

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY (CENTRAL) RULES AND REPORT OF CENTRAL COAL MINES RESCUE STATIONS COMMITTEE, DHANBAD

of the States and Union territories and Metropolitan Council of Delhi and for matters connected therewith.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) (i) A copy of the Payment of Gratuity (Central) Rules, 1972, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 412(E) in Gazette of India dated the 16th September, 1972, under sub-section (2) of section 15 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3914/72.]

(ii) A statement (Hindi and English versions) explaining the reasons for not laying the Hindi version of the above Notification simultaneously. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3914/72.]

(2) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Central Coal Mines Rescue Stations Committee, Dhanbad, for the year 1971-72. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3935/72.]

12.18 hrs

#### DELIMITATION BILL\*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE: (SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the readjustment of the allocation of seats in the House of the People to the States, the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly of each State, the division of each State and each Union territory having a Legislative Assembly and the Union territory of Delhi into territorial constituencies for elections to the House of the People and Legislative Assemblies

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the readjustment of the allocation of seats in the House of the People to the States, the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly of each State, the division of each State and each Union territory having a Legislative Assembly and the Union territory of Delhi, into territorial constituencies for elections to the House of the People and Legislative Assemblies of the States and Union territories and Metropolitan Council of Delhi and for matters connected therewith"

The motion was adopted.

SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY: I introduce the Bill

12.19 hrs.

#### MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do consider the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto."

Sir, most of the important aspects of the present international situation and Government of India's attitude thereto have been mentioned from time to time in this House, in the other House and outside, and to enable the hon. Members to get more time for their speeches, I have no intention of making an opening speech and I will wind up the debate. I commend this Motion for discussion.

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II section 2, dated

श्रीमटल बिहारी बाजपेयी (खालियर) .  
अध्यक्ष महोदय यह मोशन विदेश मंत्री ने  
दिया है वह इस पर चर्चा चाहते हैं लेकिन चर्चा  
आरम्भ करने हुए भाषण देने के लिये तैयार  
नहीं है ।

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA** (Begusarai): We should now the Government's attitude Why have they brought forward this motion?

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी (गाजापुर)  
कुछ नया प्रकाश तो डालिये ।

श्रीमटल बिहारी बाजपेयी यदि आप  
हमारा मांगत मान लेते तो हम चर्चा चलाने

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप जब भी बोलें  
इतने हाई पिच पर न बोलें । आप मुझ से  
बोलाइतली भी बोल सकते हैं । मैं आप का  
लाउड वायेम में जितना अहतराम करना हूँ  
उतना ही सोफ्ट वायेम मैं भी करूंगा । लेकिन  
आप हर वक्त गर्म रहते हैं और मुझे ठण्डा  
करना पड़ता है ।

यह आम तौर पर रिवाज रहा है कि इस  
किसम के मोशन के साथ एकमपनेटनरी भाषण  
हो जाता है आप भाषण हर वक्त कर सकते हैं  
थोड़ा सा इस पर भी कर दीजिये ।

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH** It depends on the desire of the Members of Parliament. I know that there had been numerous occasions when a motion of this type had been moved for consideration and an attempt was made to make an opening speech, when, it was generally the desire expressed by various sections of the House that the Minister should not make two speeches, one at the beginning and the other at the end, but more time should be given to Members. But there is no difficulty in

making a speech, and if hon. Members would like that I should make an opening speech, I shall do so with great pleasure

**MR. SPEAKER** The hon. Minister should go on and on till the Members themselves say that the Minister should stop

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH** No they may sometimes, for reasons best known to themselves, not be co-operative. But I do not want to adopt that attitude. I do want to take this opportunity of making some opening remarks about the international situation and the important aspects of the situation in the Indian sub-continent, in Europe and elsewhere

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the international situation over the last year or so has definitely been moving towards relaxation of tensions, and a general atmosphere of detente has been introduced almost in all important centres where formerly there was an atmosphere of conflict and confrontation

The most important region in this respect is Europe. In the European context, there was this general atmosphere of confrontation between the socialist group of countries and Western Europe. There were the pacts which were very active, namely the NATO and the Warsaw Pact and there was the question of two Germanys. These were matters which were the focal point for tension and of confrontation. Over some months now, the situation has radically changed in Europe. The main credit for this goes to the policy first initiated and then vigorously pursued by the Federal Republic of Germany under the leadership of Chancellor Willy Brandt. The signing of the Moscow Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and the USSR and later on the conclusion of the Warsaw Treaty paved the way for relaxation of tension; and acceptance of the existing boundaries in Europe

[Shri Swaran Singh]

removed one sensitive source of continued tension and uncertainty. The subsequent events have shown that this policy pursued by Chancellor Willy Brandt had been approved not only by the Parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany, but there has been people's support to this, as demonstrated by the massive victory that Chancellor Willy Brandt has achieved in the recent elections that have taken place. The agreement between GDR and FRG has already been concluded, which has the status of a treaty, and this is likely to be signed in Berlin or maybe at some other place, between the Chancellor of FRG and the leaders of GDR.

Europe has been unfortunately in history, the place where two major wars erupted in the lifetime of most of us, and any relaxation of tension in Europe is a matter of satisfaction and it strengthens the forces of peace. There is now the proper atmosphere for convening European security conference in Helsinki, and preparations are afoot to make this conference a success, so that peace might be stabilised, and there may be co-operation amongst the various countries of Europe.

Taking Asia, the situation is not as good as it is now in Europe. But the trends are in the same direction. I would not like to mention details, but the relaxation of tension which has followed the summit meeting at Peking between President Nixon and the Chinese leaders has definitely resulted in lowering of tensions in East Asia.

The Asian countries who had all these years looked to the United States of America for what they regarded as support to their policies have suddenly found that they have to readjust their thinking and have to adopt other postures as a result of the new atmosphere that took shape after President Nixon's visit to Peking. Taiwan in that situation has

now been progressively dropped by many countries which had even formal diplomatic relations with Taiwan; for instance, a country like Japan has decided to close her mission in Taiwan. This morning, there was a news item that the new Government of Australia have taken a decision to close their embassy in Taipeh. Similarly, several other countries which were recognising Taiwan as the legitimate Government of China are now progressively accepting the reality in this part of the world. They are anxious to establish normal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and in this process, the consequential effect of this on Taiwan is obvious and need to be elaborated further.

Then, again, the summit meeting which was held in Peking between the Prime Minister of Japan and the Chinese leaders has definitely altered the situation in that part of the world, and the hostility and animosity that had existed between Japan and China for such a long time is now being changed into an atmosphere of co-operation and understanding. And this again is a significant development in this part of the world.

The divided country of Korea also is at the present moment going through a very difficult process of what may be described as national reconciliation. North Korea and South Korea are undertaking bilateral discussion with the commonly agreed objective of exploring the possibility of peaceful reunification. Whether ultimately they succeed in this or not, only time will tell. It is not likely to be an easy process. But by these bilateral discussions between North

Korea and South Korea, the atmosphere of tension has yielded place to one of relaxation of tensions, and there is a likelihood of the situation being progressively eased in that part of the world also.

The position in Indo-China, however, does continue to give concern not only to the People of Indo-China, but to the whole world. The now well-known nine-point agreement that had resulted from the talks between the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the United States of America has not yet been formally signed by the two Governments. The situation in Viet Nam, both North Viet Nam and South Viet Nam, continues to be a source of great concern. Even at this stage, secret talks are taking place in Paris between the plenipotentiary Le Duc Tho of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, and President Nixon's representative Dr. Kissinger. These talks have got prolonged, and the news that is coming about the progress of these talks also is not very full. But it is commonly accepted that these secret talks in Paris at the present moment are in a crucial stage and it appears that agreement has been arrived at on a fairly large number of aspects, and efforts are continuing from both sides. The DRVN side as also from the America side, to conclude an agreement which might result in cease-fire and might pave the way for political settlement, so that the people of Viet Nam may have a government and institutions in accordance with their wishes without any outside interference.

As the stage of negotiations at the present moment is at a very crucial and critical state, I would not like to make any comment on the substantive issues involved. But one pragmatic approach can be that whatever is acceptable to both sides—and it appears that the two sides are desperately trying to arrive at an agreement—should, we hope, result in the establishment of temporary peace in

the beginning and might pave the way for final settlement in this region.

The situation in the other two countries in Indo-China, Laos and Cambodia is still confused. It is true that in Laos, some talks are taking place between RLG, that is, the Royal Laotian Government and the Pathet Lao leaders.

Several talks have already taken place but from the reports that have come to us it appears that significant progress has not yet been made. We have always taken the view that the situation in Laos for a satisfactory solution will have to await a settlement in Viet Nam. The situation in Laos is so much dependent on happenings in Viet Nam that to think of any easing of the position in Laos without a settlement in Viet Nam does not appear to be either probable or practical. A great deal depends upon the settlement in Viet Nam and it is only thereafter that the situation in Laos can move towards a settlement. We have always supported the view and this appears to be the desire of the people in Laos that the sovereignty, integrity and neutrality of Laos is something which is in the interest of the Laotian people and we have always supported that objective.

The situation in Cambodia is even more confused. There does not appear to have been any serious effort made by the parties principally concerned to establish any direct contacts and it will take some time before we can say that the situation in Cambodia is now moving in a direction where peace may be in sight and efforts may be directed towards finding a satisfactory solution of the terrible situation that has prevailed now for quite sometime in Cambodia also. We have great admiration for the people of Cambodia, peace-loving people who on account of external pressures had been subjected to untold hardships and sufferings. We earnestly hope that peace would prevail in that region.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

About the Indian sub-continent, positive aspects in the situation at the present moment predominate. There are no doubt some negative features also but if we compare the situation with what existed a year ago, at that time the armed conflict between India and Pakistan was in its full swing, we can say that very significant events have taken place in this part of the world: the emergence of Bangla Desh as a sovereign independent country, the effective manner in which the situation has been controlled by the present leadership, Sheikh Mujibhur Rahman and his party who enjoy such over-whelming support in their National Assembly, the fact that Bangla Desh—today we are having this discussion on the 7th December—was recognised by India on 6th December last year thus being the first country to accord recognition to Bangla Desh; within one year, over 95 countries of the world have accorded recognition to Bangla Desh, including the four permanent members of the Security Council. We had the honour and privilege just recently of welcoming the President of Bangla Desh in our midst and we were impressed by the manner in which he displayed confidence about the stability of Bangla Desh, about the manner in which the problems facing Bangla Desh are being successfully handled by the Government which enjoys the confidence of the people. Bangladesh as an independent sovereign country is now well-established and well set on their goal of serving their people and consolidating their sovereignty and independence in an unmistakable manner. Our relations with Bangladesh are very close, and very friendly. We cooperate with them in several fields—economic, cultural, technological, political, etc.—and we are highly satisfied with our cooperation with the Government of Bangladesh. It is also a matter of great satisfaction that within such a short time, the Constituent Assembly of Bangladesh has adopted a democratic, socialist, secular Constitution and we have all

our admiration and support for the people and Government of Bangladesh for going ahead and marching forward on their chosen path of strengthening themselves by adhering to a democratic way of life.

India's relations with Pakistan have passed through a chequered career even after the cease-fire which became effective on the 17th December, 1971. We took the initiative to start bilateral talks with Pakistan, which resulted in the conclusion of the Simla agreement. That has been debated here and I have no desire to go into the details thereof. The implementation of the Simla agreement is in progress. The delineation of the line of control has been the subject-matter of discussion between the military representatives of the two sides and even today a meeting is taking place in Lahore between our Chief of the Army Staff and Pakistan's Chief of the Army Staff, so that the matter which is still not settled may be settled or a serious effort may be made to settle that also. As soon as this settlement is arrived at and it is approved by the two Governments, the hurdle in the way of restoration of normalcy in our relationship would be removed and it would be possible to withdraw the troops in accordance with the Simla agreement in a matter of, say, two weeks after this agreement is arrived at.

I would like to say that the question of prisoners of war about which there is a great deal of anxiety amongst the international community is also a matter which was before the summit conference in Simla and it was agreed in one of the clauses of the Simla agreement itself that there will be subsequent meetings to take a final decision about the question of prisoners of war.

It is our view that the continued non-recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan is coming in the way of implementation of that clause of the Simla Agreement, in accordance with which the question of the prisoners

of war had been agreed to be discussed between the parties. We had made the position clear in Simla that with regard to the prisoners of war who came into our custody on the eastern front, including those who surrendered in Bangladesh to the joint command of India and Mukti Bahini of Bangladesh, for a final settlement of the question of those prisoners of war, the association and agreement of the Bangladesh Government is essential and necessary. Obviously, Pakistan cannot expect Bangladesh to participate in any serious discussion on any matter, much less on such a vital question as the future of the prisoners of war, unless the Bangladesh Government feel that they are entering and participating in those discussions on the basis of equality with Pakistan. Obviously, unless Pakistan agrees to recognition of Bangladesh, the attitude of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and the Government of Bangladesh in this respect is understandable. They have taken a decision, which we support, that they would not enter into any discussion with Pakistan unless the representatives of Pakistan talk to them on terms of equality. So long as President Bhutto and the Government of Pakistan continue not even to take notice of the reality that has emerged namely, the sovereign independent Bangladesh, and they continue to describe it as "Muslim Bengal" and the "authorities in Dacca", certainly that is not conducive to the creation of a situation where Bangladesh can reasonably be expected to participate in any discussion. Therefore, so far as that category of prisoners of war who can be described as having been taken into custody on the eastern sector are concerned, trilateral discussion and trilateral agreement between the governments of Bangladesh, India and Pakistan are essential, and continued non-recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan is a negative factor in the situation which is not only delaying the final settlement of the question of prisoners of war, but is

also coming in the way of stabilising peace in the Indian sub-continent.

Of late, President Bhutto and some of his other colleagues have been making statements which do give the impression that they are perhaps preparing their people for extending recognition to Bangladesh. Hon. Members of this House must have noticed that the political party, which is the predominant party in Pakistan, President Bhutto's own party, the Peoples' Party on the political plane has already stated talking of extending recognition to Bangladesh; but it is still to be done by the government, which is controlled by that political party. If the approval by this political party, which is the majority party in Pakistan, is the first step for Pakistan Government to accord recognition to Bangladesh, we welcome that step because we are desirous of establishing durable peace in the Indian sub-continent. Therefore, we would welcome any steps that are taken by President Bhutto and the Government of Pakistan for recognising Bangladesh and for strengthening the force of peace and co-operation in the Indian sub-continent. We on our side notwithstanding these various difficulties want to implement the Simla Agreement in letter and spirit because we believe that the basic concept, the foundation on which the Simla Agreement is based, namely, agreement to settle all differences between India and Pakistan peacefully and bilaterally is an excellent one end, if it is implemented by both sides, it will help the situation in the Indian sub-continent. This first step towards reversing the unfortunate atmosphere confrontation and conflict is likely to create an atmosphere of good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan. This is the spirit in which we look at the Simla Agreement.

We have many points upon which we can express our dissatisfaction and strong dissatisfaction over how President Bhutto has been dealing with this

[Shri Swaran Singh] problem. We believe that if he had dealt with this problem in a straightforward manner and had explained to his people the implications of the Simla Agreement, some of his present difficulties may not perhaps have been as pronounced as they are at the present moment. But if we take a view of the Indian sub-continent as a whole, there is distinct improvement and movement towards peace and it will be a continuous endeavour on the part of India to strengthen this process of consolidation of peace and to establish normal good neighbourly relations with Pakistan.

The situation in the West, Asia still continues to be a source of anxiety and the Israeli forces still continue to be in illegal occupation of the area that came in their possession as a result of their aggression. We have supported throughout and we continue to support the unanimous resolution of the Security Council in this respect which has called upon Israel to vacate aggression. The situation there in the Arab-Israeli conflict, at the present moment, is highly unsatisfactory and there is no significant move which may have been initiated recently that might raise some hope that a solution of this problem is in sight.

India's relations with neighbouring countries, Sri Lanka, Burma, Bhutan and Nepal, are very close and friendly—Bangladesh I have already mentioned. If our efforts to normalise relations with Pakistan succeed, then we can look forward to a period of peace, stability and co-operation in the Indian sub-continent which will be a very desirable development and which will enable us to have our programmes of far-reaching socio-economic revolution in our part of the world implemented in a more effective manner. For the good of millions and millions of people here and also in our neighbouring countries, we are cooperating with our neighbours in their developmental programmes and we are desirous of deepening and broadening

these areas of cooperation in the economic field, in the cultural and technological fields, with all our neighbours.

Sir, the general situation at the present moment is this. Whereas one can say that it has moved towards *detente*, there are several imponderables in the situation, if I may use that expression. The attitudes of countries are shifting from time to time; may be a number of these shifts are in the positive direction. Who could have said, four or five months back, that Japan and China would come closer to each other? Who could say that President Nixon would initiate far-reaching changes in his approach towards China, and who could have visualised that President Nixon's visit to Moscow would result in the conclusion of several agreements in the matter of Strategic arms limitation, in the economic field and in several other fields? The consequential effect of these changes in the attitudes of principal powers, main powers, main powers, has its inevitable effect upon other countries, whether we look at Europe or South-East Asia or South Asia or even West Asia, all these changes that have taken place are having their impact upon several countries and some of the old frozen attitudes are changing. We have to adjust ourselves to these changes and to take action so that our contribution for strengthening the forces of peace is effective and our own national interests are safeguarded.

This, Mr. Speaker, broadly, is the international situation in our part of the world and in other parts of the world.

