problems, I know. Which country has no unresolved problems? They will say that we have not advanced our national interests fully. I want to ask whether any country in any part of the world has been able to advance its national interests fully. It is a continuous process. We have to solve our own problems. And then a host of other problems arises. Therefore, while solving the problems not only

do we pursue the right policy but the right means. We have to be vigilant about new problems that are being created so that we apply the same principle to them. That, we have done, and that we will do, and this shows that the balance-sheet is in favour of India's foreign policy.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Sir, the threat has been sounded. Yahya Khan's threat to India has been given, of declaring a war against our country because we have to bear the burden of their bestiality in driving out eight million of their citizens. What will be the answer? What will be the answer from our Government? If the Government still, even at this late hour, has the courage, the wisdom, has also the manhood of a nation, it is time that the fitting reply to Yahya Khan's threat would be to give immediate recognition to Bangla Desh. Derecognise the right of Yahya Khan to speak on behalf of Bangla Desh. That is the fitting reply.

Again, there is another threat: the threat about the life of Mujibur Rahman. Now, he has come out with a statement that he is going to try Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the Bangla Bandhu of Bangla Desh. It is time that our Government should take up the matter with all the international powers, to take up the matter immediately in the United Nations; immediately send a wire to U Thant. I want U Thant to take up the matter in the UNO. I want to say it is not my word. It is the word of those commanders who are operating in the Mukti Fauj; that Yahya Khan should remember that there are over a lakh of potential hostages of the Pakistan army in Bangla Desh. If they touch Mujibur Rahman, there will be a massacre, there will be killings that nowhere in history would such a thing have occurred. There are more than one lakh of potential hostages of the Yahya Khan army. Not a single one of them will be able to return to West Pakistan alive if anything happens to Mujibur Rahman. My friend made a lot of glorification about nonalignment. Where do we stand? Neither are we aligned nor are we non-aligned. If I may use a simile, our exact position today is nothing but a modern Trisanku, neither in the heaven air nor in the earth.

A lot of things have been said about USA. If you have really pursued a nonalignment

[Shri Samar Guha]

policy, what about the largest quantum of foreign aid—over 60 per cent of it—that we get from the imperialist power, USA? At the crucial moment in 1962, was it not a fact that we prostrated before the USA—I would not say at their feet—and pleaded that the Seventh Fleet may be kept in the Indian Ocean? Was it not a fact that day and night they were giving us arms? Is it not a fact that all our mountain divisions have been equipped with the USA's military hardware? Still you are non-aligned! Now, when we have to depend wholly for our heavy and crucial armaments on our practical friend, Soviet Russia, still we are non-aligned! I want to say, the words alignment and non-alignment have become totally irrelevant in the diplomatic world today. Imperialism and anti-imperialism, colonialism and anti-colonialism, democracy and anti-democracy, communism and anti-communism—all these words to day have become totally irrelevant and meaningless.

China was calling India as a lackey of US imperialism and a stooge of US imperialism. Now what is China doing? Is not China a communist country? Therefore, all these ideological expositions of the foreign policies of the different countries have become meaningless today. There is only one presiding deity in the capital of each and every country of the world, be it a communist country, a democratic country, an imperialist country, a colonial country or a fascist country. That presiding deity is nationalism, nationalism and nationalism alone. In diplomacy, there is no Platonic international love or, to put it in a different way, there is no ideological crusade any more. It is only on the basis of hard realities of reciprocity of national interest. That is the sheet anchor of the foreign policy of each and every country of the world of every description. If we forget that, we will forget the very clan that will save the future of our nation. Therefore, I should say that our government has an unbroken record of complete failure and there are two occasions of humiliation—once, when we surrendered to the United States for our national security and, secondly, when we were dependent on Russia for our arms. Jaya Prakashji rightly said that our foreign policy is nothing but a *bachon ka khel*; it is a child's play.

15 hrs.

Our Foreign Missions are nothing but splendid post-offices receiving circulars, directives, notes and letters and sending replies. Only three or four days ago a friend of mine, who is a Professor of English in the Calcutta University, returned from a tour of the so-called democratic countries of Europe. He said that even now the people in those countries do not know that Mujibur Rehman and others are Muslims, the majority of people in Bangladesh are Muslims. They think that Bangla desh is a Hindu majority area. . . . (interruptions) So, I want the Foreign Minister to tell the House categorically how many brochures, literatures, circulars and films you have used in your missions, what are the instructions which you have sent and what are the things that you have done in the Middle East, in the Communist countries, in European countries, in China, in fact all over the world. I want a categorical numerical and statistical figures as to what you and your missions have done.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: How many flourishes have you made with your fingers?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: If I am in your position, I will not show my finger; I will show my fist.

SHRI PILOO MODY: He is suggesting that the Minister is only showing his finger.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: For want of time, I cannot go much deeper into the working of the foreign missions abroad. As I have already said, we are dependent on Russia. My information is that our government is hesitant to give recognition to Bangladesh because Russia is not agreeing to it. I have no expectation about USA, Britain, France or Germany; they are imperialist or former imperialist countries who have not got over their imperialist traditions. But I am surprised at our government not taking advantage of the commitment made by the communist countries. Their commitment was for national liberation movement; their commitment was for anti-imperialistic and anti-colonial movements everywhere, in South East Asia, in Africa, in South America and they are sending tons of volumes of literature on liberation to these countries. Could we

not take advantage of this commitment to get recognition for Bangladesh by saying "this is your commitment, your commitment can be transferred into glorified action, brilliant action, if you give recognition to Bangladesh".

Secondly, it is on the record of this House that we have made the costliest blunder by sending missions to all the countries excepting China. I do not know whether it is the reading of our ex-Minister of External Affairs or the reading of those who constitute the Chinese cell in the External Affairs Ministry. The words used in 1962 in the propaganda, circular and notes and also in 1965 were "strong warning", "strong condemnation", "solemn warning"; these were the words that we used against China. But in the conflict in Bangladesh what are the terms they are using? They use only one term always "we will give support to Pakistan". We will help them in the defence of their territorial integrity. Even there they have used the words; the wishes of the large section of the people should also be honoured. They have not mentioned a word of condemnation against Awami League and Bangla Desh liberation struggle. I am sorry what type of China cell have we got and what type of experts are operating in our External Affairs Ministry. They do not read into the mind of Peking. Many people have interpreted the Sino-U. S. understanding in a different way but I should say it is again a boon in disguise for us. Now if Pakistan forces a military confrontation on us—it has already given a threat 'we are not alone'—it is an empty threat. Now, China is getting bogged into an intriguing move the U. S. A. China cannot scuttle its national future. Therefore, all the more the apprehension that China may intervene in any eventual development of conflict with India and Pakistan is completely unfounded. Even Mr. R. K. Nehru, Smt. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit or our ambassador in Cairo could have been sent to China on Bangla Desh mission.

I want to warn you have sent one emissary on behalf of the Government—who is an ex-Minister—who is working in Tripura and trying to denigrate the Awami League. He is saying that Awami League is not upto the mark. He is parading himself as an emissary of the Prime Minister. He is trying to induct extraneous elements into the Mukti Fauj and

their fighting organisation, Awami League represents national platform of Bangla Desh like our Indian National Congress of the freedom days. He is doing positive disservice and I warn you should take notice of it.

I do not want to be unkind to either the Minister of External Affairs or to the Minister of Defence. Only, I want for their brilliant service to the nation in recognition to their achievement in relation to Bangla Desh the Defence Minister should be reverted back to his original Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Minister of External Affairs with his experts of the Chinese Cell should be shifted to the Ministry of Foreign Trade.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the demand for the Ministry of External Affairs and in doing so I should like to place before the House some of my views regarding some of the issues that confront us today. It has been my privilege to have been here on 14 occasions and this is the 15th when the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs have been debated in the House. And yet as I sat listening to some of the Members opposite repeat their theories again and again I wondered if they realised the world has moved forward fifteen years. I wondered why the old ghosts were still haunting them and why they had not been able to exercise them.

The great stalwarts who guided the destiny of the world of yesterday are gone. A new generation is now taking over. With it comes new concepts, new ideas and new challenges. Yet, some friends, again on my right, speak and act as if in today's context we needed to justify action or defend the concepts which are recognised all over the world. Non-alignment, peaceful Co-existence, international cooperation are not to be debated any more. They have been the basis of our foreign policy and they are now the fundamental tenets of international cooperation.

I do not want to take upon myself to rebut, in any detail, the cliches that have been presented year after year. I leave it to my friend, the External Affairs Minister to do that. Let us instead think of today in the context of the world of tomorrow. We have got to think in terms of a community of nations in which our children and their

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

children will be able to live in peace and prosperity. This should be our concern today. But, I am afraid, some of our friends are used to the past only. They derive not only their source of inspiration from the past but they also live in the past.

I am sorry that this morning something was said in the nature of personal criticism. Of course, we are all here in public life and we have to face personal criticisms. But, I think, it at best distracts from the serious discussion in which, I am sure, the House is interested specially because we are now at a crucial phase not only in our history but also in the history of the world.

I submit that our history, geography and economy, all point to the need for our seeking our destiny first in Asia. We have to build up cooperation first with the Asian countries. I recognise that Asia today is divided, that in Asia the war which began in 1939 has never come to an end, up to date. And that equally in Asia there is no single continental organisation—political, economic. Not even a cultural one. These have to be forged if we wish to build up Asian identity.

It is my feeling that it is necessary, first of all, for us to concentrate in this sphere of building up Asian identity and in finding a place in it for ourselves. It can be done only when we are willing to take initiatives in Asian affairs. In the past we used to be present whenever Asian issues were discussed, invited or uninvited. I am sure, Shri Krishna Menon will bear me out when I say that we were not invited to the first Geneva Conference. Yet, we were there; he himself was there for several months. At the end of it the primary responsibility for implementing the Agreements was entrusted to India. Therefore, it is not a question merely of showing interest but it is equally a question of undertaking to share the responsibility for Asian affairs.

Today, Sir, there is very great interest in China. President Nixon has just announced his proposed visit to China, on an invitation which he himself had sought. Whether he will go or not, nobody can say and nobody here can say with any precision what exactly are the reasons for which he is going there. Perhaps, he has the 1972 presidential cam-

paign in mind; perhaps, he is thinking of the largest single virgin market that exists in China; or perhaps, he is thinking of forging a lever against Soviet Union or maybe he is thinking of a mix of them all and even some other ideas. But we have got to be careful to see that this does not provide him with an alibi for his support in the killings in Bangla Desh. On the other hand, if his visit contributes to the lessening of tension, that is all for the good.

Sir, as I was going through some papers this morning, I came across a statement which, with your permission, I should like to read in this House. It says:

"We could not shut our eyes to the recent happenings in China. We do not want in any way to meddle with Chinese people, either in their sentiments or in any other matters. . . . Whether we like it or whether its fabric is like our own or otherwise, we have to recognise. . . . It is not a matter of choice."

This is not Mr. Nixon speaking in 1971 but Nehru speaking in 1949. And it has taken the United States several hundred mistakes and several hundred thousand casualties to come to the same conclusions. Therefore, when we think in terms of Asian context, when we think in terms of setting issues which still linger in Asia, when we think in terms of building a new Asian cooperation, we have got to bear in mind the mistakes that the United States has made. We have equally to bear in mind our responsibilities.

Whether we like it or not, China is a large Asian country and that we have to learn to live with China just as they have to learn to live with us. Unfortunately, they did not reciprocate the sentiments which we had for them. But in the building of a new Asian cooperation, we have got to begin to have some dialogue with China. When I talk of a dialogue, it does not mean that we should immediately rush with folded hands to them. It means that we must begin to talk with them. We must see what opportunities that presents.

It is my feeling that one such opportunity did come our way. After they started sending their Ambassadors to our functions, Mao-

tse Tung publicly sent his greetings to our leaders through our Charge de'Affairs in Peking. For the Chinese who employ such odd methods as Ping-Pong to take soundings all over the world, sending of a message of greetings in public, to my mind, was an opening that they offered us. I am sorry that we did not recognise it is a such and I am more sorry to see that some of our friends on the other side do not still recognise it. It is, I think, an opportunity that we have missed.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: (Begusarai): What is the new opportunity that you would like us to reckon?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Opportunities keep coming. When we miss them, then we call it a bad luck. We may have missed opportunities in the past. And the thing to do is not to try to miss them in future.

Equally, we cannot conceive of a peaceful and prosperous Asia without an answer to the problem of Vietnam and what it stands for. It is the supremacy of the will of the people over brute force. Whether in Vietnam or in Bangla Desh, the question is the same. Perhaps, the much dramatised Kissinger's visit to Peking is an exercise in trying to lull the people in the United States, the unsilent minority, the young and intellectuals, and to lull them to some kind of inaction. But that is not for us. For us, Vietnam is vital and that we have got to see what can be done to support the historic struggle of the people of Vietnam. It is indeed a struggle not only of the people of Vietnam. It symbolises the struggle and the aspirations of the peoples of Asia as a whole, striving to forge their own destiny by themselves without the domination of the colonial rulers of the past. And as such we have as much stake in what is happening in Vietnam as we have in what is happening in the Bangla Desh or in what happened in our own country when we were struggling for our liberation.

We must also accept that there can be no settlement of the Vietnam issue without the agreement of DRVN and also the People's Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. Here, again, we have to strengthen our relations with DRVN. We have got to begin a meaningful dialogue with the People's Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. We have to use every possible opportunity

to support them and make them believe that through co-operation, Asian co-operation, our co-operation, co-operation of other nations, it is possible for us to find an answer to these problems. And here again, last year when Madame Binh came to India and also when DRVN expressed a wish to strengthen our relations, that was the time when we should have made a beginning in better understanding. It is now a question of finding another opportunity to further strengthen these links.

When we talk of the support to the down-trodden in this country, when we talk of democracy, when we talk of socialist philosophy for India, we cannot ignore those people who are struggling for the same ideals and for the same values in other parts of Asia, whether it is in Vietnam or whether it is in Bangla Desh.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: What does the crisis in Bangla Desh point to? What are the inherent dangers and what is the mischief that is being done and by whom. And what has been the score of our own actions so far? This is something which needs to be spelt out clearly in this House not only for ourselves, but for the country and for the world as well.

We already have over 7 million refugees. It is my fear that utilising the news of a famine that is floating around, the West Pakistan army in Bangla Desh will attempt to force upon us another five million refugees. I think we should take serious note of that. There is a possibility, a serious possibility, of a large number of people still coming over from Bangla Desh unless we can act and act quickly. It is my contention which I had the honour to place before you on an earlier occasion when I spoke here that we have missed the opportunity. We should have taken this action at the end of March or at the beginning of April when we could have not only saved democracy in Bangla Desh but we could have also saved over half a million lives that were lost and that we might have been able to prevent the exodus that followed.

Again, Sir, that is of the past. We have to think of the future. We have got to find a

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

way out by which the aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh are realised. I recognise that it is primarily the efforts that the people of Bangla Desh make, which will decide their future and no amount of pressure from outside whether from Pakistan or from her allies is going to prevent the realisation of the hopes and aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh. They are going to get their freedom as they have expressed. The question is: how and when and what is it that we can do to assist them in trying to realise the ideals which we ourselves cherish deeply.

SHRI JAGANATH RAO (Chattrapur):
What do you suggest?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I think I did suggest something last time and if it is the intention that I repeat it, I shall be very glad to do so, but you have already rung the bell once and I don't think that that is your intention. I will be glad to send the hon. Members a copy of what I said on the last occasion. And what about the sympathy and promises of support this House and we gave to Mukti Foj and to the people of Bangla Desh? It is going to be very much more difficult as time passes on to do anything. It will be more costly; it will be more risky. Time is, therefore, of the utmost essence.

