

DISCUSSION RE. SITUATION ARISING  
OUT OF ESCALATION OF U. S.  
BOMBING OF HANOI

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, we take up the Discussion under Rule 193. Shri H. N. Mukerjee to raise a discussion on the massive escalation of the United States bombing of Hanoi and other parts of Vietnam.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : I have given a written notice for suspension of Rule under Rule 338 and substitution of the Rule 193 discussion, which means nothing at all in fact, considering the gravity of the situation; I have given a substitute motion which should be placed before the House for consideration.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have your letter before me. Under Rule 388 even for moving the motion to suspend the rule, you require my consent, my permission; and that consent, even for moving, has to be given on a certain basis.

Firstly, you have moved for the suspension of Rule 193 for the time being. You suspend Rule 193. What comes next is a vacuum. Rule 184 does not permit you to move a motion. You have got to give notice of that to the Secretary in advance and, therefore, by suspending Rule 193, Rule 184 does not automatically apply.

Further to that, you had already given a motion under Rule 184 which, I am told, was considered by the Speaker who has not allowed it. This was also discussed in the forenoon discussion, and the House had agreed that the discussion should be under Rule 193. I am sorry, I cannot accept your submission.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : The moment Rule 193 is suspended, I have given on the same piece of paper a substantive motion under Rule 184. There is no vacuum. In fact, if you so desire, and you will appreciate the gravity of the situation...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please don't make a speech. I do appreciate the gravity.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : That may be put before the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I cannot do that. Under Rule 184, notice of the motion should be given in writing.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : I have already given.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : But it was disallowed. You had given the same motion before. It was considered by the Speaker and it was disallowed. It was discussed in the House in the forenoon, and the House agreed that it should be under Rule 193. Therefore, the question cannot be raised now.

Shri Mukerjee.

SHRI JOYTIRMOY BOSU : I regret to mention that what you are stating is not correct. You will realise that this is a recent development and a different subject. About the motion for suspension of Rules, I have given it in a piece of paper a motion under Rule 184. How is it that it is not receiving your consideration ? What is the objection ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This was considered by the Speaker.

SHRI JOYTIRMOY BOSU : There was no mention before the House in the morning.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You had given before, in writing, a motion under Rule 184, and that has been disallowed and disposed of by the House.....(Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : This is different context altogether. I am afraid you are not abiding by the Rules of Procedure. I suggest that this be put before the House to decide whether this discussion should be taken up under Rule 184 as a

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

motion or it should be talked out under Rule 193 which is nothing at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House has already decided it in the forenoon

Shri Mukerjee

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI  
(Patna) *rose*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER Order please

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I know the Foreign Minister is very reluctant to pass a resolution. I know their political attitude, but the Chair should not side with the Government

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY  
(Nizamabad) : This is very unfair

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU What is the harm in having a resolution ? Let something concrete go before the world that this Parliament has adopted a unanimous resolution condemning US action and the escalation of bombing of Hanoi why is it that you want to stop that ? Why is it that the Foreign Minister is not supporting us in this matter ?

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER Mr H N Mukerjee

SHRI H N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East) Mr. Deputy—Speaker, Sir, this morning, the whole House, in almost every section of it, was seized with anger and indignation at the ghastly American action in Vietnam and I feel personally privileged to have this opportunity of starting the discussion on this subject. But would like to add, Sir, that this House in its wisdom, I hope, would decide when we have finished our discussion that there should be something more positive than a mere discussion which might appear somewhat theoretical in regard to this subject and a decision in regard to a unanimous resolution by the House, which, by the

morning's temper appears to be very likely, is something which I commend to everybody in this Assembly

Sir, President Nixon has been bragging lately that with China alongside him, he has the future of the world in his hands. I know, Sir, and the world knows that like the dream of the "American century," this latest dream of the pettifogger in White House with putrid policies and performances which stand condemned before the bar of history will vanish into thin air

As sure as the sun will rise tomorrow the radiant and stupendous fight for the liberation of Vietnam will triumph, come all the battalions and brigades and blackguardries of all the imperialists in the world against her Sir I feel that India's voice must rise loud clear, in condemnation of the mad-dog employment by American imperialists of the largest ever air and naval armada in a senseless vendutta against the people of Vietnam

In the last 48 hours the port of Haiphong in North Vietnam has been subjected to the heaviest bombing attacks in history, Added on to the My Lai and other unspeakable mass atrocities with which mankind is familiar, Nixon's record is that of what the valiant Vietnamese called him, 'the most heinous war criminal of our times'

Sir, if by brandishments and political or economic bribes to Peking, the American imperialists imagine that they can bail themselves out of their predicament in South-East Asia, they are living in a fool's paradise

Their much-advertised million strong army of puppets in South Vietnam has nearly vanished The vile and hypocritical talk of *Vietnamisation* and phaed withdrawal of United States troops has been shown up to be the perfidy which it always has been and they are driven today to the enormity that this House, this country and the entire world unhesitatingly condemn.

According to a recent estimate in *Pravda* which I found quoted in the *Round-table*, in an article written by a professor of Jawaharlal Nehru University, Dr. Vishal Singh, over 5.8 million civilians have been killed, maimed or left homeless during the period of the Vietnamese war. Some 7 million tonnes of bombs and artillery shells have been used by the Americans during the last 7 years.

This exceeds the tonnage of bombs dropped by America against the Fascist powers during the second world war. At the end of last year, the use of 6,800 kilogram bombs came to light. It was described by the United States military men in Vietnam, I am quoting their words, "the next best thing to a Nuke." "Nuke" is the American word for a nuclear bomb. The next best thing to a Nuke, nuclear bomb, is a 6,800 kilogram bomb.

It is so devastating that it can kill everything within a radius of 3270 feet. Let us recall, because we belong to that fundamental fraternity of Afro-Asian peoples, that the atom bomb was hurled on Japan, that the United States imperialists practised bacteriological warfare in Korea and chemical warfare in Viet Nam. All these happened in the case of coloured peoples like ours. And let these white barbarians remember that if they do not mend their ways, they would be hurled out of history by upheavals beside which the Russian and the Chinese revolutions would look like a tea party.

The Viet Nam question moved us so deeply, and this morning, the atmosphere in this House, as one saw the scenes here in this House, was one which moved us deeply, because it cannot be isolated from the anti colonial upsurge of people everywhere. It is a fight for freedom against the last vestiges of colonialism in Asia. It is a struggle by a small nation of poor people who have shown tremendous guts and humbled the world's mightiest power.

• We find that in so far as the fighting is concerned, the Provisional Revolution-

ary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam, during its discussion with the American representatives in Paris laid down some very clear and specific terms on which a settlement could surely and honourably have been arrived at. They had said:- and I am quoting their words; on the 2nd February, their statement was made

"The United States Government must set a specific terminal date for the complete withdrawal of all US troops, officers, military personnel, weapons and war materials and those of other foreign countries in the United States camp, without posing any conditions whatsoever. This specific terminal date will also be the date for the release of all military men of their parties and of the civilians captured in the war including the United States pilots captured in North Viet Nam. And the Viet Nam people further demand that the machinery of oppression built by the United States in South Viet Nam be disbanded completely and its head, the so-called president of the Saigon puppet administration be packed off."

Those are the two demands, absolutely clear, cogent, lucid and demands on which there could hardly be any difference of opinion. But the Americans have decided not to accept them but on the contrary to show how far they can go by way of barbarity.

The people of Viet Nam have shown their courage and determination in an epic struggle which will ever be remembered in the annals of man. That is exactly why we know that the world's peoples whether in the Soviet Union or in the Socialist countries or the peoples of India have rallied round the banner of Viet Nam, and that is why today in our parliament we saw scenes in the morning when everybody, almost everybody excluding

[Shri H.N. Mukerjee]

one or two people perhaps in this House, felt that something so utterly blackguardly had been done by the imperialists in Viet Nam that India should do something about it.

I feel that India has a special duty and responsibility, because India is Chairman of the International Control Commission and India along with Canada and Poland has a very special responsibility to move in this matter. I do not know what Government would say. I know that the other day, the External Affairs Minister had made a statement in regard to accelerated bombing of Viet Nam and expressed the sorrow of our country in regard to that. But a great deal more is demanded. Why is it that we do not know more about what the International Control Commission of which India is Chairman has been doing in this regard? What have we done in order to move the Security Council? Have we approached the chairman of the Geneva Conference so that we can move in this matter more effectively?

What are the exact steps which India has taken? In the mean time, as today's morning's papers were read by every one of us, we felt that the first thing to be done—I do not know if Sardar Swaran Singh has done it; I shall be very happy if he tells me that he has done it—was to summon the US Ambassador to South Block, just as Moscow has done in regard to the US Ambassador in the Soviet Union, and to tell him to convey to his Government India's condemnation of the kind of incident which is being perpetrated by the Nixon Gang.

In our own interest also, India must move closer and identify herself with the just struggle of the people of Vietnam. And that is why the long-overdue step of fully recognising the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam should be taken, and we should establish full diplomatic relations. I do not see my hon. friend, Shri Dinesh Singh,

here, but we know how Madame Binh came to this country, how a certain kind of *faux pas* was committed by our External Affairs Ministry because they did not quite know what to do about it. But surely their eyes must have been opened by the concatenation of events since that incident, and we should do something here and now. I hope the External Affairs Minister is in a position to tell us, if not today, then tomorrow or the day after, that India shall give full diplomatic recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam.

I do not wish to go on adding to the same theme because it is a theme shared by everybody in this house bar a few puerile exceptions. I say, let us do something honest and positive about it. That is my desire is—and I commend it to the House that we try to proclaim to the world, preferably by means of a Resolution, which by waiving the rules we can easily manage to accept if Government comes forward to suggest waiving of the rules, I am sure the House would not have any objection, to have a Resolution,—and by a Resolution and by other means, we condemn entirely and unequivocally the latest American enormity, and send our greetings and good wishes to the wonderful and heroic fighting people of that region.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore):** With your permission, I may just inform the House that news has just come that thousands of people have been killed in Hanoi and Haiphong.

**DR. SHANKAR DAYAL SHARMA (Bhopal):** I rise to join in the condemnation of the barbarous, dirty war of America against the people of Vietnam. This is the only word to use, and there are reasons for it. It will be remembered that it was in April 1968, four years back, that President Johnson announced that bombing north of the 17th parallel would stop. But now we find four years later that not only has bombing been resumed, but has been resumed

in a bigger way. There is greater intensity in it. Just now we were informed that so many civilians have been killed. No information is needed. This morning, we come to know that large scale bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong had started. The bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong was entirely concentrated on the civilian people. If the American think they can make the people of North Vietnam succumb and so dissuade them from helping the People's Liberation Army, they are sadly mistaken. It is not only North Vietnam, but the sympathies of free peoples throughout the world are with the valiant people who are fighting against the stooges of the USA.

Of course, many of us, when we were told in April 1968 that bombing north of the 17th parallel would stop, know this might be a trick; when we were told that the boys would come back, as Nixon promised, we knew also that Mr. Nixon was trying to win the presidential election as a peace candidate. The trick worked. He did win by a slender majority, but what we feared has come true. We were told that Vietnamisation will work, and the American forces will be withdrawn. Of course, Vietnamisation did not deceive anybody. We knew that Vietnamisation simply meant they wanted their stooges, the mercenaries of the puppet government of South Vietnam, to fight with the arms supplied by the armament factories of the United States of America, and the brain of the Pentagon there to guide them. This was, according to me, in line with American policies. I have always believed, and it is very obvious, that the armament manufacturers, the armament lobby in America, have always been strong. The links between the armament lobby and the Pentagon are also well known. It is a well-known fact that the various generals after retirement go on the Boards of Governors of those massive armament concerns. It is also known that at times the directors of some of these big manufacturers of arms for human massacre become Secretaries of State. The link

between the American Government, the Pentagon and the armament manufacturers is known.

And this is quite obvious. Moreover, there can be no mistake about it, the armament manufacturers want to test the new arms that they manufacture; and for testing, they must find some place in Asia and Africa, and this they think is the best area where they can use them without creating problems for themselves in the States.

In regard to the bomb which has been referred to; the bomb about which Mr. Mukerjee has been talking, it is known as the daisy-cutter; a beautiful name has been given to it. It is a bomb which kills everything living within half a mile radius of the place where it is dropped. Other weapons may be tried; but one thing is clear; and we must make it clear to the world that this will not do; I have absolutely no doubt that this particular attempt will not succeed. As we have seen, in spite of this heavy bombing, cities are falling in South Vietnam against the onslaught of the People's Liberation Army.

I am repeating this and am using the term People's Liberation Army carefully and with a purpose. Because, at times, there is a confusion and the impression is created that the fighting which is going on is between the North Vietnamese forces and the Saigon forces, it is not the North Vietnamese forces which are fighting. It is the People's Liberation Army of South Vietnam; the people who want to be free and live their life and develop in the way that they want.

So far as this House is concerned, so far as we in the Congress Party are concerned, there should be no doubt about it. It was as early as 1970 that in a resolution in Delhi itself in the AICC, we had clearly said that the people of Vietnam should decide their own

[Shri Shanker Dayal Sharma]

future. And not only that. The foreign forces must leave Vietnam, starting with the United States of America. At that time people said that we were partial and that we were showing anger against the American forces. Today our stand has been justified. We knew that if the American Forces continued to operate there, no settlement across the table would be possible. So long as third parties are there, so long as American presence is there, it is not possible to get a settlement. The process of vacillation of aggression has got to start and if it has to start, those who are guilty of intervention in Vietnam those who have been bombing Vietnam should first be asked to quit.

The question of our giving greater help to the peoples of the South Viet Nam and North Viet Nam who are being subjected to barbaric bombing has been raised. There again the position is clear, our Party's manifesto for the 1972 elections refers to the improvement of relations with North Vietnam. We did express in clear terms our admiration for the heroic people of North Viet Nam in their long struggle and this had been re-emphasised by our recent decision to establish closer diplomatic ties between our two countries. So naturally our hearts, our sympathies go to the heroic people of North Viet Nam who are being subjected to this type of barbaric bombing by the American Forces.

At this time one other thing comes to our mind. It looks that perhaps this renewed bombing of North Viet Nam is linked with the Nixon-Mao confabulations sometime back. It is clear that the condemnation of bombing has been lukewarm so far as China is concerned. They have not issued their condemnation in clearest terms. Of course it was not possible for anybody to support what is being done by Americans, not even for one or two friends of America

in this House because no human being will condone this type of bombing of unarmed people. So China also is joining in condemnation but it is not condemning these actions in strong terms it should.