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh): You have not said anything about our relations with China, whether they are improving or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Africa?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** I will not now leave without touching upon these points which have been raised. It was precisely for this purpose that I wanted you to have more time. You have given me time; so, I must utilise it.

It has been mentioned that I have not said anything about the situation in Africa. The situation in Africa, broadly speaking, can be described in three categories: the situation in the northern part of Africa, i.e., the Arab world; then the situation in the areas where the freedom fighters are carrying on a relentless struggle against the Portuguese colonial forces, whether it is Portuguese Guinea or Angola or Mozambique and also the countries where racist apartheid regimes are functioning, i.e., South Africa and Rhodesia; and then we have got the countries north of South Africa and south of the Arab world where many of these African countries, the newly independent countries, are trying to consolidate their position. Our support to the forces that are fighting to end colonialism, racism and the apartheid regime is total and we have supported their cause stoutly in all forums and this support continues.

With regard to the countries north of that region, we have faced and persons of Asian origin have faced problems in Uganda about which I have made statements from time to time and I have nothing more to add except to say that very few persons of Asian origin have been left in Uganda. I think their number cannot be more than 2000 or so and the main problem now is of assets left behind and we are in touch with the Government of Uganda and we are making serious efforts to salvage as much as we can but I am not very optimistic; however, this effort has to continue.

In relation to other countries, the situation is more or less normal. We are very happy that our economic relations with several of these countries

are being strengthened. We have a mission from Tanzania here and we hope that as a result of this visit and as a result of our President's visit to Tanzania, the basis for a fruitful co-operation, in the mutual interests of both India and Tanzania, would be consolidated and we will be co-operating in their economic and industrial development in a number of ways. We want to strengthen this process of more purposeful and meaningful co-operation with other African countries as well. We know these African countries, although they have attained their political freedom, continue to face economic problems and they are also facing pressures from former colonial powers and we have, therefore, to strengthen them in every possible manner.

Regarding Our relations with China, about which the hon. Member opposite belonging to the CPI (M) is very anxious to know, I am not sure whether I can give any useful information on that I will certainly come and report to this hon. House as soon as I see that there is any improvement in the relations...

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU** (Diamond Harbour): How deep is the failure.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** Now, I deal with our failure and of the party which sits in the extreme left.

**SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA:** You please make a statement about the progress. There is no question of failure!

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH:** I have also to make a statement if there is no progress. That is my responsibility. You can ignore it but I cannot ignore it because I have to tell the House and the country the facts as they are.

At the present moment, I can say that we, on our side, are desirous of normalising our relations with China. But obviously, this can be brought



[Shri Swaran Singh] about only if there is the same desire on the part of China as well. If the strident note that we see in the Chinese speeches in the United Nations on the situation in the Indian sub-continent, if the hostile statements that are made by the Chinese leaders in Peking at the time of visits of several visiting dignitaries, are any indication, then one does get a feeling that the Chinese perhaps are not desirous of improving relations with India. But, so far as we are concerned, we have been more than willing.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is what you say.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I thought I was speaking now. And, I am saying this on behalf of India.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Your Government.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: My Government, and they are in charge of the External Affairs of India..

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Which represents the Government.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I think I am voicing the feelings even of the Opposition parties, if not the entire opposition parties, at any rate, the party to which my dear friend Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu belongs, that we are desirous of improving relations with China, and we have made this position clear on a number of occasions. We have avoided being drawn into polemics, but having done all that, it does not appear that China at the present moment is responding positively to these various suggestions and various statements that we have made. That does not mean that we should give up our effort.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: How many times of responding you have,—positive response, neo-positive response, semi-positive response, ultra-positive response..

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Abusive response.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Positive response obviously, according to the simple English Dictionary meaning, should be that if we want to make friends with them, they also should say, yes, they are also desirous of making friendship. And negative response obviously will be the contrary of it. I say, I want to make friends and from the other side also..

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: As you are doing with Mr. Nixon now.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I think, from Peking to Washington. It appeared at one time that it was a long distance, for the party to which Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu belongs and probably that distance has now contracted; I wish him well.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to sit through the lunch hour? The Minister is ready for that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would say, Sir, in all seriousness that China is our neighbour and geography has placed us together. We have to live as good neighbours. There are some differences. There are some unfavourable attitudes and postures of China on certain matters which are vital to us. We continue to hope that China will appreciate the desirability and the necessity of normalising relations with India so that the two countries, India and China, can live as good neighbours. We have that objective in view and we will continue to work for that. That, in a nutshell, is our approach towards China.

I think I have now exhausted the patience even of those enthusiasts who were asking me to make an opening speech. I would leave the rest for them and I will say something at the end also.

MR. SPEAKER. Motion moved

"That this House do consider the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto."

THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR). We will forego lunch hour today.

MR. SPEAKER. We have some substitute Motions.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that—

(a) the Government of India have not made any significant and vigorous efforts to build up Indo-Bangladesh friendship on a firm basis and notes with grave concern the growth of anti-Indian feelings in Bangladesh;

(b) the Government should take note of the adverse criticism of its policy by some senior Bangladesh politicians and make all possible efforts to remove misgivings, if any, of the Bangladesh people about India.

(c) in spite of many assurances and promises by the Government, trade between India and Bangladesh has not grown appreciably;

(d) the Government have not taken any steps to liberalise that passport and visa rules in respect of travel between India and Bangladesh;

(e) the Government have yet to define its attitude towards the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam which is the genuine representative of the people of that country; and

(f) the Government have failed to take the House into confidence by 'celling it what positive steps it has taken to open bilateral talks with the Peoples Republic of China with a view to normalise Sino-Indian relationship." (1)

DR. LAXMINARAIN PANDEYA (Mandsaur): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the image of India has gone down on the international plane as a result of the policy of the Government of India in this regard and the country has failed to maintain close relations even with friendly countries which has affected her prestigious position in the international world and recommends that the Government of India review the foreign policy to make it really effective so as to revive and enhance the country's prestigious position in the international world." (2)

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion, that—

(a) in order to cement the bond of friendship with Bangladesh, all out support and help should be given to the newly born Republic and Bangladesh should be given all support to weed out the pro-Pakistani and anti-Indian elements from there;

(b) special attention should be paid to increase and develop trade relations with the Bangladesh, and

[Shri Ramavatar Shastri] immediate steps be taken to liberalise the passport and visa rules in respect of travel between India and Bangladesh;

(c) the Government should urge upon the Bangladesh Government to allow the non-Bengali Muslims i.e. the Muslims from Bihar and U.P. who are not implicated in any case to go to the countries of their liking;

(d) the Government should release all the Pakistani civilians from the Indian custody and allow them to go back to Pakistan;

(e) the Government of India should follow consistent anti-imperialist, non-aligned and peaceful policies;

(f) the Government of India should immediately recognise the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam; take positive steps to normalise relations with the People's Republic of China; and establish and develop trade relations with Cuba and other socialist countries. (3)

MR. SPEAKER: There is a suggestion that we should go without lunch hour today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister has come prepared for it.

श्री प्रदल बिहारी बाबुवैशी : नहीं अध्यक्ष महोदय कुछ लोगों के लंच पहले से ही फिक्स होते हैं दूसरों के यहाँ तो लंच प्रवर होना चाहिए ।

MR. SPEAKER: Then we adjourn for lunch to reassemble at 2.P.M.

13.11 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at our minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MOTION re. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): I have heard the long speech given by Sardar Swaran Singh on international situation. At the outset I want to state that from his speech I have not been able to understand what are our foundations in relations with other countries. That he has not spelt out so clearly as I expected. Before taking up the points I want to deal with, I would say that the most significant thing in the international situation today is that the balances of forces are fast changing in favour of freedom, peace and Socialism and the forces of reaction and imperialism are getting moribund day by day. I fully agree with Sardar Swaran Singh so far as the relaxation of tension in Europe is concerned, after the two Germanys came to terms and after the agreement between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Coming to the Vietnam issue which has been dealt with by the Foreign Minister, our Government is not emphatically condemning to barbarities which the United States is still continuing there. The United States should be condemned for breach of faith. On 18th October, it was agreed by USA that the agreement on the Vietnam issue will be signed. But they backed out. In the meantime, they are supplying large quantities of arms to South Vietnam and the blockade is still going on. The bombardment is still continuing. By the continued struggle by the Vietnamese people against the armed aggression and barbarities of the United States and its stooges, the Nixon Administration was forced to agree to come to terms with Vietnam. Even after that, as per the natural

characteristics of imperialism, he US imperialism is trying to slide back. This point should be taken up by our Government. If we are sincerely anti-imperialist, about which I have great doubts, we must condemn this action of the American imperialism. Of course, I congratulate the Government on raising the status of our relations with North Vietnam to ambassadorial level. It is good. But, why should they hesitate to recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet Nam? It is gratifying to know that they have now recognised GDR. But it was done only when both the Germans decided to come to an agreement and when it was unanimously accepted in the United Nations Assembly to recognise G.D.R. Are they waiting for that in the case of PRG? I know that they will have to give recognition to the PRG of South Vietnam. Why not give it now? Why this hesitation? My complaint against the Government is that they have no stable and consistent foreign policy and they are resitant in their policy. They are like the pendulum of a clock swinging from one side to the other. This is characteristic of our foreign policy.

Coming to our relation with our neighbouring countries I must say that the prestige of the country has been heightened by our positive stand in respect of the liberation struggle in Bangladesh. The emergence of Bangladesh as a sovereign independent country is a blow to imperialism which wants to dominate the sub-continent.

At the same time, I must also say that there is unanimity or consensus throughout the country, except perhaps the Jansangh, about the Simla Agreement. There may be some difficulties here and there, but we do not consider it proper to say, like the Jansangh did, that it is dead. It cannot be dead. I say emphatically that we must take an objective view of the situation. Pakistan is our neighbour and we must try to establish friend-

ship with our neighbour. For our own sake, for the sake of ensuring durable peace in the sub-continent and for preventing the big powers from interfering in the original problems we should adopt a sincere and unbiased attitude in the implementation of the Simla Pact in both letter and spirit. We are for the implementation of the Simla Agreement in its totality. At the same time, I will say that both Pakistan and India should not haggle about this condition or that condition. Both countries must come together and peace must be established between India and Pakistan.

Coming to our other neighbours, our relations are not as good as they should be. What was the necessity for sending the army to Ceylon when the Ceylonese youth were fighting their government for some of their just and genuine demands. This has embittered our relations with the youth of Ceylon. I must emphatically protest against it and say that it should not be done again in future.

Coming to Bangladesh, our intention is to establish friendly relations and help that country to come to its proper shape. But, taking advantage of the present position of Bangladesh, some business-men here are acting in a way which creates embitterment in our relations with the people of Bangladesh. All blackmarketeers and big traders are taking advantage of our pact with Bangladesh. They are acting in a way which is creating tension in the people of Bangladesh, which we must take note of. I do not say that the Government is intentionally doing it. But by circumstances, some corrupt traders of our country and some industrialists are becoming the cause of embitterment and strained relations with the people of Bangladesh.

The same is the situation with regard to Nepal. Can you say that we have better relations with Nepal than what China has with Nepal? Why? Because of the same kind of action

[Shri Dinan Bhattacharjee] by a section of the business community. The ultimate result is that our relations with Nepal are getting deteriorated. That should be checked and immediate action should be taken in that direction.

Regarding our relations with other African countries it is true the Minister also has expressed his desire for the success of the liberation movement in Africa. But I would say that the Government of India must give material help to these forces in Africa and in South America who are fighting against imperialism. In this context I may say that whether it is liberation struggle in South America in Africa or in Vietnam the people of those countries are fighting our cause and they are weakening the influence of imperialism in the world, thereby paving the path for freedom, peace and socialism in the world.

I would urge upon the Government to take a positive stand in respect of the liberation struggles and the freedom movements that are going on in Africa and in South America in Angola in Mozambique in Guinea and in Yemen and in other places. It is the same American force, the same American imperialism that wanted to demolish the freedom struggle of Bangladesh and wanted to threaten our country by bringing the Seventh Fleet into the Indian Ocean. It is the same American imperialism which is conspiring and doing all the mischief to see that the freedom struggles in South America and Africa are smashed and it is the same American force which is responsible for all these bloodsheds in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. As such, I ask why the Government should not condemn here and now the American imperialism without any hesitation and emphatically state that they must come to terms and that they must sign the Agreement with the Vietnamese people?

Now I would deal with some other problems.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He does not have much time for that.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: I am concluding.

My contention is the one with which I started and that is that India has no stable foreign policy. It is not essentially anti-imperialist policy; it is not essentially for the success of the freedom struggles of the dependent countries throughout the world. It is because our economic foundation is unstable that we have to depend on his sort of unstable foreign policy. Sir, unless we do not give up the policy of depending on any imperialist country for the development of our economy, you cannot expect our country to be stable in its foreign policy. I mention this because now hobnobbing has been started to bring back Nixon here again in spite of the fact that we know what this Nixon Administration is. What his America is, I am not saying this. The papers which fully support you are in a very crude form trying to create this impression in the people who have tasted what is imperialism during the Bangladesh struggle, now they are trying to clear the way so that Mr Swaran Singh may establish relations. (Interruption) not that way, not an honourable settlement so that they may lose over us, so that in the name of our economic development they can dictate terms to us. That way the Government is moving. That is most dangerous development. You are bringing back again imperialism. We are not against any friendly relations with any country but we are against imperialism. If it comes here again, it will ideologically and economically spread its tentacles on our economy.

AN HON MEMBER: What about Mr Nixon's visit to Peking?

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA :**  
I do not consider Mr. Nixon's visit to China a defeat of China; it is a victory to the peace forces which are advancing. That is why U. S. imperialism realised now that, without coming to terms with China, they cannot survive, that is why, Mr. Nixon had to go; it is not that peking leaders went to Washington.

Now there is so much of talk about CIA. Why should the Government not come forward with a white paper on that? The Peace Corps also, in the name of helping our country, is spreading its espionage system, is spreading its tentacles even in our administration. Why do you not come forward and ask them to quit immediately?

We do not say that India is not eager to come to terms with China, to establish its friendly relations with China. I have no doubt that India has now realised that in the whole of Asia and in our region, if we have to build up our own economy and if we want peace, we must have good relations with China. Unfortunately....

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Please conclude.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
You must give me, Sir two or three minutes more. This half-speech will create confusion about my party's stand.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Please conclude.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
I am just concluding.

From this House I will plead with China also to realise the reality. It is not a fact that India has got any bad intention because of Indo-Soviet Treaty. They should realise that in its proper per-

specitive, and sincere efforts by both India and China must be made to re-establish friendly relations.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** You have made your point

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
I will finish.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** You have exceeded your time

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA**  
What is the time allowed.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** You were given 13 minutes, but you have already taken 20 minutes.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
What is the harm, Sir? I will finish now.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
I will finish in a minute.

What I want to say is that they must realise the realities. Why not China recognise Bangladesh? Why not Pakistan also recognise Bangla Desh? Why not there be a stable place in our land by our closer relationship with both China and Pakistan?

Ultimately, I will say that our Government must take a positive stand regarding the CIA. This CIA was responsible. I will say, for our confrontation with China in 1962. It is now clear from all the reports. So, beware of CIA, beware of the American imperialism and save our democracy and save the peace of this region from the conspiracy of the American imperialism and its stooge, the CIA.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Shahabad):**  
The House and the country as a whole will agree with the assessment of the foreign Minister which he made this morning, about the positive deve-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

developments which can be described as developments in the direction of peace and creating an atmosphere of *detente* taking place in all parts of the world. Particularly, the year 1972, will go down when it ends by the end of this month, as a great watershed which will close its doors against the policy of confrontation, of military pacts, of cold war and usher in an era of peaceful negotiations and settlement of disputes through negotiations, bilateral as well as tri-lateral or multilateral.

In this year, right from the beginning of the talks between President Nixon and Chou-En-Lai or the talks between President Nixon and the Soviet leaders, as well as the opening of negotiations on Vietnam which is coming to its final phase of settlement, one hopes in the course of the next few days, and then this affects also Europe, as the Foreign Minister said, and the great joy of the people of Germany in giving a big hand a massive mandate, to Willy Brandt in his policy of Ostpolitik as also North and South Korea coming together and, most of all, the great changes that have taken place in this sub-continent during the last 18 months which have changed the face of this part of the world—all these meant positive gains to the forces of peace, the forces of stability in this part of the developing world; but they have also created new problems, new strains. Any change is bound to create, and great changes are bound to create great problems. Sometimes our attitudes do not change as fast as the changes take place. Whether it is Bangla Desh or the Simla agreement, almost the entire people rallied behind the policy of the Government.

It has become a national policy and the voice of the people is behind it. But the position is that this has created problems and I would like to place on record my appreciation of the positive role that the Government, the foreign Minister, the Prime Minister and the President, who in a recent statement mentioned about the changing pattern of our relations with the major

powers and with our neighbours, have taken, and nobody can say that during this time, the Government and the External Affairs Minister and the Ministry were lagging behind in any initiative. We can criticise some of their initiatives. That is a different point, but they have not been lagging behind, and that is a very very welcome change, and that shows the strength behind their policy. That shows the democratic forces that are goading them or guiding them to take these steps, the strength of the people, the unity and the new confidence that has been generated in the country.