I believe that, the pressure from the Sino-American *detente* will be to freeze the power-balance on the sub-continent. It will be their effort to try to keep Bangla Desh with Pakistan and to use Pakistan as a lever against India. And, if we want to break out of this, we have got to build our strength. Our economic and defence capabilities have to be built up. At the same time, we have to be decisive and take decisive action.

I should like to conclude with just one quotation that I came across and this quotation has been in my mind as I sat through, listening to the speeches of hon. Members and I am sorry that I am doing so even at the cost of repetition of what I had said at the beginning. This is again a quotation from Jawaharlal Nehru, and he says:

"One of the tragedies of history is the slowness with which people's minds adapt themselves to a changing environ-

ment. The world changes from day to day, not so our minds which are peculiarly static and insist on imagining that today is the same as yesterday and tomorrow will not differ greatly."

श्री एस० ए० शमीम (श्रीनगर) : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं कल से यह बहस बड़े गौर से सुन रहा हूँ। मुझे ऐसा महसूस हो रहा है कि इस मुल्क के खारजी मसायल पर बहस करने के बजाये हम कुछ और मुमालिक के खारजी मसायल के मुताल्लिक बहस कर रहे हैं कि अमरीका को क्या करना चाहिए, रूस को क्या करना चाहिए और चीन को किस तरीके पर बिहेव करना चाहिए। ये इरशादात और हिदायात इस ऐवान से जारी हो रहे हैं। लेकिन हमें क्या करना चाहिए और हमने क्या किया है, उसकी तरफ बहुत कम तबज्जह दी गई है। आम तौर पर मुकाबला होता है कि हमारा दुनिया में कहीं वजूद नहीं है, हम फ्रेन्डलेस हैं, हमारा कोई दोस्त नहीं है—यह सही है कि एक मुल्क के लिए जिसकी आजादी को सिर्फ 24 साल का अर्सा गुजरा हो उसका एक ऐसे मुल्क के साथ मुकाबला करना जिसकी आजादी को 40-50 साल से ज्यादा हुए हों, यकीनन गलत नतायज पैदा कर सकता है। सवान यह है कि आप मुकाबला करते हैं कि चाइना एक सुपर पावर बन गया, अमरीका एक सुपर पावर बन गया लेकिन उनके सुपर पावर बनने में जो एक तारीख है, जो जद्दो-जहद है उसको आप नज़रअन्दाज़ करना चाहते हैं। दूसरी अहम बात यह है कि आप मुकाबला करते हैं पाकिस्तान के साथ कि पाकिस्तान के बहुत सारे दोस्त हैं, उसकी खारजी पालिसी कामियाब रही और हमारी खारजी पालिसी नाकामियाब रही। आज पाकिस्तान की खारजी पालिसी कामियाब रही है, अगर उसकी जानिवदाराना पालिसी, अमरीका के साथ दोस्ती और चाइना के साथ दोस्ती उसको बचा सकती तो पाकिस्तान आज यह क्राइसिस फेस नहीं करता होता जिससे कि आज उसका मुकाबला है। इस लिहाज़ से हमें सिर्फ अपने को कन्डेम नहीं करना चाहिए। इसके मुकाबले अपने इस मुल्क में हमने एक

ऐसा निज़ाम कायम किया है और इस निज़ाम को कायम करने के लिए कोशिशें हैं जो इस किस्म के प्रेशर्स को बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकता है। इस एवान में दो तरह की तनकीद हुई है—उस हलके से लोगों ने यह कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान रूस का दस्तेनिगर है और दूसरी तरफ से यह कहा गया कि यह अमरीका का दस्तेनिगर है। दोनों में से एक ही बात सही हो सकती है। मेरे खयाल में सही बात यह है कि यह मुल्क न अमरीका का दस्तेनिगर है और न रूस का दस्तेनिगर है। इस मुल्क के सामने कितनी ही मुश्किलात हैं जिनसे निपटने की हम तैयारी कर रहे हैं।

15.28 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARI in the Chair]

बंगला देश का सवाल हमारे सामने आया है। बंगला देश के सवाल के मुताबिक इत्फाक से तमाम मुल्क की एक आवाज़ है, इस हद तक कि बंगला देश के मुजाहिदों के साथ हमारी मुकामिल हमदर्दी है और हमें उनकी एखलाकी हिमायत हासिल है। लेकिन इस हिमायत को देने का क्या तरीका हो सकता है, इसके बारे में इख्तिलाफ़ राय हो सकती है। लेकिन बुनियादी तौर पर इस मुल्क के सामने अपनी फ़ॉरेन पौलिमी का जो यह मकसद है हमें सिर्फ़ बंगला देश में नहीं बल्कि दुनिया में जहाँ भी जम्हूरियत को तकलीफ़ पहुंचती है, डिक्टेटरशिप को बढ़ावा मिलता है उसकी हमें मुखालिफ़त करनी चाहिये, यह हमारी फ़ॉरेन पौलिमी का बुनियादी मकसद होना चाहिये।

कहा गया है कि मुस्तकिल दोस्त भी नहीं होते और मुस्तकिल दुश्मन भी नहीं होते। मेरे खयाल से हमारी सबसे बड़ी बुराई यह है कि हम यहाँ तकरीरें बड़ी जोरदार करते हैं, हम कहते हैं कि अमरीका ने हमें खुश करने के लिये यह क्यों नहीं किया, अरब देशों ने हमारे साथ हमदर्दी क्यों नहीं की This is asking too much. This is expecting too much. अमरीका भी आपसे ऐक्सपेक्ट करता है कि आप वियतनाम

में उसकी पौलिमी की हिमायत कीजिये। अगर नहीं करते हैं तो उसकी कीमत देनी पड़ती है। हर मुल्क को अपनी आजादाना पौलिमी अख्तियार करने के लिये कुछ कीमत देनी पड़ती है, और इस मुल्क को भी कीमत देनी पड़ रही है। पाकिस्तान को हथियार मिल रहे हैं बंगला देश में नस्लकुशी करने के लिये। अमरीका ने न सिर्फ़ बंगला देश में ही नस्लकुशी के लिये पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये, बल्कि वियतनाम में भी नस्लकुशी के लिये हथियार मुहैया किये हैं।

आप समझते हैं कि सिर्फ़ चीन के साथ दोस्ती करने के लिये अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती की? यह हमारी तंग नज़री है। अमरीका की पौलिमी ग्लोबल पौलिमी है, उसके जहन में बहुत बड़े-बड़े मकासद हैं। वह आपकी और मेरी परवाह नहीं करेगा, और तब तक परवाह नहीं करेगा जब तक हमारे मुल्क में ताकत नहीं है। वह ताकत कैसे बनती है? न लड़ाई से बनती है, न तकरीरों से बनती है कि साहब हम बहुत कमजोर हैं, हमारे पास कुछ नहीं है, हमारी दुनिया में साख़ नहीं है। हम को अपनी बुराई करने की आदत हो गयी है कि हम कमजोर हैं, हम में ताकत नहीं है। इससे काम नहीं चलने वाला है।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह अर्ज करनी है कि बंगला देश के सवाल पर आपने अरब मुमालिक से तक्को रखी इमदाद की। कल माननीय वाजपेयी जी तकरीर कर रहे थे। वह एक ऐसी जमात की मुमाइन्दगी करते हैं जिन्होंने साफ़ तौर पर कहा है कि हम पाकिस्तान का डिसेंट्रेशन चाहते हैं। और उस जमात की रेपूटेशन अरब मुमालिक में यह कि अपने मुल्क में भी यह मुसलमानों के दुश्मन हैं। मेरा यकीन है कि अरब मुमालिक की सर्दमहरी का जो रबैया था उस का बहुत हद तक कसूर उस जमात पर जाता है जिसकी तर्जुमानी माननीय वाजपेयी जी कर रहे हैं।

कल माननीय वाजपेयी जी ने मजहूल इस्लाम का सर्टिफ़िकेट पेश किया कि उन्हें भी जनसंघ की

ہندوستان روس کا دست نگر ہے اور دوسری طرف سے یہ کہا گیا کہ یہ امریکہ کا دست نگر ہے۔ دونوں میں سے ایک ہی بات صحیح ہو سکتی ہے۔ میرے خیال میں صحیح بات یہ ہے کہ یہ ملک نہ امریکہ کا دوست نگر ہے اور نہ روس کا دست نگر ہے۔ اس ملک کے سامنے کتنی ہی مشکلات ہیں جن سے نپٹنے کی ہم تیاری کر رہے ہیں۔

بلگلا دیش کا سوال ہمارے سامنے آیا ہے۔ بلگلا دیش کے سوال کے متعلق اتفاق سے تمام ملک کی ایک آواز ہے۔ اس حد تک کہ بلگلا دیش کے مجاہدوں کے ساتھ ہماری مکمل ہمدردی ہے۔ اور ہمیں ان کی اخلاقی حمایت حاصل ہے۔ لیکن اس حمایت کو دینے کا کیا طریقہ ہو سکتا ہے۔ اس کے بارے میں اختلاف رائے ہو سکتی ہے۔ لیکن بلیدیادی طور پر اس ملک کے سامنے اپنی فاریں پالیسی کا جو یہ مقصد ہے ہمیں صرف بلگلا دیش میں نہیں بلکہ دنیا میں جہاں جمہوریت کو تکلیف پہنچتی ہے۔ ڈکٹیٹر شپ کو بڑھاوا ملتا ہے اسکی ہمیں مخالفت کرنی چاہیئے یہ ہماری فاریں پالیسی کا بلیدیادی مقصد ہونا چاہیئے۔

کہا گیا ہے کہ مستقل دوست بھی نہیں ہوتے اور مستقل دشمن بھی نہیں ہوتے میرے خیال سے ہماری سب سے بڑی برائی یہ ہے کہ ہم یہاں تقریریں بڑی زوردار کرتے ہیں ہم کہتے ہیں کہ امریکہ نے ہمیں خوش کرنے کے لیے یہ کیوں نہیں کیا۔ عرب دیشوں نے ہمارے ساتھ ہمدردی کیوں نہیں کی۔ This is asking too much. This is expecting too much. امریکہ بھی آپ سے ایسی ہیبت کرتا ہے کہ آپ ویٹنام میں اس کی پالیسی کی حمایت کیجیئے۔ اگر نہیں کرتے ہوں تو اس کی قہمت دینی پڑتی ہے۔

ہو ملک کو اپنی اُزادانا پالیسی اختیار کرنے کے لیے کچھ قہمت دینی پڑتی ہے اور اس ملک کو یہی قہمت دینی پڑ رہی ہے۔ پاکستان کو ہتھیار مل رہے ہیں بلگلا دیش میں نسل کشی کرنے کے لیے۔ امریکہ نے نہ صرف بلگلا دیش میں بھی نسل کشی کرنے کے لیے پاکستان کو ہتھیار دیئے۔ بلکہ ویٹنام میں بھی نسل کشی کے لیے ہتھیار مہیا کیئے ہیں۔

آپ سمجھتے ہیں صرف چین کے ساتھ دوستی کرنے کے لیے امریکہ نے پاکستان کے ساتھ دوستی کی۔ یہ ہماری تلگ نڈری ہے۔ امریکہ کی پالیسی گلوبل پالیسی ہے۔ اس کی ذہن میں بہت بڑے بڑے مقاصد ہیں۔ وہ آپکی اور میری پروا نہیں کریگا۔ اور تب تک پروا نہیں کریگا جب ہمارے ملک میں طاقت نہیں ہے۔ وہ طاقت کیسے بنتی ہے۔ نہ لڑائی سے بنتی ہے۔ نہ تفریروں سے بنتی ہے کہ صاحب ہم بہت کمزور ہیں۔ ہمارے پاس کچھ نہیں ہے۔ ہماری دنیا میں ساکھ نہیں ہے۔ ہم کو اپنی برائی کرنے کی عادت ہو گئی ہے کہ ہم کمزور ہیں۔ ہم میں طاقت نہیں ہے۔ اس سے کام نہیں چلنے والا ہے۔

دوسری بات مجھے یہ عرض کرنی ہے کہ بلگلا دیش کے سوال پر آپ نے عرب ممالک سے توقع رکھی امداد کی۔ کل مانگیہمہ واجہائی جی تقریر کر رہے تھے۔ وہ ایک ایسی ضمانت کی نمائندگی کرتے ہیں جنہوں نے صاف طور پر کہا ہے کہ ہم پاکستان کا تسانگہکریشن چاہتے ہیں۔ اور اس جماعت کی ریجوٹیشن عرب ممالک میں یہ ہے کہ اپنے ملک میں بھی یہ مسلمانوں کے دشمن ہیں میرا یقین ہے کہ عرب ممالک کی سرد میری کا جو رویہ تھا اسکا بہت حد تک تصور اس جماعت پر جاتا ہے جس

[شروی ایس اے شمیم]

کی ترجمانی مانلیہ واجپائی جی کر رہے ہیں۔

کل مانلیہ واجپائی جی نے مزہر السلام کا سرٹیفکیٹ پیش کیا۔ کہ انہیں یہی جن سنگہ کی کشمکش سے مسرت ہوتی ہے۔ انہوں نے بھی بنگلا دیش کے لیٹے جن سنگہ کی جدوجہد کی تشریف کی ہے۔ میں ان سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر وہ واقعی ایڈگلا دیش کے ساتھ ہمدردی رکھتے ہیں۔ اگر انکی بڈگل کی حریت پسندوں کے ساتھ میں ہمدردی ہے۔ دلچسپی ہے تو وہ اپنی اس ہمدردی کا اظہار نہ کریں۔ ساری دنیا جانتی ہے کہ انہیں ہمدردی نہ بلکالوں سے ہے۔ اور نہ بلکال کے مسلمانوں سے۔ اور نہ وہاں کے ہندوں کے ساتھ دلچسپی ہے۔ بلکہ پاکستان کی ڈسانٹیگریشن کے ساتھ ہے۔ لیکن ہندوستان کی پردہان منتری نے یہ بات کہل کر کہی ہے کہ یہ ملک پاکستان کا ڈسانٹیگریشن نہیں چاہتا ہے پاکستان کا ڈسانٹیگریشن دو ہی آدمی چاہتے ہیں۔ ایک واجپائی جی اور دوسرے جبرل یاہیاخان۔ مسٹر بھگو کسی قنار میں نہیں آئے۔ ان دنوں سہیں اگر کوئی سلہند ہے تو ہے اگر نہیں ہے تو پھر غیر شعوری طور پر۔ ان انٹہشڈلی۔ یہ ایک دوسرے کی مدد کر رہے ہیں۔

ہمارا مقصد صرف یہ ہے کہ ہم امن کی دنیا میں رہنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اور اب یہی جمہوریت کو جہاں پر خطر پہنچتا ہے۔ ہمیں کہل کر آواز بلند کرنی چاہئے اور اس وقت تک کا انتظار کرنا چاہئے جب تک ہماری طاقت اتلی بڑے جائے گی کہ ملکی معاملات میں ہمارا زیادہ سلجھدگی سے نرتس لہا جائے۔

ابھی اس میں وقت لکھتا۔ لیکن پریشانی کی۔ ڈیسپریشن کی۔ مایوسی کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے ملک میں ایک مظہوت سہاسی نظام قائم ہے جو یقیناً ہمیں اس راستے پر لے جائے گا۔

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam): Any student of foreign affairs or authoritative spokesman of the foreign policy of any country would tell us that any effective foreign-policy should reflect the domestic policy of a country or should be an extension of it or there should be a geopolitical colouration to it or, as some others would say, it should reflect the enlightened self-interest of the country. I would say that the foreign policy of this country has been reflecting a combination of all these aspects.