When it is said that the matter should be brought before the Security Council, there can be two opinions about it. For there is the veto power given to permanent Member in the Council. Of course, if one of the big powers, permanent Members of the Security Council brings this matter forward, I have no doubt that India will support the stand taken by the people of Viet Nam, North or South. Our Government's attitude is unequivocal, resolution or no resolution. What is important is that the unanimous opinion of this House and of the people of India should be expressed in no uncertain terms, condemning the action of the Nixon Administration.

I congratulate the House on this discussion because I feel that it will strengthen the hands of those forces in America who are not one with the Nixon Administration. People in America, I am sure, feel like people everywhere, that this is an unprovoked and unnecessary massacre of innocent people. So, I join in the condemnation, and I hope that we will not be wanting in doing all we can in support of the valiant people fighting for their own rights in Viet Nam.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) Once again I express my regret that, although a Resolution was tabled about ten days ago and I had held dialogues with a number of eminent Members belonging to the ruling party, they did not think it fit to allow the Resolution to be debated and also to be adopted unanimously on the floor of the House. It seems to me that the Government is reluctant, and therefore, the Resolution was by-passed. While we have heard about the pious Resolution of the AJCC, which remains very

much on paper, we would have been very happy to see that Resolution implemented in the conduct of the Government on the floor of the House.

This dirty imperialist war is headed by Nixons, Johnsons, Me Namaras and Westmorelands. In fact, the U. S. Government's barbarism has surpassed all of its type in history. It tramples upon the last shred of human rights and they can hardly call themselves civilised today. They are no better than heynas and wolves, creatures that look like human beings. They come all the way from America to bomb another peaceful country, people who are toiling hard to make a living for themselves. Today they have taken recourse to bombs with delayed action, meant to inflict more casualty on the civilians, they have taken recourse to bacteriological warfare use of chemical weapons and napalm bombs. But this has created, I am glade to say—let us take our hats off to the people of Viet Nam—more determination, and it will be a lesson for all in history. The unprecedented escalation of this bombing has been created to counteract the recent revolutionary sweep, and that is why they have taken to incessant bombing of North Viet Nam, including Hanoi. Here during the Bangla Desh trouble, we had the Seventh Fleet in the Bay of Eengal. That was sent to threaten and blackmail the people of India and Bangla Desh, but there in the Gulf of Tonkin around Veit Nam, the Seventh Fleet is actually operating. We have not forgotten 18th March, 1968, when in My Lai they say 600 old men, women and children were butchered and buried. There have been many more My Lais in these last 18 years since Dien Bion Phu of 1954.

Let us come back to our own home, our Government's policy, what India, as the Chairman of the International Control Commission, has done during the last 18 years. I want to know from the hon. Minister what they have actually and specifically done and how, as Chairman of the

International Control Commission they have helped the freedom fighters of Veit-Nam, what they have done to mobilise world opinion against this U. S. action and as a Government, weat they have done for a peaceful solution of this Viet Nam trouble. India as the Chairman of the ICC, especially as Co-Chairman, is treated with utter contempt and disregard by the Government of South Viet Nam under the command of the Pentagon of the American Government. Our Government has taken lightly the way they have treated our personnel very recently in the matter of grant of visas and the U. S. inspired rioting in front of the Consul in saigon, because it does not suit them to be strong there. We know these pepole very well by now.

I want to ask a question whether they have forgotten what the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had done in the Brussels Conference in 1927, when, as freedom fighters. Nehru and Dr. Ho Chi Minh, took united decisions.

This Government is a Member of the Security Council. Have they in the past raised the matter before the Security Council? Have they tried to bring matters like my Lai before the Human Rights Commission? No. why were these issues not raised? Instead, they invited the great butcher, Gen. Westmoreland to pay a State visit to this country as a State guest along with Mrs Westmoreland. Why are they so adamant about refusing recognition to P. R. G.? Even the other day on the 10th April on the floor of this House in reply to a calling attention motion, Sardar Swaran Singh said, a clear no, as far as the issue of granting recognition to P. R. G. is concerned.

Even the full-fledged diplomatic relations with North Vietnam came only a few months ago in the context of Bangla Desh, not before. Have we given any assistance to the freedom fighters of Vietnam? My answer is, no. In Delhi,

[Shri Jyotirmoy Basu]

if we call on them in their Embassies, we are shadowed by half a dozen CID officials. Our numbers are taken. We are interrogated. That is the position; that is the attitude taken.

On the contrary, what have they done for South Vietnam? They have been trading with South Vietnam and selling strategic materials, the quantity and value of which had been increasing since 1971. This Government succumbed to US pressure and imposed a ban on trade with Cuba and North Vietnam. Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government took the plea that if we traded with North Vietnam, the articles might find their way to China. Now, we are trading with Nepal. Can anybody explain to us what are the measures you have in your hand to prevent those goods from passing on to China? There is no answer to it. We understand the ban on trading with Cuba and North Vietnam was imposed under express pressure from the American Government. They have been surrendering themselves to the US pressure, while rendering lip service to North Vietnam. There was a circular in the early 60s issued by the American Government on the Marines which had stated that any steamer carrying any goods for North Vietnam and touching any port of North Vietnam will be banned from carrying foodstuffs under American aid to India. Will you believe it, Sir, that they had recirculated that circular to all Central Government Departments of the Government of India? Mr Chagla, who was the Foreign Minister at that time, admitted in reply to a question of mine that no department will hire such steamer which had carried goods for North Vietnam. That is the character of this Government.

Mrs Gandhi is a socialist leader. During her visit to the United States in 1966, she had called this great butcher President Lyndon Johnson as a man of peace; That spoke for your outlook and for your assessment about the Vietnam war. We did not even try to stop this Indian beauty queen

Rita Faria from visiting South Vietnam and entertaining the American troops there. That young lady has been given a passport and visa to come back to India and visit her people here. That is the attitude we have seen.

How did they behave with the honourable lady, the Foreign Minister of P. R. G., Madame Binh? When she came here, not a single minister went to receive her Under US pressure, even her aircraft was being forbidden to land on the soil of India. Then after a lot of pressure that we exerted on the Government, Government agreed that her plane could land. I suggest that this Government should give up its timidity and sever diplomatic and trade relations with South Vietnam, the puppet Government which actually does not exist. It is criminal to have anything to do with this puppet Government of South Vietnam. Here and now Sardar Swaran Singh should make a statement demanding the stoppage of bombing immediately, withdrawal of United States and foreign troops from Vietnam and the whole of Indo-China and recognise fully PRG. Then, this Government must send a note to the United States Government, condemning its action and intimating the displeasure of the government and the people of the country over this. Then, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, on behalf of all of us, you should send a note to the US Government and intimate to them the great displeasure that the house has expressed today

I want a positive and definite reply and I expect the House will join me in saluting the heroic people of Vietnam.

SHRI S. A. KADER (Bombay-Central-South) : Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, some people have a knack of spoiling things. Here I find that my hon. friend, Shri Jyotirmoy Basu, has spoiled the feelings of the House by making it a party issue and trying to attack the majority party. The hon. Member, Shri S. D. Sharma, has made clear the stand taken by our



party on the Vietnam issue, Today morning we witnessed a scene in which all sides of the House, except, one or two, were clamouring for a debate here and now, and this should be the attitude and the spirit of this house, if we want to have an effective say on the barbarous atrocities that are being committed on the innocent people of Vietnam.

History has created people, both good and bad. We have many number of good people ; but we have bad people also. We had Timore, Chengiz Khan and Nadir Shah. Recently, we had Tikka Khan in East Bengal. Now it is the Nixon of America who is creating and recreating history by destroying the innocent people from the air.

During the Bangladesh crisis we saw Americans— and when I say Americans I mean the American Government ; American people are different—the American government and their friends kept quiet over the atrocities which were perpetrated in Bangladesh. Not only that, they instigated and inspired China to see that confrontation with India is complete and to see that Bangladesh is not made an independent sovereign State. Now that Bangladesh has become a reality, which even the Americans have recognised, they are now turning their attention to some other areas. As rightly pointed out, they are trying out their missiles, their weapons to see that they are properly tested

As far as this Vietnam question is concerned, we are worried today that but for the atom bomb everything is being tried out. We do not know, may be a moment will come when even the atom bomb may be used for the purpose of annihilating the people of Vietnam. Then, what would be the result ? It would be world confrontation. If this House, which is the representative of 550 million people, one of the largest democracies, does not take into account the international complication, then I think we shall be

failing in our duty if we do not raise our voice of disagreement, our voice of protest, our voice of saying that what you are doing is wrong.

What are we to do ? Mere speeches will not do. We will have to take some concrete action. Our Government can be requested to alert all the chanceries and embassies of the world. Just as we were creating opinion about Bangla Desh, it is high time that our embassies should consolidate the world opinion which is already created against the atrocities perpetrated by America in Vietnam.

The second thing that we should do, as pointed out by Shri Bosu, is that the ban on trade with North Vietnam should be lifted immediately and we should start trading with them. We should also recognise the provisional government of that country as soon as possible.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI :  
Immediately, today.

SHRI S. A. KADER : At the appropriate time. We should leave it to our Government.

We should in all our earnest efforts mobilise all such forces and people in the world and the Government should see that this is taken up in the United Nations, either in the Security Council or an urgent meeting of the United Nations may be called for this purpose. If we do this, then alone we would have done our duty so far as this humanity is concerned.

Let us at this moment not forget those victims, that too innocent victims, men, women and children, in Hanoi and all other places where they are bombed. Today we not only express our regret at the mass killings but also strongly protest against the barbaric attitude of the Nixon Government and all that they have done and are doing in Vietnam.

\*SHRI P. A. SAMINATHAN (Gobichettipalayam) Hon'ble Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, the House is now discussing the barbaric and inhuman bombing resorted to by the United States on Hanoi and Haiphong and I wish to participate in the discussion of such an important issue. On behalf of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam to which I have the honour to belong, I wish to condemn in the strongest possible terms this inhuman tragedy that is being enacted by the United States in Vietnam.

15 45 hrs

[SHRI N. K. P. SALVE in the Chair]

Sir, India is a member of the United Nations Security Council and this membership of the Security Council provided us with a golden opportunity to raise the issue of the atrocious and wholly condemnable activities of the United States in Vietnam. Unfortunately Sir, so far no action seems to have been initiated by our Government to have this matter raised in the United Nations Security Council. This, in my view, Sir needs an explanation from the hon. Minister of External Affairs. I would like the Government to tell the House as to why they did not think it fit to raise the matter in this important international forum.

The situation in Vietnam is getting worse day by day and the present uncivilised action of the United States only heightens the need for immediate action to put an end to the atrocities being committed by the United States in Vietnam. The entire world is shocked at the impunity with which the United States continues to perpetrate this ghastly tragedy in Vietnam. Every day the newspapers carry the stories and tales of suffering of the people of Vietnam at the hands of the United States forces now in operation in Vietnam. In London,

Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General of the United Nations talking to reporters expressed his horror at the bombing of North Vietnam cities by the United States.

Thousands of brave soldiers of Vietnam liberation forces are laying down their lives. This recent bombings by the United States had left behind many people killed. The attacks had been directed against the civilian targets. We can well imagine the colossal damage this bombing would have done to North Vietnam in terms of men and property when the air attacks were resorted to five times in a single day.

This being the situation in Vietnam, President Nixon simplistically proclaims that the issue in Vietnam must be solved by the people of Vietnam themselves. This attitude of Nixon stupefies the entire international community. Even the United States Senator Fulbright has condemned the attitude of Nixon. Reports have appeared in the papers condemning the postures of Nixon administration in relation to Vietnam.

Sir, the Government of India and more particularly Sardar Swaran Singh, hon. Minister of External Affairs, has told the House that India is taking all the steps to bring about peace in Vietnam and that it feels that all the foreign forces, including the United States forces, should withdraw from Vietnam. However, I would like to ask from the Government as to what concrete steps we have taken so far in furtherance of our objective. It is not enough to give expression to our views alone. We have to take some effective action. Sir, as I pointed out earlier, India will have to take up the matter on its own in the United Nations Security Council.

The conscience of the entire world was shocked when the inhuman and wholly barbaric drama the United States army perso-

\*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

nel perpetrated on the people of My Lai unfolded itself in the news papers. All the conventions of war were thrown to the winds. Women were raped and later killed. Others were just put to death. This being the background of the United States, their conscience was naturally not provoked when similar tragedies were being perpetrated by the blood-thirsty hoodlums of West Pakistan on the innocent masses of Bangla Desh. Not a word of sympathy was expressed by the United States Administration. They chose to remain the silent spectators of the heinous crimes committed by the Pakistani soldiers on the men and women and children of Bangla Desh. But, what is more, when the conflict between India and Pakistan arose, they did not lose any time to malign India in the United Nations Security Council. They sponsored resolutions in the Security Council and did not hesitate, contrary to all evidence, to even brand India as the aggressor. This being the totally anti-Indian attitude of the United States, it is really unfortunate that India had not raised the Vietnam issue in the Security Council and condemned the activities of that country strongly.

Sir, for the past two years, the Nixon Administration had been saying that they wished to withdraw their forces from the soil of Vietnam. They also assured the world that they were for "Vietnamisation" of the South Vietnam forces. Not only they took no steps in that direction, but they have done everything contrary to their publicly proclaimed stand. They have doubled the Seventh Fleet and their bombing activity had been resumed on a massive scale. This is an unparalleled perfidy of the Nixon Administration. They did not even hesitate to use bomb of 6800 kg.

Since the beginning of the war in Vietnam, 58 lakhs of people lost their lives and the people have been subjected to untold miseries. Seven million tons of bombs have been showered on the soil of Vietnam by the United States Air Force.

The United States, on the one hand, are carrying on peace talks with the leaders of the PRG of South Vietnam at Paris and on the other hand are resorting to all kinds of hostile activities against the people of Vietnam.

The sufferings of the people of Vietnam are at no less scale than what we saw in Bangla Desh. Unspeakable cruelties at the hands of the United States Army are the order of the day in Vietnam. We are discussing this grave matter to-day in the House and all sections of the House are unanimous in extending their sympathies to suffering brave humanity of Vietnam. Government have expressed their concern on the situation there. As we did in the case of Bangla Desh issue, when we mobilised by all methods the international opinion in favour of the people of Bangla Desh, we have to make the international community to become alive to this momentous and grave issue. The least the Government can do, even at the cost of repeating, I would say, is to raise immediately this issue in the Security Council.

The people of North Vietnam and South Vietnam are ethnically and culturally one. The division of Vietnam is illogical. This splitting up of Vietnam was solely responsible for bringing in the American imperialists there and the problems that followed.

While concluding, Sir, I wish to condemn the bombing activities of the United States on Vietnam once again.

**SHRI VASANTRAO PURUSHOTTAM SATHE (Akola):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is really a thousand pities that a great country and the great people of America should have to see this day the President feeling so utterly frustrated, defeated and desperate. That desperation has led to near-madness and he is raining on the small people of Vietnam the worst bombardment seen in history.