In this context I come to the problems created by the changing pattern in this world the changing pattern of Europe, the new power balance, etc. Although the old war has ended, the rivalries of big powers have not ended. In the present situation the possibility of any major military conflict may have forced the big powers to take a stance of negotiation and settlement through peaceful cooperation. But the rivalries have not ended. We have to function in this situation. Many people criticise and say that when there is no cold war, the military pacts belong to by-gone ages. And, therefore, there is no relevance of non-alignment today. Those who take that view are taking an incorrect view of the situation. The basis of non-alignment is independent action. It is a positive policy for peace.

After 20 years, after the decades of the fifties and sixties non-alignment has undergone certain amount of changes in application. This has to be applied to a different emerging situation. It has to be applied in an entirely different context. Our policy during the last few years, has followed this pattern. We have continued to follow the basic principles of this policy. Our policy has been independent action and we have pursued our policy to settle all disputes by peaceful means and following the national interest in a changing situation. Although the situation in the sub-conti-

ment has changed, we are faced with new problems.

The success of our policy is contained in the realisation of our objectives in this changed situation. Our relations with our neighbours, our relations with major powers in Asia are determined by this. Take the case of our relations with Pakistan. Bangla Desh has been recognised by 95 countries. Its non-recognition by Pakistan and the creation of normal situation in the sub-continent is the crux of the problem. The Simla agreement is a bold agreement in that respect. Our Foreign Minister said in the morning that it is not unexpected—I emphasise the word—that some people might have expected miracles to happen, within two or three or four weeks. The major powers have taken years in negotiations. China and America talked in Warsaw for ten years. In Paris the negotiations have been going on for two years.

In the pursuit of peace, more than in the pursuit of war, patience is required, wisdom is required. All the time, adherence to our basic objectives and principles is required. We should not give way to jingoism as has been done by some sections of the people, small in numbers. The alternative to the Simla agreement is not jingoism. It is not chauvinism. We have to patiently, firmly and purposefully follow the basic principles of our policy as contained in the Simla Agreement. That is what we are doing. All the democratic forces in the country are in favour of peace and peaceful settlement with Pakistan. The voice against the spirit of the Simla agreement is a weak voice. In Pakistan the voice can be stronger. Whatever Mr. Bhutto may be doing, or his contradictory speeches, we should not be unnerved by them. There are internal forces operating. We should not create conditions which weaken these forces towards a peaceful settlement. Following the spirit of the Simla Agreement, we should have bilateral nego-

tiations without any outside interference, whether it be from the US or China or any other power. We should make this area an area of peace and stability on the basis of the mutual interests of the countries concerned. We should pursue our policy of friendship with Bangla Desh and consolidate and strengthen it. There are forces in the world and inside Bangla Desh which are trying to disrupt the firm friendship of Bangla Desh with us. We should guard against these forces.

Therefore, this is an occasion when wisdom has to be shown. There should be adherence to our basic national interests. Our national interest today is to pursue with firm determination the refashioning of our relations in this part of the sub-continent with Bangla Desh, a relation of firm and eternal friendship has to be built. We have to identify ourselves with the people of Bangla Desh, help them by all means and make our mutual friendship sufficiently firm so that outside interference is not able to demolish that friendship.

With Pakistan, we have to pursue our policy in the spirit of the Simla Agreement initiating a process of peaceful settlement of issues between us. Whatever time it takes, it should be our national determination to pursue that. We should not allow any internal forces or outside forces to deflect us from that path of peaceful settlement of disputes.

Our hon. friend had taken objection to the statement of the External Affairs Minister when he reiterated our stand that we want to pursue a policy of friendship with the US. I do not know whose national interest he is serving. We have never said that we want to pursue a policy of hostility with the US or, for that matter with China, or even Pakistan, with whom we have had difficulties in the past. How was it that our relations with the US deteriorated? Let us examine it. It was mainly



[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

because they followed a policy of balancing Pakistan with India when they gave massive military aid to Pakistan. That bedevilled our relations with the USA. There may have been a period when we have had PL 480 and other aid from the U. S. But all those things are irrelevant because the US followed a wrong policy of balancing Pakistan with India, piling up the former with massive military aid which resulted in several conflicts. That fouled our relations with that country.

But once that position has changed, the realities of the situation demand that the US or other powers recognise this fact the countries of this sub-continent have to settle their disputes themselves and have to live in peace, amity and co-operation. The spirit of co-operation has to be developed. This can happen once the old policy given up and the reality is recognised.

Similarly in regard to Bangla Desh, the completely erroneous policy which they followed which put them on the side of the worst crime against humanity has to be changed and the present reality recognised. Voices were raised in the U S itself against this policy. Leading papers, Senators and other Congressmen were against this policy. Therefore, if the US is willing to give up this policy and recognise the realities of the situation, that can be the basis of a new relationship. They have recognised Bangla Desh.

It is a positive factor. Some people have very uncharitably said that because we are having food difficulties and we need aid, we are trying to adjust our policies with the United States. Nothing can be more ungenerous and unpatriotic than this because it is the firm policy of the Government, these matters of aid are not connected with our basic policies and we are not to be guided by this. The basic thing is: our relations with

the United States will improve, can improve only when they give up this policy of balancing Pakistan. Whatever they may do, if there is no massive arms aid again to Pakistan—I am glad indications are there that they are not giving arms assistance to Pakistan—if they do not give it, it will be a positive factor, positive straw in the wind of change. These are the basic issues on the basis of the realities of the present day situation in the sub-continent.

Another irritating matter was Viet-Nam. We have consistently criticised the United States policy. Now that problem will also be solved, because peace will return to Viet-Nam. These are positive developments. If these developments take place and if there is a desire on the part of the United States to improve relations, we should not be lagging behind.

Similarly with China. Their attitude to the developments in the sub-continent, their attitude to Bangla Desh and their attitude to Pakistan is a very negative factor in the development of relations with China. We hope that in the near future if they show signs of recognising realities, positive steps can be taken for normalisation of relations with China. In all these aspects our objective are clear and form in the background for normalising relations with China.

Our relations with the Soviet Union are on a firm foundation. Nothing can change, nothing can obstruct our growing friendly relations with the Soviet Union. The Indo-Soviet Treaty is not directed against any other country. Therefore, whether China or any other country has fear or suspicion because of our close relations with the Soviet Union there is absolutely no foundation for such suspicion on their part. There is no compromise on this. Friendly relations with the Soviet Union is not only a Government policy, it is the desire and wish of the common

people here. They have stood by us in our most difficult times and therefore whatever winds of change, whatever new situation, new emerging pattern there may be the basic element of our foreign policy is our friendship with the Soviet Union and it will grow, because it is based on mutuality of interests and is also bringing stability and peace in this country; it is not directed against any country. Therefore what is needed today is that we should take more positive initiatives in the pursuit of our objectives. We should pay closer attention to our neighbouring countries, Nepal, Sri Lanka or Malaysia or other countries, littoral countries of the Indian ocean. We have been saying that the Indian Ocean should be an area of peace. A resolution is being moved in the United Nations; a panel of the United Nations has recommended it. Our national interest is involved in this and therefore we should take a more positive stand. I will not say that there should be a conference; this is not the stage at the moment but we must pursue with the countries more actively diplomatically, and try to create conditions in which we could convey our point of view and have a common programme of action in which this area can be maintained as an area of peace. There are other ramifications, naval presence of foreign countries. I do not have the time to go into that. I can only say that strong opinion should be created among the littoral countries so that that problem can also be tackled and the defence of our coasts can be maintained.

Lastly, in the present-day world, when the power blocs, language of war and military pacts have given place to cooperation and strengthening of relations, it is not the sinews of war but the sinews of peace—cultural, scientific, technological and much more so economic and commercial—which will be the weapons

of understanding. Many other countries are following it. The Chinese are going in for commercial and economic relations with many countries including Japan. The Japanese are doing the same with the Chinese and the Soviet Union, whether it is in the Pacific basin or South East Asia. All our talks of friendship will be meaningless particularly in this part of the Indian Ocean countries, the Persian Gulf countries and Asian countries unless we are prepared to share our know-how, scientific skill and economic strength, with the other countries, whether it is through transfer of technologies, joint ventures or various other things. It is a positive direction and the Government must continue this positive thrust of the foreign policy that they have been undertaking during the last 18 months. It calls for more detailed work and greater initiatives. That will be the real contribution of this country in the pursuit of peace and creating a climate of understanding and cooperation and stability in this world.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am glad that earlier today my friend, the Foreign Minister, persuaded himself to give us an extemporaneous survey of the world scene and it was done with characteristic self-assurance. And, I enjoyed also the other aspect of his speech that which was that it was a very pleasant lullaby. I say this because I discovered only towards the end of his speech that he referred to something really important and that is, the imponderables of the present situation, implying that the simplistic formulations that are being bandied about so glibly these days about *detente* being there and everything being more or less lovely in the garden, these simplistic formulations have to be examined at certain depth. We do not have an opportunity in this House, but elsewhere the Foreign Minister, I hope, does carry on exercises which would be less simplistic

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]  
than they appear to have been so far.

In spite of what my friend Shri Bhagat just now said—he has made by and large a very welcome speech—I would say that the recent bonanza of pleasant exchanges between India and the United States is more than a little intriguing and as a press wit said the other day, the Prime Minister's "thoughtful" message to President Nixon on his re-election has started snowballing. With sudden and uncanny chivalry, perhaps hoping that he would get from Shrimati Gandhi a repetition of the compliment she had paid to President Johnson in 1966 as a man of peace, with sudden chivalry, President Nixon, the X in whose name looks like the Swastika, the Fascist emblem, to freedom fighters in different parts of the world, has sent her birthday good wishes and the cautiously formulated hope of a sounder mutual relationship. The emphasis is on "sounder".

India's President, Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and whoever else could jump into the bandwagon, took up the cue, and my friend, the Foreign Minister, made a very important speech in the Rajya Sabha, which drew response, we are told, from the US Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, because, according to US commentators, it is "the most conciliatory ever in years". All this had been preceded by behind-the-scene operations, Shri B. K. Nehru leaving Assam bleeding in a thousand wounds to carry on confabulations in Washington, Shri Kewal Singh, now Foreign Secretary, carrying on with mystery-man Kissinger and others, the Indian Food Secretary on a secret mission to the dollar land. From the other end, as if to throw a sort of somewhat comic blind on the picture, comes a Billy Graham, evangelist and many other things besides armed with two meetings with Nixon, for discussion with India's Prime Minister. How and

why she prefers to find time for such gentry is quite a 64 million-dollar question.

All this in the name of *detente*, of course; we have a new manoeuvrability for everybody, it seems, is changing stances. The bi-polar structure of world politics is now giving way, we are told, to multi-polarism. Apart from United States and USSR, there is China, there is Japan and there is the emerging European community, and so on and so forth. If Nixon can be mending fences with China and the USSR, well, let him also be good enough to pity us and pull us out of our economic rut, for the incorrigibly *pukka* sahibs in our bureaucracy and their gullible political masters can never think of any but USA and her friends as really and truly able to help us, poor natives, with food, technology, machinery, know-how and God knows what else.

To put a brave face on things, our Foreign Minister waxed eloquently the other day on "common values of an abiding nature" which we are supposed to cherish equally with the United States—such as, he says our "belief in democracy, individual liberty and human dignity". There is a saying "tell that to the marines". I ask the Foreign Minister to tell that to the Vietnamese, against whom the rulers of USA have been fighting the dirtiest war in history—a chemical, electronic and, of late, geophysical warfare, aimed at destroying man's environment. The total weight of bombs dropped on Indo-China in the last six years was 13 million tonnes, equivalent to 450 atomic bombs of the Hiroshima type, bombs rained at the rate of 60 kg. per second and 300 kg. per person. There is no necessity to refer to the foreign basis of the United States and its ugly role as the gendarme of world reaction. Whatever their belief in democracy, individual liberty and human dignity might be, we do not share these with the rulers of the United States.

There can be no objection to our having normal relationship, diplomatic, commercial and other kinds of international friendly relationship with the United States, or any other country, irrespective of what we think of their rulers or their ideology. But following on a period when our relations with the United States were soured over American arms aid to Pakistan and other pinpricks and then turned bitter in 1971 when they had the gumption to send the Seventh Fleet to the Bay of Bengal, are we now beginning—I am asking this question—to repeat the 1966 act and cringe and curry favour with them? Are these the first, tentative, beginnings of a new shift towards reaction in the brave name of *détente* in our foreign policy? Is it a preparation for backsliding, which appears from time to time so clearly in our economic policy, and is now extended to foreign policy? Perhaps, it is no surprise that government now prepares to purchase, to import, a large quantity of foodgrains from the United States at increased prices, and stultifies the Ahmedabad AICC Resolution on the State take-over of wholesale trade in rice and wheat which is sabotaged by the Congress-led administration in different parts of the country.

Nixon will have to pull out from Vietnam but with repeated perfidy, a settlement is being delayed and sought to be distorted. Refusing to abide by the 9-point settlement which had been agreed to be signed before the end of October, U.S. imperialists still seek to operate from a position of strength. They have intensified fighting. They have got their Saigon puppets starting a terror campaign, jailing patriots by thousands and killing them off—all part of a pre-planned scheme to delay the peace. Except for mildly worded and belatedly mumbled phrases of unhappiness, India has scrupulously avoided taking a principled line. This must be the reason why in the settlement that is to come, India,

though Co-Chairman of the Control Commission, has no role. We have been rather namby-pamby in our policy and, while the Americans detest us for a variety of reasons, the freedom fighters of Vietnam are often perplexed at whatever we are doing. We invite Madame Binh, but mess up things when she comes to Delhi and do not yet recognise her Government. We do not sharply set our face against the United States' effort to delay and distort freedom in Vietnam and everywhere else.

Even so, in our sub-continent, the emergence of Bangladesh means a qualitative change in the picture of South Asia and makes possible a new pattern of relationship amongst the States of this region. With Bangladesh whose President was welcomed so cordially here, we have as with the Soviet Union a treaty of friendship and cooperation, a silken bond that nothing can snap. With Pakistan also India sincerely wants friendship and cooperation, and the Simla Agreement so welcome to us is being cleverly sabotaged in a peculiar manner characteristic of Mr. Bhutto. The Simla Agreement stresses—and we genuinely stand by it—bilateral solution of all mutual problems without foreign busy-bodies butting in and dirtying the waters.

The trouble is that United States and China both are hell-bent on keeping this part of the world in as much of trouble and difficulty as possible. They are specially hostile to India because she is the biggest factor and potentially the most progressive and powerful element.

Even lesser powers, like Britain which has never yet forgiven India her freedom, mouth words of sanctimonious concern in the U.N. or elsewhere, but you should not be influenced by the sanctimonious expressions. They will do everything possible to hinder cooperation between India, Bangladesh and Pakistan. For them, a grand panorama of

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

Asian cooperation beginning with all our neighbours would change the texture of world politics. To that panorama my hon. friend, Mr. Bhagat, made a tentative reference. But I do hope in the Congress party there is a greater awareness that India can take the leadership in building up the grand panorama of Asian cooperation. But that cannot be done with the blessings of the Nixon administration and that cannot be done by cringing before it. They would like to stand in the way of India being the initiator of a new progressive policy in this part of the world. Come what may, we have to have strength enough to defeat these machinations against us.

We shall be ready for the sake of peace and friendship to offer to Pakistan whatever is reasonable and even more. But we must tell Pakistan that there are limits which must not be crossed.

Whatever final settlement emerges has to be with the full concurrence of Bangladesh which must be recognised. These reactionary foreign elements are at work in Bangladesh and the rest of the sub-continent, fomenting trouble of every sort. We just cannot let down our guard. The C.I.A., Bhutto's blatant bla-bla about "Muslim Bengal", the slyly-manipulated "ultra" movements with the comic relief of Maulana Bhashani thrown in—all these are indications of what kind of plotting is going on in our part of the world

On any normal computation, Sino-Indian relations in the context of today should, without much difficulty, be normal, if not entirely cordial. India has expressed her readiness in this regard, but China, fabulously inscrutable, does not appear responsive perhaps because of her global calculations and of her suspicion, a kind of peculiar suspicion she has developed of India as a friend—and she certainly is a friend—of the Soviet Union. It is a pity that China flies

high today the banner of anti-Sovietism, in the process developing queer western contracts, wishing even for a so-called united Europe as a counter-poise to the Soviets in their western flank, offering sly encouragement to even Japan in spite of Japan's offer of permanent bases for the United States' Seventh Fleet, repudiating the people's magnificent upsurge in Bangladesh and behaving as badly as China does in the United Nations, reiterating hostility to India, using the veto against Bangladesh in the United Nations and voting sometimes in the company of such countries as Portugal and South Africa. In pitiful contrast with certain shining achievements of the great Chinese Revolution, Peking's policy has been peculiarly perverse, a kind of obstructionism in world affairs as far as the advance of freedom, peace and socialism is concerned. No doubt, this madness will pass; no doubt the enemies of world socialism cannot be allowed by intra-socialist division to go on making hay the way they do at the moment. This will happen the sooner if world developments assist the return of good sense.

India's foreign policy, for all the good intentions we have advertised, have been vulnerable on account, basically, of our economic weakness. For a country like ours with its commitment to economic independence and to the setting up of a new social order, it is essential to have a wide, comprehensive framework of foreign economic policy. Now that the world has changed, now that the Dollar and the Pound no longer mean what they did in the Fifties and Sixties, now that technology and know-how are not the monopoly of the United States and Britain, India must seek a different form of economic relationship based on bilateralism and mutual benefit. Relationship with the developed countries or a group of them will have to be examined very carefully in the light

of our interests and our independence and integrity. For example, it was impertinent on the part of the Japanese and derogatory on the part of a Planning Commission Member to say that, in an agreement of Indo-Japanese collaboration in the field of power generation or fertilisers, it would be provided that, in case the Indian welders went on strike, the Japanese would have the right to airlift welders from Tokyo. The foreign investor cannot be allowed to build an independent State in India like what the oil cartels, for example, have always been trying to do.