If we analyse the various postulates of our foreign policy, we would be able to discern in it some emphasis on this or that aspect of the situation I have outlined. I have been following the debate since yesterday. I should like particularly to address my remarks to some of the Opposition members. The most important element of our foreign policy is our concern to follow an independent foreign policy. One of its basic motivation has been to decide each issue on its merits. A major power may act one way at one time and another way at another time. We are not concerned with that. We have consistently been trying to develop an independent foreign policy. It has had no relation with what the Soviet Union did at one time or the US did at another time or what some other power did at a third time. A certain consistency, a certain historical continuity, has been the most striking characteristic of our foreign policy.

Much was being made by the Opposition of the so-called diplomatic victory of China or the US. Any serious observer of international relations cannot but come to the conclusion that if Pakistan had developed friendly relations with China within the framework of a Pakistan-US agreement, it was at the instance of the US. The honeymoon with China has to be seen in that context. The US wanted a rapprochement with China. So it had been utilising Pakistan to develop communications with China. This is the situation that has all along been there.

India was aware of this. We have always tried to steer clear of power blocs. Today if the US has overnight staged a volte face for cultivating China or honey-mooning with China, it serves its foreign policy interests. As some of the friends have pointed out here, China for its own reasons, because it is getting isolated from the communist movement or from the movement of the down-trodden people, wants a new power nexus. Probably she finds friendly relations with the United States useful to her. India need not be concerned about that. India's foreign policy has always been to steer clear of alignments with power blocs. India's foreign policy has been following certain basic motivations and basic concepts. What are those basic concepts and motivations ?

We wanted to see that no hot war was projected into this area. We never wanted any part of our country to be the theatre of a hot war. If our foreign policy had not been stewarded well, on this Kashmir issue alone there would have been war and a Viet Nam or a North Korea would have resulted in Kashmir. On the other hand, we referred the matter to the U. N. O. and we are seeking a solution of this problem through peaceful means. That has been India's consistent foreign policy.

Now the Bangla Desh issue has come. Our friends say that we should immediately recognise Bangla Desh, that we should immediately adopt a posture of war. Have they thought about the consequences? As you know, Pakistan is an ally of almost every military entente, the CENTO, SEATO and what not. As soon as any member of these military alliances is involved in a war with any country, immediately *ipso facto* all the other members of the alliance get involved in war. And we are not a country pursuing a war policy. Although there were several occasions, we always thought that we should avoid war and extend the area of peace. Consistently we have been saying that the area of peace should be extended. It has a certain historical continuity. India's basic domestic needs warrant us to adopt such a policy. For the last 150 years we are exploited by a foreign country and hence we lost precious time for development. In the wake of industrial development, other countries have developed, and we want peace in our country to develop. Unless we have peace, we just

cannot develop our country. The power blocs are interested in creating chaos in this country so that we may not emerge as a strong economic power with viable economic policies. It may be in the interests of the United States or China to create conditions of war in this country, but we are trying to avoid such a possibility here. On the other hand we are trying to be friendly with all countries.

People say that we have no friends, as if all the other countries are there to dance to our tune. If we have cultivated the Arab countries, it is not because we want to drag them wherever we are involved in a conflict. On the other hand, we always adopted a posture of secularism, against oligarchical system and feudalism prevailing in the Middle East. When countries like the U. A. R. came forward to fight against the feudal set-up, we befriended them. It is in continuity of our domestic policy.

On the question of Bangla Desh the position is not what many opposition friends say. I was very much depressed by the atmosphere of cynicism generated by my hon. friend Shri Manoharam who was saying that we were friendless. I believe in the strength of India. It does not stem from military strength, but from our moral stature, from the fact that we constitute one-sixth of the population of the world. Our strength should not be judged in terms of alignment with Russia or U. S. A. or China.

We may befriend China. We have always adopted a posture of befriending China because that was also a country diplomatically isolated by the power blocs. So, when China adopted a friendly attitude, we cultivated China. When she showed signs of aggression, we resisted. We do not want to be involved in a war with China.

On the Bangla Desh issue, all that we can do is to help the forces which are fighting for democracy and the secular way of life. It does not at all mean that we should be involved in a war with other countries. If Yahya Khan today says that he is going to start a total war against India, the basic reason for such a posture is this that he cannot hold on any longer there.

The forces of democracy, the younger generation who want freedom and libera-

[Dr. Henry Austin]

form of Government are giving hell to them. In order to create national unity at the expense of Bangla Desh he is projecting the war image. This is the success and victory of India's foreign policy because Pakistan with its hostile policy, with its negative policy cannot carry on in the international scene. Bangla Desh shows that Pakistan's policy is a failure. In West Pakistan also, Pakistan is going to face trouble. That again is a victory of the foreign policy of India.

Without aligning with any military bloc we have been able to create such conditions as would make Pakistan incapable of following military dictatorship there. In closing, I am not in a mood of frustration or despondency or hopelessness as my hon. friend Mr. Manoharan or other Members in the Opposition. On the other hand, within the framework of democracy, by our efforts to increase the area of peace, by our independent foreign policy, step by step, we show to the world that without war and power politics we can establish ourselves a healthy and viable democracy.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON (Trivandrum): It is one of those occasions, all too rare in the history of Parliament during the greater part of this decade, when we are discussing what is popularly called foreign affairs. I am aware, not only am I aware, I yield to none in the awareness that we have an audience for larger than the whole of this House or even the Foreign Minister, that is to say, we are concerned what impact this makes upon the other countries. While it is quite true that the Government is the maker of the policy, this Parliament of India has responsibility for the prestige of this country, not only for its present day adventures or otherwise, but also for its whole future.

I said it is one of the rare occasions. I do not say by way of political criticism; I say so because it has political significance. It is because the Government,—I think, perhaps wrongly, or maybe rightly, history will show,—has attempted an exercise in isolation. If that isolation were not ambivalent, perhaps there was some meaning, that is to say, if they concentrated all their economic, political and intellectual and other resources in order to develop the country and thereby gain strength. But that is not the pheno-

menon and that belongs to another chapter of parliamentary history.

But this isolation has created a situation, a lack of credibility in the world. It is quite true that there is lack of respect and regard for India; that does not arise from the blunders of the Government. Without any disrespect to the Foreign Minister or to his colleagues, I should like to say that this country is not the Government of India; this country is not the Government's mistakes or its good deeds; this country is the entire people and their history, the hopes that it arouses in other people, the example it might have set in the past and it can set in the future; this country is also represented by the people and there is considerable population inspite of family planning, and what is more, very considerable resources which are necessary for its own development and for the rest of the world.

Secondly, I want to say that the general tendency for us to regard ourselves as friendless arises from a subjective attitude of mind; it has no relation to reality. In a small way I go round the world and I have not found ourselves so friendless; I find ourselves in the position that a large number of people regret that we are not able to make an impact, or contribution to peace and co-operation and to our own development in the way people had hoped.

Is it true that we are friendless? In the course of the post independent history, in a very desperate situation, we assisted in the stoppage of carnage in Korea; we had no armaments and little diplomatic skill. We brought to a stoppage the war that was waged for a long time; it was part of the American imperialistic policy in those days to build up that base in Asia. Was it again lack of friendlessness where the entire world, with the exception of a small group of imperialist countries, ultimately assisted and succeeded in the promotion of the resolution and decision regarding decolonisation, and declared colonialism a crime against the law of the United Nations. India initiated a resolution; it was after-wards taken up by the Soviet Union. Today it is part of our policy. If it is not as successful as it should have been, it is because we have backslided on it in the last few years and there were squabbles

among nations desirous of following individual policies.

It is the same thing with regard to the freedom of the Arab countries which had not been liberated at the end of the first world war like Algeria or our own possessions, in preventing a European war over Cyprus by the domination of Turkey etc. In all these places, we stood against the policy of imperialist powers of not divide and rule—that happened in the 19th century—but today, divide and leave, either Korea, India or Germany or any other country, to cut up a country and to away. We are also gradually modelled not only in internal politics but external politics and also to a certain extent falling a victim to this. So I think it is part of our duty not to wail over the lack of friendship. There can be no friendship in the sense that our country adopts our policy and then not be independent. The essence of non-alignment is that we are non-aligned with a non-aligned country. There is nothing else.

Second, I can only subscribe partly to what my friend Shri Dinesh Singh has said in regard to the Asian frontiers that he has got in his mind, because I do not know where the frontier of Asia is; whether it is in San Francisco or in Tokyo, it is a moot question. But one thing is clear, that in the present distress in regard to Bangla Desh, so far as my knowledge goes, Government's mind has not projected into the continent of Asia very much because we have our neighbour, Indonesia, with a large Muslim population or the people of Malaysia, again with a large Muslim population in some respects are not sympathetic to the fact that those people are suffering under Pakistan or even Japan, on a casual visit, to the whole of the Asian gallery, the Pacific gallery, into the United Nations that Pakistan is waging a war has not projected itself into their conscience even during the ministerial travels.

Then, in this aspect, our Government not only today but for years have been painfully unconscious of the existence of a place called Okinawa. Okinawa is the slaughterhouse of Asia. So long as Okinawa lives in its present state, this country is not secure today or the next generation or the generations to come. It is the largest base in the world, equipped with all the nuclear weapons and a great laboratory for bacteriological and chemical warfare, where the population has

been denuded not only in liberty but in respect of their homes, and villages have been converted into night-clubs, with whatever is left of civilisation—everything—disappearing. Today, it is merely a large war camp of a character where at 12 O'clock every day, bombers go out to bomb the peoples of Viet Nam.

Now, there is very little conscious understanding of these facts. At the same time, there is distress in the minds of thinking Members of Parliament—except those who are paralysed by the size of their own party—in my opposition—that is one of the effects of this—to blame it all on what are called our ambassadors and legations. It is not part of my function; it is the Foreign Minister's function. But I think, Mr. Chairman, it is very improper, it is unkind, it is unrealistic, to blame our foreign service, our ambassadors or our officials. As I said the other day, they can only reflect the policy that exists. It is a bad time for this country if ambassadors make policies; it was done sometime ago and we stopped it. Ambassadors are not to make policies, but to purvey our views and to transmit to the Ministry such information as they have of other people's policies. Therefore, this is an occasion when we should realise that these men who have been abroad are some of our best foreign service men in any country in the world. I have some personal acquaintance with them, and I have worked with them in the Government and afterwards. But I think we do no service by denigrating either this country or denigrating our missions in this way.

It is quite true that the Government today is seized by the idea of patronage and distribution of favours and is sending out people who have failed in other spheres, whether it be in the elections or in the armed services, as ambassadors and thereby denigrating the seniority of those who are entitled to be there. It is a great mistake. Whatever might be the justification in those days of Independence, there is no justification today to introduce this element—neither experience nor anything else—into our foreign service. Ambassadorship is not a patronage to be conferred. It is a functional office of responsibility. I have no doubt that the Foreign Minister privately will feel the same thing about this.

Then we come to the question of the essence or our foreign policy. I do not say this be-

[Shri Krishna Menon]

cause I was associated with it during a period. There is nothing to blame ourselves for any period when we could make an impact upon the problems of peace and co-operation abroad. It is not because we have changed our policy—the Foreign Minister will tell us that our policies are basically the same today—but it is largely because there is no such thing as a basic thing in foreign policy in this way. There are a large number of factors which make an orientation and that orientation cannot be separated or dismissed by saying that foreign policy must be concerned about the national interest of that country. How do you serve the national interest of that country if other countries are determined to go to war against us or if the world itself is plunged into war? It was Lenin who said thirty years ago that every nation lives in a society of nations. It was true then and it is true today and it will be true tomorrow, so long as there are nation States. There is a cliché that goes round that is more fashionable than the other one nowadays, namely, that every nation is concerned with its own self-interest. But its self-interest cannot be separated from the interest of other people, because they also have self-interest. Therefore, going from one cliché to another does not take us anywhere. We have to be concerned about our policies making for the security of our country. The non-alignment approach to this was part of the cultivation of this security, by not being involved, not being pre-empted for a war. If one had to define it in one word, this is probably the essence of non-alignment: Our commitment to war would not be decided by somebody else. We are not pre-empted in that way, in the way you would be if you were in a military bloc. If you are in a military bloc, then the decision will not be made in the country. If a war is to be waged, it will be waged by a group of countries. So, the promotion of world cooperation, the concern about those centres which may lead to eruption of a world war, are our responsibility in the sense that we are a part of the world. They are not our responsibility in the sense that we dictate to the rest of the world.

There was no time when there was need for greater dynamism than at the present moment in our foreign policy. Did we ever put ourselves in the front and say, we are the leaders of the world? Did we try to take the

opportunity of Korea, Algeria or Cyprus or of any other problem at any time or in regard to disarmament to inject into that context of affairs an approach towards world cooperation? I mentioned Okhinawa because it is so near to us; it is in the Asian field as such and as I said, it is the centre of destruction.

The problem of European security may seem remote to some people and they may say, this man has lived abroad and that is why he talks about European security. But let us not forget that in this generation, in the last 50 or 60 years, three times the world has been shaken to its foundations by wars that erupted in the middle of Europe, in Germany. Whether it is a Franco-Prussian war or the great World War or the last war, this is the hot-house of war and we are making no contribution towards that except saying that at the appropriate time, we will recognise Algeria, etc. I would tell the Foreign Minister with all respect, he gives himself away, if he reads the speech again, when he says that there are talks going on between West Germany and East Germany and then we will do something. It is not what the West Germans do that is important; it is what we do that is important. If we follow West Germany to recognise Berlin, we have not done anything. In the same way, while talking about recognition of Indo-China, he says, when the elections are being concluded, when they are united, when there is one Vietnam, then we will recognise it. The question may well be at that time—I do not say it very seriously—whether they will recognise you. There will be no need then. This idea of being hind-most always does not help us.

Again, if I may put it that way—it should not be taken quite literally—the decisions in regard to our foreign policy, since we are living in Delhi, have to be made on the banks of the Jumna, not on the banks of Potomac, because if you do that, the whole of our policy will be governed by what Eisenhower called the military industrial complex. Publication of these papers by the US Congress reveals that the apprehensions raised in this House on behalf of the Government during the early 10 or 15 years of independence have only proved too true, where it has been said that they were promoting reprisals. They have faked the whole incident in regard to Tonkin

in order to plunge America into war. It is only when their people could not stand deceit any more that they have come out. Why should we complain about lack of faith, betrayal, not consulting us, this, that and the other? If the State Department can deceive the American people, why should they not deceive us? This is the proposition. Therefore, we have to recognise that it is not a question of whether we like the physiognomy of some people, or whether we like the colour of their skin or the language they talk but what is our policy in regard to this.

16 hrs.

There are countries which have got 3,300 bases in the world, not in their own territory but in the world, and that raises the question whether in waging a war the American interest is affected. Our Foreign Minister told us about the American troops in Vietnam, the bombing there and that no American interest is affected by it. It is a part of the larger question of world domination.

Then, if we consciously or unconsciously say that we have a Consul-General from South Vietnam and we have a Consul-General from North Vietnam, we are not supporting the liberation movement. Then what you are saying is that North Vietnam Consul-General and South Vietnam Consul-General are two pieces of a pod; one a stooge of Communism, and another a satellite created by imperialism, according to the papers now published. At various times they will go to pieces and then some McNamara, Taylor or somebody else will come and retrieve the position; otherwise, the government will fall. That is the kind of situation which we witness in Vietnam.