Sir, the United Nations was founded with the sole object of keeping peace in the

[Shri Vasantrao Purushottam Sathe]  
world, and one of the founders of the United Nations was the great President Roosevelt. Shall I recall, Sir, that the United Nations Charter opens with these words

"We, the people of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our life-time has brought untold sorrow to mankind and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights in the dignity and worth of the human person .."

It was with this object that they began to save mankind, and if any Government has violated the U N Charter and made the United Nations most weak in the comity of nations, it has been the American Government by that one single act of their involvement in Vietnam. I am sure, Sir, that President Roosevelt must be stirring in his grave to see the violation of the very object of the United Nations, to see the acts of his successor, particularly, Nixon. All this policy began with the Dulles' formula of containing communism. They wanted to contain communism by arms. That was the dullest policy ever evolved by any country in the world. The result is that they have not been able to contain communism by arms, and ultimately Nixon himself realised that communism could not be contained by arms. Therefore, he went with overtures of friendship and love to Mao and Chou and we thought that, now at least, these two big Powers had come together and that the first fruitful result of that friendship would be withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam and stoppage of bombardment. But, actually, we have seen that, after this friendship war in Vietnam has been escalated more and bombardment now has gone even beyond the 17th Parallel. Is this the outcome of friendship? We really hoped, and we still hope, that the big Power that China is, will be able to exert its pressure on this new friend of theirs to stop this bombardment and compel withdrawal. If China joins hands with USSR, India and other big

Powers on the world like France and U.K., I am sure, enough pressure can be generated on the United States to see that this barbaric bombardment is immediately stopped and the United States quits Vietnam lock, stock and barrel here and now. That is the only way by which it can be saved.

Arguments were advanced that, after all, they had gone there as advisers or friends of the South Vietnamese people at their invitation. It has been proved utterly false. We know what happens when the people of a particular country want to fight for their liberation freedom, and that has been amply demonstrated in Bangladesh. When people wanted to fight for their freedom a war was fought and the liberation succeeded in just fourteen days. Here, for more than 14 years, the attempt to Vietnamise has been going on and the more they try to Vietnamise, the more the people of Vietnam rebel against the Americans. What is this Vietnamisation? This is robotisation. People of Vietnam are not willing to fight. Now robots are being employed, automatic weapons and automatic bombs are employed to fight and to fire against the people.

16 hrs.

Every inch of Vietnam has been bombarded in the last more than two decades and poisoned and it is really surprising how these tiny small people living in these conditions of bombardment could practically live for two generations in that country. Yet, these small people have continued to fight this giant and that is the shame which is frustrating Nixon. He thought that by resorting to the popular slogan, 'I will withdraw my boys and bring them back', he would please the American people but we know what it is. Sir, we want to distinguish here the American people from the American administration because we know that by and large, the majority of the American people are against this barbaric and brutal action of Nixon administration. The motherhood of America is against sen-

ding her children and boys to fight this war because they know it is not America's war. They don't know that they are being sent as mercenaries to fight for a puppet in Vietnam and actually, crores of American motherhood, nay, the motherhood of the entire humanity and the world is anti-Nixon. Therefore, I have no hesitation in saying that the only thing that can solve this problem is to exert enough world pressure on Nixon administration. We are creating world public opinion. All methods that can be resorted to must be utilised. This is the time because we don't know. Nixon is out-Hitlering. Hitler because just now it was pointed out that more persons have been massacred probably than in the entire last World War. Recently, we witnessed it in Bangla Desh and now it is in Vietnam. All that massacre in Bangla Desh was possible only with the tacit consent and assistance of America and now in Vietnam also the same thing is continuing.

I believe that if it is necessary let us get together the nations of the world. We have seen unfortunately, the Security Council, because of the vote or whatever it is, is really not an effective forum. If it is necessary, let us take some steps to get together these world powers outside the United Nations, if recognising the PRG helps, let us recognise PRG. Let us take every step because I am afraid that if proper steps are not taken now, this war may spread because a mad man, we do not know, what he will do. There may be a conflagration engulfing this entire region and possibly, the whole world. Therefore, I submit that every possible step must be taken to see that this escalation, this major escalation is stopped, the bombing is stopped and the American troops are withdrawn and there is peace in this region.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी  
(म्बालियर) : सभापति महोदय, अनेक शताब्दियों से वियतनाम की जनता अपनी

स्वतन्त्रता के लिये, प्रभुसत्ता के लिये, संघर्ष कर रही है। पहले वह चीन से लड़ी थी, बाद में उसने आक्रमणकारी जापान से मोर्चा लिया, फिर उसने उपनिवेशवादी फ्रांस को पराजित किया, और आज दुनिया की सब से बड़ी शक्ति के साथ वियतनाम के लोग टक्कर ले रहे हैं। उनके संघर्ष में अमरीका को छोड़कर, जो वहाँ सीधे रूप से एक पक्ष बन गया है, अन्य बड़ी शक्तियाँ अपने कर्तव्य का पालन करने में विफल रही। ऐसा लगता है कि दुनिया की बड़ी ताकतों में वियतनाम के बारे में कोई गुप्त-चुप, अलिखित समझौता हो गया है जिस के कारण वियतनाम का मामला हल करने के लिये न तो संयुक्त राष्ट्र सभ में और जेनेवा सम्मेलन के बाद संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के बाहर कोई कदम उठाया गया।

वियतनाम की जनता, चाहे उत्तर में हो चाहे दक्षिण में, एक भयंकर संघर्ष में से गुजर रही है, बड़ी से बड़ी कीमत दे रही है। रक्तस्त्रित वियतनाम सारी मानवता के लिये चुनौती है, लेकिन दुनिया की बड़ी-बड़ी राजधानियाँ या तो केवल हथियार दे कर सन्तोष कर रही हैं या वियतनाम की सफलता की कामना कर के अपने कर्तव्य की इतिश्री समझ रही हैं।

1954 में जेनेवा सम्मेलन हुआ, जहाँ एक समझौता किया गया। उसके अन्तर्गत वियतनाम का विभाजन हुआ। श्री पैरल्ले, एक समानान्तर, रेखा खींच दी गई। जेनेवा में तब हुआ कि दो साल बाद चुनाव होंगे। लेकिन चुनाव नहीं हुए। अमरीका ने दक्षिण वियतनाम को सैनिक सहायता देना प्रारम्भ कर दिया। अमरीका में कोई कपड़े धोने का काम किया करते थे, उन्हें लाकर साउथ वियतनाम का राष्ट्रपति बना दिया गया।

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

उन्हे दक्षिण वियतनाम की जनता का समर्थन प्राप्त नहीं था। बहा निर्वाचन नहीं हुआ। वियतनाम की जनता को अभी तक अपनी इच्छा से अपनी तकदीर का फैसला करने का अवसर नहीं दिया गया।

भारत कंट्रोल कमिशन का चेअरमैन था। कंट्रोल कमिशन की जिम्मेदारी थी कि युद्धविराम का रक्षा करे और वियतनाम में चुनाव कराये। मुझे लगता है कि कंट्रोल कमिशन इन जिम्मेदारियों का पालन करने में विफल रहा है। हा सन्तता है कि उम को काम करने का मौका ही न दिया गया हो। लेकिन उसके बाद कंट्रोल कमिशन का बनाये रखने की जरूरत नहीं थी। भारत उस से त्याग-पत्र देकर अलग हो सकता था। कंट्रोल कमिशन खाली कमिशन ही है, उसके हाथ में कंट्रोल कोई नहीं है अभी तक यह भी पता नहीं है कि जेनेवा समझौते का उल्लंघन किस ने प्रारम्भ किया। इस बारे में परस्पर विरोधी रिपोर्ट आती रही है। उत्तर वियतनाम से ऐसी कार्रवाइयों की खबरें आई हैं जिन के कारण अमरीकी शासन को अमरीकी जनता की आँखों में धूल भोक कर अपने को वियतनाम के सघष में फसाने का मौका मिल गया। पैटागान पेपर्स प्रकाशित हो गए हैं। किन कारणों से अमरीका वहाँ फसा, यह अब कोई पहेली नहीं रही। वियतनाम का सघर्ष मुख्य रूप से एक राष्ट्रीय आजादी का सघर्ष है। वियतनाम कम्युनिस्ट बने या न बने, यह प्रश्न गौण है। पहले वियतनाम पूरी तरह स्वाधीन होना चाहिये। दूसरी बात यह है कि भारत ऐसा वियतनाम देखना चाहेगा और केवल वियतनाम ही नहीं, लाओस भी, कम्बोडिया भी, जो स्वतंत्र हो, तटस्थ हो, न्यूट्रल हो, नान लाइड हो, जो किसी गुट के साथ अपने को न बांधे और इस

क्षेत्र में भ्रान्ति के निर्माण में योगदान दें। इस प्रकार का वियतनाम युद्ध में से नहीं निकलेगा। मेरा निवेदन है कि बड़ी ताकत वियतनाम की लड़ाई को एक गैर हाजिरी की लड़ाई के रूप में चलाने की कोशिश न करें। अमरीका उलझ गया है। अमरीका वहाँ से निकलना चाहता है लेकिन निकलते निकलते अपना चेहरा बचाने की कोशिश में है जिस के बचने की कोई सम्भावना दिखाई नहीं देती। रूस हथियार भेज रहा है लेकिन यू० एन० में या उसके बाहर यह मामला हल हो जाए, इस दृष्टि में प्रभावी रूप से सक्रिय नहीं हुआ है। पेंकिंग के नेता बड़े चतुर हैं। वे वियतनाम के सघष का लाभ उठा कर अमरीका के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध सुधारने और अपनी मिलता की पूरी कीमत वसूलने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि भारत इस मामले में पहल कर सकता है। सयुक्त राष्ट्र सच में यह मामला न उठाने का कोई अनित्य नहीं है। मुझे डा० शर्मा की इस बात को सुन कर बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ कि वहाँ वीटो है, कोई निषेधाधिकार का प्रयोग करेगा। लेकिन वीटो होते हुए भी बमला देश का मामला क्या वहाँ नहीं उठा था? कौन कितने पानी में है यह पता लग सकता है। आज अमरीका भी यू० एन० में है, सोवियत रूस भी है और चीन भी है। कम में कम वहाँ जाकर हम माग कर सकते हैं, सुरक्षा परिषद में यह आवाज उठा सकते हैं कि वियतनाम का युद्ध बन्द होना चाहिये, अखिलम्ब बन्द होना चाहिये, अमरीका बम वर्षा रोक दे और उत्तर वियतनाम भी यह वचन दे कि जब तक समझौता नहीं होता तब तक वह कोई भडकाने वाली कार्रवाई नहीं करेगा।

दूसरी बात यह है कि एक तारीख तय होनी चाहिये जिस तारीख पर अमरीकी सेनाएं

वियतनाम छोड़ कर चली जाएं और जितने भी युद्धबन्दी बनाए गए हैं, उनको भी रिहा कर देना चाहिये। भारत को इस बात का भी प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि एक तिथि तय की जाए जिस पर वियतनाम में निष्पक्ष और स्वतन्त्र चुनाव हो सके और वियतनाम की जनता अपनी तकदीर का फैसला कर सके। हमें प्रसन्नता होगी अगर वियतनाम एक नान-एलाइड और एक तटस्थ राज्य के रूप में विकसित होने का सकल्प करे। इसके साथ विश्व जनमत को जगाने का काम होना चाहिये। जैसे अभी कहा गया अमरीका का एक बहुत बड़ा वर्ग वियतनाम में चल रहे युद्ध के पक्ष में नहीं है। लेकिन अमरीकी शासन एक ऐसे सकट में फँस गया है जिस में निकलने का कोई रास्ता नहीं सूझ रहा है। राष्ट्रपति डिगाल ने अमरीका को चेतावनी दी थी कि जहाँ से फ्रांस निकल रहा है अगर वहाँ अमरीका फँसने की गलती करेगा तो अमरीका के लिए निकलना कठिन हो जाएगा। अमरीका के नेताओं ने, और मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि केवल श्री निक्सन का मवाल नहीं है, वियतनाम के मामले में गलती तब से आरम्भ की जब से अमरीका ने जेनेवा के सम्मेलन में अपने को अलग रखने का फैसला किया, अमरीका ने जेनेवा सम्मेलन से अपने को बाधा नहीं और उसके बाद अमरीका वियतनाम में ऐसी कोशिश करता रहा कि जिससे जो राष्ट्रीय मुक्ति का सपना है उसके बीच में और कम्युनिस्टों के साथ चलने वाले युद्ध के बीच में विभाजक रेखा बहुत पतली हो गई।

16.15 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

मुझे वियतनाम जाने का मौका मिला था। मैंने वहाँ जाने के बाद कहा था कि

अमरीका की जनता इस बात को संभ्रम ले कि वियतनाम अपनी स्वाधीनता के लिए लड़ रहा है और वह किसी का उपनिवेश बनकर रहना स्वीकार नहीं करेगा। वह निरंतर आजादी के लिए लड़ता रहेगा। और स्वाधीन होने की उसकी कामना का हमें धाँवर करना चाहिये। एक न एक दिन अमरीका को वियतनाम छोड़कर जाना पड़ेगा। भारत सरकार वियतनाम की जनता की पीड़ा, वेदना और उसके कष्ट सहन को कम करने के लिए अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में अग्रर कोई ठोस और प्रभाव कारंवाई करेगी तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस गुप्तरी में से कोई रास्ता निकल सकता है। यह कसौटी है एक रचनात्मक राजनीतिज्ञता की, आज कसौटी है नई दिल्ली की कि हम इस में कोई सचमुच में सक्रिय महायत्ना दे सकते हैं या नहीं। केवल भावनाओं का प्रकटीकरण पर्याप्त नहीं है। बम वर्षा की निन्दा करने में सारा सदन और सारा देश साथ है। लेकिन निन्दा करना मात्र वियतनाम की समस्या का हल नहीं निकल सकता। उसके लिए नीतिमत्ता की, कूटनीतिज्ञता की कसौटी पर कस कर भारत सरकार को अपने को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में प्रभावी सिद्ध करना हीमा और मैं चाहता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री महोदय जब इस चर्चा का उत्तर दे तो थोड़ा सा संकेत दें कि लसे पता लग सके कि सचमुच में इस स्थिति में हम कुछ करने लायक है या नहीं और अगर करने लायक हैं तो क्या करने लायक है।

अब तो भारत सरकार एशियाई सुरक्षा की बात कर रही है। एशिया के देशों में सहयोग बढ़े, सद्भावना बढ़े, इसके लिए हमारे प्रयत्न, अगर हम चाहते हैं कि सफल हो तो वियतनाम के संघर्ष के बारे में केवल मौखिक सहानुभूति प्रकट करके हम उस समस्या को हल करने

### [श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

में योगदान नहीं दे सकते। बड़ी शक्तियाँ जब तक इस भूखंड में हस्तक्षेप पर तुली हुई हैं चाहे फिर वह प्रत्यक्ष रूप से हों या अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से, तब तक एशियाई देश निकट नहीं आ सकते, उनमें सहयोग और सदभावना की हमारी कल्पना सफल नहीं हो सकती। मुझे लगता है कि एशियन सिक्योरिटी पैक्ट की चर्चा करने से पहले हमें वियतनाम के संघर्ष को शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से और वियतनाम की जनता के हित में हल करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। इस दिशा में भारत सरकार पहल कर के दिखाए यदि उसने ऐसा किया तब तो फिर एशिया में ऐसा बातावरण बन सकता है जिसमें छोटे-छोटे देश अपनी अल्पहता के प्रति दाश्चस्व होकर और जनता की राय से अपनी शासन व्यवस्था, संघर्ष व्यवस्था का संचालन कर सकते हैं, प्रत्यक्षा नहीं। इस दिशा में बड़ी शक्तियों के साथ भारत भी अपने कर्तव्य का पालन करने में कुछ विफल ही रहा है। अब हम देखें कि इस संघर्ष की चढ़ी में मैं दिल्ली क्या नेतृत्व देती है।

**SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON**  
(Trivandrum): Mr. Speaker, this debate takes place not in the context of the North Vietnam bombing incident or of another chapter in the tale of atrocities that have been committed in that part of Indo-China, but we are now concerned because the present phase of this aggression and war is one that well-nigh threatens world peace on a large scale; and secondly, the remedies that might be suggested from various places, including this House, might perhaps have the effect of rebounding on itself by invoking a machinery which prevents Vietnamese resistance.