The External Affairs Ministry is the weakest link, I think, in its handling and understanding of economic affairs, and the economic Ministries deal with foreign affairs absolutely perfunctorily. The Foreign Trade Ministry has primarily a trader's approach, and this was reflected in our poor showing from the point of view of Afro-Asian interests which in an earlier period of time we appeared to champion and lead; but we failed from the point of view of Afro-Asian interests, at Unctad, UNCTAD-III, and the comparative failure of India to make an impact at Lima is due to the fact that there has been no co-ordination between the External Affairs Ministry or any other really and truly directing Ministry with the operation of our foreign trade

This country should know our own principled stand in world affairs and without appearing to make sanctimonious gestures, we should let the world know quietly but strongly about it. We should not hesitate to go ahead on principled foundations—moving correctly and cautiously with powers like the United States and China—correctly and cautiously—refusing to place ourselves on a plank of hostility but refusing also to cringe and kowtow. For lack of inner strength, we do not have a decisive role in global questions and we should tell the world that we wish

to be friends of all, especially and, to begin with, with our immediate neighbours, including China and Pakistan, but, that we are, at the same time, pledged to the cause of freedom, peace and socialism, howsoever far we might appear to be from our objective. Thus, we should have no delay in heightening links with North Korea, the P.R.G. of South Vietnam, developing lively contacts with that exhilarating little marvel of a country, Cuba, where unaccountably we have only a Charge' d' Affaires while they have an Ambassador representing them and present here all the time, evolving mutual consultation mechanisms with countries like the GDR and with which our relations have been brought up to the diplomatic level very happily and with countries like Chile. We should have consultation mechanisms also with countries like Tanzania and Algeria and with other countries whose experience in socio-economic reconstruction is valuable. The first priority today, of course, remains with the task of working out a genuine and lasting settlement as between ourselves and Bangla Desh and Pakistan—and also the inevitable pre-condition of progress, the reconstruction of our own peoples' lives, without which we remain the waifs and strays that we almost happen to be to-day in the world affairs.

Sir, I have done. I wish, but I fear I am too optimistic and I think I should not be too hopeful that the Government would try to take some meaningful note of some of the things which I have tried to say. Discussions of this sort can only be important if they really bring about qualitative changes in our foreign policy.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh): The year 1972 will undoubtedly remembered the year of *detente*. It is the year in which the post-war policies of confrontation are now

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

yielding to the policies of competition. It is the culmination of the policies that had been started many years ago even in the United States where the Kennedy administration had changed its policies from massive retaliation to flexible responsiveness.

But the question that comes before us is: for whom is this *detente*? Is it going to be a *detente* just for the few major powers or is it going to bring in its wake also something for the rest of the world and for the developing countries? To say that any change will bring benefit to the whole world, I am afraid, is not altogether true. We have seen that colonialism has been at its deepest when there has been an understanding between the colonial powers. Therefore, what we have to watch to-day is: what is going to be the shape and form of what we call to-day *detente*?

What do we see as a result of *detente*? That there is a better understanding between the two super powers, that they have made an arrangement to protect themselves against an attack from the other, that there is a wider understanding between the next group of powers, what we call the major powers. But what has it brought for us in Asia? War in Vietnam and conflict in West Asia, the growing gap between the rich and the poor countries, and this is where there is the question of what we can do, what India can do. What is India's validity? I hope my hon. friend, Mr. Krishna Menon, one of the architects of the concept of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, will go along with me when I say that the natural extension of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence is in international co-operation. It is an international co-operation based not on the domination by a few countries over the rest, but an international cooperation based on the interest of all countries, especially of the developing countries. History has seen the exploitation and the developing countries today owe

a responsibility to developing countries as they owe their development and prosperity due to the exploitation of these developing countries.

Therefore the valid question that comes up before us is this. What is India going to do in this situation? We cannot forget the geographic fact that we are in Asia. Our primary responsibility is to try to build up institutions in Asia which are willing to cooperate. It is a matter of deep regret that today—even after two decades after most of the countries have become independent,—there is no Asian organisation for the Asian Ministers and representatives of the Asian peoples to sit together to ponder over these questions. Our primary responsibility is to think in terms of assisting in the building up of some of these Asian institutions.

Much has been said about a peace zone, a zone of peace in the Indian ocean. But how can there be a peace zone unless we seek identity of interest among the countries that border Indian ocean?

Sir, to say that no one will come here is not an answer. Our fiat does not run all over the world. We cannot say no navies or no foreign countries will come into this area because we have no means of preventing them. Any initiative can come only when we in Asia try to coordinate our action and build in Asia an understanding in which the interest of the people of Asia are protected.

We had made a modest beginning. An Asian Council of Ministers was formed under the aegis of ECAFE and I think it is a matter of deep regret that this was allowed to die out. One does not hear of it. One does not see any tangible results coming from it.

We had a scheme in this country whereby we were trying to utilise the surplus of one country for the developmental processes of the other

countries. We initiated an arrangement with Iran whereby we would be able to utilise their surpluses in oil resources in building up fertiliser plants in this country on joint collaboration basis. We had also a scheme of sharing of resources when we proposed a consortium between the tea companies of India and the tea companies of Sri Lanka so that we could go into joint marketing of the surplus that exist in both the countries. One does not hear of both these projects today. Unless we are able to think in terms of larger association, the country tends to get isolated. It gives opportunity for other countries to come in the region and try to deepen their own associations and defence pacts and economic arrangements. This is where economic diplomacy is of the greatest importance. Next year China will enter ECAFE, from the reports that we have today. What is going to be our strategy when Chinese becomes an active member of the economic association that governs Asia or that helps Asian countries? What is going to be the role of China? What is our assessment? What is going to be our reaction? The Foreign Minister has very kindly devoted a considerable portion of his opening speech to Asia. I welcome it because it is in Asia that we have got to make the beginning and then when these institutions begin to take shape, we have got to concert them with similar institutions in other continents where there are large numbers of developing countries, whether of Africa or Southern America, the Latin American countries or others; then only, we can think in terms of a meaning of *detente* for the developing countries. Otherwise, a great risk remains that it may become a *detente* only for the few and may create complications for us more than what we have seen in the past. That does not mean that it may become a *detente*. I think that it is one of the things that we have all to recognise, to welcome and to appreciate that there is lessening of tension. But lessening

of tension between a few should not be a cause of increasing of tension between others, but it must aim at a general lessening of tension.

The *detente* that we have been talking about is an interesting phenomenon in the sense that it has been born out of the new confidence that these countries have acquired. Unfortunately, we have not been able to acquire this confidence in the developing countries. In our own region, we have not acquired the confidence with which we can deal with our neighbours, and that is largely because our own economies have not reached a stage where we can be confident of greater initiative and action. But even so, at some point of time we have got to take these risks and of operating from confidence and persuading other countries also to operate from confidence, so that there is a general appreciation that the prosperity of one country will not be at the cost of the prosperity of another or that the prosperity of one country will lead to the domination of another country. This is where what I said earlier acquires double importance, namely that the prosperity should be colinked in a manner in which all the countries have a stake in the prosperity of one another.

Much has been said about the United States and the Soviet Union and about our steps, if one may so call it, of trying to normalise relations with the United States. I would say that there is nothing wrong in our taking initiatives for normalising relations with several countries, whether it is the United States, or whether it is China or whether it is any other country. If we are pledged to peaceful co-operation, if we are pledged to peaceful coexistence, then the normal expectation is that there would be peaceful relations between countries. But it is equally important that friendship with one country should not be at the cost of the other. I hope that I can speak for the Foreign



[Shri Dinesh Singh]

Minister when I say that our friendship with the United States will certainly not be at the cost of our friendship with the Soviet Union or any other country. We do share certain ideals with the Soviet Union and we share certain ideals with the United States. Both are democratic countries, despite what the administration of the United States may have done in one circumstance or another. I entirely agree with Shri H. N. Mukherjee when he says that one of the tragedies of the modern world has been the attitude of the United States towards colonial countries and the attitude of the United States in Viet Nam. History will never pardon the administration, the administrators, and the people who were responsible for the barbaric acts of war and annihilation in Viet Nam.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai):** Will history pardon that State which has crushed Czechoslovakia and Hungary also?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I am sorry if the hon. Prof. Samar Guha is feeling neglected. I shall presently come to him also.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** Not neglected. But crime is a crime; it may be done by any superpower anywhere in the world.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** We share with the US values of democracy and certain freedoms. We also share many values with the Soviet Union. Our common struggle against colonialism is an example which will remain in history as one of the fundamental co-operations for peace and prosperity. It is, therefore, important that we preserve these values wherever they are.

There is only one other matter to which I would wish to refer. That is, that whatever happens, it is important for India to remain active in the international world. That does not mean that we have not been active, nor that we are inactive. But the situation today calls for greater activity. It is a matter of pity that

when Asian solutions are being thought of, we seem to be out of the picture. When one thinks of peace in Vietnam, when one thinks of arrangements that will come, it appears India is not in the picture. It is not enough to say that we have to be invited by both sides, that we cannot be participants unless we are invited by both sides. Canada is saying the same thing, and yet she is being invited to this conference. But it is important that we create conditions in which it is useful to have India. I would not go into the past history. I have had occasion in this House to refer to how we remained in the picture in the earlier solutions that were thought of in Vietnam, even though we were not initially invited to that conference. It is still not too late for us to think in terms of active co-operation in finding peace in Vietnam. It is not enough to say that it should be left to the US, the DRVN or to the people of South Vietnam joining in. If there is any group of foreign powers to determine peace in Vietnam, India must be amongst that group that is active there. Otherwise, we will gradually slide out of the Asian scene.

The same thing applies to West Asia. Unless the arrangements envisage a position for India, not a position of dominance, not a position of interference, but a position of co-operation, we may slide out of the scene. It is not enough to say that we have to be invited to go. Of course, an invitation is useful, but there are many ways of getting an invitation.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai):** I am thankful to you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, for giving me an opportunity now although my priority is not so high.

The hon. Sardarji has made a rather very quick geographic survey of recent global events, unfortunately without giving us clearly an evaluation of the new developments and new orientation in the international world, particularly in regard to diplomacy and the lesson we can derive for our national benefit. Strangely,

we are witnessing today the definition of either erstwhile or potential enemies losing its significance. We find that the concept of ideology or military alignment in the international area has undergone a radical change. We are finding new alignments inconceivable even a few years before. Perhaps five years before nobody could even imagine that it was possible; that those countries which were so inimical to one another like the United States and China, China and Japan or Russia and Germany could come together in such kind of pacts as have recently been enacted between those countries. It is one of the unique phenomenon, I should say a miracle in reorientation of international diplomacy that we are witnessing today which has its effect on military alignments also, apart from politics. We find that the importance of the NATO block or the Warsaw block, or the SEATO or the CENTO is increasingly missing.

It is very natural that India could have taken pride in this new development because after our Independence for the first two decades, India was scrupulously fighting for a policy of non alignment in the international world. The Indian image was very bright as a non-aligned country. But unfortunately in the last one or two years the Indian image of non-alignment is not as shining as it was before, however much we may wish that our image as a non-aligned country remained as it was before. We have not been able to convince international powers that India remains a non-aligned power as before. This is because our Government has allowed itself to be identified too much in international politics and international diplomacy with a super power. If we really want that not only the Indian Ocean but the whole of the Indian sub-continent together with the Indian Ocean should be neutralised from the influence of international power blocs, then it is absolutely essential that India must try, consciously try hard, to restore her image as a non-aligned power.

There lies the key to the problem of neutralisation of the Indian sub-continent as well as the Indian Ocean.

The test of success of our foreign policy is not in making a good survey of international events or writing a good thesis on it; the test is—I shall again use the word neutralisation—whether as a first step, as an immediate step we can neutralise Pakistan. By using the word 'neutralisation', I mean this. The deformed Pakistan is standing today, not on its legs, but on two crutches, one supplied by China and the other by the United States. The sooner Pakistan is denied these two crutches, more quickly will Pakistan be brought to *terra firma* of realism, that has happened after the emergence of Bangla Desh. Why do I emphasise that India should strive hard for restoration of her image as a non-aligned power? There lies the key again to the question whether we shall be able to take away the crutches from the deformed Pakistan.

I know there are friends who do not grudge Mr. Nixon meeting a certain set of politicians in the international world. But when India, for her own interests, wants to have a certain kind of understanding and relations with a certain power, our friends see ghosts in them. As Indians of the Indian soil, believing in the Indian heritage, Indian tradition and freedom, we must look at it as a non-aligned power. The whole success of the future of our international relations depends on how quickly we can normalise our relations with China on the one hand and the United States on the other, not at the cost of Russia. It does not mean that it is at the cost of any country. Our relations with other countries as a nonaligned power should be viewed from our national perspective, national interest and national objective. For that, it is absolutely necessary that we should try our best ingeniously to restore normal relations with China and the United

[Shri Samar Guha]

States. I use the word "ingeniously" because the minister said that we have not been able to make progress in getting response from China. But now to Peking many doors have been opened through Tokyo, London, Paris and Bonn. We can now see clearly the events developing in China, if not through the window of Delhi, through the other windows which have been opened. We can take advantage of those windows to get into the mind of China.

We should also disabuse and remove the apprehension of China regarding the Indo-Soviet Treaty. We should make it clear that the treaty is not directed against China in the sense that we are a party to the strategic containment of China from the southern region. This apprehension is standing in the way of normalisation of our relations with China. The basic condition for affording an opportunity for normalisation of our relations with China has radically changed. The former axis of rivalry between Delhi and Peking has changed. The axis of rivalry is no longer between Delhi and Peking. The axis of rivalry is now between Peking and Moscow. It will be wrong and dangerous for a democratic country like India to get into the jaws of two super communist powers. You must be careful about it. If you are careful, certainly it will be possible for us to quickly normalise our relations with China, provided we can disabuse China of her apprehension in regard to the Indo-Soviet Treaty.

About the United States, I know many of my friends will call me reactionary—I want normalisation of our relations with the United States. We knew the emissions and commissions of the United States. But may I say, we do not look to the past but to the future. It is in our own interest that we should normalise our relations with the United States. Some members of the ruling party, including the Congress President,

have been making valuable charges, undefined and unidentified charges of CIA activity in India. This kind of kite-flying does not add to the dignity of a big country like ours. Identify them; I will have nothing against that. But unidentified voluble charges neither add to our dignity nor to our interests. Therefore, we should be careful about them. If Shri B. K. Nehru's visit can bridge up the difference between India and Washington, I will hail his visit to the United States; I will not decry it.

The hon. Minister said in the morning that the Government was making good progress with Pakistan in regard to the implementation of the Simla Agreement. Yes, we are making good progress, but towards what? Towards wature inside Pakistan. The second mistake, which we are continuing, is that we are moving on the basis that dealing with Pakistan we have made three fundamental, basic mistakes. I will mention those three mistakes. Firstly, we made a premature move to negotiate with Pakistan before the political events, after the emergence of Bangladesh, were allowed to mature inside Pakistan. The second mistake, which we are continuing, is that we are moving on the basis that we fought two separate wars against Pakistan, although our war with Pakistan was one single war. But we treated it as two years, one on the eastern front and another on the western front. We have proceeded to negotiate with Pakistan on the basis of that, we have tried to settle the question of prisoners of war with Pakistan on the basis of that two-war theory.

The third mistake we have made is that we have emphasized too much on the politics of bilateralism. Bilateralism is good for our international relations but not for countries that belong to the Indian sub-continent, because that would be unrealistic. Because of the history and geo-physical situation of the Indian sub-continent, we cannot think of bilateralism because there are three countries inextricably involved there. We have to

take lessons from recent developments in East and West Germany, North and South Vietnam, North and South Korea; things are changing and countries are changing and as such we have to think of new types of diplomacy, new outlook and new ideas for the entire Indian sub-continent. Peace is indivisible and security is indivisible. We entered into negotiation with Pakistan, excluding Bangladesh and the result was the Simla Agreement. I know I will be dubbed, I do not know by what terms, but I would say that because of our mistake of having premature and unrealistic negotiations with Pakistan in the form of Simla Agreement, we have deterred, we have deferred, and we have allowed the recognition of Bangladesh to recede. If we had insisted that Bangladesh must be a party to the negotiations, if we had insisted that peace is indivisible in the Indian sub-continent. Pakistan would have been obliged, compelled, to recognise Bangladesh and Bangladesh would have got its rightful place in the United Nations by now. I am sure you have seen the statement of Shri Samad about tripartite negotiations regarding the problems of the Indian sub-continent. Peace, security, friendship, amity and neutralisation of the influence of the foreign powers in the Indian sub-continent cannot be achieved without tripartite negotiations, where India, Bangladesh and Pakistan will have to sit together, deal the whole problem together and come to an agreement together. Because of our historic and geophysical position, we cannot escape from tripartite talks for durable peace in this area.