We should recognise that those who are anti-imperialists, and Soviet Union makes no bones about recognition, or support or anything of that kind,—it is not only a mistake but a grievous mistake on our part that we have missed the opportunity. The crime against this nation is that there are these people who have broken all record in human history in resistance to a mighty empire, these 250 million people against all the wealth that lies behind that mighty power. We have noticed long ago, when in 1951 or 1952 president Eisenhower stated "if we lose Indo-China, then the whole of Asia will go Communist; therefore, we cannot let it go" that

it was a question of the ideological position of the defence against communism. At that time they were fighting Communism, be it China, Russia or anybody else. But now they are giving aid to Yugoslavia, which is a Communist country. So, it is a question of geo-politics, an attempt at world domination, and that is reflected in the existence of all these bases everywhere in the world. I say all this not to take away the attention of the House from Bangladesh or anything of that kind but to say that foreign policy cannot be discussed today without taking into account the whole of this world.

Secondly, the Foreign Minister will notice that in the last three or four years while it is quite true that we have been sending some balloons or whatever they are into space, we have not done anything in the diplomatic field, in the field in which we are interested, in order to make a contribution on the subject of the space not being used for war purposes or in order to resolve the various problems that affect humanity in regard to their own security. Even today we can make our great contribution towards space law because my house, or your house or your country can be destroyed at any time. It is your responsibility to do this, but you have no time to do this because you are doing something more spectacular, all rolled up into one and saying we have exploded something somewhere. That is not sufficient. Therefore, these various aspects of the foreign policy get so little attention than they have to receive at the hands of the Ministry. Because, Parliament is here only to legislate, to criticise, to correct, to receive information and so on. Governing is the function of the government. And they say that if people cannot govern then they must get out. But there are too many to get out and, therefore, they will stay and, therefore, they must govern.

I talked about world co-operation. Another aspect of non-alignment is, we may not allow not only our own self-respect and our safety to be violated but we will not allow anybody to take us for granted. We are a big country and we cannot allow any country, be it big or small, to take us for granted. Secondly, communiques are no substitutes for policy. If the communique will reflect the policy, it has some meaning.

Then that takes me to another aspect of it, which I wanted to avoid if I could, but I

[Shri Krishna Menon]

do it only to bring home to the Foreign Minister an error of his. He referred to the fact that Kashmir was not assisted by long speeches but by the Soviet veto. There is personal element. The veto comes after the speeches. All decisions are made by a vote and, therefore, it is no use saying it is not your argument but the vote that decided. But how the vote came in. Second, from there to go on to discount the importance of international organisation because either in United Nations we like some of our friends hear either Parliament or some institution does not function therefore that is to say if you have headache then cut off your head then you will have no more headache. This is the remedy! To hear from the Foreign Minister the denigration in the international organisation to cover up the sin of this Government for not invoking the Genocide Convention when the United States is supplying Arms to the people who are marauding who are guilty of genocide. They are abetting genocide. They come under the U.N. Articles and we should invoke this Convention and not left it to Norway, Sweden or somebody else. If it is good I think they have to go there. Why don't you go there? Almost the first item that was raised in the United Nations in 1946 was the position of the people of Indian origin in South Africa. There were only a half million of them when we were three hundred million. That was the first question raised and it took five to six years to argue out whether it was a domestic question coming under Article 727 or otherwise. But that shows the importance of the issue whether you call it foreign or otherwise.

Since you have rung the bell I skip over some of the points. Next, it is largely prompted by internal considerations—a facile attempt to declaim or to malign the Arabs and when I say that you say he is partial to the Arabs. It is not the question of Arabs or Pathagons. They are the Middle East. Eversince the opening of Constantinople and the opening of the road it has been the highway of the empire and who were populating it becomes important to us. Eisenhower and Dullas regarded it as vacuum. For us it is a roadway whether Suez Canal has that importance as it had hundred years ago or not, the Middle East will become important under any rule in this country.

Under the British rule the Middle East was important in a different way. Indian Army stood guard to the Middle East in the battle of Catalmara. It was a win for the Army and not for everybody. But at the same time it was a liberation of a large part of territory. To blame the Arabs for their lack of concern about ourselves—what concern have we showed? We passed a Resolution in this House of sympathy and support. Have we implemented that? With what face you talk about the Arabs about this and that? Our people have not said a word about the whole Palestine Liberation Movement support to Bangla Desh. They came out and said they will support the liberation movement. Why is it that during the last few years nobody said anything about that. What is more nobody has said how wrong it would be to go to the Arab countries when they have internal revolution. Why should we expect Arab people to open our tins? Revolutions are not organised by tin-openers. They are led by people and, therefore, this attempt for diversion is not going to assist anybody.

Now, I come to the last phase of this peculiar drama—President Nixon's visit to Peking. I think it is pathetic. Wherever Mr. Nixon had gone he has brought trouble. He went to Vietnam in 1943 and pumped arms into Indo-China and armed Bodai. Then he went to Korea with the same thing, came back to America and was rejected by his own people. There is no greater war monger—individually Macnmara not excluded—who made greater contributions than present President of the United States and it is nothing un-Parliament. The whole world says so. His visit is only in May and so many things might happen. If I may say so with great respect to our former Foreign Minister it is a mixture of motives; it may be to give diversion in regard to the Paris talks or to frighten Madam Bins' colleagues. They are not to be frightened you can say what you like but I am going to the elder brother, China. They are not bothered about that. Or, it may be to tell the Soviet Union that there is more than one pebble on the beach or it may be the identity of interest of opposition and hostility to India between China, Pakistan and America together.

At what time have we been assisted in any moral or material way? You say, PL-480.

It has ruined our economy, destroyed our character and knocked the bottom of our sense of self-respect. There is no greater mistake that you made than in continuing to go on begging for food, clothes, aid and begging to be recognised, not diplomatically. This country has completely lost its personality in this way until the time when we will be able to turn round and say we will take what we want and when we want and not take the rubbish that you do not want. May I say that the United States has to thank us a lot for taking away the grain because it is uneatable? But that is another matter altogether.

Therefore it is not good to denigrate the Arab people for this or not to recognise the comparative laxity in our method and approach to the whole of the colonial question and not to recognise that even a country like Sweden whose Government supplies arms to people who are fighting for their liberty in Mozambique, themselves brought them under control to cede some territory and backslide on the whole question of Apartheid. It is not sufficient to pass a resolution that there must be an African government in Rhodesia. This is not wished away by saying, come out of the Commonwealth. Who is going to stop you? It is easy to come out. I have no objection to your coming out, if you want. I have something to do with your being in the Commonwealth. If you want to come out, do. But at the same time let us not forget that that will not solve the problem of our not being dynamic about imperialism as such.

I would beg of the Foreign Minister not to regard this as a kind of an opposition's speech in a way of personal denigration. He shows complete lack of understanding of foreign policy when he refers to Kashmir in the way he has done. The exposition about the Kashmir question in 1957 alone enabled the world to say that the fact of Kashmir being part of India is something that is not open to question any more. Before that we were best with various difficulties.

If we take this approach of saying that we do not refer this to international organisations and make use of them, it will not help. We have not made use of the Human Rights Commission, the Genocide Convention and we have not even investigated the question

what is the position before the World Court. We have not made any contribution to the definition of aggression in the committees all these years; nobody has either. But we can say as a point of argument that when a whole population is pushed into our territory, it is indirect aggression; it is aggression by the forcible tresspass of their nationals into our country. We are not to be frightened by the fact that this may lead to conflict with Pakistan, China, Timbuctoo or anybody else. Conflicts may come even if we do not wish them. I agree with everyone who says that war is no remedy and we should at no time take the initiative in war. But if war is forced upon us, we have to face it. There is no other way. I do hope it will be recognised by the External Affairs Ministry and the Government that our ambivalence, our timidity and our desire for decision to be made on the bank of the Potomac have prevented us from recognising North Vietnam and the Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and the German Democratic Republic. It is not sufficient for Shri Piloo Mody to say that they make bad tractors. It is only the West Germans who do an awful lot of business. It is not sufficient for him to say that they make bad tractors. Why should we have to buy tractors at all if we can make them ourselves?

SHRI PILOO MODY: Yes, that is better.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON: I do not say that the Tatas should make them. I said, we could make them.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You make them. I do not mind it.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON: Wherefrom we buy tractors or whether the tractors are bad or not is not the issue. It is about the recognition of the GDR. If I were saying the wrong thing, I would have said the whole of this policy is one of inertness. But there is no policy at all. It is characterised by imbecility. It is an inane policy which has neither guts nor fibre, no orientation, no objective and no decision as to who is a friend and who is a foe. How can we even believe that Vietnamese after several years of war, men, women and children engaged in it would be sold over their heads by China? Let us not forget that they have fought Chinese empire for thousand years from 113

[Shri Krishna Menon]

B. C. to 1916 A.D. and Americans have stayed there for thousand years.

श्री शशि भूषण (दिल्ली-बंकिण) : समा-पति महोदय, पिछले दिनों में जो घटनायें घटी हैं, उनके सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह कहना है कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी पर जो स्ट्रेन पड़ा है, इस के बावजूद भी, वह जानते थे कि जिस देश में वह जा रहे थे, उस देश का हमारे देश के प्रति क्या रवैया रहा है; उनका जो धैर्य रहा है, उसकी मैं सराहना करता हूँ। एक अच्छे स्टेट्स-मेन तथा डिप्लोमेट में जो गुण होने चाहिये उसीके अनुरूप उनके चेहरे पर हमेशा मुस्काहट रही, दिल में आग होते हुए भी, जाहिर नहीं किया। उन्होंने भारत के लिये जो प्रयत्न वे कर सकते थे, किये। वह सराहनीय हैं। उनके साथ ही हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय की ओर से काम करने वाले जो राजदूत हैं, तथा कर्मचारी हैं मैं उन का भी उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ। मैंने स्वयं विदेशों में जाकर देखा है, विदेशों में हमारे दूता-वासों में जो हमारे नौजवान काम कर रहे हैं, वे बड़ी हिम्मत और साहस, सूझ बूझ, के साथ काम कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने देश के लिये हमेशा अच्छा नाम कमाया है। जो लोग हमेशा अपने लोगों की बुराई करते रहते हैं, दूसरों के हाथों में अपने देश को खिलौना बनाना चाहते हैं, उन्हें हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय के कर्मचारियों के प्रति भी कुछ हमदर्दी रखनी चाहिये, क्योंकि उन्हें जिन हालत में काम करना पड़ता है, वे ऐसे हालत हैं जिनमें आम आदमी काम नहीं कर सकता है, धन और दूसरी कमियाँ उनके सामने होती हैं।

एक विशेष बात मैं यहां पर कहना चाहता हूँ—विदेशों में जहां हमें ज्यादा कन्सेन्ट्रेट करना चाहिये, जिन इलाकों में ज्यादा खर्च करने की जरूरत है, वहां ज्यादा खर्च करना चाहिये, लेकिन जहां जरूरत नहीं है, वहां नहीं खर्च करना चाहिये। जैसे यू० के० में इतना बड़ा स्टाफ रखने की क्या जरूरत है। जब भी हमें किसी काम के समझौते इत्यादि के लिये प्रति-निधियों को भेजना होता है, सदा हर मिनिस्ट्री

का एक एक मिशन वहां जाता है, इस तरह से ऐसे मिशन हमारे देश पर बहुत बड़ा भार बने हुए हैं। ब्रिटेन को ही ले लीजिये—ब्रिटेन से इस देश को कोई तबक्को नहीं करनी चाहिये। जब भी इस देश पर मुसीबत लाई गई चाहे गोवा अथवा काश्मीर के प्रश्न पर चाहे पाकिस्तान ने इस देश पर हमला किया, हमेशा ब्रिटेन ने हमारा कभी साथ नहीं दिया, बल्कि विरोधियों का साथ दिया और आज आर्थिक मामलों में और दूसरे क्षेत्रों में ब्रिटेन का जो रवैया है, अच्छा मित्रतापूर्ण नहीं रहा है। इस लिये वहां पर हमें दूतावास के खर्च को कम करना चाहिये और जो समाजवादी देश हैं, तथा फ्रांस, अरब-वल्ड, अफ्रीका के देश, लेटिन अमरीका के देश, वहां अपने दूतावास की तादाद को बढ़ाना चाहिये और जो साम्राज्यवादी देश हमेशा हमारे विरोधी रहे हैं उनकी तरफ तबक्कह नहीं देनी चाहिये।

इसके साथ ही मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें एक विशाल राष्ट्र के तौर पर जहां भी हमारी एम्बेसीज हैं—टिट-फोर-टैट का रवैया अस्तियार करना चाहिये। जो हमारे दूतावास के कर्मचारी हैं, जो बाहर विदेशों में काम करते हैं, जो फंसिलिटोज उन मुल्कों में उनको दी जाती है, वही हमें वहां के राजदूतों के कर्मचारियों को देनी चाहिये। वर्ना क्या होता है—हमारे कर्मचारियों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सेन्सर करते हैं, कई दूसरी दिक्कतें हमारे राजदूतों के रास्ते में डालते हैं। इसलिये बराबरी का व्यवहार होना चाहिये, समान स्तर पर काम करने में श्लिन्नक नहीं होनी चाहिये।

अब मैं दूसरे प्रश्नों पर आता हूँ—जब से जनाब निक्सन का चाइना जाने का प्रोग्राम हुआ है, तब से हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े-बड़े अखबारों ने, तथा फ्रैंक-मोरेस जैसे पत्रकारों ने और हिन्दुस्तान की कुछ राजनैतिक पार्टियां इस बात की कोशिश करने लगी हैं कि हमको चीन से अच्छा सम्बन्ध बनाना चाहिये। यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है, लेकिन

एक बात में कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाइना से अगर हमारे अच्छे सम्बन्ध होंगे तो वह केअर-आफ़ न्यूयार्क नहीं होंगे, सीधे दिल्ली और पीकिंग में होंगे। अभी चार दिन पहले तक चाइना से अच्छे सम्बन्ध बनाने की कोई बात तक नहीं करता था, अगर कोई करता यही विरोधी दल शोर करने लगते थे लेकिन आज निक्सन के चीन जाने की खबर आने से यह कहना शुरू कर दिया कि चीन से अच्छे सम्बन्ध बनाने चाहिए। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें केयर आफ़ न्यूयार्क अपनी कोई भी पालिसी नहीं बनानी है। जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि भारत का कोई मित्र नहीं है वे वही लोग हैं जो कि मिलिट्री एलायन्स की बात करते हैं। अगर हम उनकी नीति पर चलते तो आज हिन्दुस्तान का दुनिया में फार्मूसा और इजरायल ही दोस्त रहता और दूसरा कोई भी दोस्त नहीं रहता। लेकिन आज फार्मोसा भी क्या करेगा जबकि निक्सन खुद चाइना जा रहे हैं। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि उनको वहाँ पर जाने की जरूरत क्या है? वियतनाम में जो हजारों लाखों अमरीकन नौजवान मरे हैं और उसकी जो प्रतिक्रिया अमरीका में हुई है, अनेकों डिमांस्ट्रेशन्स अमेरिका में किए गए हैं निक्सन शासन के खिलाफ, लोगों ने गोलियाँ खाई हैं, वहाँ की सरकार इतना दमन कर रही है कि कुमारी ऐंजेला डेविस जैसी क्रान्तिकारी महिला पर भी झूठा केस चलाया गया और अब अमरीकी जनता को जवाब देने के लिए निक्सन शासन के पास कोई चारा नहीं है। इस तरह से एक तो अन्दर का दबाव और दूसरे वियतनाम के बहादुर लोग अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद का डट कर मुकाबला कर रहे हैं इसीलिए तंग आकर निक्सन को आज चाइना जाना पड़ रहा है। ऐसी स्थिति में आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो अमरीका के आस-पास घूमने वाले पत्रकार हैं या उनकी करीब की पालिसी रखने वाले जो लोग हैं उनसे मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाइना से जो भी हमारी मित्रता होगी वह आत्म-सम्मान के आधार पर होगी। आखिर को एक दिन तो मित्रता होगी ही लेकिन वह न्यूयार्क के