Therefore, I would like to say a few words about this. First of all, much have been said about Indian's responsibilities

I am not one of those who want to say that India has not shouldered those responsibilities nor discharged them from time to time. But equally, there have been lapses. The main responsibility we have is in suggesting to and persuading the Indo-China parties to agree to the acceptance of the Commission. The Commission would have been accepted in 1954 by the Indo-China parties, whether it be Vietnam or any other, but for the fact that India was leading the Commission and by her persuasion the other party had come in in that way, because the Indochina people were not willing to accept Canada at that time, though Canada during that period, in the south-eastern world, was regarded as part of the British system. That is one of our great responsibilities. I will come to that in a moment.

But the situation here today is one in which we have to remind ourselves and bring the responsibility of the United States home in this matter. I want to say at once, not because Mr. Pilo Mody is sitting in front of me,—this castigation or indictment or criticism or analysis of it is not anti-American propaganda; we are not against the United States of America; nobody is. We are against the policies of the United States of America which led to the world war, which suppressed the liberation movement of the peoples, and what is more, which introduced a new doctrine that, like the British had been before, God created the Englishmen to police the world. No such thing happened so far as I know. I do not know anything about God, and I do not think anyone would say that. It is too much of a job. In this way, this predatory mission of the Seventh Fleet travelling all over the world, as though international custom permits it, is something that threatens our security.

There was a time in this country when United States turned down to our Prime Minister and said, "You cannot send this particular element to a certain part of the world because it may of use to the manu-



facture of atomic weapons, and therefore, you must take it off your ship." And he said, "We can go through your roof; we can send it wherever we like." The position today is that this country acts upon its sovereignty.

Now, we come to the question of the violations. First of all, the aggressive war in Indochina, it is needless to say, is a violation of international law; a violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter. But over and above that, the large number of Geneva conventions—I am not talking about the Geneva Conference—the convention in relation to the treatment of the prisoners of war, the convention in relation to the use of gases in 1925—she has not signed—and then the other conventions in regard to genocide, the human rights convention, the convention in regard to the articles of Nuremberg in regard to war crimes—if one had the time one can tabulate, and they are numerous—they are all international violations, and also violations of the convention or the laws of the sea, where inland waters are regarded as open waters by them and warships go in. It is a total violation against the international law, and international anarchy has been let loose by American aggression in Vietnam.

Then, I will come to the domestic aspects of it. I want to say at once, I would not like to be guilty or take upon myself to say anything, to give expression to anything which may mean that even a private individual in this country wants to say who should be elected President of the United States. That is their business. So far as I am concerned, they are all about the same. There have been Democratic Presidents as well as Republican Presidents. Anyway, it is not our business. It is highly improper.

But when violations of their own municipal laws or their own internal laws are of such a character that makes the war illegal, then it is my business; that is to say, this war is waged against the American

law itself. The United States accepted the articles of Nuremberg by a declaration in the Congress, and thereby, it is not only a violation of the Nuremberg articles but violation of the American law itself, and sending large numbers of people illegally, and thereby—without using any strong language—committing international brigandage at the instance of someone who has no authority to do so.

The other aspect of it is—again it is a border-line the release and the utilisation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, under the United States law, is the privilege, the monopoly and the function of the President of the United States. That is to say, the coupling of those bombs by the person to drop it; he is told that whatever system it is, when he is flying and drops the bomb, the security, the survival of this world, is relegated to one person; and there have been instances of presidents going mad; not this one; I am not talking of this one. Therefore, it is far too much of a responsibility to be entrusted to any one individual.

The US is guilty of violation of international law not only in the general sense, not only in the sense of the UN Charter in the sense of various commitments than she accepted particularly the commitment in the Geneva Conference when Mr. Dulles said and issued a statement: we will do nothing to upset the arrangements that have been made by the conference but also other conventions on the treatment of the prisoners of war, about cruelty, about the use of gas and other weapons which cover defoliation, whereby means of life had been taken away. Large parts of Indo-China would not be fit for agricultural processes for a long time; not only human beings but the whole soil has been poisoned; because the jungle was giving protection, they took away the leaves so that they can see right through them. This process of strip-tease act on the trees has created a situation where when the war is over the population faces other disasters.

[Shri V.K. Krishna Menon]

Then you come to the question of the present situation. Here, it seems under your procedures no one can say things at the right time, I mean no disrespect to the Chair; I only mean that for this debate you have had to wait for ten days. It has been reported that the Foreign Minister said the other day Mr Krishna Menon was there and he did not invoke the Security Council. First of all there is such a thing as this doctrine, as times change conditions change. But apart from that I have never asked for the invocation of the Security Council. I know what will happen. The Security Council will pass a resolution unless the Russians veto it, asking the Viet-namees to stop fighting just as they asked us recently. I have no desire to invoke the machinery of the United Nations for this purpose. It is a total misunderstanding to say that the Security Council or the General Assembly or the other organs including the Human Rights Commission have got other functions when there is danger to the world, apart from local wars when there is threat to peace in the world. The Security Council irrespective of previous commitments comes forward in order to stop that threat of world war. That threat of world war is on account of the intervention of the United States.

The next aspect of the question is in regard to negotiations. It would be a bad thing if it went out from this House that even in the worst circumstances we thought the only way of solving the dispute is by war, that is to say ultimately. The Viet-namees say that there is not only room for negotiation but there must be negotiation. Negotiations for what? Negotiations for vacating aggression that is to say for the withdrawal of these troops, to assure that Americans would not be killed and the other people would not be killed, and that arrangements may be made for them to get out in the same way as the British and French troops did after the depredations over the Suez, too see that a machinery is provided for them to go out. In that sense

there is room for negotiation. It is that negotiation that the United States sabotages because it was clear that there were no real difficulties about the withdrawal. It is said that if they withdrew too quickly, then all people will be killed. They do not want to accept the pledges and commitments of the Viet-namees people that they will observe this, that are the other. That is the purpose of the negotiations. That negotiation should have the approval of all responsible people.

But at the present time we have a situation where war is raging on a large scale, where bombing is far more intensive and there are greater bomb loads than at any corresponding time including the round-the-clock bombing of Germany by the Allies. More children have been killed in Viet Nam by bombing than the total destruction of human lives in Germany during the last world war. We can go into various other things but you could not come to any conclusion by merely reciting the atrocities. There are cruelties, disembowling, various other things which should come before the Genocide Convention of the Human Rights Commission and persons concerned, President Nixon in this case, Secretary of State and other warlords they would have to come up for trial, if international law were to have its play as in Nuremberg, they will have to come before such a Commission.

I am sure the Foreign Minister would not take it as any thing except political criticism. I regret the statement made by the Foreign Minister in this House that the PRG did not qualify for recognition. Who are we to say this?

Who are we to say that the PRG does not qualify for recognition? Beginning with bamboo sticks, they have gained control over four fifths of the territory, that is to say their sovereign rights over the territory. I do not want to treat this as a seminar on international law, but what are the criteria for recognition? Firstly,

territory. That they have got. Secondly, Government. That also they have got. People owe allegiance to them. The third criterion is whether they are able to perform their obligations. If they were not able to perform their obligations or near enough to do so, the Government of India or the Foreign Minister would not have invited the Foreign Minister of the PRG to come here. That is to say they do qualify in this way. But I am not saying that either this House or any one of us should tell the Government when to recognise and whom to recognise. That is their responsibility. If they make a mistake, they suffer for it as they did in the matter of East-Bengal.

What is our duty in this matter? I would say only one or two things. We cannot say that public opinion in this country has been activated by those who are able to activate it for our purpose. I will not go into details. There is not a large volume of opinion that a neighbouring country is sought to be annihilated. There is no doubt that the purpose of this war, so far as the American side is concerned, is the annihilation of those people, and that is why the war is being waged in this way.

Secondly, we have not raised the question that the war is being waged from American territory. From the east coast point of Indo-China, the west coast point of the United States is 1800 miles away. There is no allegation that at any time the Viet Nameese have even as much as thrown a stone at America, that any American life has been endangered on American territory.

The presence of the United States in Viet Nam is itself a violation of the Geneva Agreement and all aspects of international law. They have no business to be there, because they went in there in order to stop communism, as they said. It was not stopped in China or Russia, and they tried to stop it in Indo China. What is more, after that it was said that they had gone, privately of course, in order to pre-

vent communism getting into India—there are lots of them here—so that communist invasion may not come to India. These things do not wash, and they are like political manifestoes and so on. They are useful sometime, but nobody believes them.

We have a situation where war is waged on such a scale that it is no longer a local issue, and I must think that we must hope that this is the last phase of this war. The last phase of this war is when Saigon falls. If Saigon does not fall, the war will continue, and I cannot say whether they will get so far or they will have to make another effort. It should be over endeavour to see that the forces that are trying to liberate Saigon should be assisted to do so in every possible way. No one suggests that this country should lead an expeditionary force, allow its Navy, whatever its size, to go into these waters. But the first elementary, essential step is that this Government should recognise the PRG of Viet Nam. If you do not, it means that you have no confidence in these people being able to liberate the whole country. It means that we are holding the scales even, as the British did between Pakistan and ourselves. And therefore, the first responsibility that we have is the recognition of the position of the Revolutionary Government. At any rate, we have no right to say that they do not qualify for recognition. I think it is really a thing against them.

Thirdly, it is necessary that in the United Nations, while the Security Council cannot be invoked that way, if our diplomacy is sufficiently energetic, there are various other ways in which world public opinion can be utilised through that organisation.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godbra) :

On this solemn occasion, we have to recognise that what is happening in Viet Nam has happened in many parts of the world. All of us abhor war, we abhor violence, we detest the destruction of vast territories and innocent lives of people and the atrocities that we have come to learn that

[Shri Piloo Mody]

mankind can commit on other members of the species. It is to protect us all that we have over the years tried to develop a system of security, a system of laws, which we have tried to embody, as my hon. friend, Mr Krishna Menon, put it, in the various charters and conventions that all the countries of the world have come to accept as international law governing the affairs between countries and people. It is this deviation from the rule of law which we all should accept that has resulted in human misery. I cannot think of a single country in the whole world, not excluding ours, which on occasions has not tried to cut corners and deviate from the rule of law as laid down by the UN in its various charters and tried to do things which have resulted in large-scale human misery and loss of many lives

There is a peculiar observation that the larger the country, the stronger it is, the greater is its folly. The United States emerged out of the second world war as not only a very large country which it has always been but also as the strongest country in the world. I think history after the last world war indicate that the United States has committed more folly than any other country in the world, closely followed by the Soviet Union, which in strength and size is large and has also done the same things and deviated from the same rule of law, the same principles which we have all sworn to uphold. We are supposed to be the largest democracy in the world and we are also gaining in strength from day to day. I would very much like to hope that the folly that has been committed by the large powers is not committed by us.

On this particular issue of Vietnam, I would make an earnest plea not only to this House but to everybody in the world: Let us leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. Let them decide their own future. Let them decide for themselves what form of Government they want. Let them decide

for themselves who shall lead them. Let us for Christ's sake leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. Most of all, I would like to tell the United States, leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. I would like to tell the Soviet Union, leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. I would like to tell the Chinese, leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. I would like to tell the people of our own country, leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. And, I would like to tell this Parliament, leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. I would like to tell all the interested members here, leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. Finally, I would like to tell the North Vietnamese to leave South Vietnam to the South Vietnamese. Thank you.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh)

Sir, I am one with the hon. members in this House who have said that the struggle in Vietnam is a struggle for national liberation. But I would add that it is not merely a struggle for the liberation of North Vietnam or of South Vietnam or of Indo-China as such. But it is the continuation of the struggle of the Asian people for their liberation. It is the symbol of the people all over the world who are struggling for independence and for equality. As such, it is a matter which is not only of interest to us but it is a matter which concerns us deeply.

I agree with the hon. Member, Shri Piloo Mody, when he says that we should request the United States or others to leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. He was conveying his views that the United States should leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. I agree with him to the extent, that we should all leave the Vietnamese to determine their internal matters. But we cannot leave it to anybody when freedom is in jeopardy. Then it is our duty as citizens of the world, as a responsible country, as a responsible government, to take interest in the preservation of peace, in the elimination of domination and colonialism. I do not agree with the hon.

Member, Shri Piloo Mody, that we should leave the Vietnamese struggle to the Vietnamese people only. It is part of our struggle. What happened when the Seventh Fleet came into the Bay of Bengal? How did we feel then? Can we say that we shall ignore altogether where and how the Seventh Fleet, or any other number fleet, goes and does what it likes? Is it not part of our duty, as an independent country to express our views; not only express our views but to participate together with other members of the comity of nations in the preservation of peace and in the defence of the people who are being oppressed today?