With Bangladesh we are doing quite well at the governmental level. But we have plugged communion, communication, negotiation, exchange of ideas and friendship at the popular level by unnecessarily introducing passports and visa, which have led Mr. Bhutto to talk of Muslim Bengal, and which have created a lot of misunderstanding inside Bangladesh. I congratulate Bangladesh for on the

17th they are giving to themselves a new Constitution on the basis of nationalism, democracy, socialism and secularism. I hope Bangladesh will lead the Indian sub-continent by giving a new philosophy of secular nationalism, when for the last 25 years we have not been able to change even the names of Muslim and Hindu Universities. Bangladesh has banned all communal parties. Bangladesh will lead India and Pakistan to a new future of non-communal nationalism for the whole of the sub-continent.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, Mr. Dinen Bhattacharyya opened his speech by complaining that the hon. Foreign Minister did not spell out in detail the achievement of our foreign policy. But he forgets that in international diplomacy, what is not spoken is sometimes more important than what is spoken. Our hon. Foreign Minister is a master in that art. Therefore, if he has not been able to gather from what the hon. Foreign Minister has not spoken, he should blame himself and complement the hon. Foreign Minister whenever that may be.

Today, when we are discussing about international situation and international politics, and while doing so, we must take into account certain factors that have taken place in the last year, namely, *detente* between China and U.S.A., the *detente* between U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., the Indo-Soviet Treaty and the re-structuring of the entire geo-political situation in the Indian sub-continent on the emergence of Bangla Desh. We cannot today discuss effectively and objectively and international situation, without keeping our mind open to these factors. With these factors in view, I shall try to analyse our relationship with other countries, firstly, with our immediate neighbour Pakistan and, then, with other countries.

Coming to the speech made by Prof. Samar Guha who is not here now, I found in his speech absolute contradiction when he said on the one hand

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

it is our duty to neutralise Pakistan and on the other criticised Simla agreement. How can we neutralise Pakistan? According to him we can neutralise Pakistan by taking away the two crutches upon which Pakistan is standing the crutch of China and the crutch of U.S.A. I ask him: Why is it that we have taken a pledge to redeem and make successful the Simla Agreement? One of the very basic objective of the Simla Agreement is to take away these crutches upon which Pakistan is standing. We should not forget that the main obstacles which have come in the way of implementing the Simla Agreement today are, firstly, the internal stresses put on Mr. Bhutto by the military regime in Pakistan and, secondly, stresses put in by external forces, of China and also America.

After all, if the Simla Agreement succeeds, certain basic consequences will follow. The consequences will be that, firstly, it will mark a definite and positive decline of influence of China and America on policies of Pakistan. Secondly, if the Simla Agreement succeeds, the two crutches upon which Pakistan is standing today, according to Prof. Samar Guha himself, will be taken away. I think, if Simla succeeds, we will achieve the objective which he has asked us to achieve.

Then, we should also remember that if the Simla Agreement succeeds, it will mean a shift in the attitude of many pro-Pakistan countries and that will be definitely beneficial to our country. It will mean a victory of popular forces over military forces, it not democratic forces in Pakistan. If we want lasting and durable peace in the sub-continent, obviously, we must try for this victory.

I want to make it clear that when we entered into the Simla Agreement, we did not enter into that with any petty shop-keeper's attitude in order to achieve certain bargaining advantages, simply because we were in a position of bargaining. We entered

into the Simla Agreement with an honest and pious hope for lasting and durable peace. We will continue to do whatever is possible to make this agreement success. Let us hope that Pakistan will also reciprocate.

As I have said, in the changing structure of Indian sub-continent today, our foreign policy should have a new outlook and should undergo a new assessment. Up till a few years ago, Pakistan, as an ideological concept, put a posture of protecting Muslim interests and, because of that posture, we found that some Muslim countries which otherwise had very friendly relations with us, at the moment of our crisis with Pakistan, tried to desert us or at least were indifferent to us. Today, after the emergence of Bangladesh, Pakistan cannot put before the International world that posture because the happenings that have taken place during the last year have amply proved to the international world that Pakistan is not a nation which has really protected the Muslim interests as it professed to be.

Secondly, we should not forget that, numerically, today Pakistan stands only third in the Muslim world and, therefore, on the basis of these changes we can think in terms of making certain amount of adjustment, certain amount of re-thinking, certain amount of re-vising, in our attitude with the Muslim and particularly Arab world. Till this moment we have treated the Arab world as a homogeneous unit, as a bloc, and our attitudinal extreme hostility towards us. One of the reasons why we did not there are certain countries in the Arab world today which, unfortunately, even in the moment of crisis, in spite of our good wishes to them, have shown extreme hostility towards us. One of the reasons why we did not want to alienate the Arab world as a whole from us was because that would have helped Pakistan to achieve its objective. But when the very ideological concept of Pakistan has been dead after the emergence of Bangladesh, I think, the time has come when we can revise our attitude towards the Arab world; and instead of

treating it as a homogenous bloc, we can start thinking of taking individual stand in terms of individual countries in the Arab world itself. That is a view-point which I submit for consideration before the hon. Minister of External Affairs.

Then I come to our relations with America. I do not know why our Communist friends, Marxist friends and also the right Communists friends, are so very sensitive about normalising relationship with America. After all, in the international policies in international diplomacy, countries do not stand glove to glove as if to fight a game until the other party is either knocked out or surrenders. In international diplomacy is a game of chess, where manoeuvres have to change with counter-manoevres of the other party. If a detente can take place between America and Russia and America and China, there is no reason why there cannot be a detente between us and America. Two significant factors have taken place on account of which, I think, a significant change in American attitude towards India can be expected. The first one is the emergence of Bangladesh. The two significant factors which came in the way of normal relations between India and the USA in the recent part were: America's attitude to Pakistan particularly in reference to Bangladesh, and, secondly, America's commitment in Indo-China. Because we spoke in extremely strong terms on the basis of our longstanding and inevokable attitude and ideology in respect of the Vietnam issue, America had, to a certain extent, a hostile attitude towards us. But, if newspaper reports are any indication, perhaps America is slowly getting away from its commitment in Indo-China. Also, Bangladesh has become a reality today. So one of the two stumbling blocks between USA and India have disappeared and other is the process of disappearing. In that context, I do not know why any one should be sensitive if we talk in terms of normalising our relations with Am-

erica. If China invites Mr. Nixon to Peking according to our Marxist friends that is a good thing for the world. But if we want to normalise relations with America, then they say that we become a tool of the capitalist world! I will ask my Marxist friends to avoid these double standards and have a uniform standard—the two popular phrases which are extremely popular at least to Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu.

Then I come to our relations with China. Whatever may be said, unless China is prepared to give up its spirit of expansionism in Asia, unless it is prepared to see the relations that India has no such idea of expansion, I do not think of immediate prospects of any better relations with China. Our doors are open, our hands are open, for better relations with China, but I have my own apprehension; as things stand today, I do not see a very bright feature at least in immediate future.

As you are ringing the bell, I will conclude by making a reference to only three points in a couple of minutes. My first submission to the Minister of External Affairs is that, perhaps, the time has come when we should have a more positive approach towards Japan. Nobody can deny that within the next decade Japan will be one of the strongest forces in the international scene and its voice will count very much in the international community. The people of both these countries have mutual respect for each other. We should try to open up new avenues with Japan; we should also try to open up new avenues with the other countries of South East Asia.

Before I conclude, I want to make a mention about two more points.

One is regarding Indians staying abroad. We have seen what has happened in Uganda. I am sure the Foreign Minister or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will take steps to protect their interests. But, one thing we should remember that these Indians residing in Africa or in countries

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

outside India project the image of the country abroad and to that extent, their projection of the image, their relationship with the local people play its own part in projecting our image before these countries. Therefore, if the Indian residents of those countries want that in their moment of crisis we should come to their help which is their duty also to see that they behave in a manner so that our image in those countries may remain extremely high and the basic values for which we stand today in the international community are projected in just and proper perspective.

Lastly, the other aspect to which I would like to make a mention and which has been mentioned by Prof. Mukherjee also is the necessity of co-ordination in the economic and foreign relations of the country. After all, we cannot have a non-aligned foreign policy successfully implemented unless we are self-reliant. Whatever one may say about aid without strings, we have seen from our past experience that the donor countries always expect a sense of gratitude from the receiving countries. The donor countries always carry a feeling that it is the moral duty of the receiving countries to follow them and to abide by them. The receiving country on the other hand feels that as the aid is without strings, it is entitled or at least it has the freedom to act in any manner as it likes. This leads to tensions in the international community. We cannot have international brotherhood when such things prevail. Therefore, if we want successful implementation of our foreign policy, we must be economically strong and independent. Therefore, I appeal to the Foreign Minister to have better co-ordination with the Foreign Trade Ministry because it has a direct relationship with our foreign policy.

With these words, I conclude.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (गुवाहाटी)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, किसक बंदोबस्त हुए मान-

किस से एक बार फिर यह बात स्पष्ट हो गई है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में आज भी न कोई स्वार्थी भिन्न होता है और न कोई स्वामी बन्द होता है, अत्येक राष्ट्र अपने स्वार्थ का विचार करता है यह बात अलग है कि स्वार्थ को शान्ति, स्वीकृति, स्वतन्त्रता या कम्युनिज्म के आवरण में लपेट कर रखा जाता है चीन और अमेरिका का निकट आना कुछ वर्ष पहले एक अकल्पनीय घटना थी लेकिन यह घटना सम्भव हो गई। आज उसकी प्रशंसा की जा रही है। उसे देता का नाम दिया जा रहा है। हम देख रहे हैं कि अमेरिका कल तक जिन अ्यांग कई शोक को मिर पर बिठा कर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रंगमंच पर परिक्रमा करता था उन्हें उसने बता दिया। दूसरी ओर चीन का रबैया यह है कि वह कल तक बिग्व भर में मुक्ति संग्रामों का मिरताज बनने का दावा करता था लेकिन अब बंगला देश का सबाल आया तो सर्कीण स्वार्थ से प्रेरित होकर, मैं उसे मंकीण स्वार्थ कह रहा हूँ, उमने बंगला देश के मुक्ति संग्राम की पीठ से छुरा भोंकने में सकोच नहीं किय। सोबियत रूस भी यद्यपि कम्युनिज्म के तारे लगाता है किन्तु अपने हितों को प्रमुखता देता है। इसमें कोई मुझे शिकायत नहीं है। लेकिन शिकायत तब होती है जब हमारे देश में विदेश नीति का निर्धारण राष्ट्र के हितों के आधार पर नहीं, किसी बिशेष विचारधारा के आधार पर तय करने का फैसला किया जाता है।

उदाहरण के लिए अभी इस बात की चर्चा करे गई कि अब अमेरिका ने विद्यमान में फिर से बम बर्षा शुरू कर दी और हमारे कुछ मित्र निकसन को हत्यादा और किस्मियत को

मैसैजर आफ डैथ कह कर उनकी निन्दा कर रहे थे तब क्रैमलिन के विशाल भवन में निक्सन और किसिजर के स्वागत के लिए लाल गलीचा बिछाया जा रहा था। अगरे रूस अपने हित में जिसे वह विश्व हित का नाम देता है, अमेरिका से मित्रता करे तो न तो साम्राज्यवाद आड़े ना है न कम्युनिज आड़े आता है, लेकिन हमारी विदेश नीति में अगरे थोडा भी लचीलापन लाने का प्रयत्न किया जाय तो उसे एक आइडियोलोजी के खम्भे में बाध कर जड़ बनाने की कोशिश की जाती है।

यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है, मगर है यह सच कि आज भी दुनिया के फैसेले शक्ति के आधार पर होते है। हम इस स्थिति को बदलना चाहते है, यसच है लेकिन हमे वास्तविकता की धरती पर पैर रख कर चलना पड़ेगा, कल्पना के लोक में विचरण करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। यह चीन की शक्ति का प्रताप है कि जापान के प्रधान मन्त्री को पेरिकिंग की न केवन यात्रा करनी पडी मगर अपने आक्रमण के लिए माफी मागनी पडो। जो हमारे मित्र चीन से नार्मनाइजेसन को बान करते हैं उन्हें समझ लेना चाहिए—तो नार्मनाइजेसन विदाउट न्यूक्लोराइजेसन। जब तक हम ऐटामिक शक्ति नहीं बनगे, जब तक हमारा चीन की शक्ति से सन्तुलन नहीं होगा, जब तक दोनों देशों क नह पता नहोगा कि युद्ध का अर्थ विजय नहीं विनाश है, तब तक शान्ति नहीं होगी।

रूस और अमेरिका के मित्र बनने का यही रहस्य है। दोनों की ताकत बराबर है। दोनों लड़ने की भूल नहीं कर सकते। मुझे

समझ में नहीं आता कि उठते बैठते हम चीन के सम्बन्ध सुधारना चाहते है, हम चीन से सम्बन्ध सुधारना चाहते है, यह रट क्यों लगाई जाती है। नीति सम्बन्धी वक्तव्य एकाध बार होना चाहिए और जो कुछ आप को करना है परदे के पीछे करिए। दिन रात रट लगा कर भारत को उपहास का विषय मत बनाइए। जब तक चीन के रबीये में परिवर्तन का मकेत नहीं मिलता, दोस्ती का एकतरफा हाथ मित्रता पैदा नहीं करता।

मुझे सदेह है कि चीन भारत के साथ सामान्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना चाहेगा। अभी भुट्टों साहब ने इम रहस्य का उद्घाटन किया कि पाकिस्तान क इशारे पर चीन ने वगला देश का प्रवेश यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में रोक दिया। पहले हमारे नीति निर्माता कह रहे थे और पाकिस्तान के जो प्रतिनिधि आए थे मिस्टर अजीज अहमद उन्होंने भी कहा कि चीन ने अपने आप उनका प्रवेश रोका है, हमने नहीं कहा। लेकिन अब भुट्टो साहब कहने है कि हमारे कहने से रोका है। शायद चीन इम भूबण्ड में शान्ति नहीं चाहता, पाकिस्तान का उपयोग करके यहा तनाव बनाए रखना चाहता है। वगला देश के निर्माण के समय चाऊ एन लाई ने जो कुछ कहा उसको भी हन स्मरण रखें। चाऊ एन लाई ने कहा था कि यह अब भारत के विघटन का प्रारम्भ है। अगरे चीन के रबीये में परिवर्तन होता है तो बडी खुशी की बात है। लेकिन परिवर्तन का ठोस प्रमाण मिले बिना दिन रात सम्बन्धो को सामान्य बनाने की रट लगाना यह कोई फनदामी विवेक नीति का परिणाम नहीं है।



### श्री छटस बि.रं. ब.ज.देवी

अमेरिका के साथ हमारे सम्बन्धों में सुधार हो, यह आवश्यक है। लेकिन सुधार तभी हो सकता है जब डा. भूखण्ड के बारे में अमेरिका के दृष्टिकोण में परिवर्तन हो। अमेरिका का एक नया है इस भूखण्ड के बारे में। शायद राष्ट्रपति निकसन ने एक नक्शा बनाया है और वह कहते थे कि हमने एक अर्रेंजमेंट सोचा था। भारत ने बंगला देश की मदद करके उन अर्रेंजमेंट को बिगाड़ दिया। लेकिन निकसन साहब लचीले भी हो सकते हैं। अगर वह एक साथ चीन और रूस के मित्रता का तर्क है तो उन्हें भारत के सम्बन्ध में या इन भूखण्ड के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करने में संकोच नहीं होना चाहिये। अमेरिका अगर नये सिरे से विचार करे तो भारत सरकार कुछ हमारे इन मित्रों के कहने के आधार पर इन सम्बन्धों को सुधारने में संकोच न करे।

केवल सोवियत रूस पर निर्भर रहना— एक अच्छी नीति नहीं है। सोवियत रूस हमारा मित्र है, मित्रता के इन बन्धनों को हम सुदृढ़ करना चाहेंगे, लेकिन सोवियत रूस की मित्रता का अर्थ यह नहीं हो सकता कि हम अपने सब आपशब्द बन्द कर दें, सारे दरवाजे अपने लिये रोक दें और केवल रूस की दगा-दृष्टि पर निर्भर रहें। यह देश के हित में अच्छी नीति नहीं होगी। जो रूस समर्थक हमारे मित्र ऐसी सलाह देते हैं, वे रूस का हित भले ही करते हों, लेकिन भारत का हित संवर्धन नहीं करते।

16 hrs.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन ने भारत-सोवियत सन्धि का स्वागत किया था। उस

सन्धि ने बंगला देश की मुक्ति में हमारी मदद की। उस सन्धि में कहा गया था कि सोवियत रूस हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल नहीं देगा। यह सन्धि की शर्त है—आर्टिकल 1 में कहा गया था—

“Article 1: Each party shall respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the other party and refrain from interfering in the other's internal affairs.”.

मैंने अपने भाषण में कहा था—सोवियत रूस अगर यह वायदा करता है तो यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। हम उनके अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल नहीं देना चाहते, लेकिन हम उन्हें अपने अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल देने की इजाजत नहीं देंगे? सन्धि से पहले वह दखल देते थे, साल भर चुप रहे और अब फिर उन्होंने दखल देना शुरू कर दिया है। मैं एक समाचार पत्र की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ—

#### Moscow Hails Election:

“Moscow, Nov. 29: The Orissa Chief Minister Mrs. Mandini Satpathy's election was described here yesterday as victory for India's democratic forces. A report circulated by the official news agency on the election said that reactionary forces had challenged the candidate of the ruling party.”