जरिए नहीं बल्कि अपने आप सीधे-सीधे मित्रता करनी होगी।

जहाँ तक उत्तरी वियतनाम का सवाल है, उसके प्रति हमारे देश की पूरी-पूरी हमदर्दी है। मैं नहीं समझता हमारी सरकार वहाँ पर पूरे राजदूत स्तर का दर्जा क्यों नहीं देती है। मैं समझता हूँ इसमें किसी का दबाव नहीं है। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि दबाव है लेकिन ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें हमको जल्दी करनी चाहिए। हमारे देश को अगर एशिया में लीडरशिप लेनी है तो जब चीन वियतनाम की कीमत पर अमरीका से दोस्ती कर सकता है तो हमें भी मौका है कि वहाँ की जो दक्षिण वियतनाम में क्रान्तिकारी सरकार है मैडम बिन्ह के नेतृत्व की उसको पूरा दर्जा राजदूत का देना चाहिए। जहाँ तक जी० डी० आर० का सम्बन्ध है, हमारे उनसे अच्छे सम्बन्ध रहे हैं, बंगला देश के प्रश्न पर वे हमारे साथ थे और इसके अलावा हमारा समाजवादी दृष्टिकोण भी उनसे मेल खाता है इसलिए वहाँ पर भी हमारे सामने कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। सीधा प्रश्न यह है कि कुछ काम हमें जल्दी वार फुटिंग्स पर करने चाहिए। समय कम है, कल करना है उसे आज करें।

अब मैं बंगला देश के प्रश्न पर आता हूँ। बंगला देश के सम्बन्ध में कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि वहाँ पर कुछ नहीं हो रहा है लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूँ कि वहाँ गुरिल्लाज काफी कुछ कर रहे हैं, कमी रेलवेज तोड़ देते हैं, कमी सड़क तोड़ देते हैं और धीरे-धीरे ट्रेनिंग लेकर वे अपना काम करते जा रहे हैं और इसमें उनको प्रशंति भी मिल रही है। जनाब मुजीबुर्रमान वहाँ के बहुत ऐतिहासिक नेता हैं। जब हमारे देश में असहयोग आन्दोलन चला था तो किसी भी जज ने या बड़े राजनैतिक अफसर ने इस्तीफा नहीं दिया था लेकिन बंगला देश में जजेज से लेकर चपरासी तक और जेलर से लेकर साधारण आदमी तक सभी ने पाकिस्तानी सरकार के साथ असहयोग किया। हमारे देश में जब असहयोग आन्दोलन

[श्री शशि भूषण]

चल रहा था डा० श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी जैसे लोग जो कि राष्ट्रीय नेता बन गए वे वायसराय की कौंसिल के मेम्बर थे . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) : डा० श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी वायसराय कौंसिल के मेम्बर नहीं थे । . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री शशि भूषण : डा० श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में कभी एक दिन के लिए भी जेल नहीं गए । उनका राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में कभी सहयोग नहीं रहा ।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि अब कोई ताकत भी बंगला देश को गुलाम नहीं रख सकती है । वहाँ के लोग अब अपने पैरों पर खड़े हैं और जो नौजवान हिन्दुस्तान में आये हैं वे भी अपने बल पर उसको लेना चाहते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार उनको पूरी पूरी मदद करेगी । बंगला देश को हमारे देश की जनता ने मान्यता दे दी है । इसलिए जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि बंगला देश के सवाल पर हम पीछे हैं किसी से वह गलत है बल्कि बंगला देश के लोगों को अगर सबसे ज्यादा किसी ने सहयोग दिया है तो वह कांग्रेस पार्टी ने ही दिया है । अगर उनको इस सरकार का सहयोग न होता तो बंगला देश के लोग कितने दिन खड़े रह सकते थे ? आज हम उनके साथ कमिटेड हैं । इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमको अपनी विदेश नीति पर नाज़ है और नाज़ इसलिए है कि हम लोग निर्भीक रहते हैं, हमेशा हमने साम्राज्यवाद का विरोध किया है, जहाँ भी क्रान्तिकारी स्वाधीनता की लड़ाई हुई है—चाहे वह अंगोला, अफ्रीका, लेटिन अमरीका में हो या हिन्द चीन में हो—हमने हमेशा क्रान्तिकारी जन-आन्दोलन की मदद की है । हमारा मकसद बिल्कुल साफ है कि हमने कभी भी किसी का बुरा नहीं चाहा है हमेशा पड़ोसियों की मदद की है और हमें पूरा विश्वास है कि एक दिन सारा संसार सच्चाई का साथ देगा । जय हिन्द ।

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA (Maharajganj); Mr. Chirman, Sir, while I listened to the Debate for two days, I have felt mortified when my friends have said that we have no friends, we are not respected, our policy has failed, etc. I am not so pessimistic. I feel, our country has a great future, though at this time, we have missed the bus in Bangla Desh. In the beginning of April, if we had recognised Bangla Desh, we could have easily walked into help the Mukti Fauj to set up the full fledged independent Government of Bangla Desh. The Pakistan army there was then very small. We then missed the bus. It was a fatal mistake. But, mistakes are always made and we should not be too much worried over them. But, now, I think, if we delay the recognition of Bangla Desh further, we shall not be pardoned by history. We must immediately recognise Bangla Desh and give whatever help we can to the people of Bangla Desh for fighting their battle of independence. They are patriotic, they are brave, and they are even now—without our help—doing so much to harass the Pakistani army. I hope Government of India will at least give arms and train the young patriots among Bangla Desh refugees in their use and allow those trained patriots to go and fight for defending the independence their country, even if we cannot send our armies there immediately on a mission of mercy to stop this continuing genocide and uprooting of millions of people and their exorn into India.

Sir, some people are worried about Nixon's visit to China. That only shows that only those nations can command respect who have strength. China, in 1948, was weaker than ourselves. But, by its own efforts, without the help of America or anybody else, in fact in the teeth of their opposition, it became so powerful. They tightened their belts and they worked hard with determination and they gained strength. They made atom bombs; they made hydrogen bombs and today they are regarded as a great power.

Therefore, if we want to become a great power, we must have strength. If we want to command the respect of nations of the world, we must have strength.

I feel that we should not be ashamed of our large population. Nations today are

respected on the basis of the largeness population. We are the second largest nation from the point of view of population. I, therefore, oppose the birth control measures. Today the world respects numbers. China is respected because it is a nation of 700 millions. We are now laying so much importance on birth control. I don't think that our country is so small that we will not be able to feed our people. I hope, Sir, that we must not discourage our growth in population.

Sir, we must become militarily strong. Today our army is 8 lakhs but China's is 25 lakhs. We must strengthen our Army, our Navy and our Air Force to become equal to China's. We must have a nuclear stockpile greater than China's. Then and then only we will be secure and we will be respected by America, by the Soviet Union and by other countries. Till then it is no use lamenting that we are not respected.

16.29 hrs.

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

So long as we remain weak, every nation will take us for granted and we will be made to suffer humiliation as we are doing today.

Sir, it is not fair to blame the Foreign Minister. He is a Member of the Cabinet. Even if he desires, he cannot give recognition to Bangla Desh because unless the Prime Minister and her Cabinet assents to it, this cannot be done. The whole Cabinet, as it is constituted, is responsible for the present situation. And, therefore, it is not proper to put the whole blame upon him and make him a scapegoat. He is a seasoned politician, a very old freedom-fighter, with great patriotism and wisdom. I hope, if we have to condemn anybody for the present situation we must condemn the Prime Minister herself who is really responsible for our failures, and it is not proper to make a scapegoat of the Foreign Minister.

I only hope that Yahya Khan's threat to invade us and to hang Mujibur Rehman will be answered by us immediately by giving immediate recognition to Bangla Desh. That is the fitting answer that we should give. Then we shall see what he can do. Once we recognise Bangla Desh and recognise Sheikh Mujibur Rehman as its President, he cannot do anything. I hope that this recognition will

not now be delayed any further. You promised recognition at the proper time. I think the time has now come. I hope the External Affairs Minister will consider the matter and will immediately recognise Bangla Desh after this threat of invasion from Pakistan and the threat to try Sheikh Mujibur Rehman for treason and to hang him.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Calcutta South): I support the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs, and I firmly support the foreign policy pursued by the Government. But on this occasion I would like to express some of my views and also put forward some suggestions to be considered by the Ministry in the light of the present developments in South-East Asia and particularly the proposed visit of President Nixon to China.

So far as our foreign policy is concerned, I would like to consider the Member's view that we are suffering from a disease and that disease is lack of perspective in thinking. Whenever we make any approach to any nation in our foreign policy, that becomes merely an *ad hoc* approach. It is for this reason that India has not been able to provide a rigid or firm approach in its basic policy relating to foreign affairs, and it is because of this that our own Indian politicians and even the people in other countries have sometimes been confused or misguided by our approach.

Basically, however, I support the policy of non-alignment. But certainly I would like to express the view that the whole world is emerging into a changing atmosphere because of the modern scientific developments, the new aspirations of the people, the new developments in the party philosophy the change of doctrines and the approach to things based on self-interests. So, India also needs immediately to reorient its foreign policy basically in the national interests of our Indian community.

Many of the learned speakers and parliamentarians from the Opposition criticised the Government. I support some of their views while I do not support some other views of theirs. I was reading the book *The Discovery of India* written by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and when I finished reading it I

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsif]

felt that there was nothing to discover in India again. But when I heard the speeches of some of our senior parliamentarians who had been once on the Government side and also in the Ministry explaining their new views in the context of the new developments in Bangla Desh and in South-East Asia and attacking the Government's time-honoured policy, I felt that there was yet something to be discovered in India. I do not follow actually how the nation will get guidance from the leaders of the political parties of our country.

Some of them made a fervent appeal to immediately recognise Bangla Desh. I also firmly believe and I still stand by this view that we must recognise Bangla Desh. But unfortunately nobody cares to explain the situation properly. After recognition, if any serious things happen in Indian territory and if any liability comes on our shoulders, and we are forced to share the miseries and sacrifices of the people, will those political parties and will their leadership stand solidly behind the Government in all the steps that they would take and say that they will support Government and also share the miseries? It is really difficult to understand the intention and motive guiding the Government of India particularly on the subject of foreign affairs. It is a fact that we extended our support to thousands and millions of people in the Middle East when there was a danger to them from Israel. Similarly, we extended our support to the South-East Asian people when they were struggling for their liberation. These are facts. But it is also a fact that at this stage we are not finding such a positive response in regard to Bangla Desh.

Many hon. Members have criticised the foreign policy of India—on the ground that today we have come to realise that we have no friends in the world. If we consider the matter from the point of view of treaties and pacts, certainly there is no friend of India. But if we consider the fact that there are certain things which will develop in the next generation, in the generation after Nixon or Kosygin or the Indira Gandhi Government, if we consider the question from the point of view of the future generations that would be coming into existence, then I can certainly say that a new world is coming into the pic-

ture soon, for peace and progress, a world where nobody wants any pact or alignments or any sort of treaty organisations or assignments for war or nuclear experiments, then certainly we have our friends.

So far as the Indian position is concerned, it has now become clear that whoever has nuclear weapons or is conducting nuclear experiments commands a respectable position in the world power equation. I have seen in my student days that whenever any critical situation arose in world affairs, as in Cuba or Suez Canal, the white House, the Kremlin and New Delhi were concerned. It was not only to the credit of Pandit Nehru and his own image, which the Opposition now criticise; it was also due to the transcendental spirits of Indian culture and tradition for which Jawaharlal Nehru stood and the whole Indian nation stands. Our policy of non-alignment is based on our basic approach in world affairs which is essentially of peace. If we say that our policy should be based on our national interest, we should first define what is national interest. My senior colleague, Shri Krishna Menon, was saying that not only our national interest but our foreign policy has been scuttled and degraded.

Here we should consider what is the objective of our national policy? It is that our country should be self-sufficient in agriculture and industry and in all other spheres of national life. But what do we see? In 23 years of our independence, what has been the role of the Opposition. They have always criticised the Government. Have they taken any share in our development programmes? So we cannot still say that we have a national interest and we are doing all we can to fulfil those national objectives in different spheres. We are not yet ready for it. We have not demonstrated our readiness either in the parliamentary or other spheres of our national life. We do not yet know what is the definition of national interest. Whatever Mao Tse-tung does after the revolution there, is governed by this consideration that it is a one-party State. Whatever has been done in the Soviet Union in their national interest has been done on the basis that they have a one-party rule. Kosygin and his predecessors have done their best to develop their country in all spheres of national activities on this basis. In America, they have done their best

to develop their programmes and projects for national development. In Japan, they have done the same in spite of the conflicting attitudes on domestic issues of their political parties.

What about India? Even now on the Bangla Desh issue, I see many members of the Opposition trying to hit Government for not recognising Bangla Desh. Shri Samar Guha was saying that if he had been in the foreign ministry he could show the fist to Yahya Khan. He should realise that the Commander can show his fist if the lieutenants are behind him. Then only he will have a sanction behind him. That situation is yet to emerge in the country. That is the reality in the country. Still we have to depend on loans from America, still we are depending on roubles from the Soviet Union; still we bank on Yugoslavia for certain projects the same is the state of our relations with Czechoslovakia. It is a fact that our economy is not yet self-sufficient. For achieving this objective, there should be an all-round universal effort on the part of all of us.

I would request our External Affairs Minister that considering our national interest, we should take our stand whether it be on the Bangla Desh issue or it is in the West Asia crisis or whether it is in our relations with China.

Everyone is now talking about the proposed Nixon visit to China. Someone said it is a conspiracy. I know that we cannot be friends with China so long as she retains a vast stretch of our land. But I do not believe that Sardar Swaran Singh should say that we should not talk to China. But so long as she is in occupation of a part of our land, there will be no absolute friendship with China.

About China's recent posturings in the sphere of foreign relations, this much I can say that to the young people of the world, the image of the great revolutionary has been affected. From the image of being an opponent of imperialism and its practice in the world, the younger generation will see now an image of a China engaged in a conspiracy, of a Chou En-lai and Kissinger taking part in it. This will be the image of Mao Tse tung

and his policy of communism that will now project itself in the eyes of the younger generation. It is rather good for India and those who are indulging in mischievous activities in the eastern part of the country will realise that actually the basic approach of the Indian Government and the Indian tradition are really in the interests of the Indian people, not that of others. So, basing ourselves on this ground, we shall always extend our support to the South-East Asian complex and Bangla Desh and particularly Mujibur Rahman, providing possibilities of recognition to them. We shall also support talks with China on the basis that they should return the land which they have retained.

*SHRI M. M. JOSEPH (Peermade): Mr. Chairman, Sir, all independent countries in the world have got their own foreign policies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you can speak very well in English?

SHRI M. M. JOSEPH: Sir, there is arrangement for simultaneous interpretation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can speak in any language you want.

SHRI M. M. JOSEPH: Sir, I am speaking in Malayalam. I have given advance intimation about that.