Much has been said about the atrocities in Vietnam. Mylai and so many other incidents have been discussed in this House and elsewhere. I do not wish to repeat them. But I would like to read out a small portion of an article which I happened to read the other day. It gives a somewhat graphic account of what is happening in Vietnam today. This is a study made by the Cornell University and not by the Vietnamese people :-

"A Cornell University study has calculated that this is equivalent to two and a half Hiroshimas a month or a ton of bombs every minute. The total of 6.3 million tons of bombs dropped on Indo-China from 1965 to 1971 represents 250 lbs. for every man, woman and child in Indo-China, or 22 tons for every square mile of territory and is more than twice the 3.1 million tons of bombs dropped during world war II in all the theatres of fighting and the Korean war combined."

Then it goes on to say how the United States in its efforts to force Asians to fight Asians is now trying to put out what is called an electronic war. Vietnam has become a laboratory, a place to try out new weapons that the United States is developing like Pave Phantom, Smart

bomb, Laser Bomb, TV bomb and Command Vault and so on. It adds :

"To these must be added the pineapple bomblets (each of which can spew out 250,000 steel pellets in a horizontal pattern across the bombed area), the flechette (meant to drive several hundred one inch barbed nails through human bodies, shredding muscles and body organs) ....."

Here is Asia being made a laboratory to try out electronic war by one of the super powers. How can we in this House sit quietly and wait for these bombs, these weapons, to be perfected in Asia, to be used against Asians, maybe in Indo-China today and in India tomorrow? Can we say that it is not our concern? Can we say that it is not our duty to see that the destruction of human lives and the values for which our own people have given their lives should be allowed to be destroyed, as we sit and wait in this House?

Besides this, there is an obligation on us as the Chairman of the International Control Commission. The House is aware how the struggle of the Vietnamese people culminated in what was the Geneva Conference in 1954 and an expectation that that would end the colonial rule in Vietnam. The Geneva Conference was basically an exercise in enabling the colonial power, France, to find a face-saving formula for leaving Vietnam and enabling the people of Vietnam to take over.

Then, suddenly we found that France had left but the United States stepped into the shoes of France. How the United States came into the picture seems to be amazing. Having come into the picture, what did they do? They keep on changing the governments in South Vietnam; they kept on picking up and throwing out Presidents and they kept on doing so many other things which have been mentioned in newspapers but which I would not wish to repeat in this House.

(Shri Dinesh Singh)

Then, what do the United States say? They say that they must be satisfied that there would be such-and-such arrangement before they can go. Who are the United States to decide or even request, much less demand, that they should be satisfied? How would the people of the United States have felt had some outside power said, when there was a civil war in the United States, that they should decide how that war was to end and how the wishes of the people were to be ascertained at the end of the civil war? Can we say that any outside country has a right to decide how people will conduct their affairs, settle their disputes and sort out their affairs? This is exactly the position in South Vietnam today.

The people of South Vietnam, who have grouped themselves round the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, have gone to the furthest limit to accommodate opinions of everybody, including that of the United States, to say that they would be willing to negotiate, discuss and see that foreign troops are withdrawn, to give every satisfaction to those countries which have troops there, to ensure that all their troops will be withdrawn free from damage and also that their would be a transitory government which will arrange for elections. I do not think that one could expect from the Government of South Vietnam a better deal than this, that they are satisfying all the interests which have interposed themselves in South Vietnam.

And yet, the United States continues to step up its war efforts, to go on from the conventional war weapons to electronic ones some of which I read out just now, and on to the dangers of a nuclear war. Maybe, they will find some nuclear weapon which will be on the borderline, which will have a nuclear explosion but which will be given some other name, and then they will try it out in Vietnam. It is an exercise in pushing us, so long as we are

willing to accept being pushed by the United States. They go on increasing their capacity to destroy; they go on increasing the size of the bombs, the rapidity with which they are dropping them and the number of planes that are dropping them.

What, after all, is a nuclear bomb? It is a weapon of mass destruction. If they can destroy entire Vietnam without the use of a nuclear bomb, there is hardly any need for it. But what is the end result? Human life is being lost, property is being destroyed, and their natural wealth is being destroyed. There is chemical war, electronic war and there may be some kind of a semi-nuclear war.

How long are we going to wait? Where do we stop? After they have used some kind of a nuclear bomb, maybe, we shall again sit and discuss this and pass some resolution.

I agree that in the conduct of affairs affecting other nations one cannot impose one's will. I agree with the hon. Member, Shri Krishna Menon, who has had every great personal knowledge of the negotiations during the Geneva Conference, that we cannot send an expeditionary force. But is there anything other than the sending of an expeditionary force and the forcing of our opinion? I say, there is something, and that is the mobilisation of the international community.

What did we do in Bangladesh? For 10 months, we watched and when the people of Bangladesh suffered, we were mobilising the international opinion. Are we doing that today in relation to Vietnam? The hon. Minister made a statement in this House on the 10th of April. It is a statement I would commend for its brevity. It says:

"The Government of India have always opposed these bombing raids and they hope that these bombing will stop immediately."

If the bombings could have stopped so easily, they would have done many years ago. This is a kind of statement we have made on several occasions. But the thing is that we stop there.

The question is: Has the Minister of External Affairs invited the American Ambassador? Has our Ambassador seen American officials in Washington? Have we talked to the Asian Ambassadors? Have our representatives— I appreciate our Ambassadors are here in a meeting in New Delhi—the *charge-d'affaires* talked to the Governments in other Asian countries? Have we approached the African countries? Have we approached the Latin American countries? Have we tried to mobilise the world opinion? There is also another forum, the United Nations, the Security Council or the General Assembly. I have no doubt that the Foreign Minister will give thought to this matter because it is a matter which concerns us very deeply.

Today, when we talk of living in a cooperative world, we must accept that there will be aberrations, that there will be difficulties. But we must equally recognise that there are ways of dealing with it. The United States cannot live in isolation; the United States cannot dominate the world. There are other forces. And the strongest force is the will of the people. There will be, I think, no other record in the annals of history of bravery and courage as that displayed by the people of Vietnam in their struggle against the world's mightiest power today.

There is, I think, a need for us to stand for their support. There is much talk today of an Asian approach, of Asian security. Here is an example where Asian security is being violated. Asian lives are being lost. Asian independence is being subjugated. It is a matter where our diplomacy will be put to test. But I am equally conscious that these responsibilities are in the safe hands of

our Foreign Minister and that he will make every effort to bring about a solution which will not only uphold the honour and dignity and the independence of the people of Vietnam but will also give honour and respect to the policy of the Government of India. It is a matter in which we have got to take an initiative. We have accepted the responsibility, an international responsibility, as the Chairman of the International Control Commission which is charged with the implementation of the Geneva Agreement. What is the essence of the Geneva Agreement? I would say that the essence of the Geneva Agreement is to bring about the independence of Vietnam. How do we bring about the independence of Vietnam? A procedure has been laid down a procedure that was agreed to. If that is not being implemented, we have got to see whether there are other alternatives to bring about the recognition of the government in Vietnam. And that is, if other efforts fail, we must make it clear now, and declare that, if other efforts fail, if the United States does not immediately stop bombing, we shall have no option but to recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government as a token of our faith in the people of Vietnam.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA** (Begusarai). Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do realise that on a subject on which there is almost a national consensus the debate at a certain stage is bound to be of a repetitive nature. But the repetitiveness of the debate only emphasises the fact that there is near unanimity in the country on the subject.

16.55 hrs.

[**SHRI N. K. P. SALVE** in the Chair]

To my mind, Mr. Chairman, the present situation is the result of failures all round.

There has been failure at the level of the United Nations. We can hardly imagine a world body sitting supine while an in-

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

numerable number of people have been killed and almost a nation stands in the danger of being decimated

Then there had been the failure on the part of the International Control Commission. It has existed only in name.

Similarly, Mr Chairman, the super Powers which have appropriated to themselves the duty of maintaining peace in the world have done precious little in this direction, in the direction of solving this problem.

Also the contribution of the non-aligned nations has not been in evidence to any extent so far as this vast tragedy that has been enacted for a pretty long time is concerned.

Our contribution too, the contribution of our Government, more particularly when you consider that we have been the Chairman of the International Control Commission, has been negligible, and it seems as if there has been no Commission and India has not been the Chairman of the Commission.

So we find ourselves in the present situation. It does seem to me that we are meeting at one of the most critical moments in the history of Asia. Perhaps Asia had not undergone a more critical period even during the Second World War. This is a moment of decision for the United States, but, equally, it is a moment for coming out of the warm bath complacency so far as the Asian nations are concerned. It appears now that Asia is sought to be converted into the cockpit of another world war. There is now a measure of stability and peace in Europe and, therefore, the arena of conflict is sought to be somehow shifted to Asia. A special responsibility rests on Asians to see that Asia is not sucked into another vortex of war. So, Mr Chairman, I was thinking whether it is not imperative on the part of Asians to

take an initiative in this matter, and whether India, as the Chairman of the International Control Commission, could not, in collaboration with other countries of the world which are so-minded, take an initiative in the matter of convening a Conference of Asians.

Now, in the past such Conferences have been held and I do not want to cite those examples which must be very much in the minds of the hon Members at the moment. But, it appears to me that this is one of the categorical imperatives of the present situation that such a conference must be held without delay.

17 hrs

Now it has been emphasized by so many hon Members that the people of Vietnam had given an example of a will which cannot be conquered by the mightiest power in the world. And may I say that at this moment our thoughts go to the great revolutionary leader, Ho Chi-Minh, who provided a unique leadership to his people, a leadership which has not been rivaled for centuries, a leadership which has steered the determination of the people which has not flagged even after the disappearance of the leader from the scene.

Now, how much have they suffered? When we remember that, it sends a shudder down our spine. There are few people in the world who would not like to emulate their example when it comes to seeking national identity and liberating their country from the foreign clutches. It is not my intention to repeat most of the suggestions which have been made by hon Members, but a few suggestions bear a repetition.

In the first instance, I must say that we are clearly of the opinion that this brutal bombing by the Americans must cease without delay. But how is it going to come about? Can it be brought about by the expression of a pious will by



the Parliament of India? In fact, we are proud of the Parliament of India that it has taken the earliest opportunity of expressing the sentiments and feelings of the entire nation on this subject, but we would have been equally proud of this Government if it had come out with a resolution expressing the feelings and sentiments of the entire nation instead of throwing the whole subject into a kind of a peculiar wishy-washy discussion . . . (Interruptions)

It is also very clear that our countrymen would like that the Americans withdrew from the scene and allowed the Vietnamese problem to be settled without the benefit of the American bombs. This is another thing which must be made abundantly clear to the Americans

It must also be in the interests of America, which now seems to find itself in a great predicament, and is almost caught in the cleft of a stick as it were, that they must not stick to the regime of Mr. Thieu and they must try to go by the doctrine of recognising fact. If there is going to be a solution without Mr. Thieu, the Americans should not fight shy of agreeing to such a solution

These are some of the things which must be made clear to the Americans and, at the same time, if we as a Government, that is, as the Government of India, take some steps in the direction of convening an Asian Conference, I hope there would be a distinct change in the situation. Probably, the moment it comes to be known to the Americans and to the other side also that there is an initiative in this direction, there is bound to be a relaxation of tension and of conditions in which the issue may be taken away from the battle-field to the conference table. That must be the first step in this direction and I have no manner of doubt that if things are allowed to develop in their own way, South Vietnam would develop into the Yugoslavia of Asia.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What do you mean by this ?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : If he wants to know what exactly do I mean by this, I would say that it would not develop like a satellite Communist country, but as an independent country. With these words, Mr. Chairman. I express my complete agreement with the sentiments expressed by other hon. Members of the House so far as the complete denunciation of this escalation in the situation in Vietnam is concerned.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Bada eara) Mr Chairman, despite the two interventions from the two extremes of the political spectrum, one from the extreme right, from Mr. Pilo Mody and another from the extreme left, from Mr. Jyotirmov Bosu, the debate so far has shown that the heart and soul of this country and this Government and my party is absolutely sound, and that we stand by the commitments which we have inherited from our own struggle for freedom and of our own policies and manifestoes, that is, concern for world peace, anti-imperialism and that concept of Jawaharlal Nehru, that is, of Asian solidarity.

I was a bit sorry to listen to Mr. Pilo Mody when he talked of isolationism and said 'leave Vietnam to Vietnamese'. I do not know whether he would have said the same thing about the brave people of Bangla Desh, and said let these people bleed to death, when unheard of massacre was going on there. It is unimaginable that when there is naked aggression against some Asian people, our friends and our neighbours, we should leave them to their own fate. I am so sorry for what he has said. I must say it is rather shameful on his part to have said this in this House. What we are concerned with today is the dastardly attack of imperialism against the freedom and sovereignty of a brave people. It is against a friendly country, a country

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

with whom we have close ties. And I must remind the House that it is a country with whom we have diplomatic relations. The saga of Vietnam is a saga of supreme human achievement, a seminal event which has changed the course of history. We have never seen such a valiant fight anywhere, at any period of history. I would invite the attention of the House to the scenario of Vietnamese history. It is not the first time that they are fighting for freedom. They have fought against the Mongols, they have fought against the Manchus, against the Japanese, against the French, and now they are fighting against the Americans, and I am sure that this House will agree with me that the struggle for their liberty will succeed whatever much Pilo Modys might say or think. Their determination is something unique. The tragedy which they have faced since 1965 when the United States stepped up aggression, escalated this war, can be imagined from the scale of their own efforts. They had built about 50,000 km of trenches and 21 million individual shelters. It is not true to say that it is with Russian supplies or Chinese supplies alone that they are fighting the war in Vietnam. It is those brave and heroic people of Vietnam in their tiny hamlets who are fighting the struggle in Vietnam.

I want to say this, because it has been suggested in this House before also that the kind of thing that has been going on in Vietnam is something good for us because China is no longer friendly with us, this Country is in China's sphere of influence etc. We must, and this House must, repudiate this suggestion firmly because this is a heroic struggle and ultimately, as Mr. Krishna Menon has pointed out, they will win against heavy odds. I hope this is the final phase of their liberation struggle. I am sure this is the final phase. The world press and the intelligentsia of the world from the late Bertrand Russell to great economists like Prof. Gunnar Myrdal and all those who have witnessed this tragedy have come to the conclusion and

judgement that it is the guilty men of the Pentagon, the guilty men of Whitehall who were perpetrating this tragedy in Vietnam, a crime against humanity. I agree with Mr. Krishna Menon who said that our stand is not against the people of America. I would even say, it is not even against Mr. Nixon, because he is the prisoner of a system. Mr. Pilo Modys has, by his performances reminded us here that only if you oppose capitalism you can understand the significance of what is going on in Vietnam. For it is the system that promotes American capitalism and multinational firms which is responsible for this policy and for the military industrial complex which is engaged in building the American economy for war. If you do not understand this you just cannot understand what is going on in Vietnam. As Joan Robinson said some time ago, the United States is against development because of this intervention in Vietnam because they are against freedom and therefore against development.