अगर कोई स्वतन्त्र पत्र इस तरह के विचार प्रकट करे तो शिकायत का कारण नहीं है। लेकिन वहां स्वतन्त्र पत्र नहीं हैं। वहां तो सम्वाद समिति भी स्वतन्त्र नहीं है। दूसरे—यह आफिशियल रिप्लेशन है अगर आफिशियल रिप्लेशन यह है कि एक पार्टी का उम्मीदवार जीतेगा तो रूस कहेगा कि लोकतन्त्रवादी शक्तियों की विजय हुई

है अगर अगर एक पार्टी का उम्मीदवार हार जायगा तो कहा जायगा कि प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियों की हार हुई है—हम अपने घर में एक दूसरे को प्रोग्रेसिव कह सकते हैं, रिएक्शनरी कह सकते हैं, लेकिन रूस को इजाजत नहीं दे सकते कि हमारे देश के घरेलू मामलों में दखल दे और किसी को प्रोग्रेसिव और किसी को रिएक्शनरी कहे। अगर कल अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति किसी पार्टी को प्रोग्रेसिव या रिएक्शनरी कहना शुरू कर दे तो क्या यह हमारे मामलों में दखल नहीं होगा।

इसी तरह की एक खबर तास ने भी छपी थी। वह भी एक सरकारी सम्वाद-समिति है और मैंने पत्र लिख कर विदेशी मंत्री जी का ध्यान उस की तरफ दिलाया था, लेकिन कोई जवाब नहीं मिला, यहाँ तक कि पत्र की पहुँच भी नहीं मिली। . .

श्री एस० ए० शर्मा (श्रीमन्) : वह डरते हैं कि कोई बम न हों।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हम चाहते हैं कि हम सोवियत रूस को स्पष्ट कर दें कि हमें मित्र चाहिये, मालिक नहीं चाहिये। बराबरी के आधार पर मित्रता होगी। सोवियत रूस को हम घरेलू मामलों में दखल देने की इजाजत नहीं देंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय शिमला सम्मेलन से जो आशयें की गई थी वे पूरी नहीं हुई। मुझे इस के लिये खुशी नहीं है, मुझे इस लिये अफसोस है। शायद हम ने अल्दबाजी में शिमला समझौता कर लिया। भुट्टो की टोकरी में सारे अण्डे रख कर हम ने बुद्धिमत्ता का परिचय नहीं दिया। आज हमारे सेनापति

लाहौर गये हैं। वह पहले भी लाहौर गये थे। सीमांकन के सबल पर गाड़ी अट गई है। क्या इस के पीछे सारे पाकिस्तान का दृष्टिकोण प्रतिबिम्बित नहीं होता है? अगर हम डेढ़ मील का इलाका छोड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं और छोड़ना भी नहीं चाहिये तो अपने प्रधान सेनापति को लाहौर का आवागमन करने का कष्ट उठाने देने की क्या आवश्यकता है? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस दिन बंगला देश के राष्ट्रपति और उनके सहयोगी हमारी राजधानी में, थ उसी दिन दिल्ली के समाचार पत्रों में बंगला देश के हत्यारे टिक्का खा का हमारे प्रधान सेनापति के साथ फोटो छपा था। उन्हें यह अच्छा नहीं लगा। उनके साथ आए हुए कुछ लोगों के साथ मेरी बात हुई। उन की वेदना को हम समझे। बंगला देश में यह भावना पैदा हो गई है कि भारत बंगला देश की उपेक्षा कर के पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती के सम्बन्ध कायम करना चाहता है।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: That is absolutely wrong. He cannot attribute this to our friendly country, Bangla Desh. It is unfair to us, it is unfair to Bangla Desh.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: This my reading of the situation.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): It is at least a reasonable assumption.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—शिमला में आपने भुट्टो से यह क्यों नहीं कहा कि हमारी आपकी बात तक तक पूरी नहीं होगी, जब तक आप बंगला देश को मान्यता नहीं देंगे और बंगला देश के राष्ट्रपति को भी त्रिपलीय वार्ता में बात-चीत करने के लिये नहीं बसायेंगे। शिमला

[श्री अटन बिहारी वाजपेयी]

मे आप पहली बात यह कहते। आप देश को यह बता कर गये थे कि सारे मामले एक साथ तय होंगे और आपने टुकड़ों में मामला हल कर लिया। अब आप कहते हैं कि भुट्टो ने बामदा किया था कि बगला देश को मान्यता दे देंगे, लेकिन भुट्टो ने मान्यता नहीं दी। अब आप सेनापति को लाहौर भ्रमण के बजाय भुट्टो साहब को सूचना दे सकते हैं कि इस भूखण्ड में जो भी समस्याएँ पैदा हुई हैं, उन को तीनों देशों के नेता मिल कर हल करेंगे, सवाल टुकड़ों में हल नहीं किया जायगा। कदम-ब-कदम सवाल हल करने की नीति में हम विफल हो चुके हैं। इस बार फिर विफल हो गये हैं। सारे सवाल एक साथ हल करने होंगे—इस के लिये पाकिस्तान की बुनियादी नीतियों में परिवर्तन होना चाहिये।

शेख मुजीबुररहमान ने एक भेद में कहा है—25 सालों से पाकिस्तान चार बातों को अपनी नीतियों का आधार बनाये हुए है। पहली बात—भारत हमारा दुश्मन है। दूसरी बात—हिन्दू काफिर है। तीसरी बात—इस्लाम खतरे में है। चौथी बात—पूरा जम्मू-काश्मीर पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में आना चाहिये। क्या इन चार बुनियादी बातों में पाकिस्तान के रबैये में कोई परिवर्तन हुआ है? क्या शिमला सम्झौते के बाद भी पाकिस्तान वास्तविकताओं को स्वीकार करने के लिये तैयार हुआ है? शिमला सम्झौते में निहित सिद्धान्तों से किसी का विरोध नहीं हो सकता। यह सिद्धान्त बहुत अच्छा है कि हम दोनों प्रायत्स में मिल कर झगडा तक करें, यह सिद्धान्त भी बहुत अच्छा है कि

बातचीत से मामला हल होना चाहिये। लेकिन अगर पाकिस्तान बातचीत से मामला हल करना नहीं चाहता, अगर विदेशी शक्तियों के हथियार के रूप में हमें कमजोर बनाये रखने का उपकरण बनता है तो शान्ति की हम लोग कितनी ही कामना करें—शान्ति नहीं आ सकती। शिमला सम्झौते का भी वही हाल हुआ है जो ताशकन्द सम्झौते का हुआ था।

मेरा निवेदन है कि हम फिर से इस भूखण्ड की समस्याओं पर एक माथ, जिस में बगला देश भी सहभागी हों बातचीत के लिये पाकिस्तान का प्रेरित करे और म्याथी शान्ति का आधार रखे। कोई पाकिस्तान से लडाई नहीं चाहता है। लेकिन लडाई में जो जमीन हम न जीती है, उसे हम छाड़ दे और उमी जमीन को लेने के लिये फिर हमारे जवानों का वलिदान देना उडे—उड़ कूट-नीतिक बुद्धिमता नहीं होगी। यह अकल का दिवंग-गण होगा, जिस का कमी भी समयन नहीं किया जा सकता।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, गू-टिस्ट नक्षत्र में बगला देश के प्रवेश का मामला आया, जनरल असेम्बली से आया। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स ने प्रस्ताव रखा लेकिन उस के साथ एक और प्रस्ताव पेश कर विभंग गया—वह प्रस्ताव अजेन्टिना ने रखा था—बगला देश के प्रवेश को पाकिस्तान के कैंदियों की रिहाई से जोड़ दिया गया। दोनों का क्या सम्बन्ध था? किसी भी देश का यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में प्रवेश एक अलग विषय है और आर्टिकल 4 के अनुसार अगर कोई देश शान्ति-चाहूँ है और चाहूँ

मे निहित मिद्धानो को स्वीकार करता है और सगठन के दृष्टिकोण में अगर वह चार्टर के उत्तरदायित्व का निभा सकता है तो उस को जगह मिलनी चाहिये। लेकिन मुझे आश्चर्य है कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में हमारे डेनिगेशन के लीडर ने इस बात का विरोध नहीं किया। यह परस्पर विरोधी प्रस्ताव कैसे पास होने दिये गये। कैदिया का मामला अलग है— यह बात हम ने कहा नहीं कही। इस पर बल नहीं दिया। हम और देश का इस दृष्टिकोण से सहमत नहीं करा सके। इस बार फिर ऐसा लगा कि हम यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में अकले हैं। यह मामला — प्रवेश का मामला — 1949 में वर्ल्ड कार्ट में भी गया था और कोर्ट का फैसला है कि किमी देश के प्रवेश करने देन के सवाल के साथ शर्तें नहीं लगाई जा सकती, लेकिन यहाँ बगला देश ने प्रवेश के सवाल पर शर्तें लगाने की कोशिश की जा रही है। इससे तो यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में हमारी भूमिका बहुत अच्छी रही ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता। मैं चाहूँगा कि विदेश मंत्री इस बात पर प्रकाश डालें कि हमने दूसरा प्रस्ताव पास करने का विरोध क्यों नहीं किया। जहाँ तक अर्जन्टीना का सवाल है मुझे याद है अर्जन्टीना यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में इस प्रस्ताव को लाने का कारण बना था जिसमें कहा गया था कि किसी भी देश के प्रवेश के सवाल पर शर्तें लगाने की छूट नहीं होनी चाहिए। सच्चाई तो यह है कि प्रवेश के सवाल पर किमी देश को वीटो का अधिकार हो यह बात समाप्त होनी चाहिए। और इस दृष्टि में यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के चार्टर में भी परिवर्तन करना जरूरी है। लेकिन जब तक यूनाइटेड

नेशन्स बगला देश को मान्यता नहीं देना कम से कम पाकिस्तान से बात चीत करते हुए हम ऐसा न दिखायें कि हम भी बगला देश की उपेक्षा कर रहे हैं। मैं जानता हूँ विदेश मंत्री उपेक्षा करना नहीं चाहते लेकिन अगर सरकार के आचरण में ऐसी भावना निकलती है तो यह दुर्भाग्य है। मैं समझता हूँ अब उन्होंने थोड़ा सा सुधार किया है। ट्रिगार्टिट बातचीत पर उन्होंने जोर दिया है।

बगला देश में भी एक बात कहनी चाहिए कि जिन कैदिया पर आप मुकदमे चलाना चाहते हैं उनका बारे में कार्यवाही जल्दी पूरी कर लीजिए। इस मामले का ज्यादा नटकाने की जरूरत नहीं है। उन्हें बगला देश को वापिस भेजा जा सकता है उन्हें कटघड़े में खड़ा किया जा सकता है और बाकी मामलों पर हम बगलादेश और पाकिस्तान मिलकर विचार कर सकते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष जी केवल नानग्लाइनमेंटों की घायला काशी नहीं है हमारे दिमाग में भी नानग्लाइनमेंटों हानी चाहिए।

**श्री अमृत नाहाटा (बाडपेर)** यह हृदय परिवर्तन अब हुआ ?

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी** यह हृदय परिवर्तन नहीं है यह आपका शायद कर्ण परिवर्तन है।

हम इस बात के हामी रहे हैं कि भारत गुटों में अलग होकर खले स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करे। हर प्रश्न की कसौटी राष्ट्र का हित होना चाहिए। लेकिन सरकार अभी

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

रूस के साथ जुड़ जाती है। रूस से लाभ उठाने के अलावा बाव है लेकिन उसके इतने आलिंगन में जाना ठीक नहीं है कि छूटना मुश्किल ही जाये। अब अमरीका की तरफ झुकने की एक हवा चल रही है। मेरा कहना है कि सबके साथ दोस्ती करे लेकिन राष्ट्र की शक्ति पर विश्वास रखें। आर्थिक दृष्टि से संकट में फंसा हुआ देश, सैनिक दृष्टि से दूसरे पर निर्भर देश, राजनीतिक दृष्टि से . . . (अध्यापक) . . . संकट से घिरा देश—ऐसा देश जैसी विदेश नीति चाहे उसका अवलंबन नहीं कर सकता। उसे सीमाओं में बाँध कर चलना होता है। हमारी विदेश नीति का लक्ष्य होना चाहिए राष्ट्र के हितों का रक्षण और राष्ट्र का हित इसी बात में है कि हम आर्थिक दृष्टि से सबल हों, सैनिक दृष्टि से स्वावलम्बी हों। हम भारत को रूस, चीन और अमरीका की पकड़ में खड़े रहने लायक बनायें। अगर विदेश नीति इसमें सहायक होती है तो वह सफल है और अगर इसमें सहायक नहीं होती तो विफल है।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): I am happy that this House has been given an opportunity to discuss our foreign relations. The speeches that have been made from the different quarters have projected different approaches to the question of international relationship. On the one hand there was some criticism that the Simla agreement had proved to be a failure and it was bad; on the other hand there was criticism that in the matter of so-called neutralisation of our relations, improvement of relationship with America, we are committing an act of slide back from the policy we have been pursuing. Another friend of the CP(M) charged

us with inaction in the matter of normalisation of relations with China. Different points of view have been projected. I do not want to cover all of them. But it is clear that 1972 is a memorable year for India, not merely because of the atmosphere of detente and normalisation in the international arena, but because in the different areas where India is particularly concerned, events have happened which have vindicated the stand that India has all along taken. Looking back to the year when we got independence and the period during which the basic concept of our foreign policy was evolved, you will recall that India took certain definite stands with reference to certain international problems like the African problem, West Asian problem, Vietnam problem, the problem of admission of China into the UN and so on. Recalling the stand that we have taken the developments that have taken place, we have got justification to draw gratification that the events have proved that the stand we have taken is the correct stand and the international forces are moving in the direction we have indicated. The detente of which we are speaking now is also the line which we have been indicating. We were against blocs and confrontation. We have been pleading for cooperation between big powers and other powers. Now the compulsions of different countries, be it America or others, have taken those countries to a stage in which they have to extend their hands to one another and create conditions of normalisation, without detracting from the basic stand they have taken in regard to other problems. If detente is a thing which can be desired, if the spirit of cooperation and understanding between America and Soviet Union and between America and China could be welcomed, if detente is what we want, certainly it follows as a logical corollary that avenues of detente will have to be explored between India and America. I cannot understand the Nervousness

with which this development is being approached by some friends. A sort of understanding does not mean the disavowal of the policies we have been pursuing. We are not giving up the anti-imperialist stand; we are not giving up non-alignment; we are not giving up our stand in regard to Arab countries or South Africa and apartheid. Keeping firm in these basic stands, the question is, whether or not we can have normalisation with regard to other countries. I have nothing more to say about this.

My hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, as could be expected of him, went at a tangential force against the Simla agreement and the subsequent developments. Listening to him, I have been feeling whether he was really happy with the developments that are taking place or whether he is sorry. Although he said he was sorry, I could feel a sense of satisfaction in him that the Simla agreement is going into rough weather. Is it really going into rough weather or not is the question. It depends on what we expected of the Simla agreement. Did we expect a miracle that overnight everything will be normalised in the sub-continent, that all these questions of delineation, fixation of international frontiers, withdrawal of troops, exchange of prisoners of war, recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan, etc., will be solved overnight merely because the Simla agreement was signed or is it that the Simla agreement was just the opening of an era wherein the period of bilateralism could be started? Bilateralism was the fundamental of it. Bilateralism pre-judges and denotes that things have not been settled. If everything has been settled, there is no question of negotiations. Negotiation means things remain unsettled; negotiation means things may get into rough weather. Therefore, this sort of unholy glee which has been demonstrated in certain quarters is, if I may say so, unpatriotic and most uncharitable.

Now, after the Simla Agreement certain things have happened which are to our satisfaction. Looking back a year back, what happened when the confrontation was taking place? In the United Nations 104 countries voted against the stand of Bangladesh. Many events have taken place subsequent to that. Bangladesh has been liberated and it has become a sovereign country. Now what is the position? In the place of 104 countries, which have voted against Bangladesh, now 95 countries out of the 132 countries who are members of the United Nations have recognised Bangladesh. Now when the question comes before the General Assembly, instead of voting against that, we find a unanimous resolution being passed recommending that Bangladesh be admitted to the United Nations. Is it something which is brought from the heaven? Or, is it as a result of the developments which have taken place subsequent to the confrontation, passing through the Simla Agreement, passing through the bilateralism which has been injected into it?

Shri Vajpayee asked why we did not oppose the Argentina resolution. Why should we oppose that? It simply says that the Geneva Convention be observed in the case of prisoners of war. It also says that steps be taken for the normalisation of relations. According to us the prisoners of war should be exchanged according to tripartite discussion. China itself has taken the stand that Bangladesh cannot be admitted because the Geneva Convention has not been observed and the resolution of the Security Council has not been implemented. That resolution can be implemented only by that party to which the prisoners of war had surrendered. That means, by that contention China has conceded that the surrender was to a unified command. If the surrender is to a unified command, it follows as a matter of logical position that it must result in discussion. The Simla

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

Agreement also stipulates that discussion must take place concerning the prisoners of war, whereas the Geneva Convention does not stipulate discussion for the purpose of exchange of prisoners of war. So, a new element has been brought in by the Simla Agreement. Whatever may be said about the Simla Agreement, the discussion has to take place. Therefore, the international convention has been altered to that extent. The question is between whom and under what circumstances the discussion must take place. Once you concede that surrender was to the joint command, it follows that the discussion has got to be tripartite. This is really where we have scored

Shri Vajpayee said that all eggs have been put in the basket of Pakistan. Which eggs, I do not know.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:**  
I said Mr. Bhutto.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** Let us consider one thing. The implementation of the Simla Agreement would depend to a very large extent on the forces that operate in the different countries. I am asking a question. Suppose the Jansangh which believes in jingoism, is really a powerful party in this country. Would it be possible to go the way we are now going? Would it be possible to restore the atmosphere of peace in the sub-continent? I do not think it would have been possible. So also, if Jamait-i-Islami is powerful in Pakistan, Bhutto may have his own difficulty. The question is whether any attempt is being made or not to implement the Simla Agreement. The difficulties there will be. Bilateralism suggests that difficulties must be overcome by discussion. At the stage of the very first obstacle, are we to throw out the Simla Agreement?