Sir, India is an independent country. From the time it achieved independence it has been making efforts to follow an independent foreign policy. To achieve co-operation from all parts of the world it has been following a policy of co-operation based on the principles of Buddha. To achieve peace and co-operation in the world it has been following a policy of non-alignment and it is the principle of non-alignment which has given shape to India's foreign policy.

It is a fact that India was marching forward successfully with her foreign policy based on non-alignment. If I say that the main reason for that success was the dynamic personality of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who could wield considerable influence in international politics, I will not be wrong. But when he himself reached the last stages of his Prime Ministership this policy of non-align-

[Shri M. M. Joseph]

ment was slowly proceeding towards failure. Today, Sir, I cannot help saying that this policy has proved to be a complete failure. In our language there is a saying which means that because the father has climbed over an elephant it does not follow that his daughter also will be able to do that. A situation resembling something like that is what we are today able to see in the whole of India.

Sir, very briefly I would like to go into some of the adverse incidents that took place during the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself. Pakistan attacked India. Who was there to help us? China also attacked India. Was there anybody to help us or at least to speak against that aggression by China? There was nobody. See the countries that lie around India. Take the case of Ceylon. From Ceylon the people of Indian origin are being shunted out. They are being deprived of their citizenship. A major portion of these people who have been shunted out from Ceylon have come and settled down in Kerala and Tamil Nadu. For decades together people of Indian origin had been living in Burma. From the time of their forefathers they acquired a lot of money and invested it on plantations. They are now being kicked out of Burma. Today we are faced with a situation where we are unable to enter into a trade pact with our closest friendly neighbour, Nepal.

What is the position of Nepal today? China is conducting a survey on our borders for the purpose of cultivation of cotton. Tomorrow they might demand to have a survey in Nepal for marine products.

Sir, the most pitiable aspect of our foreign policy is that the External Affairs Ministry does not know anything about what is happening across our borders and things are allowed to proceed without our knowledge. We have got our embassy and High Commissions in almost all the countries of the world. What are they doing? When India is faced with difficulties, when some problems arise in India, our Ministers are sent abroad to tell the world powers about our problems. My hon. friend on that side asked today morning about our Embassy in Nepal. I am also forced to ask whether our diplomats in foreign countries are sleeping 24 hours—day and night alike.

Under the Ministry of External Affairs there are Trade Counsels. What have they done about export trade promotion. In that matter also the Minister of External Affairs should try and bring in the necessary changes.

Sir, I will conclude in another minute. Today the countries around India, whether it be Burma, Ceylon, Nepal or Pakistan, have turned out to be our enemies. Even the Arab countries, whom we helped a lot, did not have the courage to raise their little finger or say a word against Pakistan's atrocities in East Bengal. It is a matter of sorrow that excepting Israel no other country raised its voice against the heinous crimes committed by Pakistan in East Bengal. Today, Sir, from East Bengal lakhs of people are coming as refugees to India. The number far exceeds the mass exodus of Israelis from Egypt mentioned in the Bible. Genocide is being perpetrated in Bengal. We find that even though we have tried to go ahead with a foreign policy with the sole objective of world-wide peace and co-operation not a single country has raised its voice against the atrocities committed by Pakistan in East Bengal. I want to remind the Government that we have to make drastic changes in our foreign policy.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

श्री शंकरदेव (वीदर): चेयरमैन महोदय, मैं बहुत देर से इंतजार कर रहा था कि मेरा नाम आयेगा या नहीं। मैं विदेश नीति के ऊपर चर्चा में शामिल होते हुए सबसे पहले भारत सरकार को बधाई देता हूँ और बंगला देश की समस्या को सुलझाने के लिए जो उसने प्रयत्न किया है उससे मुझे बहुत ज्यादा खुशी है।

संपूर्ण देश एक स्वर से चिल्लाया कि कि बंगला देश को रिकगनाइज करना चाहिए। इसके बावजूद यह सरकार नहीं हिली और समझ-बूझ के साथ उसने इस समस्या को टैकिल किया और कर रही है लेकिन जो कदम लेना चाहिए उसके बारे में सरकार ने अभी तक नहीं सोचा।

श्रीमान्, हमारी भारतीय परम्परा के अनुसार हम अहिंसा के प्रतीक हैं और इसके लिए

वचनबद्ध हैं। हमारे ऋषि-मुनियों की परम्परा और महात्मा गांधी ने जो हमें सिखाया उसके मुताबिक हम पूरी तरह से यह कोशिश करेंगे कि बंगला देश की इस समस्या को किस तरह से अहिंसात्मक ढंग से हम सुलझा सकते हैं। इसके लिए कई तरीके हो सकते हैं। सबसे पहला तरीका यह है कि हमें यू० एन० ओ० में जाना चाहिए। यू० एन० ओ० एक ऐसा क्षेत्र है जहां पर हमारी कोई चीज सुनी जा सकती है और फिर उसके बारे में हम कुछ कह सकते हैं। इस सदन के जो सदस्य मिले थे उन्होंने इस बारे में विचार किया और अहिंसात्मक जो तरीके हो सकते हैं उनके अन्दर एक तरीका हमने यह अपनाया है कि यू० एन० ओ० के नाम पर यहां नई दिल्ली में जो कार्यालय है, उसके सामने मूख हड़ताल की जाए और विश्व के जो भी राष्ट्र हैं उनके सामने यह व्यक्त किया जाए कि वास्तव में हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर ऐसे भी तत्व हैं जो अहिंसात्मक ढंग से अभी भी विश्व की समस्या को हल करने के लिए सोच रहे हैं। तो इस दृष्टि से हमको यह चाहिए कि इस बंगला देश की समस्या को अहिंसात्मक ढंग से पूरी तरह से हल करने की कोशिश की जाय और सोचा जाय कि इसको कैसे सुलझा सकते हैं।

इसके अतिरिक्त हम विश्व में भ्रमण करके जो विश्व के जनमत को अपनी तरफ करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, वह बहुत अच्छा उपाय है। इसके अलावा हम विश्व की ओपीनियन को अपनी तरफ करके पाकिस्तान का सामाजिक, आर्थिक और सैनिक हर तरह से उसका बहिष्कार करके उसको मजबूर करें कि बंगला देश के अन्दर वहां के लोगों को जनतंत्रीय अधिकार दिये जायें। बंगला देश के बारे में बहुत से लोगों ने कहा कि नान-अलाइनमेंट की जो पालिसी है वह फेल हो रही है लेकिन मेरा दृढ़ विश्वास है और मैं उनसे, जो भी यह कहते हैं कि हमारी नान-अलाइनमेंट की पालिसी फेल हो रही है, यह कहता हूं कि उनको रियलिस्टिक होना चाहिए। मैं कहता हूं कि विश्व के अन्दर आज जितने भी राष्ट्र हैं, सारे के सारे रियलिस्टिक हैं यह हम

समझ रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं यह कहता हूं कि इस दुनियां के अन्दर कम से कम एक राष्ट्र ऐसा होना चाहिए जो दृढ़ विश्वास से सोच सके और वह हो सकता है तो वह हिन्दुस्तान ही हो सकता है।

लोग कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान ने हर एक को फ्रेंड बना रखा है—रशिया को भी बना रखा है, अमरीका को भी बना रखा है और चाइना को भी—लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान का एक भी दोस्त नहीं। मैं उनको कहना चाहता हूं कि 'ए फ्रेंड आफ आल इज ए फ्रेंड आफ नन'। हमारी जो नीति है, हमारी जो नान-अलाइनमेंट की पालिसी है, उसके मुताबिक हम हर एक के फ्रेंड हो सकते हैं। लोग यह भी पूछ सकते हैं कि आखिर हमने क्या अचीव किया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान के साथ अगर तुलना करें तो उन्होंने क्या अचीव किया है? उन्होंने क्या प्राप्त किया है। आप देखेंगे कि विश्व के जितने भी राष्ट्र हैं उनके अन्दर, उनके दिलों में पाकिस्तान के प्रति इस वक्त क्या भावना है। आप देखेंगे कि विश्व के राष्ट्रों ने पाकिस्तान का बहिष्कार किया है और उनकी ओर से पाकिस्तान को सैनिक सहायता या आर्थिक सहायता नहीं दी जा रही है। हिन्दुस्तान के हर एक व्यक्ति ने यह सद्भावना प्रकट की है कि हिन्दुस्तान ही एक ऐसा देश है जो 70 लाख शरणार्थियों को अपने ही बलबूते पर पाल रहा है और अब तक उनके लिए सब प्रकार की व्यवस्था कर रहा है।

इस दृष्टि से मैं कह सकता हूं कि हम ने विश्व के राष्ट्र में जो सद्भावना और गुडविल प्राप्त करने की कोशिश की है, वह हमारा गेन और एचीवमेंट है। पाकिस्तान उस को प्राप्त नहीं कर सका है बहुत से लोग कहते हैं कि यह पालिटिक्स है और पालिटिक्स में कोई पर्मनेंट दोस्त या पर्मनेंट दुश्मन नहीं होता है, बल्कि पर्मनेंट इन्ट्रेस्ट होते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान यह सोचता है कि पालिटिक्स में पर्मनेंट दोस्त और पर्मनेंट दुश्मन भी नहीं होते हैं और पर्मनेंट इन्ट्रेस्ट भी नहीं होने चाहिए, बल्कि पर्मनेंट प्रिंसिपलज होने चाहिए।

[श्री शंकर देव]

हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी बहुत अच्छी है, लेकिन उसमें डायनामिज्म की कमी है। हमारी पालिसी न्यूट्रलिज्म की है, लेकिन वह डायनामिक न्यूट्रलिज्म होनी चाहिए। देखने में उसका शरीर तो बहुत अच्छा है, लेकिन उस में प्राण नहीं है।

विदेशों में हमारे जो एम्बैसेडर हैं, पहले उनको पंचशील की नीति की ट्रेनिंग दी जाये और फिर उन्हें एम्बैसेडर बनाकर विदेशों में भेजा जाये। वे सत्य, अहिंसा और प्रेम की हमारी नीति और नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी के विषय में पूरे पंडित और प्रवीण होने चाहिए। जिन जिन देशों में उनको भेजा जाये, वहां वे सेमिनार और कांफ़रेंसिज़ बुलायें और हमारी इन नीतियों और आदर्शों का प्रचार करें।

इस समय ऐसा न होने के कारण हमारी यह मिनिस्ट्री फ़ेल होती दिखाई दे रही है। मैं फ़ारेन मिनिस्टर से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह इस तरफ़ ध्यान दें, क्योंकि जो बात हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी को जिन्दा रख सकती है, वह यह है कि हमारी न्यूट्रलिज्म एक डायनामिक न्यूट्रलिज्म होनी चाहिए, स्लीपिंग न्यूट्रलिज्म नहीं।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा (खम्मम) : सभा-पति महोदय, मुझे इस बात का खेद है कि डी० एम० के० के नेता, श्री मनोहरन, ने चाऊ-एन-लाई के व्यूज़ का उल्लेख करते हुए उनको एनडार्स किया है। मैं श्री मनोहरन से कहना चाहती हूँ—चूँकि वह हिन्दी नहीं समझते हैं, इसलिए मैं अंग्रेजी में कहना चाहता हूँ :

It was the strength of India, when the Chinese attacked India—It was the inferiority complex, the fear that India was creating friends in this part of the world and among the non-aligned nations, and the jealousy against Nehru's Personality that was reflected in the world and the development of our country—that made China attack us. To say that India is a third-rate power is absolutely false, and I think he should with-

draw that word. I felt ashamed when he said that, because it is not becoming of any Indian citizen to talk in the tone of Chou En-lai. Sir, our policy has proved successful. History has shown that walls have started cracking.

आज की इस चर्चा में सबसे प्रमुख विषय बंगला देश का ही हो सकता है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। पाकिस्तानी शासकों ने बंगला देश की निहत्थी जनता पर जो अत्याचार किये हैं, मानवता के इतिहास में बर्बरता के ऐसे घोर उदाहरण शायद ही मिल सकते हों।

बंगला देश की घटनाओं ने पाकिस्तान के दो राष्ट्रों वाले सिद्धान्त को पूरी तरह झुठला दिया है और अब यह बात स्पष्ट हो गई है कि धर्म के आधार पर राष्ट्र नहीं बन सकते और राष्ट्रीयता नहीं पनप सकती।

मैं आशा करती हूँ कि आज की दशा में इस मामले में भारत को जो ठोस कदम उठाने हैं, उन्हें उठाने में सरकार देर न करेगी। अभी तक देर हो चुकी है।

खेद इस बात पर होता है कि मानवता पर कलंक लगाने वाले इन अत्याचारों के बावजूद पाकिस्तान को अमरीका से हथियारों की सहायता लगातार मिलती जा रही है। यह बात सभी जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को दिये जाने वाले हथियार भारत के विरुद्ध इस्तेमाल किये जायेंगे, क्योंकि पाकिस्तान को और किसी देश से लड़ना ही नहीं है। एक तरफ़ हमें आश्वासन मिलते हैं और दूसरी तरफ़ पाकिस्तान को हथियार। यह एक अजीब पहली लगती है और भारत के प्रति अमरीका के अस्नेहपूर्ण व्यवहार और रवैये का प्रमाण है।

मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने कल राज्य सभा में अमरीका के इस अमैत्रीपूर्ण रवैये के बारे में भारत सरकार की नाराज़गी को स्पष्ट कर दिया है।

इस चर्चा में डा० किसिंगर की चीन की विजिट और निक्सन की होने वाली पिलग्रिमेज टु पीकिंग का भी उल्लेख किया गया है। मैं समझती हूँ कि अमरीका की विदेश नीति सदा ही विचित्र रही है और उसने एशियायी राष्ट्रों की आकांक्षाओं की बार-बार उपेक्षा और अवहेलना की है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि अमरीका अब चीन से भी दोस्ती करके ऐशियायी मार्केट को हस्तगत करना चाहता है। अगर पाकिस्तान को लगातार हथियार भेजने में उसका हेतु इस इलाके में सैनिक संतुलन कायम रखना है, तो इसमें उसे सफलता नहीं मिलेगी। पाकिस्तान को जो भी सहायता दी जाती है, वह अन्त में चीन की ही ताकत और असर को बढ़ाती है। पाकिस्तान किसी भी दशा में चीन का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता है और न ही वह कभी चीन के प्रतिद्वन्द्वी के रूप में तैयार किया जा सकता है। अमरीका की इस नीति का सारा लाम अन्त में चीन ही को मिलने वाला है।

मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से अनुरोध करूंगी कि चीन को मजबूत बनाने और एशिया में जनतंत्र का नाश करने में सहायक होने की इस अमरीकी नीति के विरुद्ध अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर आवाज उठाने, और उस नीति में परिवर्तन लाने, के लिए अमरीका को मजबूर करने में आवश्यक सभी कदम उठायेँ। मैं इसको न केवल भारत के हित में बल्कि विश्व-शान्ति और जनतंत्र के हित में भी अत्यन्त आवश्यक मानती हूँ।

पाकिस्तान से यदि किसी देश की हानि होती है, तो केवल भारत की, क्योंकि भारत को कमजोर करना ही पाकिस्तान के अस्तित्व का एकमात्र उद्देश्य है। ऐसी दशा में अमरीका की यह नई नीति भारत के प्रतिकूल पड़ेगी, यह निस्सन्देह है। कुछ लोग समझते हैं कि इस नीति से शायद रूस और चीन के बीच विरोध बढ़ेगा और यही अमरीका का हेतु भी है। लेकिन यह हेतु कभी पूरा नहीं होगा, क्योंकि इस इलाके से वैसे भी रूस का अधिक सम्बन्ध नहीं है। घाटा तो अन्त में अमरीका का ही

होगा और उसे मुंह की खानी पड़ेगी। यही नहीं, बल्कि चीन और रूस के बीच जो खाई है, वह एक नौबत पर पाटी भी जा सकती है। अन्त में चल कर इस इलाके में जनतंत्र का ही सफ़ाया हो जायेगा और सारे विश्व को इसका फल भोगना पड़ेगा।

इसलिए मैं अनुरोध करूंगी कि भारत और अन्य शान्तिप्रिय देशों को अमरीका की इस खतरनाक नीति को छुड़वाने की पूरी पूरी कोशिश करनी चाहिए।

17 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

समापति महोदय, मैं बंगला देश के बारे में अब कुछ कहना चाहती हूँ। और वक्त नहीं है नहीं तो मैं वाजपेयी जी ने जो हमारी विदेश नीति के बारे में कहा है उसके बारे में कुछ बताती। बंगला देश के संदर्भ में ही मैं बोलूंगी। आज के पेपर्स में मैंने देखा याह्या खां ने जंग की बात की है। ऐसे याह्या खां हजारों इतिहास में आए और गए। अंत में बंगला देश स्वतंत्र होकर रहेगा। बंगला देश जरूर आजाद होगा और बंगला देश की जनता की आशाएँ पूरी होंगी।

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Demands relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. The external affairs is the field in which we can project the image of our country abroad and it is this field that requires the maximum of skill on our part.