They started with a strange theory of power vacuum which led to intervention through SEATO and then to total aggression and complete escalation. In short, it means total and complete aggression against a helpless Asian country. As we have seen, the presence of half a million American troops in Vietnam has been the greatest provocation that any freedom loving people have ever faced anywhere. Further, it is not just that they have introduced chemical and biological warfare. They have brought a complete upset in the ecological balance of the entire terrain and territory of Viet Nam and also bombed theatres, Catholic churches and pagodas indiscriminately. In short, it is a war against humanity. It is there that the 'anti-personal fragmentation bombs' have been tried which again have been an invention of the military machine of the United States. It is the territory of Vietnam where napalm corpses are stalking about in countless numbers. In these circumstances, we are compelled to ask

ourselves, shall we keep quiet or shall we act ?

Because the Indian policy has been very clear, I may remind Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, right from the Geneva conference over this question. We have not equivocated anywhere, and because it is a part of Asia, our own continent, that is aflame, no Government in India can remain motionless, no government in India can remain silent whatever Pilloo Mody may say. But, however we do not want a counter-productive policy. We have a certain responsibility, and certain international responsibilities in connection with the International Control Commission. We must see that either we reactivate the Commission with the help of Canada and Poland or we must take into consideration the facts that exist in Viet-Nam today and unequivocally recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam.

Personally, I have nothing more to say, but I am sure that this debate will enable us to rouse public opinion in this country and the big powers, the USSR and China, will also take note of this.

As Shri V. K. Krishna Menon has pointed out, we have entered a new phase in this struggle. In conclusion, I would only say this. Chairman Ho Chi Minh, before his death, when he was asked by a fellow-journalist, remarked. Our rivers, our mountains and our men will always remain. That was the great declaration of one of the greatest revolutionaries and one of the greatest freedom fighters that history has ever seen. I have no doubt that they will not only remain but they will prosper in freedom.

**SHRI RANABHADUR SINGH** (Sidhi): This House meets today in a very sombre atmosphere. This meeting and this discussion have been brought about because each one of us in this House has in his heart bled for the people who died

yesterday. In a situation like this, there are always two options open to assemblies like ours; either we are led away by the polemics of the situation, and we weep and cry and we make a long catalogue of the lethal instruments used and we almost measure in litres the blood that has flowed. Alternatively, there is another course open to us, which I am sure is more in keeping with the dignity and the heritage of this House and this nation; that we should take stock of what we can do in this respect, and do it. And we can only do this when we approach this whole matter in a quite and realistic way.

What is happening, or what happened yesterday in Vietnam was a completely logical development of what started in North Korea. If I am mistaken, it was Gen. MacArthur who when he got the hiding in Korea, gave this advice to his countrymen; in future, America should take care not to get involved in warfare in the east with foot soldiers. It is merely a logical development of that advice that today when American soldiers have been recalled from the soil of Vietnam, aerial warfare has been stepped up and resultantly, many innocent lives have been lost.

As I look at it, before we as a nation can take any action which would lead to a meaningful solution of this whole problem, we must take a good stock of the situation and the likely developments thereof. It appears to me that the present Government in Saigon has lost not only the support of the people but all credibility and capability during the elections held there and it is but a matter of time before this regime is entirely repudiated and thrown out. When that happens and if it coincides with the further escalation of these air attacks, it can be easily foreseen that a situation is developing where a coalition government is going to be firmly in place in Saigon. It is such a government which can possibly pave the way for a future where the Vietnamese can live a free life.

[Shri Ranabhadur Singh]

It has been our historical heritage that we have not been concerned with polemics but with peace. It is in this context that I would appeal to our Government to approach this problem, but I would like to sound a note of warning here. Any efforts on our part as a nation or as a people at this moment will be liable to a grave threat. The threat comes this way recently we have had a traumatic experience with US foreign policy, if we are to do anything meaningful in the context of stanching the flow of blood of the Vietnamese, we have first to make sure that our reactions, our diplomatic efforts do not come as a retaliation to that traumatic experience. We have first to lift ourselves up from the possible danger that our foreign policy might suffer from because US policy during the last war we had with Pakistan was something which was shocking to us as a nation and if we try to do something now in the context of a solution to the Vietnamese war, we must be on perfectly sure ground that we cause no eye brows to be raised in the international community that our actions have been a reaction to US policy during the last war.

Sir, as has been stated so many times over in this House just now, the only possibility open to stop this war completely is to provide some international method by which all foreign armies vacate the land and that can only be possible and that would be, I think rather hopeful at the present stage of things, if we see that somehow it is brought to all the parties concerned, that warfare and power will not prevail in this situation. Our country which only a quarter of a century ago led the world in the methods of fighting for freedom in our own land has a message and has a heritage left with it, wherein some policy or some method can be found which would be meaningful and will carry this Message to the people concerned.

MR CHAIRMAN Though we have allotted three hours for this debate, I am afraid many Members of the opposition and from the Congress who sent their names will not have an opportunity to participate, because, I would have to call the hon Minister of External Affairs to intervene at about 5.30 also. And there after a statement is to be made by the Minister of Agriculture, Shri G. A. Ahmed Sa, should the House concur we may extend the debate by an other half an hour. I think up to 6.30 we will go on.

AN HON MEMBER One hour

MR CHAIRMAN For the time being, half an hour will be good enough. And most other Members would be able to participate. May I request the Members to be brief? Because the list is very long I would request the Members to give due consideration to others who want to participate in this important debate today.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Shahabad)  
Mr Chairman Sir when the great leader of the people of Vietnam Ho Chi Minh died and his will was published it was found that he had exhorted his people to continue the struggle for the national liberation and the unification of Vietnam and fight imperialism throughout the world wherever they tried to subjugate the people's liberation movement. That very clearly states the basic objective for which the people of Vietnam are fighting. This can also be seen in its historical perspective because in the last two decades, the House had occasions to discuss this question and many times serious situations like the present one had appeared, and the consensus expressed in the House showed that America was the only case perhaps in modern history where a strong power continues to perpetuate its folly despite the reverses and an angry public opinion throughout the world and does not see any wisdom.

In the bargain, we see the most gruesome human tragedy perpetrated before

our very eyes. Various speakers have mentioned the seriousness of the atrocities in bombing, and the new types of bombs that are being used. If I say it in one word, the bombings in Vietnam exceed all proportions. So far it has been calculated that seven million tonnes of bombs have been dropped on North Vietnam.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** In the whole of Vietnam.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT :** No, on North Vietnam itself. This is more than double the total number of bombs dropped by the Allies during the world war. I hope the House appreciates the unprecedented bombing there.

It is a historic fact that the United States did not recognise and accept the Geneva Agreement for holding elections as a means of bringing about the unity of the country and that is how the present trouble started. Instead they followed a policy of military warfare and bombing and escalation and conflict. The American society is divided; there is complete alienation of the American youth from the actions of the Government. What can be a greater condemnation of the American policy than the attitude of sizable sections of their own people? What is their objective? They want to keep their puppets there in power and change them to suit their needs. Yesterday it was Ky, today it is Thieu and tomorrow it may be somebody else. This policy is doomed to failure, whatever may be the forces behind it.

What is the history of the last few months? The American Government started the present phase of bombing on 26th December 1971, saying that it was a limited operation, necessitated by the military build-up in Laos and Cambodia and the need to protect American lives there. Mr. Sihanouk's Government was thrown out and puppet Government was set up and to support it, they put out the plea of build up in Laos and Cambodia. In south Viet-Nam they said that a Tet offensive was

building up. They said that they wanted to counter this and it was a limited operation. But it still continues and since April 1, the worst type of bombing is taking place, 500 sorties in one day. Automatic electronic device bombs were used first in Laos on the Ho Chi-Minh trail. Then in Cambodia and Viet Nam. Now it is taking a dangerous form.

If you see the Paris peace talks, despite the fact that they were long and protracted, they had made progress. The PRG'S seven point proposals, Nixon's five point proposals, finally PRG'S nine point proposals and Nixon's eight point proposals. There was almost unanimity about the military situation and agreement about the release of the POWS; the demand of the PRG was that there should be unconditional withdrawal of the American troops and it was felt that the POWS should be released, it should be simultaneous. It was on the political settlement that the difficulty arose. However, at the later stage, four parties to the talks DRVN, PRG, USA and SVN, made a significant progress. North Viet Nam and the PRG had agreed to talk to the Saigon Government, but minus Mr. Thieu. Earlier they were not even prepared to talk to them because they said it was not a representative Government. It is known Thieu was elected without allowing anyone to contest. So the talks were progressing, but we do not know what went on into the minds of Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger who was having secret talks with China. When these talks were likely to succeed and might have resulted in a political and peaceful settlement of this most vexed problem that Asia is faced with, they started the bombing. The reason they have given is that there is concentration, military build-up and need to save American lives. After April they have said that there is invasion from North Viet Nam. Nobody believes that, even the American citizen does not believe these excuses of the U. S. Government. Therefore, the tragedy is perpetuating

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

itself; and there does not seem to be an end of the war. The solution of the Viet-Nam problem is the key to the peace in Asia and even go of a new world. Since the Americans were trying to re-align their relations with China, we had hopes, but they have been completely belied. The role which the United States is playing is rejected by its own people, by the entire people of Asia, by the entire humanity. Therefore, it is incumbent on the Government of India to heed the unanimous voice of Parliament expressing its abhorrence at the continuation of the bombing and the escalation of the conflict. I know that the Government of India have stated their point of view very clearly that bombing must stop immediately and that the matter should be settled by peaceful negotiation. But see how jittery the American Government is. The statement of the Minister on the 6th and 7th in Parliament has been described by the American Government as unfriendly. Not only that. The French Government said that the matter should be settled in the U. N. through peaceful negotiation. That has also been frowned upon by them. Therefore, they are jittery, they are desperate, they know they are losing, but it is the duty of this great country, this great people who have love for freedom and national liberation, who have fought against imperialism and colonialism and for peace in Asia, to pursue this in all the Capitals of the world. We must create consciousness, a strong public opinion in the international community against the American policy in Viet Nam, against the policy of genocide, perpetrating terror and death in Viet Nam, and create a situation in which the American Government realises its folly and retraces its steps and goes to the conference table for talks and settles this matter peacefully and in a democratic manner.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd) :** No words of condemnation are adequate to express the indignation of this House,

and for that matter of the entire Indian people, against the savage, barbarous and inhuman bombing of Hanoi and other parts of North Viet Nam by the U. S. A. We will fail in our duty, while condemning U. S. bombing of North Viet Nam, if we do not pay our highest tribute to those brave and valiant fighters of Viet Nam who suffered for decades the miseries of French imperialism and who were under the Japanese imperialism for some years, also, and also who for several years have been facing the mightiest military power of the world, I mean the United States. It goes to the brave people of Vietnam that they have thrown the political pervers of the Nixon Administration into a mess of mid-summer madness, in committing mistake after mistake in dealing with the problems of Vietnam.

The issue of Vietnam is to be viewed not only as a human issue, not only as the issue of right to liberty of the people of Vietnam, not only as an issue of the security of the Asiatic people, but we have also a moral obligation to the people of Vietnam because we had a historical relation with them not now but centuries before. A large part of Vietnam was known as the Champa Kingdom having close link with the Indian civilisation. When the great nationalist leader of Vietnam Ho Chi Minh visited India, he admitted that he was in the true sense a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, because he showed the same spirit of revolt against the French imperialism and other imperialism which Mahatma Gandhi showed against British imperialism. It is also not known to many people in India that Netaji Subash Chandra Bose had not only close relation but cordial relation with Ho Chi-Minh. Before he left Saigon for an unknown destiny after fall of Japan he instructed the top officers of the INA not to surrender to any government but to go to Hanoi and surrender to Ho Chi-Minh, which they did. Therefore, it is our moral obligation that we shall stand by the people of Vietnam in their hour of misery, suffering and agony.

We, the people of India, consider that it is the inalienable right of every people and the people of Vietnam who have withstood all kinds of barbarism and savagery of different imperialisms, one after the other, to choose their own future in their own way. It is their sovereign right not only to choose their political future but their socio-economic future also according to their own genius. For that reason, our main stand should be that we should ask the US imperialists to quit Vietnam immediately. We should also ask the other big powers to keep their hands off from the issue of Vietnam. We should urge that Vietnam should be left to the people of Vietnam, to solve their problem in a way which they think best.

I know many big powers of the world today will ask, "What will happen to the people of Vietnam if we leave Vietnam in the present condition of chaos and disorder?" I would remind them of the historic remark of Mahatma Gandhi. The same logic was put forward by the Britishers when the Quit India Resolution was passed in 1942. The Britishers said, "If we leave India, there will be chaos and disorder in India." The reply given by Mahatma Gandhi was, "I prefer chaos against orderly anarchy." In the same way it is the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own future. No other big power should meddle or muddle with the problems of Vietnam.

As other hon. members have pointed out, I also want to highlight the fact that today Vietnam has become the experimental ground of the latest and most dangerous types of weapons. It has become an experiment ground not only for USA but all other big powers for testing their newly discovered weapons.

I want to draw your attention that there is a great danger of the escalation of the crisis, and this conflict in Vietnam may spread not only to South East Asia but to other parts of Asia also. It is

linked with international confrontation also because there is already a threat of use of nuclear weapons. I do not know what will happen when nuclear weapons are used. I want to remind this House that there is another type of new weapon that has been discovered by USA which is as much powerful as the nuclear weapon used in Hiroshima. It is a weapon of 20,000 ton TNT destructive capacity and that is being used by USA in Vietnam.

Many people have suggested many remedies. I do not know whether we really have any capacity to influence any of the big powers, USA, China or Russia particularly the United States, to honour the Geneva agreement that was entered into by the North and South Vietnam, I do not think we have either the capacity, or the strength or the international position to do that. All that we can really do is to create international public opinion, world opinion against the savagery and barbarity that have been and are being committed by the big powers, particularly the United States, in Vietnam. Such international public opinion will have great force. There is a big gulf between the American government and the American people. We can tell the American people look, what has happened to the America of Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln and Roosevelt. Look how the American administration is committing mistake after mistake, crime after crime in the name of containing Communism; it is defending all kinds of corrupt and reactionary regimes fascists, militarists, imperialists and colonialists all the world in the name of containing Communism but by their conservative politics they are really strengthening the hands of communism.

We can do much to help the people of Vietnam by creating world public opinion. We have read in the newspapers that a US military contingent revolted against bombing innocent people. If world opinion can be created it will even influence

[Shri Samar Guha]

the American people inside America, then it may happen that the flowers of society of America, the youths serving in armies, air force and navy may refuse one day to go to Vietnam to commit butchery of the people there. They may revolt against their military command.