I am not surprised at the plea of the Jansangh that the Simla Agreement is dead, because according to

them it was a stillborn child. At the time it was born Shrimati Indira Gandhi was accused of infanticide. If it is not yielding results, there will have to be patience. The question is whether we must have peace in the sub-continent or not. If there must be peace in the sub-continent, the stronger party, the stronger country, will have to play its own role and carry on without surrendering its basic right and basic position which it has taken. We have not surrendered an iota of the basic position that we have taken. We have not surrendered the position that prisoners of war cannot be surrendered unless Bangladesh also agrees to it. We have not surrendered the position that a tripartite discussion is a precedent to the normalisation of relations. But for Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee to say that in order that western area must be delineated Bangladesh must also be at the table is a contention I just cannot conceive of. How is Bangladesh concerned with it? How can Bangladesh, a sovereign country, come into the picture when we are discussing the delineation issue between sovereign India and sovereign Pakistan. Bangladesh cannot come into the picture.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** Obviously, the hon. Member has misunderstood me. I did not say that Bangladesh should be associated with the talks now being held between India and Pakistan regarding delineation. I said, for an overall settlement, Bangladesh must be a party. Bangladesh should have been present at Simla. Otherwise, we should not have talked to Mr. Bhutto.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** That is what I am saying. Therefore, a piece-meal discussion is possible. An overall settlement will finally come as a result of the piece-meal discussion.

The question is, whether in this sub-continent, an atmosphere of peace must be injected, and for that, the Simla Agreement is the basic thing and we do stand by the Simla Agreement.

Then, a very vital point was raised by my hon. friend, Shri Dinesh Singh, about the arrangement of *detente* between the super powers. The super powers come under that arrangement. But with that arrangement, I feel, the problem of the developing countries are becoming neglected. The problem of South Africa remains as poignant and painful as ever; the problem of South America remains as poignant and painful as ever. The developing countries are being neglected.

When it comes to that position, when the arrangement of *detente* between China, Soviet Union and America is to the disadvantage of developing countries, India may have a new role to play. On the international front, the African countries have their own African Countries' unity organisation; the American countries have their own American Countries' unity organisation; in Europe, a new sort of arrangement is emerging. But coming to the Asian countries, not only there is no organisation worth the name but different countries are at logger-heads. This is the position. We may have to solve that and the Asian countries will have to find their own place. For that, this atmosphere of *detente* has got to be developed in a forthright manner. For that, an arrangement will have to be forged with China. How many times we may attempt is absolutely no question. There is no question of inferiority about it because the two major countries of Asia have got to come together. And that is the absolute necessity of the day.

The spirit of *detente* which I may say India initiated even at the time of confrontation through its policy of non-alignment and understanding is now bearing fruit. Let us not in a chicken-hearted manner do anything which will weaken the spirit of *detente* but we go on to do everything in order that in the sub-continent we may come to a settlement of peace and such arrangement so that economically we go ahead. The forces of anti-imperialism, anti-neo colonialism,

may be strengthened and developing countries may be given a helping hand to progress and a world of peace and prosperity may be ushered in.

With these words, I congratulate the hon. Foreign Minister for the policies that are being pursued by the Government.

**SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON** (Trivandrum): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Government in its wisdom has said that this debate is to consider the international situation. Of course, it is natural that the main spokesman, the Foreign Minister, should deal only with such aspects of it as are possible to be dealt with within the time at his disposal and also, perhaps, within the limitation of field that belongs to him.

It is not possible for any Member in this House to ignore the fact that we have an audience much vaster than this country while dealing with the international affairs. Without any disrespect to anybody on this side, we cannot treat this as a party affair, not even the ruling party, and if that is done, when there are retorts from the other side, it becomes a skirmish in this way. (*Interruption*). Legislators, public men and public opinion, generally, cannot be as educated on International affairs as they should be owing to the vastness of the problems, and we should not add to the confusion.

The Foreign Minister has made it difficult by laying down a dictum that there is *detente* in the world; he means, in the world and not in any particular country; that is to say, relaxation of tension. With great respect and without being unduly critical, I would say that I have experience of similar *detente* in the last 15 years so many times. That is to say, it is almost a condition of international phraseology. You bend some muscles and afterwards there is relaxation; as is the human body so is the body politic.



[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon]

Now, what is this *detente* that we have? I yield to no one in saying that perhaps the most important event since the conclusion of the Second World War is the undoing of the broken speech, the relations between the two independent sovereign countries of Germany, first of all, the recognition by the countries in the Western alliance of the German Democratic Republic as a sovereign independent nation; and the second, recognition, not in so many words but in fact, of the Order-Neisse frontier on the east, thus solving a question which could not be solved by the conference of four Powers; the agreement between two Germanies, more or less, cut through all that and the very disputed frontiers of Poland and the position of East Prussia—all have been almost settled overnight. I think, it will be relevant and only appropriate that the world should recognise that the initiative in this rested with the Soviet Union. It is quite true that at the right time the West Germany responded. That initiative has fructified and today we have a situation of comparative ease, I would not say, undoing of the broken speech; it remains to be seen; if this progress is in the way of, I would not necessarily say, liquidation, but dwindling of the NATO,—one of the great war combinations of the world thereby dividing Europe into two and the world into two,—that is a great achievement which has taken place. (*Interruptions*).

The most important problem left unsolved in this German issue is the problem of Czechoslovakia, not in the way the gentleman there thinks but in the way that there can be no peace in Europe until the Agreement of Munich is rescinded. (*Interruptions*) German population were shifted about at that time; neither Czechoslovakia nor the rest of Europe will sit quiet until this matter is resolved. In that, this country, in the pre-Independence days, had a voice, though not an effective voice but a voice in the world to express.

Secondly, we should draw our own attention to the fact that between the Democratic Republic of Germany and Poland, there is no passport or Visa, there are no currency restrictions, while here to go from U.P. to Bengal one must have a passport now-a-days. Between these two sovereign countries which attained their maturity at different periods and which have different policies on many matters, there are no restrictions with regard to people's movement. A large number of Germans are working in Poland in the same way as the Poles are working in Germany on account of shortage of labour. It is an example set by two socialist countries in that part of the world.

Then we look to the third aspect of *detente*; the Foreign Minister no doubt, on account of lack of time, did not perhaps refer to that. I ask to be excused. There is certainly no *detente* in regard to Indo-China. We have seen in the last 15 years, in the last 20 years, so many times the United States had committed itself to pledges only to break them. Not so long ago, the American representative came to Geneva for the Conference and sent for the French Ambassador. (*Interruptions*) At that time also, having agreed to the final act, they repudiated it the next day. I am not a prophet of doom. But, even if this agreement is signed, I am more concerned about what happens after the signature. That is to say, whether the whole paraphernalia of war, the men, the equipment, its aeroplanes, its ships and everything else will be moved from that area and whether war by land, by sea and by air will stop, war by all methods, and then, only, there would be peace and there is as yet no sign of it. There is nothing in the drama of the last 40 days. When two great countries initial an agreement, how can they repudiate it afterwards? There can be questions of numbering of paragraphs and things of that kind but the basic principle is that once the treaty has

been initialled, I have not known any case in international law that it has been repudiated and there is no information till this afternoon that the United States is going to sign the agreement as it stands. It has probably served its purpose for whatever it was worth, since the elections have been over.

There is no country in the world which desires a peaceful end to the war in Vietnam than the Vietnamese themselves and they have gone out of the way to meet the situation. Further more, after having initialled this agreement, what takes place? Even the agreement reached in 1959 said that they will not bomb beyond the 20th Parallel but that was violated. There have been more bombs dropped in Indo-China, more than three times the bombs dropped on all the three fronts in the Second World War and other diabolical weapons were used and that makes the non-user of the atomic weapons somewhat less important than otherwise. So, the war goes on and the war in principle in South Vietnam is diabolical in character since the initialling of the agreement and it is for us—we are also realists in this matter. While welcoming any small mercies there are, any kind of easing of the situation there may be, it is for us to assess whether after the agreement or the actual supply of air power, equipment and so on to the Thieu Government, to the Saigon Government which makes it the third air power in the world, larger than ours, and next only to the United States and the Soviet Union has stopped. Now, where will they go? Supposing there is a signing of the agreement, are the Americans going to hand them over to the new United Vietnam? No. The idea is apparently to create territory which will remain there permanently as South Korea was and that is the problem with regard to South-east Asian American imperialism. To put it in other words, since you would not give me very much time, unless there are definite indication—I do not say

proof, but indications that the essential nature of their imperialist approach has changed, it is not time for us to feel that there has been a real relaxation. So far as that is concerned, you take one part of the world or the other. Take Latin America. The monopolists of the world, the American imperialists operating against the Chilean copper interests, confiscating their goods and what is more, reduce their currency to what it is and freeze whatever deposits they have and they are trying on Chile what they tried and failed in Cuba. Now, it may be that the Chilean Government may not fail because it has a presidential form of Government which may carry on for six years without anything of the kind which has been done in Tamil Nadu. But that does not mean that they could carry through popular measures they wanted to do. But the attack on Chile to-day is an attack on the economic level. In a different way, it is the same as the attack on Vietnam.

In Cuba, the Cubans perhaps are more careful. They did not wait for these things. They took over everything, whether it be hotels, motor cars, whatever it is and immediately went into educating the masses so that there is no illiterate people in Cuba as we have.

So, the attack on the Latin American continent, either be it Peru or Chile or Cuba or in the rest of the Caribbean, is to-day far more intense than it was and it should not be forgotten—sometimes people think that America has developed imperialism only after the Second World War—that America had an empire in South America for the last 130 years and treated it as a colony, even much worse than Pakistan treated East Bengal. That is why they hate them so much. Therefore, she is not a new person in this matter. It is not sufficient to make this perhaps interesting to say this way but we must look what we have to look. The United States has

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon]

got about 4,300 bases in the World—in other people's countries. They are not bastions of peace, they are portals of war. And, unless there is some indication that there is going to be liquidation of them, or there is going to be a change in the position, we cannot just be thinking that the world is at peace. Now, these 4,300 bases are intended as an attack on the Soviet Union, and encasing them that way, on account of the power of that country, and what is more, there is considerable popular support, let America make no mistake about that. Even those who are against Soviet Union admire this, because there is a general feeling that numbers of people have come to the economic and political reality of freedom and enjoyment.

That takes us to the other question to which the Foreign Minister made a brief reference, namely, European Security. It is an unfortunate word. European Security is not just European Security. It is world security.

During the last 60 or 70 years two wars have devastated the world; they began in Europe, mainly centered in Germany.

So far as India is concerned, for 350 years, every war in the continent of Europe had an echo over here in our own continent. When France and Britain fought, there was war in this place also and Europe, all along, has been a magazine of the war the whole time and therefore the peace of Europe is something that is not a question of race or country or continent, but it is something which concerns the world as a whole,—apart from the fact that, with the exception of the USA, if it is thought to be a part of Europe, as part of the NATO alliance,—there are very powerful economic strings of the world which are vested in this country. Over and above that, new factors have arisen to which our country has paid very little attention.

There is enormous volume of immigrant labour in the various countries

of Europe, living in conditions which not only border on *apartheid*, but are *apartheid*. That is to say, a new situation has arisen in regard to immigrant labour in these countries which only certain sections of the nation oppose. That is a problem of very great importance for us because we have also Africans in far lesser number.

When we look at Africa what is the position? War is being waged upon the black people of Africa. What happens in Mozambique and Angola is war, almost on the side of war in Vietnam, though they have not used the same weapons, where the Mozambique people have brought under control one-third of the area, and, some of these people are people of Indian origin, though they are Mozambique people, they don't at all have any relations with our country.

Now, these liberation movements today are not receiving even our mental alertness as much as it used to be. It is quite true that Government policy supports the African position in Rhodesia, there must be majority rule; it is quite true that we are seized up with *apartheid* and so on. But, it does not strike us that large numbers of people, thousands of them, have been uprooted and taken away from their homes to far away Bantustan, not only losing their property, but losing everything. And, what happened in Africa is something that never happened before.

Over and above that, we are not conscious, diplomatically and politically, of the effective changes which have taken place. Even in the revision of international law, in fact, by the decision of the United Nations recently, they admitted certain colonial freedom movements as observers in the United Nations. There was a time when the question of the Indians in South Africa was discussed, some 5 or 6 years ago. There was a fight for 6 or 7 years and it was said that

it was an internal matter. Today these liberation movements have representatives in the United Nations, not as members, but as observers. This is a big advance in the whole interpretation of international law, recognising what we said at the time of Algeria that 'Sovereignty is in people', only latest by the lid of imperialism, and when we took that, the people became free. These are the great advances that have taken place. But I regret to say that our relations with Africa or the African people are not as good as they should be. The fault may be ours or may not be ours; that makes no difference. But the fact is Africa is an emerging country, and contrary to our schoolboys' education, it is not a country emerging from barbarism but a country with an ancient civilisation. Therefore, I should like to say that I shall, therefore, be very happy to think that the Foreign Minister will be able to announce something in this regard, because I saw in the newspapers this morning that we have gone into some commercial relations with Tanzania or what was formerly called Tanganyika for whose emergence to freedom at that time we also had made our own contributions, and I hope that this Rs. 50 crore agreement is a line of credit which would enable that country to be free and to develop for itself without political interference from other States. A great deal more can be said on this matter, but since there is not much time, I shall say this only.

A great deal has been said about this place which Government chooses to call the Indian sub-continent or the Indian peninsula, I suppose. There is nothing worse in geo-politics than being a peninsula, because we have 3,600 miles of coastline and added to this vast landmasses on the other side to be safeguarded from attack. In this situation, the most important question is not whether the Simla agreement is working well or not. I think that everybody has got his own opinion about it. I said at that time, and my

view at that time was that Government had only claimed for the agreement cessation of war, return of the territories and the desire to talk, but the main questions had been left over. But I would like to submit, that from official sources or semi-official sources, this rather very loose use of the words 'international frontier' is something that is going to create a lot of trouble for us. The history of Kashmir is one where we have used phrases without being careful about them, and without being precise, where we have allowed borders, verbal borders to be very wide in that way. The only international frontiers of Kashmir are the frontiers of that Kashmir which was under the suzerainty of the Maharaja and no other international border.

There are any of us including some of my hon. friends who say that well, we must recognise realities now. If recognition of realities means that the aggression of 30 years old must be conceded, then I submit that that is a very dangerous proposition. What is more, if the cease-fire line were moved 30 miles up or down, we would be solving no problem, because the same armies will be there, and we shall have the same question of infiltration the same question of *jehad* and the same question of everything else.

Over and above all that, the situation that has developed is that Pakistan has conceded to China 2,200 miles of territory in the Karakoran and Gilgit areas, and that has brought China right on us. Time does not permit me to develop on this point any further.

When we are talking about *detente* I feel that we must also think whether we are going to the Congress of Vienna when the Czar talked of 'My Christendom and the Fatherhood of God' and set up a tripartite alliance, that is to say, we must consider whether there is not any emergence of a new balance of power, whether the United States is not playing with China in order to balance it against Russia and thus

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon]

create a situation which will be to her own advantage, so that the same position would remain.

I come back to the situation again so far as Viet Nam is concerned, and I hope that nothing will be said by any responsible person here, thinking that this is peace. They said three years ago 'This was peace', and I remember that on that day in New Zealand, the newspapers came out with big posters that that was the end of the war, but the next morning, Mr. Dean Rusk had said that nothing had changed. So, until this is signed we cannot say anything definite, and after that is signed, we have to see whether these people go out or not or whether there is going to be a Saigon territory as such. If there is any unity in South Viet Nam, then the United States can go out. This has nothing to do with normality or abnormality. Every country wants normal relations with other countries, and after some time relations become normal. But the normality of the United States is different from our normalities, and we have got to find a middle way where these normalities are bearable. That is why I say that we must draw some index by which we can say that there is no attempt at economic domination and there is no attempt to build up bases in other territories.

Finally, I come to the question with regard to what is popularly but loosely said as the Indian Ocean being an ocean of peace or something of that kind. I have never been able to understand this. Seas are always peaceful; it is only when you put ships on them that something else happens. We are a littoral State with a coastline of 3,600 miles, and our neighbour Bangla Desh has also got a vast coastline of over thousand miles, and one day I suppose when the relations between our country and Burma are slightly better than what they are now that coastline will also come in and it will all become a part of that area. The only way to ensure peace in this area is to have a strong marine arm,

or naval arm. Unless our marine arm or naval arm is strong enough in this part of the world, which today is not as much as it should be, we shall not be in a position even to know whether there are any foreign ships in this ocean. That is literally true. But it is not necessary for us to embark on a naval building programme with the weight and tonnage of other powers. But we must at least know what is happening in the world. Therefore, until the naval arm of this country sufficiently extends, until its electronic apparatus enables you to probe and find out who is and who is not doing what through the process of underwater photography and other devices, as only a few years ago the Americans offered free and gratis, for sounding of the Indian Ocean, you cannot have one officer there whose job is to ring the bell.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam): One of the striking phenomena an observer of the international landscape today sees is the mighty impact, the emerging scientific civilisation makes on the relations of the various countries. Opening the debate on international situation the External Affairs Minister presented to us a picture of the international situation today, and that picture has been—I do not know why—characterised by my hon. friend, Prof. Hiren Mukherjee, as a simplistic formulation. I think his picture or assessment of the situation reveals a sense of idealism without any illusion. From his assessment of the situation, he was trying to brief us or place before us the picture of the emergence of a climate in international relations where a palpable relaxation of tensions is visible, and this has engendered a spirit of *detente*. My hon. friend, Shri Krishna Menon, however, has been belittling or de-emphasising the significance of this *detente*.