I want to refer to some specific problems that have lost attention so far. When the Chinese aggression took place, the newspapers in Tokyo were handicapped for certain reasons. I met some of my Japanese friends and they told me that though Japanese were sympathetic to Indian point of view, yet they could not reflect the Indian point of view properly for one reason and the reason was that there was a dearth of people who knew Japanese language in our own Embassy. So, what happened was that the news as reflected from China was published

[Shri Narain Chand Parashar]

earlier in Tokyo press and, even though the Japanese were sympathetic to us, they were not able to project our point of view. I think, for a sound foreign policy and for a sound projection of the image of our country abroad, we have to lay stress on the learning of foreign languages in our country. This is a point that I referred to in my speech on the Demands of the Ministry of Education also. But, unfortunately, there was no reply from the Minister concerned.

Now, if you read *Meinkampf*, Hitler's biography and war stories from other countries, you will find that the maximum emphasis is laid on the teaching of foreign languages and the teaching of geography. I am also aware of the fact that in U. S. A. today there are richest centres for teaching and learning of Chinese language and the text-books that we use in Delhi University and at Shantiniketan are printed, neither in Peking nor in Hong Kong but they are printed and made available to us through the agencies of the United States. So, if America can do this, and if other countries can do this, for us, I think, it is also incumbent on our part to do that and we will be helping our country to the maximum if we try to encourage the teaching and learning of foreign languages in our country. When Hitler talked of war, he always kept the map of the world before him, and geography was a thing that was taught with great stress. Due importance was given to the teaching of geography because one could understand the countries around. But, unfortunately, in our country, geography is not being given the attention that it deserves. For any kind of understanding by our diplomats in foreign country and also for the people of our country to understand that, we have to lay due stress on these two aspects, namely, that the men in our Embassies are proficient in the languages of the countries concerned, as are spoken and as are written there and also the men who are in our Foreign Affairs Ministry here are proficient in those foreign language. I am specially interested in referring to the school for foreign languages which is here in Delhi. I was reading through the Report of the Ministry of Education and in that Report it was stated the results of that school were not good. If the grounding in foreign languages is not sound and deep I cannot understand

the fun of learning about China through the English press because when there is a Peoples' Daily published from Peking I find there is world of difference about the Chinese events in the Chinese press and as we read them through the American or the British press. Unless we have our own men and read the Chinese mind till that moment we will not be doing justice to our country.

We have to do one thing more, that is, our Missions in the foreign countries should reflect our way of life. To our great discouragement and embarrassment the people who man these Missions they represent India but most of them are persons who are unable to understand either our own culture or our own philosophy. So, the people of those countries find a little difference between the Europeans living there and our own men living there. I visited some of the countries and found that the people with whom I talked are ignorant of what India represents and stands for. I visited the exhibition in Nepal which was organised in connection with the birthday celebrations of the King of Nepal I was surprised to find that our stall did not reflect the rich culture of India. When I visited the Chinese stall I found they were able to depict that part of Chinese development which attracts the world attention to the maximum. So, I would like to say that our persons working in the Missions abroad should reflect not only the true culture but that aspect of our development which catches the attention of the people most. So, I would submit unless we are having sound grounding in these languages and also in our own philosophy and culture and the men there represent these aspects the world will not know what it deserves to know and wants to know.

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA (Bahraich): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the demands of the External Affairs Ministry not because that I am a Member of the Party which represents the Government but on merits. The policy of External Affairs Ministry has stood the test of time. During our freedom struggle we were inspired by two ideologies—one agitation for the rule of law and democracy and the other that there should be a socialistic type of democracy. Naturally, after the attainment of freedom in this country we could not be wholly aligned either to America or British democracy nor could we

wholly align to Soviet Russia. So, we adopted a Constitution based on socialistic principles consistent with the concept of personal liberty. The foreign policy of a particular country is a resultant force of the home policy as conditioned by the events in the foreign countries.

If we judge the foreign policy of the Indian Government from this point of view we find that it has justified its existence from the time we attained independence. It has been criticised time and again that the foreign policy of this country is wrong because it will not align to America or does not align to Britain. I submit this view is wrong because when there was a conflict between Pakistan and India on the issue of Kashmir it was Soviet Russia that vetoed every move of these imperialistic powers against India. Therefore it has stood the test of time.

Now, we are time and again defaming and denigrating the home policy as well as the foreign policy initiated and sponsored by the Congress Government from its inception. But I want to make it clear at the outset though everybody is trying to praise Pakistan yet Pakistan is an adventurous country from its very start. It entered the SEATO and the CENTO. It took advantage of foreign military aid from Britain and America. It also took aid from Soviet Russia. But what do we find? When it started an adventurous war against India in 1965, military aid was denied to us from every country. But since our home production was so strong and since the foundation of our secular state were so strong that we could defeat Pakistan in battle, not because we were aided or assisted by any foreign country. We did our best.

We find that we have adopted a Constitution which is based on secularism. Pakistan in spite of the aid and support of all the countries in the world, belonging to the Communist group, the Socialist group and the imperialist group, is failing on its home front. Why is there trouble in East Bengal? It is because it has not been able to function properly, because it could not meet the aspirations and needs of its own people. Therefore there is a crisis in East Pakistan.

Since the time at my disposal is very limited, I would only like to say that the whole

heat has been generated in this House because of the millions of refugees who are coming from East Bengal to our country. What could have been our attitude? Could we have denied entry to those millions of refugees who were our own kith and kin till the other day?

Recognition has been pleaded very passionately by different Members of this House. My submission is that mere recognition of the Bangla Desh would not have cut any ice or solved the problem. According to their logic, the problem could be solved only if the Indian Army marches into the land of Bangla Desh and liberate the people and put an end to genocide. But the question is: Should war be declared? Is war such a cheap phenomenon or remedy in international complications? My submission is that the External Affairs Minister should not be forced time and again to say on the floor of the House as to what is being done on behalf of the Government and what contribution and assistance is being given by this country. Let us exercise restraint. Let us be sober on this matter and we should have full confidence in the Government in what it does.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, I have heard with great attention the contribution that has been made by hon. Members in the present debate. Although at the present moment there are some very vital and immediate problems, about which our attention has to be concentrated, it is a healthy sign that besides these immediate problems some general problems about the world situation, the problems of peace and war, of disarmament, nuclear bomb and the question of space and several other matters of General importance to the international community have been highlighted and comments have been offered on those important aspects of international life. I am also conscious of the fact that a very large number of hon. Members of this House have participated in this debate and as many as 34 members have already spoken. Much as I would have liked to reply to all the points that have been raised, it may be appreciated that it is not possible to do so. I will, however, endeavour to say something about some of these important points and will not try to answer each and every point that has been raised. I would, at this stage, assure the hon.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

Members that what they have said will be very carefully examined in the Ministry and by me. We will go into the suggestions that have been made and we will examine with the greatest care the observations and the opinions that have been expressed by the hon. Members on the floor of the House.

Before I come to the current matters of interest, first of all, I would like to say something about some matters which have been raised in the course of the debate, particularly in relation to our neighbours and our general policy about them and about our success in establishing friendly relations with our neighbours. Although some comments have been made, and some of them not well-informed, I would like to say that our relations with our neighbours, excepting two, are friendly and close and there is a great deal of understanding and goodwill between India and our immediate neighbours. Our relations with Burma, Nepal, Ceylon and Afganistan, which are our immediate neighbours besides Pakistan and China, our relations with these four of our neighbours have been traditionally friendly and there is a great deal of understanding, goodwill and friendship between India and these neighbours. We may not always agree with their policies and they may not always agree with our policies and this is not uncommon. But basic friendship and understanding does exist between us and I would appeal to the hon. Members not to lose sight of this. This we have been able to achieve by pursuing consistently a policy of befriending our neighbours.

With our neighbour Burma our relations have been extremely friendly and close. There has been co-operation in several fields. As a result of an agreement arrived at between India and Burma about the demarcation of the boundary, more than 700 miles of this boundary has already been demarcated and work is proceeding in a satisfactory manner. I would also like to remind the hon. Members that in several other fields also there is close cooperation and there is complete exchange of information about several matters in which we are vitally interested and the Government of Burma is also vitally interested; particularly, in their northern part and in our north east-

ern part there is very useful exchange of information between our two governments.

With Ceylon we have friendship and it is good that we were able to resolve a matter which had been outstanding between us and Ceylon at the time when Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was the Prime Minister, a satisfactory solution of that problem and agreement between the two countries which had been initiated at one time by my hon. friend, who has now become a bitter critic, namely, Shri C. C. Desai, when he was our High Commissioner there. I am glad the agreement has been arrived at because that is one matter which stood in the way of close relations between India and Ceylon in economic field and several other fields and now that is out of the way.

And I have no doubt that when this agreement is implemented--and both Governments have expressed their determination to implement this agreement--the relations will become even more close. We have very good economic relations with Ceylon and we will continue to co-operate to our mutual benefit in the economic field, and in the technical and cultural fields and this is a development which should receive the blessing of the House.

With Nepal we have very close relations and we have participated in the development effort of Nepal in a very significant manner. Apart from the amount that we have spent in the development effort of Nepal in helping them to build their infra-structure, in helping Nepal to open up their road system and in helping them to establish several projects of benefit to the people of Nepal, this is a record of which any country can rightly be proud of. We cannot always be quite happy that some critics in Nepa might have to offer uncomplimentary remarks about certain aspects of our policy from time to time. But we should not be deflected from pursuit of this policy, which is based on our interest and which is in the mutual interest of both India and Nepal. The treaty of trade and transit has been a subject matter of some difference of opinion between the two countries, but I would like to remind this hon. House that although the treaty had expired several months ago, we took special care to ensure that all the essential supplies from

India reach Nepal so that the people of Nepal may not suffer and I have also every reason to believe that this treaty before long will be finalised. Already there has been consultation between the appropriate organization in Nepal and our Ministry of Foreign Trade and I would also like to recall that Government leaders in Nepal have made statements saying that they are anxious to conclude this treaty in a manner satisfactory to both countries and I have every reason to hope that before long this treaty will be concluded.

With Afghanistan, we have traditional friendship. Afghanistan has got its own problems, problems of trade and transit, being a land-locked country and the logistics and means of communications are such that it has to depend to a very large extent upon Pakistan for movement of most of their goods into Afghanistan and also out of Afghanistan. Notwithstanding that dependence upon Pakistan, our relations with Afghanistan have always been very friendly and very close and I myself visited Afghanistan some months ago and I was greatly impressed by the goodwill expressed by the Government leaders of Afghanistan to the people and Government of India and this is the basis upon which there has been a great deal of not only understanding but co-operation in several fields, educational, cultural and economic and our efforts to still further strengthen these relations will continue unabated. With regard to other countries. . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Has any of these four countries made any statement with regard to the problems of our refugees from Bangla Desh? Has any of these four countries made any such statement?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would like to say that although our relations with these four countries which are our neighbours have been good, unfortunately, our relations with our two other neighbours, Pakistan and China, have been uneven, have been either hostile at times or indifferent or tense; and therefore, we have to live with this situation.

I would like however to clarify that this is not of our seeking and if we find that our relations with two of these neighbours on the west, east and north have been of this nature, we have to see the background.

The hostility that Pakistan has always entertained is the result of the basis upon which India was partitioned. And, subsequently, Pakistan was fed by several outside powers in the belief that it is in Pakistan's interest to continue the policy of confrontation, and Pakistan, in this respect, had been receiving a great deal of encouragement, not only moral and political, but substantial help, in the sense of economic aid, military aid and all manner of support even for causes which appear to be on the face of it, absolutely unjust. We have therefore to frame our attitude and our policy, knowing this background. In relation to China, this matter has been explained on several occasions and I do not want to go over the entire history. But, even before the Chinese attack in 1962, their attitude was taking a certain shape which smacked of hostility and friction against India.

It is in this background that we have to see as to whether the policy that we have been pursuing in relation to our neighbours,—both those who are friendly as well as those who, for not fault of ours, are not friendly to us, but are actually hostile to us—is the correct policy to be pursued, placed as we are, in this situation.

A great deal of effort has been put in by several hon. Members in order to show that our policy of non-alignment, the policy that we have pursued so far, has not yielded results. I had, however, been very careful and attentive to find out if any alternative was suggested by any hon. Member to the policy of non-alignment that we had been pursuing.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Silence.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I don't think that silence is Mr. Piloo Mody's weakness.

So, what could be the alternative of the policy of non-alignment? Can it be a policy of aligning ourselves with any of the power blocs? Obviously no one has suggested this and no one can, in any seriousness, suggest this.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Independent, nationalist policy. . .

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Independent, nationalist policy is precisely the policy of non-alignment and it is that policy that we have been pursuing so far.

I agree with those hon. Members who have said that this policy of non-alignment means that we decide ourselves what our attitude should be in any particular situation, not that others take steps or take actions as a result of which we ourselves find that we have also to adopt a particular policy or oppose a particular policy. If we have been out of these pacts, if we have not subscribed to any of these defence pacts, if we have not aligned ourselves with any of the power blocs, it has been with a view to ensure our independence of action, our independence of approach and our independence of action in any given situation.

I was amazed when some hon. Members—I would not name them, because sometimes if we mention names, the people concerned feel too much excited—propounded a strange theory that if we get any arms from any country then we become aligned with that country. That is a proposition which is very dangerous and that is a proposition which we can never accept and we should never accept. I have said on more than one occasion that where our own national interests are involved, where our own security is involved, when we stand in need of any military equipment of a sophisticated nature or of a type which we do not manufacture in our country, I shall have no hesitation in getting that equipment or that material from any source whatsoever, and I do not see why there should be any objection to that.

SHRI PILOO MODY: How is Pakistan different?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I quite agree, if the hon. Minister means me.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Shri Pilloo Mody thinks that he has put a very bright question, namely 'How is Pakistan different?'