In conclusion, I would say that India presiding over the International Control Commission serves no purpose. We can serve some purpose if we can mobilise Asian public opinion and international opinion, and by using the force of that public opinion to exert pressure upon the people of America to influence their Government. That may be of some help. Otherwise, we cannot really do anything positive to stop this butchery of the Vietnamese people by USA.

Finally, the Vietnamese problem should be left to the Vietnamese alone to solve in their own way. Let them decide their future as they think best. Let all the big powers have their hands off Vietnam. Let America quit Vietnam immediately and without any delay.

श्री शक्ति बूबल (दक्षिण दिल्ली) :  
शब्दाल महोदय, इस छोटे बहादुर राष्ट्र का बलिदान हो रहा है और दुनिया की बड़ी बड़ी ताकतें निरीह बन कर देखती रहे, यह कैसे संभव हो सकता है? पिछले दिनों पेरिस में पीस कौंसिल की मीटिंग हुई। दुनिया के तीनों देशों से प्रतिनिधि उसमें आए थे यह तथ्य हुआ था कि श्री कृष्ण भेनन और दुनिया के दूसरे प्रतिनिधि पेरिस में जा कर अमरीकी राजदूत से मिले, लेकिन उन्होंने मिलने तक से इन्कार कर दिया। उस विश्व शांति परिषद् में वही फैसला हुआ था कि बातचीत फिर से शुरू की जाय। उस सम्मेलन में दुनिया के तरकीबी पक्ष मुल्कों के लोग आये थे और अमरीका से भी काफी बड़ी ताबाह में डीलीमेंट आये

थे। इस से जाहिर होता है कि अमरीका की नीयत क्या है। जिस तरह से हीरोशिमा, नागासाकी वर एटम बम गिराया था, आज कई जैनरेसन के बाद भी वहाँ के बच्चों का सामाजिक सम्बन्ध जापान के लोगों से नहीं हो पाता और अजर चोरी से हो जाय तो तलाक तक नीयत पहुँच जाती है। यही हालत आज वियतनाम की है। वहाँ विवैली गैस और कैंसर जैसी बीमारियों के बम डाले गये हैं। वहाँ के बच्चों, बूढ़ों और जनता की हालत बड़ी दयनीय है। इस पर सभी ने प्रकाश डाला है।

सभापति महोदय, आज अमरीका अपने को क्या समझता है? दुनिया के देशों का चौकीदार है या पुलिस का सिपाही है, जहाँ चाहे लड़ा हो जाय, यहाँ कम्युनिज्म को नहीं आने देंगे, यहाँ सोशलिज्म को नहीं आने देंगे और आज इसी दृष्टिकोण से वियतनाम की जनता को दबाने का प्रयत्न किये जा रहे हैं। मंडम बिन हिन्दुस्तान में भाई थीं, हमारी सरकार की मेहमान थीं और हम सब लोगों को उन से मिलने का मौका मिला। उन्होंने यही कहा था कि हम बातचीत कर के एक फैसले पर पहुँचना चाहते हैं। वियतनाम अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहा है और जितनी कुरबानी वियतनाम ने की है, दुनिया में आजादी के इतिहास में कभी किसी ने इतनी कुरबानी नहीं की। जिस तरह से बंगला देश को बहुत ही मुनासिब समय पर हमारी सरकार ने रिकगनाइज किया और बंगला देश स्वतन्त्र हुआ, उसी तरह से पी० आर० जी० सरकार को रिकगनाइज करने का यह सबसे उपयुक्त समय है। भारत सरकार को इसमें देर नहीं करनी चाहिये और फौरन उसे मान्यता देनी चाहिये। आज विश्व की चौकी ताकत हिन्दुस्तान की है। सोशलिज्म, युनियन, आरब और



शाहना अथवा आज सिक्योरिटी काउन्सिल में या यू० एन० ओ० में अपने प्रभाव के देशों के जरिये प्रयत्न करे और दबाव डालना चाहें, तो अमरीका को आइसोलेट कर सकते हैं। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप तुरन्त रिकगनाइज करें और यूनाइटेड नेशन्ज में इस मामले को उठायें, सिक्योरिटी काउन्सिल में उठाने की कोशिश की जाय ताकि इस मामले का फोरन हल हो सके और हो सकता है कि तब तक सीगान पर वहाँ के क्रान्तिकारी विजयी हो जाय। अथवा सम्भव हो सके तो हमें तटस्थ ही नहीं रहना चाहिये, क्रियात्मक तौर पर भी बियतनाम को मदद देनी चाहिये। जो राष्ट्र हमेशा साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ सड़ते आये हैं, भारत ने हमेशा क्रान्तिकारियों की मदद की है, हर ऐसे देश की मदद की है तो फिर आज बियतनाम को मदद देना हमारा फर्ज हो जाता है।

**SHRIMATI M. GODFREY** (Nominant—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to condemn the genocide perpetrated by Nixon and his gang on the innocent people of Vietnam. Let the world know that this great democracy, the democracy of India, condemns wholeheartedly the brutal massacre of the people of Vietnam.

The people of Vietnam have a right to their own country, they are being butchered by the blood—thirsty Americans who have no right to be there. The people of Vietnam have the courage and perseverance which has been given to them by no earthly power and we hope that this supernatural power will guide and strengthen them to defeat and drive out completely the American wardogs who are trying to devour every village in Vietnam. The atrocities committed against women are unheard of in history. I would not like to repeat them here because they are too gruesome to be repeated and talked about. It is disgusting to think that an enlightened and cultured nation should use its intelli-

gence and wealth to destroy the weak, poor and small people as the people of Vietnam.

I would request that our Foreign Minister should take up this question in the Security Council and show to the world that India has always stood by the weak and has always supported those who have been tortured or tormented and that India always stands for the freedom and goodwill with all the people who are suffering and who are ill-treated by big nations. If India mobilises goodwill and coordination of other powers, I am sure, Mr. Nixon and his war-mongers will see through their falls and they will try to at least remedy what in future they may anticipate. Although they cannot bring back all the damage they have done, yet, we hope, that at least now they will stop and look back on all the bloodshed, the brutalities and the criminal atrocities they have committed against humanity.

With these few words, I would request that action be taken by our Government so that we will stand out, once again, as a peace loving country and as a country always supporting the small nations.

**SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL** (Lucknow): Mr. Chairman, Sir, since the last decade, Vietnam has constantly borne a severe battering. A whole generation has gone by without seeing any normal times in that area. Now, we have learnt about the ruthless bombing of the American bombers and the pounding that has been undertaken by the U.S.A. Government to bomb not only the military area but the very city of Hanoi and Haiphong and, according to Radio Hanoi, the situation has become very tense.

It is inhuman to kill innocent women and children and to deny them their very existence. It is not only killing women and children of Vietnam but by polluting the whole atmosphere, it is endangering the lives of the people of countries that are surrounding Vietnam.

[Shrimati Sheila Kaul]

The Government of U S. A. wants to use the armaments which its factories are producing every year and, to avoid its over-spilling, has been using and selling these arms and weapons wherever possible. It does not matter to them if they are used against innocent people as long as their women and children continue to enjoy the fruits of their sale.

During the world war II, I happened to be in London I know what it is to go through War. It is hell!

What is this struggle for? To my mind, the struggle is between reactionism and progressivism, rightism vs. leftism. It is not only confined to Vietnam but also in many parts of the world. In some countries, the rightism and reactionism has been defeated by the ballot like in our great country. But in some places, it is being decided by bullets. These are the dictates of time and no power, including Mr. Nixon, can change them.

I do not wish to repeat what has been said already. In the name of womanhood, I appeal to my sisters in the United States to restrain and stop the heinous crimes that are being perpetrated by their menfolk in the streets of Vietnam. We also appeal to the women of the world to raise their voice against this brutal bombing of women and children. We condemn these bombings.

**SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT** (Kozhikode): I rise to express my deep indignation and anguish at the barbarous action of American imperialism in Vietnam and the inhuman bombardment of Hanoi where thousands and thousands are reported to have been killed. At this grave hour which threatens peace not only in Vietnam, not only in Asia, but peace throughout the world, I feel that it is our duty to raise our voice and put our weight against the policies of Nixon Administration in Vietnam and against the atrocities committed by the American forces to crush the freedom fighters of Vietnam.

Sir, I feel that our Government has certain obligations as Chairman of the International Control Commission and as a member of the Security Council at this hour of crisis in Vietnam. I have no doubt in my mind that it should demand immediate stoppage of bombing and withdrawal of all American troops from the Vietnamese soil and for this purpose we must mobilise the world opinion. I also wish to express my admiration to the great people of Vietnam who are fighting for freedom against the imperialistic forces and who desire to have freedom to decide their own future.

I would request, in conclusion, the External Affairs Minister who is present here to tell us as to what country proposes to do not only to save peace in the world but also to help the freedom fighters in the country of Vietnam.

**PROF S L SAKSENA** (Maharajganj): Our Prime Minister has risen to great heights in our country. She has attained the leadership of her father in the country. I wish her to attain the same leadership of the world also. When Dien Bien Phu was besieged, Pandit Nehru issued a statement. The American Government were going to use atom bombs in Indo-China, and Pandit Nehru's statement forced them to drop that idea and completely changed the world situation. I hope, the situation today is similar to what it was then. What is happening today in Vietnam is almost similar to what the situation was then. I want that, as Chairman of the International Control Commission, we must assert our position, call a meeting of the Commission and demand immediate stoppage of bombing. Otherwise, we must immediately recognise the PRG and say that we recognise that Government as protest against the American action. I think, that will raise our status to the same great heights to which Pandit Nehru had raised when he made that statement on the occasion of Dien Bien Phu battle. I hope, the hon. Minister of External Affairs

will give us some idea as to what he proposes to do.

**SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Pupri) :** I wish to congratulate the people of Vietnam who are fighting for liberation against the mightiest military machine known to human history. I want to emphasize one or two points. One is that the conduct of the whole war in Indo-China is done under the guidance of CIA. This point has not been brought up in the House and, therefore, I have raised it. In this connection I have a quotation from a report of as far back as 1965. It says that, when there was a discussion about the war in Indo-China, the Director of the CIA is supposed to have suggested that it is not bombing of one bridge or two bridges here and there but what they must do Indo-China, in North Vietnam, is that they must strike the airfield, the petroleum resources, the power stations and the military compounds. And, to this, the joint Chief of Staff is supposed to have added, 'This is not enough; we must also strike on their sanctuaries, railway yards, locks and dams.' In short, the very life-line of the people of North Vietnam. So, this is a total war which we must not lose sight of. They are waging a total war on the people of Vietnam and it is the duty of the people of India to stand by them. I do not know what the limitations of the Government are in this regard. But Indian public opinion must be organised. Not only this should be organised but that world public opinion should also be aroused. I appeal to the leaders of all political Parties to organise Indian public opinion and also to convene on an unofficial basis a world conference on the Vietnam issue.

18 hrs

Secondly, I wish to say a few words about the Chinese. The Chinese claim to be the leader of the great revolutionary movement in the world. Right. I have no dispute with that. But, it is not a mere coincidence that the resumption of heavy

bombing and the escalation of war have taken place after the visit of Mr. Nixon to China. Now, if the Chinese are sincere in their efforts and in their declarations about Vietnam, then they must categorically and definitely come to the aid of the Vietnamese people. And in this regard, the first step should be the recognition of the PRG by the Chinese. If this is not done, then the charge that they are in collusion with President Nixon shall be proved.

With these words I wish to remind Mr. Nixon of the fate of the hated Nazi General Marshal Goering. It is said that Marshal Goering was allergic to the very word 'culture'. In the same way, it seems, Mr. Nixon is allergic to the word 'peace'. Otherwise there is no rational explanation for Washington's reaction to the suggestions made in Delhi and Paris for resumption of peace talks. I wish to remind Mr. Nixon that he will also meet the same fate as the fate of Marshal Goering. I would therefore, urge upon him that he should read the writings on the wall and here and now should declare the resumption of Paris talks and order cessation of bombing and withdraw from the North Vietnam. The United States has no *locus standi* to be there in Vietnam. America has neither geographical nor historical nor ethnic affinities with Vietnamese. This claim of containment of Communism is all bogus because they are now playing ping pong with the Chinese. Which is the Communist power in the region other than the Chinese which they were to contain? Therefore, it is quite clear that they must in order to maintain peace in the world, in order to save whatever goodwill and good name of America is left in this respect in the world, withdraw from Vietnam and must resume the talks in Paris and stop bombing of North Vietnam. This is the minimum they can do to be a civilised government.

**SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar) :** In a war like the Vietnam war, no country,

[Shri S A Shamim]

no community and no individual can afford the luxury of being neutral. I am glad that this House has expressed its deep sense of anguish and protest against the bombing in Vietnam

The fact that the American soldiers are fighting thousands of miles away from their homes is a clear proof that they are aggressors, that they are foreign forces in a country which is trying to establish its own hegemony

It is a cruel irony that on the day when Apollo-16 is hurtling towards the moon, poisonous bombs are killing and maiming thousands of children in Vietnam. In this situation, the duty of every citizen of the world and of every country as such is not only to protest by passing resolutions and by making speeches, but by some overt act to show our solidarity with the brave fighting people of Vietnam

I can understand the confusion created by the Americans as to North Vietnam aggressing South Vietnam but by any stretch of imagination can the American's presence be explained in Vietnam? That is something which even President Nixon cannot explain to his own people. Nixon's Government is reputed and its predecessors too, of having lied to their people. The Pentagon Papers proved it beyond reasonable doubt that American Presidents and the American administration can and have lied to their own people. Therefore, whatever the American Embassy has said in the hand-out which was issued to the Members of Parliament recently explaining as to what is happening in Vietnam and what has provoked the recent fighting should be treated as white lies. I am afraid, by condemning President Nixon alone, you will not be telling the whole truth. The People's Republic of China is in secret conspiracy about what is happening in Vietnam. How it happens that immediately after Mr Nixon met Chou the recent occurrences have taken place, the recent fighting in Vietnam and

the complete, silent, lukewarm attitude of China? That shows probably there is some sort of secret understanding. By its lukewarm attitude China is not only supporting the American action, but is practically collaborating. Why is it that China is lukewarm at this stage of war, when the battle has entered a decisive phase already? I am not at all happy with the Russian attitude as well. We have not heard a word from Radio Moscow that the people of Moscow will never welcome President Nixon when he goes there, and that he will not be allowed to visit Moscow, in the light of what is happening in Vietnam.

Therefore, the first and the foremost thing that a country like India can do is this. We have acted according to our moral duty in respect of Bangla Desh. We must pass a resolution. Mr Pilloo Mody is not present and so I think we may pass this Resolution unanimously. I do not know why the Foreign Minister is reluctant to pass the resolution. We cannot talk out such a serious and important problem as is faced by the Vietnamese people today. Freedom is indivisible, threat to freedom is indivisible. What is happening in Vietnam today will threaten freedom movement all over the world. If we are really interested in playing our part well, we must make our stand clear that we are standing by the valiant fight of the people of Vietnam. We should point out that we are one with the people of Vietnam who are fighting against American imperialism. We must do something in concrete terms.

I am afraid, after the debate is over, we will have a pious answer to our pious wishes from our external Affairs Minister, without any concrete steps being indicated as to what we can do to help the valiant fighters in Vietnam.

Therefore, what I think is that we may pass a resolution unanimously, as Pilloo

Modi is absent now from the House. It will be a unanimous expression of our solidarity with the valiant people of Vietnam so that those valiant people will know that India has given open support to her, that India has indentified itself with the forces of freedom and with the forces which are fighting against imperialist aggression. And, at this stage, Sir, the least we can do is this We must distinguish between the people of America and the Administration of America. We find the people of America protesting against American soldiers fighting in Vietnam. Their men, women and children are condemning the Administration and I hope that they will throw out the Nixon Administration in the coming elections. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is one of the rare occasions when there is unanimity of opinion amongst the political parties represented in this Parliament about the attitude that this country should adopt about the bombing of North Vietnam and the use of naked forces by the United States of America to suppress the freedom fighters and the freedom movement in Vietnam I am grateful to hon. Members for having voiced their feelings and their approach in unmistakable terms, and I have no doubt in my mind that this will help very much not only in strengthening the will of the people of Vietnam to carry on their struggle but will also have a powerful impact on world opinion and also public opinion in the United States of America and will thus create conditions in which the United States administration may even at this stage see the wisdom of abandoning the path on which they are embarked now. I have to express my gratitude to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and have expressed near-unanimous views about this problem.

Government have already clarified their own stand, and I would like to take

this opportunity of restating our position and our attitude in this respect. As hon. Members are aware, the heroic people of Vietnam have been waging a struggle for their freedom and independence for more than 25 years. They have borne great hardships and gone through a long period of suffering, the destruction of human life and property and yet their spirits are undaunted. It is unfortunate that instead of finding a peaceful political solution of the Vietnam problem, military means are being used to try to settle it on the battle-ground. The Government of India are convinced that apart from the unnecessary bloodshed and loss of human lives, military measures cannot solve this problem. A peacefully negotiated political solution will have to be found. Government had hoped that with the cessation of bombing on North Vietnam and the opening of the Paris talks at the end of 1968, a political solution would have emerged. Government regret that these talks were unilaterally postponed by the United States Government recently. Government deplore the unprecedented and large-scale bombing particularly of inhabited localities like Hanoi and Hapiphong by the United States B-52 bombers during the last few days. This is most regrettable and will not only jeopardise the success of peaceful negotiations but may escalate into a bigger conflict. Government cannot but express their condemnation of this callousness to human suffering and resort to such large-scale destruction which will only increase bitterness. It will not deter the Vietnamese people from carrying on their struggle for their independence but will only strengthen their determination to repel force until they have achieved their goal. Government still hope that better sense will prevail and the United States Government will put an immediate stop to this large-scale bombing and revert to the negotiating table in Paris.

Several Members have made mention of the fact that very recently president Nixon had visited Peking and this

[Shri Swaran Singh]

escalation should take place only a few weeks after that visit is something which is no doubt intriguing. I would like to draw the attention of the House to a paragraph in the joint communique that was issued at the end of president Nixon's visit, in which both sides had solemnly subscribed to the well-known international doctrine and code of conduct, namely their agreement not to use force to settle any international dispute. And this is part of that communique that was issued at the end of President Nixon's visit. That such naked force should be used only a few weeks after that visit and after subscribing to that communique is a matter which can be seen by the whole world as to whether the U. S. President was at all serious when he subscribed to that document.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Is it something new he is seeing of America ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Is there anything new in what he is stating about the US ?

It is all the more regrettable that they should resort to the naked use of force so soon after having signed solemnly in a communique their determination not to resort to the use of force for settling any international dispute.

This is the general approach and this has now the unanimous support of the entire House. I am sure this will have a powerful effect in creating that international opinion, and mobilising it, on which hon. members have laid stress.

Now I would like to deal with some of the precise suggestions that have been made by hon. members, about the manner in which we can take some further action. As for the suggestion made that we should do everything possible to mobilise and activate opinion in our own country, the fact that all political parties represented in this House are unanimous in this

approach itself will necessarily activate public opinion in the country and we can take political action either jointly or on our own platform to activate public opinion inside the country.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why cannot we adopt unanimously a simple two-line resolution ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This record is itself a very good resolution. I have a feeling that a resolution, about which there may be some difference of opinion about the words to be adopted will frustrate the very object in front of us.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : No difference of opinion. Why should there be any ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : All of us, political parties, have expressed broad agreement in favour of condemning the US action and said there should be stopping of bombing, leaving the people of Vietnam to decide their own future according to their wishes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Shall we try for a resolution tomorrow ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He is not a very good draftsman, not for these serious resolutions.

Suggestions have been made about our responsibility as Chairman of the International Commission for Supervision and Control. Just to refresh the memory of hon. members, I would like to point out that this Commission is not an all-purpose peace keeping force. Let us be quite clear in our mind. It was created for a specific purpose in 1954 after the Geneva Conference, and even the objectives to be achieved by this Commission were spelt out in the Geneva agreements in the Protocols that were signed at that time.

These were agreed to be the broad functions of this Commission :

(1) To supervise withdrawal of French troops ;

(2) To enforce cease-fire—cease-fire in connection with the 17th parallel when the French were present.

But the type of situation that has now developed, the United States coming in and mounting an aggression against the people of Vietnam, could never be visualised by those who attended the Geneva Conference. This was a subsequent development, and the International Control Commission, from the nature of its constitution, and if we have a look at the tasks assigned to it, certainly is not the body which can deal with a problem of this nature. (Interruption) Thirdly, to arrange for an election. So, in the nature of things, the Commission can function only with the consent of the parties concerned. If they resort to a shooting war, obviously the very basis upon which the Commission was constituted disappears. Therefore, the function of the Commission becomes extremely limited.

I would also be quite frank in saying this. Mention has been made that we should approach two Co-Chairmen. We have been in touch with the two Co-Chairmen. Who are the two Co-Chairmen? The United Kingdom and the USSR. Does it require a great deal of argument to state the obvious, that their views on this Vietnam question are entirely different? The USSR and the United Kingdom do not agree upon the essentials of the situation as is unfolding itself in Vietnam. Under the circumstances, the Co-Chairmen cannot provide any guidance and we are not prepared to act in any manner in which the type of situation that we face now could not be handled in an effective manner by the International Control Commission.

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA : They will all agree to the stoppage of bombing ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : They will agree to the stoppage of bombing. That is what we are saying. In fact, they had stopped bombing. That is what I have said in my basic statement, that the bombing had been stopped in 1968, and talks had started. It is all the more regrettable that when the talks were proceeding, when proposals and counter-proposals were being made, suddenly this bombing was resumed, and that process of resolving the dispute by negotiations as a result of the talks going on in Paris was reversed by resort to bombing. And all the other countries, just as we are doing, also will express their opinion strongly in favour of stoppage of bombing, and to resume negotiations in Paris. This is what North Vietnam have also indicated, that they would welcome the resumption of talks in Paris.

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA : Why not the Commission meet and pass a resolution that they should stop bombing ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The International Control Commission cannot, according to the protocol, go into this question. Where Parliaments are supreme, the Governments can take any attitude. The International Control Commission has to function under a certain protocol, and any party is entitled to say that what the Commission is doing is not within its jurisdiction. Let us be quite clear about the role of the International Control Commission, the limitations under which it is functioning and also the constraints on its functioning. If it were that simple, then it is very easy. The Members of the Commission are sitting there; and the Indians, the Poles and the Canadians can get together and pass a resolution, but it has to function according to its terms of authority, within the limits of the functions that have been assigned to it. So, we must be conscious of the issues involved, and we cannot proceed on the basis that the Commission can solve all these problems.

AN HON MEMBER : Then dissolve this Commission

SHRI SWARAN SINGH Many suggestions have been made as to whether it is at all necessary to continue this Commission if it is not doing anything effective. Do not ask me to divulge the parties who are asking us not to discontinue the Commission, because there is a certain unanimity on this, of all parties, and they have been telling us 'please continue this because there may be a time when it may be still able to perform its function.'

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU What about lifting the trade ban ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH There is no trade ban. I do not know wherefrom you get this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU From your replies in the House.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I can say quite clearly that there is no ban on trade with DRVN. In fact we have a trade agreement with DRVN and this was renewed in October 1971. I think the hon. Member was too busy with his local political matters and he did not bother to follow even this thing.

A suggestion was made. We are in the Security Council and we should raise it in the UN Security Council. I should like to divide this subject into two parts. Firstly, if the intention is that UN forum should be used to mobilise international opinion, my reply is in the affirmative: yes, we should utilise the UN forum whether it is the General Assembly or the other organs of the UN, to state our view clearly. We can expect other countries also to come forward and state their viewpoint clearly. This is an annual feature and if the hon. Members study the UN debates, they will find that countries who are of our view have expressed their viewpoint very clearly on the issues involved in the Vietnam situation.

We ourselves have done so in the UN General Assembly at the time of the debate on the general international situation. In other forums also it can be raised.

If on the other hand it felt that any action could be taken in the UN, I should like to sound a note of caution. Action is not possible. These are various reasons for it. Firstly, North Vietnam is not yet a member of the UN. To take any action in relation to a country which is not a member of the UN would not be liked even by North Vietnam because they may have to come but they will not come unless they are members. This matter has been raised again and again. I think it is my duty to clarify the situation. Even the Government of North Vietnam does not encourage the raising of this matter in a formal manner in the UN. They attach a great deal of importance to the Geneva agreements. If there is any positive elements in the entire Vietnam situation it is the adherence by all parties concerned to the Geneva agreement. North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, United Kingdom, France, USSR even the United States—all of them say they continue to abide by the Geneva agreement. Having said that, they try to make out a case that the other side is violating it and something should be done to persuade it to conform to that agreement. If then a debate is started in the UN, outside the Geneva agreement, it will not be a development which will be in the interest of restoring peace in that region, it might wreck the very basis of this agreement. There is therefore reluctance on the part of North Vietnam and its friends to raise this matter formally in UN.

Hon. Members said that we were lukewarm. We are not lukewarm. There are other countries in the UN and in the Security Council whose attitude in supporting North Vietnam is total. Even they have not thought it fit or proper to take it up formally in the UN. We should appre-



ciate the delicacy involved and understand the reasons why this matter is not being raised in the UN.

Finally, I would again like to take this opportunity of reminding this hon. House that the whole structure of the Security Council, the peace-keeping part of the U. N. Charter and the functioning of the organs under the U. N. General Assembly, is based on one essential doctrine, that is that the primary responsibility of keeping peace is on the five permanent Members of the Security Council. This is the whole philosophy behind giving them the right of veto. That is, the Security Council cannot pass any resolution if it is not acceptable even to one Member out of the five who are permanent Members, meaning thereby that if you pass a resolution by a majority then that particular country which has got the right of veto can flout that and can resort to force of arms and can ignore the resolution. The right of veto was conceded on this basis. But the corresponding obligation on them was that they would conduct their international behaviour in such a manner as not to create situations in which every other country feels that they are responsible for disturbing the peace. But if a permanent Member of the Security Council discards this obligation, as according to our view the U. S. A. has discarded the obligation which is inherent in giving the right of veto to them, there is no remedy in the U. N. context, in the context of the Security Council or in the context of even the General Assembly. They can pass resolutions no doubt saying that this action is uncalled for, that bombing should stop etc., but there is no scope for any action there. Let us be quite clear in our minds. This is the limitation from which we are suffering.

A suggestion has been made by some hon. Members that we should convene an Asian Conference to find a solution of this problem. I would request the hon. Members who have made that proposal to take a piece of paper and pencil and jet

down the names of countries in Asia. And then the answer will be quite apparent to them. Starting from China, Japan, Thailand, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, North Korea and South Korea, we go to countries like Bhutto's Pakistan, Iran, the major part of Turkey, Saudi Arabia, the kingdom of Jordan all these are Asian countries. Is it suggested with any degree of seriousness that a gathering of such spectacular people will produce any result? It will be a very impressive gathering no doubt, but I cannot expect anything coherent coming out of it. Some of these ideas are very tempting, and they appeal to us, because it is a very obvious thing. When we are up against a difficult problem and we cannot see any light as to how to proceed, this concept of convening a Conference occurs to us. I do not blame any of these brilliant Members who put forward this idea, but I have given a very simple reply. If any hon. Member still feels that anything useful can be achieved by convening such a Conference, I will associate myself with him so that we can jointly sponsor such a meeting. But I am convinced that nothing will come out of it.

I have no doubt in my mind that the debate that has taken place today has served a very useful purpose.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: What about the PRG of South Vietnam?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I have already made a statement, and I have nothing more to add to that. Already Mr. Krishna Menon is angry with me because I gave some reasons why I am not recognising PRG today. Don't ask me to give more reasons. I would only suggest that for the time being, the decision that we have taken is the correct decision. We are watching the situation and we will see which is the appropriate time. Even Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee who was pressurising us at that time will now recognise in retrospect that it was not a formula but something which has really yielded dividends. Leave the appro-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

priateness of the time, the appropriateness of the occasion and the appropriateness of all the circumstances to us to decide what to do and at what time. If you go on repeating it, you will be compelling me to repeat the same thing over and over again. After Mr. Krishna Menon's rather angry remarks, I have no intention to repeat it again and again.

With these words, I would like to say that the debate has been very useful and it will help us very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Agriculture Minister will now make a statement about the price policy for wheat for 1972-73 marketing season.

18.37 hrs.

#### STATEMENT RE WHEAT PRICE POLICY FOR 1972-73

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : Government after considering the recommendations of the Agricultural Prices Commission in their report on 'Price Policy for Rabi foodgrains for the 1972-73 season', the views expressed by the Hon'ble Members in Parliament and

by the Chief Ministers at a conference held in New Delhi on 13th April, 1972, have taken the following decisions :—

(i) The procurement price for wheat for the 1972-73 season be continued at the level fixed for the previous season, i.e. Rs. 76.00 per quintal for the indigenous common white and the different Mexican varieties and between Rs. 71.00 and Rs. 74.00 per quintal for the indigenous red variety.

(ii) The existing issue price of wheat at Rs. 78.00 per quintal be continued for the year 1972-73 also.

To enable Government to announce the procurement prices of wheat for the next year's harvest well before the commencement of the Rabi sowing season, a special study of the cost of production of wheat is being expeditiously undertaken.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18.38 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, April 18, 1972!*  
Chairra 29, 1894 (Saka).