SHRI PILOO MODY: I do not expect a bright answer.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I know that the reply will be as dull as the query. Pakistan is a member of defence pacts, and, therefore, to say that they are getting arms from

those countries with whom they are allies and are members of defence pacts, is entirely a different situation as compared to the situation of a non-aligned country like India getting arms from any source whatsoever. To suggest that we can be deflected in the pursuit of our independent policy merely because we acquire arms from one source or the other is a wrong idea, and I think that those hon. Members who made that suggestion are playing into the hands of these who want to malign India by saying that because India is getting arms from a particular source, therefore, they are aligned to that country. That is a great error and pitfall, and I would warn hon. Members not to fall into that.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: But we have to be sure that we do not allow our nationalist policy to be coloured by them.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: We have pursued this policy; we will continue to pursue that policy because that is the best policy that is in our interests, and I have no hesitation in saying that we will pursue it and we will get help and equipment from whatever source it may be available. I have no inhibitions whatsoever in that respect, and I do not see why we should not have confidence in our own country to see that merely getting help from any other country does not in any way compromise our position. That is not a correct attitude, and I would request the hon. Members not to be obsessed with that idea.

Besides these neighbours, I shall come to our immediate neighbours a little later. But before I do that, I would like to say that there are other matters of importance to the world community such as the questions of war and peace, questions of disarmament, questions not only of the remnants of colonialism in whatever form they exist but of ending the apartheid and racist regimes in South Africa or in Rhodesia etc. These are matters on which we have always lent our full support in all forums; whether it be the conference of nonaligned countries, whether it be the United Nations in its various organs or committees or bilaterally in the forum of the Commonwealth, we have steadfastly adhered to the pursuit of the policy where our opposition to colonialism in any form has been clear, forthright and unequivocal. We have steadfastly stood for helping freedom fighters engaged in the task of freeing themselves from

colonial clutches of the Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique; also our sympathy and support has always been for those who are fighting against the apartheid regime in S. Africa and the racist regime in Rhodesia. Our preoccupation with our problems does not mean that we can adopt an attitude of isolation from this contribution we must make in the affairs of the world. We have always pursued a policy where we have made our position absolutely clear and have used all our influence in order to further those causes and the causes of those who are suffering.

At this stage, I would also like to say that it was farthest from me to say anything which might have the effect of denigrating the UN organisations or the international community or the various organs in which we function. That was not my object, but we must be realistic in this respect. It is a hard reality that these UN organisations are political bodies where governments of countries are represented. I am also conscious of the fact that the UN did a great deal of admirable work in focussing world attention on problems of colonialism and several other matters, and it was mainly on account of the pressure built up in UN organs that the colonial powers found it difficult to hold on to their colonial empires, and progressively country after country became free and independent. But we must also keep this in mind that the UN being a body in which governments are represented, for getting support for any particular proposition which we want any particular UN organisation or group to adopt, we must first have sufficient support in the capitals of the countries represented in the appropriate UN body. It is with this object in view that we have been mobilising support in various capitals and also through their representatives in UN headquarters at New York, at the UN organisations' headquarters in Geneva, also here in Delhi by having contacts with the representatives of the countries concerned; also sometimes, even by special missions, not always of Ministers, but of experts, sometimes of professors, lawyers and other knowledgeable people, to convince those governments of the correctness and justice of our case.

We have already raised the question of Bangla Desh in Ecosoc and depending on the response we get, and also depending on

whether it will serve our purpose and interest, we will certainly raise it in the other appropriate organisations of the UN,—provided we are assured of sufficient support for any formulation or proposition we expect that particular organ of the UN to adopt.

The question of recognition of certain countries has been again raised by several hon. Members, recognition of GDR, DRVN, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Viet Nam etc. I am afraid I have nothing to add to what I said the other day when a non-official Resolution precisely in relation to this was debated on the Floor of the House. This matter was discussed here and I made my observations and clarified Government's stand as best as I could. I would like to say that this is not a matter one year old, this is a matter which has been with us for so many years, and several hon. Members opposite have themselves been very intimately connected even with the policy making in relation to all these matters. In between nothing has happened which requires a sudden reversal of that. Having said that, I have also made the position clear that this is a matter in which we are not opposed to recognition, but let the time for this come. (*Interruption*) The time has not come. This is the difference of opinion.

Several hon. Members have made suggestions that we should take some step to normalise our relations with China. Several hon. Members have expressed this desire. Some have even suggested that some concrete action should be taken. I would like to say a few words about this matter.

Some hon. Members have suggested that we should de-fuse our relations with China. I entirely agree that we should not only de-fuse but try to normalise relations with China.

AN HON. MEMBER: De-freeze.

SHRISWARAN SINGH: The expression used was de-fuse, also de-freeze, both.

However, normalisation does not depend upon one party alone. There has to be a mutual normalisation. If and when the Government of the People's Republic of China is willing and ready to take concrete steps towards normalisation, we shall be

[Shri Swaran Singh]

equally ready and willing to do so. It must, however, be clearly understood that normalisation can take place only on the basis of mutual respect for each other's integrity and sovereignty and on the principle of non-interference in internal affairs. We welcome the change in the style of China's diplomacy which has been in evidence of late and we hope that it will also lead to a change in substance.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: They say you do not smile back then they smile.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Mishra can grin back if he likes, but a smile or a grin will not help.

Something has been said and quite rightly about the new development that has taken place according to which it has been announced that President Nixon will visit Peking. President Nixon's Adviser, Dr. Kissinger, has already visited Peking in a secret, clandestine manner. I have made some comments already on this development when I was replying to the debate on the non-official Resolution about recognition.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): We want the official version.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: That version was official although it was made when a non-official resolution was being discussed.

I should like to make some comments on the Sino-American process of detente. In this connection I should like to recall that I have already made a statement on 16th July. While we welcome the reapproachment between Peking and Washington, we cannot look upon it with equanimity if it means the domination of the two powers over this region or a tacit agreement between them to this effect. We maintain the right of each and every country and people to decide their own destiny without any interference from outside.

This applies as much to Bangla Desh as to Vietnam or the Palastine problem. We shall not allow any other country or combination of countries to dominate us or to interfere in our internal affairs. We shall to

our maximum ability help other countries to maintain their freedom from outside domination, and their sovereignty. We have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries but this does not mean that we shall look on as silent spectators if third countries come and interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, particularly our neighbours as our own national interest could be adversely affected.

I sincerely hope that any Sino-American detente will not be at the expense of other countries, particularly in this region. However, we cannot at present totally rule out such a possibility. It can have repercussions on the situation in this sub-continent as well as in this region. We have therefore for some time been considering ways and means of preventing such a situation from arising and meeting it if it should arise.

In this we are not alone and there are other countries, both big and small, who may be more perturbed than we are. We are in touch with the countries concerned and shall see to it that any Sino-American detente does not affect us or the other countries in this region adversely. . . (Interruptions)

Several observations have been made about the motives that may have been the main spring for the development of the Sino-American detente. Several points have been suggested that one party may be motivated by this aspect and the other country by another motive. Whatever may be the motives this is a very important and very significant development. We shall have to watch very carefully the effects of this and we shall have to take every possible step to safeguard our own interests.

I know that several countries have already given their reactions. Some of them have been critical of these. Some have expressed their fears. But there is no doubt that in the months to come this will be the most important event of the year and a great of thought will have to be given to the after-effects of this and how it unfolds itself. We need not rush to any conclusion straight away. We have to be careful and watchful and take adequate steps both political and otherwise in the international field and inside our own country to safeguard our interests.

Several hon. Members have made a reference to the Press report of an interview given by President Yahya Khan. I should like to remind the hon. Members that the report in this case is from Mr. Maxwell who put forward the theory of India's war in relation to the Sino-Indian conflict. It is the same reporter. (Interruption)

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer): He predicated collapse of Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Government in the mid-term elections.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It is very difficult to make any comment upon a press report of that nature, but there are some points in that statement which require notice. I would like to take this opportunity to state Government's viewpoint with regard to some of the matters which have been highlighted in the press report and the statement attributed to President Yahya Khan.

President Yahya Khan is reported to have said that if India made any attempt to seize any part of East Pakistan, he would declare war and Pakistan would not be alone. Pakistan has been trying for sometime to mislead the world into thinking that Pakistan's problem is with India and not with the people of Bangla Desh. It is the military regime's own action, the brutalities committed by the Pakistan army in Bangla Desh, that have landed Pakistan in a morass in East Bengal, and it is only a settlement with the elected representatives of the people of Bangla Desh which will enable it to extricate itself from this morass. So long as Pakistan does not recognise this, the activities of the Mukti Fauj are bound to continue and increase. If the Mukti Fauj succeeds in liberating the territory in Bangla Desh, and Pakistan uses it as a pretext for an attack on us, then I must make it clear that we are ready to defend ourselves.

President Yahya Khan talks about his willingness to meet our Prime Minister in response to efforts of mediation. That is also mentioned in that statement. I would like to make it clear that this is not a problem between India and Pakistan, and if any mediation is required, it should be between President Yahya Khan and the people of Bangla Desh. The people of Bangla Desh have in an unequivocal manner demonstrated their faith in the leadership of Sheikh Mujibur

Rahman and the Awami League by winning as many as 167 out of 169 seats. So, those friends of Pakistan who want to do any mediation would be well-advised to carry on their mediation efforts between the military regime, that is, President Yahya Khan, and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and the leaders of the Awami League. There is no use in diverting the attention of the world by saying or by suggesting that there should be mediation between President Yahya Khan and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. This is a fight which is going on between the people of Bangla Desh and the military rulers. (Interruption)

I would like to say very categorically that these efforts to divert the attention of the international community and to project this liberation fight that is being carried on in a relentless manner by the freedom-fighters—this we have to scotch; and we have made it absolutely clear to all important countries that this is a matter between the Awami League—between Sheikh Mujibur Rahman—and the military rulers, and any attempt to divert the attention of the international community by projecting this as an Indo-Pakistan dispute is something which is totally unacceptable to us.

I would like to say something about the report that has come out about Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. The report says that there is a proposal to try Sheikh Mujibur Rahman—

SHRI AMRIT NAHTA: In camera; that makes it horrible still.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Whether it is *in camera* or open is immaterial. Even if he should be tried as it is—as mentioned in some reports—by a military court in which they say he may have a lawyer but not a foreigner as a lawyer—all this shows, if any proof was required, that there is no judicial system of the type with which we are familiar. Any trial of that nature will be a farce. It is not a legalistic matter or a matter in which we should devote so much time to these procedural matters, whether it is *in camera* or not. It is obviously a political matter in which we have taken a consistent stand that the military regime having embarked on these atrocious activities against the unarmed people of Bangladesh, they have to reverse that trend, stop military action and have discussions with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman

[Shri Swaran Singh]

and the Awami League. That is what we have been implying when we have talked of giving up military means and trying to find a political settlement, which means a settlement acceptable to the people of Bangladesh, acceptable to the Awami League and to Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, who is the undisputed leader of the Awami League and the people of Bangladesh. Any attempt, therefore, to take any action against Sheikh Mujibur Rehman will be a follow-up action on the statement that President Yahya Khan made on 28th June, which has paved the way completely for the emergence of an independent Bangladesh. Any further action of this type will be a mad action, which will result only in making the freedom-fighters more determined in the pursuit and realisation of their objective, namely, freedom for Bangladesh and for the people of Bangladesh. So, we would like to warn that any action taken against Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, who is the elected leader of the people of Bangladesh and any continuation of these atrocities and any steps taken to pursue this mad policy and continued military action against unarmed people—this is something which will make the freedom-fighters even more determined and if I may say so, it is the determination and the effectiveness of these freedom fighters which appear to have rattled President Yahya Khan and he is now trying to find excuses by saying that if any area is liberated, then he would declare war. It is obvious that now that he feels the pressure of the activities of the freedom fighters, he has tried to divert the attention of the international community in another direction.

Our attitude has been made clear from time to time. This Parliament has unanimously adopted a resolution pledging sympathy and support and we are pursuing that resolution in the best possible manner, and we are doing everything possible to lend support to the freedom fighters.

Some hon. members have made remarks against me. I am grateful first of all to Mr. C. C. Desai for making this suggestion. He himself has been the distinguished Ambassador of our country to two of our neighbouring countries, Ceylon and Pakistan. It is interesting that a great deal of wisdom dawns on many people in civil or military service when

they retire from service and they offer all types of easy prescriptions and easy solutions. I would not like to enter into any argument with him. I am grateful to the other hon. members who have said kind words about me, which perhaps at any rate according to Mr. C. C. Desai, I do not deserve. I think his shift from the Swantantra to the Congress(o) is not responsible for this type of allergy against the members of the ruling party. I had hoped he would shed some of his old allergy but he has apparently carried it to his new party. He apparently appears to have been more infected by it. I am happy, however, to be re-assured by the leader of the opposition group that this could be Shri Desai's personal opinion and not of the group to which he belongs. But, be that as it may, I would like to assure him that I am a spokesman of the government and we are discussing this matter in depth, all the time and this is the unanimous decision of the government and we review the position from time to time.

18 hrs.

I have the highest respect for Professor Hiren Mukerjee. But I cannot help remarking that somehow or other he has developed a feeling which is totally unjustified. He says I have some allergy to this problem of Bangladesh. If I have any allergy, it is my firm commitment to implement the directive that has been given to government by this august House, of sympathy and support, and it is that policy that we are steadfastly pursuing. I would request Professor Hiren Mukerjee to be a little more kind and not to read some thing which does not exist. We know each other for a long time and I feel more pained when I find that he is not satisfied with the functioning, either of the foreign office or of me personally. I may be at fault. I am responsible to all of you and I will admit when I am at fault. But so far as the foreign office and our missions abroad are concerned, I would like to assure you that they know fully well the implications of this issue. Let us not forget that this is a matter which is very vital for us, which is vital for our existence and for our survival. Therefore, we have to take major steps, we have to exercise all the wisdom but still in a relentless manner pursue our objective. The objective being to extend sympathy and support to the democratic

forces facing the attack of military rulers against the will of the people of Bangladesh expressed in such overwhelming manner by returning Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and the Awami League and giving him such massive support. Unless an administration and government which is controlled by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and the Awami League is installed there, I do not see any hope of these refugees going back, because it is not by statements alone that any confidence can be instilled into the minds of these refugees to enable them to return to their homes and hearths. There is no substitute for experience and the experience that they have had before they fled for their lives is an experience which cannot be wished away merely because somebody is making a statement that these refugees are welcome and they can return. What was the effect of the statement that President Yahya Khan made? After that 3½ million more refugees crossed into Indian territory. So, this is the response to the statement made by President Yahya Khan. Therefore, their confidence cannot be restored by statements or assurances by the UN people. It is very strange that they think that if they merely establish camps these refugees can be induced to go into those camps. That again is not likely to happen. Therefore, they will not go unless the root cause is tackled, unless the basic problem is solved, and the basic problem is the fight between the people and the democratic forces on one side and the military regime on the other. In this we are committed to support the freedom fighters and that is the objective that we have to realise.

Sir, there are some minor matters which have been raised but I have no intention of speaking on them. Already ten minutes have passed six and if there are any points which I have not been able to touch upon I may be excused. As I have already said I will go into all of them and my Ministry will go through all of them and we will benefit from them.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A number of Cut Motions have been moved. Unless any

Member wants any Cut Motions to be put separately I will put all of them together.

All the Cut Motions were put and negated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 11 and 12 relating to the Ministry of External affairs."

The Motion was adopted

[The Motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha, are reproduced below.—Ed.]

DEMAND NO. 11—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,99,92,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'External Affairs.' "

DEMAND NO. 12—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,66,91,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs.' "

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, July, 21, 1971/Asadha 30, 1893 (Saka).