It is true that in the course of international relations there is the ebb and tide of peace and war. But now it seems a realisation awareness bordering on conviction has been dawning

on world leaders about the ability of science and technology to further strengthen, consolidate and subserve national interests, without prejudice to their respective ideological postulations. If this was not a factor, it is just not possible that overnight Germanies and Koreas, leave along major super powers like the US, the Soviet Union and China, are getting closer.

16.53 hrs.

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

Therefore, the point to note today is that in a way one of the major foreign policy formulations of this country, namely, friendship with all countries, is fructifying, yielding dividends. It is the very consummation of what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stood for. He addressed the various chancelleries of the world impressing upon them that the cold war would never yield the desired peace. Our steadfastness and adherence to this policy of friendship with all countries has certainly been a major contribution towards peace; at least putting this idea constantly before the international scene. When therefore, today the bi-polarised world which was arrayed itself in opposite camps, leading to cold war, leading to death and destruction in different parts of the world, tries to come together, whatever may be their long-range goals, even as a temporary measure, it has to be accepted; and, we have to contribute from our side to the further consolidation of this new era of *detente* and relaxation of tension. However, the critics of the situation referring to the negative aspects of the emerging situation, have pointed out that this development in international relations could also cast ominous portents or trends. For instance some people have said that this is, in a way, the revival of the Yalta spirit, by which after the conclusion of the Second World War the major powers sought to divide the world and establish a dual directorate of the Soviet Union and the United States with Britain and France as

minor partners. Perhaps, by the inclusion of People's Republic of China they envisage a five power directorate. In this context perhaps, our delegation in the United Nations has a special role to play. We have to envisage this possibility also. It may be the negative side of the situation which emerged immediately after the war; the so-called Yalta spirit in the creation of the Security Council with negative vetoes for major powers. This situation namely the present structure of the Security Council has to be changed so that it might be in tune with the current developments in the international field and also to bring it upto date in time with the international developments which took place since the last war. This there should be revision of the United Nations Charter, especially in the composition and functions of the Security Council. It should include powers like Japan, Germany, and no doubt India, Nigeria and Brazil.

I would submit that it is in this context of world relaxation of tension and *detente* that India's foreign policy has to be evaluated. Even before the world powers did so, we have taken major steps towards bringing the nations closure by our own efforts. The recent Indo-Soviet treaty is a fine example in this direction. We have already seen its effort on relaxation of tensions and we are still enjoying its benefits. It is based on mutual interest. It takes into account various aspects including the extension of the area of peace. It is a model which others could follow.

In the same way, in our relations with China we have consistently maintained a friendly attitude. Considering the geopolitical situation and various other points which demand closer relations and considering that China is our neighbour with over two thousand miles frontier with a yearning for true understanding on our part. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had gone perhaps even out of his way to befriend China in order to create a border of peace between

[Dr. Henry Austin]

the two countries. But unfortunately, subsequent events have created a situation where we had to fall apart. That should not always stand in the way and we have got to see that our two countries come closer. That would be a major contribution towards stabilising and strengthening peace in our sub-continent itself. I should congratulate the leaders of our country, particularly, our Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister for repeatedly declaring that we are for better relations with China. The Foreign Minister explained this position in the Rajya Sabha recently. As regards Tibet every one knows that Tibet has been one of the major points of contention between our two countries. We have acknowledged the suzerainty of China over that part, although we had some de facto hold on this territory. This is a major step towards allaying the fears, if any, of China with respect to our intentions regarding Tibet. In the same way, we also made it clear that our friendship with the Soviet Union should never stand in the way of rapprochement with the peoples Republic of China. These postures should carry conviction with China. We want to have peaceful and friendly relations with that country, and I am sure that our foreign policy leaders have already taken major steps towards bringing about that desideratum.

Another major foreign policy objective of our country is to create conditions of stability in this sub-continent. The emergence of Bangla Desh has already provided an important base for the realisation of this objective; and, we have also taken major steps towards reconciliation with or towards bringing about conditions of friendly relation with Pakistan. It came as a surprise to some major powers particularly powers which wanted to create conditions of stress and strain in this sub-continent. Hardly six months after a major confrontation with Pakistan we were able to initiate major moves for making peace with Pakistan.

At Simla we have gone a long way in carrying conviction with Pakistan that we desire friendship with Pakistan. We want peace in the interest of Stability and peace in the sub-continent. True, Mr. Vajpayee pointed out—his party's position is like that that our hope was all a mirage. But it is not so. World history has shown us that peace is not won overnight. We have to patiently endeavour constantly for it. A study of European history shows that in spite of various areas of agreement, common bonds and identity, the countries of Europe could never get on together. England and Germany fought. England and France fought. A hundred years' war, five hundred years' war, etc., were waged. Viewed in that context, one should not be deluded to think that we can win peace with Pakistan overnight, considering especially the historical background, the partition, and the subsequent two wars. I believe we have taken a major step at Simla towards creating conditions of peace, so that we can develop friendly relations with Pakistan.

17 hrs.

We have also taken steps to improve our relations with the Arab and African countries. About United States, it has already been demonstrated that the United States cannot impose itself on the Asian continent militarily. They have seen it in Korea, Vietnam, even in Indo-China and in Bangla Desh and elsewhere that imposition of their policy through armed might is not possible and that the people of Asia will resist it. Also, it has been seen that they can never build up neo-colonialism in Asia, because the teering millions of Asia have seen through the game. Having seen all these developments, I do not think the United States will any more dare to create imperialist or neo-colonialist, hold on Asia. On the other hand if they are prepared to recognise the importance of India in the region and eschew all ulterior motives, we can, after examining their real motivations,

try to restore normal relationship with them, and there will be no need for having the sort of relations which were existing before, because we have developed the philosophy of self-reliance. No country can stand on its own and command respect unless practices self-reliance. Without prejudice to these basic considerations, restoration of normal relations may be perhaps welcome.

Sir, foreign policy, as is well known, is the projection of the domestic policy. The top priority domestic policy to which we are committed and which we are trying to implement is that of the abolition of poverty. Poverty cannot be abolished and an egalitarian society ushered in unless there is world peace, particularly peace in our sub-continent. I am convinced, that our foreign policy formulations take into account the various aspects of the situation I have stressed. The steps we have taken are towards creating conditions of peace, so that we can build up our economy and create new infra-structures which would help us to fight the enemy within. The enemy is really within and once we fight the enemy within and consolidate our economy and rouse the people's Social Consciousness. We successfully carry out the battle against poverty, squalor and unemployment. We will then develop a mighty economy and a Stable Society which will be the fittest answers to imperialism and non-clonialism. Towards this end our leaders have formulated our foreign policy, and, I therefore, congratulate the Foreign Minister who brought for discussion a picture where our role is healthy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Mishra.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai). Mr. Chairman, I would request you to be a little more kind to me in the matter of time, as I am running temperature at the moment, although it would be my endeavour to finish my speech within the time prescribed for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you are not feeling well, you can speak tomorrow.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Thank you.

SHRI R. P. ULAGANAMBI (Vellore): Mr. Chairman, while discussing the important motion moved by the hon. Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, I would like to put forth certain points for the consideration of the House—

The fact developing international situation is of so many hues that it is becoming rather a hazard to make any committed viewpoint.

Government need not take any undue pride in recognising East Germany or North Vietnam. The United States has not yet recognised China. Yet, the President of United States visited China and his personal adviser, Mr. Kissinger, often visits Peking. Japan have taken steps to normalise her relations with China. The Prime Minister of Japan openly made an apology to China for the past misdeeds, which rocked the international world much more than the explosion of the atom bomb on the Japanese soil during the second world war. South Korea initiated re-unification talks with North Korea without the United States in the picture, even though it is the closer ally of South Korea. Both East and West Germany have recognised their individual separate existence. The new Labour Governments of New Zealand and Australia have proved to the USA that they are of age to look after their security by declaring their withdrawal from the SEATO.

I have referred to these developments because our government need not take undue pride in recognising either East Germany or North Vietnam. It should have been done long ago. Of course, the Government have done the right thing, elatedly though.



[Shri R. P. Ulaganambi]

The concept of non-alignment has no validity in the present day world. Goaded mainly by the self-interest of survival, we find that the super powers do not want the trouble spots near their borders to flare up. USA tolerates Cuba on her outskirts. Russia, in spite of arming Syria to her teeth, puts up with the belligerent Israel. Russia silently left UAR without batting an eyelid. USA and Japan have no compunction in bartering Taiwan for peace with China. In spite of North Vietnam being pounded by the USA, in spite of China's border areas being bombed by USA, China which is the friend of North Vietnam, rests content with the vocal support to the plight of North Vietnam. Though both the USSR and China are showing open hostility towards one another, yet they are having talks about their trade. USA and USSR have concluded more agreements last year than any two countries in the world.

When this is the situation, where does the concept of non-alignment come? I am sorry to see the leaders of some political parties waxing eloquent about the continuation of the policy of non-alignment. Not only have we to offer our hands of friendship to whosoever seek our friendship, but we have also to work energetically for creating a climate of friendship. At the same time, we have to be strong enough to face any unforeseen eventuality.

In view of the experience in Uganda, it has become essential to pay greater attention to the development of our relations with African countries. A significant step has been taken in strengthening trade relations with Tanzania. Our diplomatic missions in African countries should become active centres of guidance for Indian settlers there. I am sorry to say that the Ministry of External Affairs has not formulated any policy so far in regard to the properties left in Uganda by Indian settlers there.

About the repatriates from Burma and Ceylon, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps have been taken to enable them to get back the properties left by them in Burma and Ceylon.

The whole nation appreciated and applauded the action taken by the Government and by our Prime Minister for the liberation of Bangladesh. At the same time, I want to know what steps have been taken to get back the area illegally occupied by China since 1962 and the area illegally occupied by Pakistan in Kashmir since 1948.

In 1962, when India was attacked by China, the whole nation supported the Government without any party barriers. The former Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, our late lamented leader, Aringuer Anna went to the extent of giving up the secession policy and extended his full cooperation to the Government of India.

Even in 1965 and in December, 1971, when Pakistan attacked India, the Chief Minister, Kalainguer Karunani-dhi, set aside the demand for State autonomy, for more powers to States, and he extended full cooperation to the Government to strengthen the Government to safeguard our motherland against foreign aggression. The people of India should not allow even an inch of our soil to remain in the hands of a foreign country like China or Pakistan.

Last December, when I visited the Soviet Union to participate in the Indo-Soviet Youth Festival at Almata which is the capital of Kazakhstan, a Republic of the Soviet Union, and after the Festival was over, while we conveyed our thanks to them, I pointed out to the Soviet Union officials also about the publication of the maps by the Soviet Union. I told them that we Indians and the Soviet Union people are moving towards the building-up of friendship between the two

countries and that we have the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace and Friendship but the Soviet Union publish maps showing areas illegally occupied by China in the maps as if they are legally entitled to those areas. In this connection, I want to know from the hon Minister what steps he has taken to see encyclopaedia maps and such other maps corrected. He is aware of all this and this matter has come up in the House also. I want to know what steps have been taken about the correction of maps published by the Soviet Union.

Regarding the area occupied by Pakistan and the area occupied by China, the Government should take steps to negotiate or to open a debate in the world body, at the U.N.O., or the Government should even take steps by military action to get back the areas illegally occupied by China and Pakistan.

SHRI K P UNNIKRIISHNAN (Badagara) Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity provided by this debate on our foreign policy and the international situations because it has come in the wake of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of our Independence. It is also the 25th anniversary of our emergence in the international area as a power to be watched. I welcome this opportunity provided by this debate also because we are entering season of hope in the international climate after passing through a bitter winter of discontent during the last two decades. But we can say that the entire idiom and the language of international relations is undergoing a transformation, compelled by circumstances and events during the last decade.

So far as our foreign policy is concerned, as has been stated by our late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and even recently by our beloved Prime Minister in an article in "The Foreign Affairs," it is not governed by the conditions and postulates which govern other foreign policies because it is not

designed to protect any overseas possessions or investments; its basic postulates and its approaches are different. We are also not interested, like many other States, in the export of any ideology, nor are we interested in creating new diversion factors in the internal situation of other countries. What we are vitally concerned has been with promotion of our own vital national interests and also the promotion of, and pursuing, the policies of anti-imperialism and peace. Having this perspective before us, we have to evaluate the present situation and our own policy and its achievement in this broad conceptual framework during the last 25 years under the successive leadership of late pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

Sir, it is also in the context that we have to view the new power equations and the new alignments that are taking shape in the world today because we can see the old camps are withering away, cracking away. But the "jossils" remain in both the camps and the influence of these "fossils" in both the camps clouds many issues. Also the forces of peace on both sides of the camps are yet to assert themselves; however much we might wish them to do so, they have not yet reached the commanding heights of international landscape.

Sir, I would submit that five or six basic and fundamental changes have taken place in the international situation during the last one year or so, even though the seeds of these developments were there for a long time; the year 1971-72 has been a very significant year, as my hon. friend, Shri Dinsh Singh, pointed out a little while ago. The basic things have been what we might call a *rapprochement* or coming together of China and the United States and also the Moscow Summit. The significant events which have taken place in Europe are the closer relations and talks between the two Germanies and the steps taken towards evolving a security system in Europe.

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan.]

Another significant happening in Asia has been the coming together of Japan and China. Though it has yet to bear fruition, in many ways, it is an event of great import and a significant event of great dimensions. Above all, relevant to us and our policies and to this region is the emergence of our own country as a power to be reckoned with, from I would say, the Suez to Singapore and it is in the context of these events that we have to evaluate our own policies and to deliberate or enquire into our own future.

In this connection we have before us a significant event—the Simla agreement. I do not want to go into the details but the most important point is that we want to secure this sub-continent away from other powers and to ensure that peace prevails in this sub-continent and I am sure that whatever temporary difficulties we may face, we would undoubtedly win the battle for peace which we started in December. It was yet another milestone in our journey of peace which Simla on 2nd July, 1972 marked.

The two most significant factors which we have to take into account are: (1) the Indo-Chinese relations which have remained in a position of hostility for well over a decade and (2) also the not too well Indo-US relations. I would say that our relations with China are of fundamental importance. I am not just taking a romantic view of things that many people used to take in the past. It is not a kind of Bhai-Bhaism to say that our relations with our immediate and powerful neighbour, a neighbour which has also mightfully gained a powerful voice in the international arena by becoming a member of the United Nations and in various organs has to be taken into account. Along with it, also its economic might, its production indices have to be taken into account and this country cannot just afford to remain in a state of hostility and the ice has got to be broken. But, whatever initiative our Foreign Ministry has in mind, I am not quite sure whether China will

respond. While we shall not cringe, crawl and go before any one, I can only hope that in the context of events that have taken place during the past 12 months or so, China will respond and we can hope for a better state of relations during the next year.

Similarly, a reference has been made to our none too happy relations with the United States of America. A question normally asked in the Press circles and everywhere is: should we normalise our relations? If the question is posed this way the answer should be emphatically 'Yes'. But, then, there is a big 'if'. There again, it is only on conditions of equality that we can normalise our relationship with any other country. That also means that we have not departed from our basic postulates, we have not departed from our positions, and our positions being the same, we would not mind normalising relations with any country. But, I am not quite sure that the United States would come forward in a very significant way whatever might have been the response reported in the Press and so on, because the basic difficulties of the United States remain, the power structure of the United States and the power system it has promoted, remains the same. The basic crisis the United State military and industrial complex have faced and are facing remain the same and I do not think their basic interests or basic postures can change in a dramatic manner during the coming few months, may be even years. But, whatever it may be, there is nothing wrong in our trying or attempting to normalise our relations and also our relations with any other country and the principled and close relationship we have with the Soviet Union need not come in the way of normalising our relationship with the USA.

I can only hope that there will be a positive response and not just fleeting remarks of an evangelist like Billy Graham! Balayogis and Billy Grahams don't make foreign policies nor change the postures of anyone!

I hope there will be some positive response from the USA and they would understand and appreciate our positions, not our difficulties, as somebody has pointed out. I hope they will understand the principled positions that we have taken on international questions.

Certain references were made, some here and some outside, to the effect that our relations with the Soviet Union will be impaired if we get closer to the United States. To my mind it is utterly absurd to say so. Our whole Indo Soviet Treaty was a principled effort at re-structuring our relationship on a new basis. It was a new phase of our principled relationship that we have developed during the last two decades. We did not close our options at that time with the treaty or later when Bangladesh emerged. Our options have never been closed and even now we have got our options and our choices are open. I do not think that our close relation with USSR will come in the way of our normalisation of relations with USA. or any other country.

The slideback in foreign policy to which some persons refer to, is only in their imagination. It is only a figment of imagination in the minds of some people who have in the minds of some people who have got no confidence in themselves. As long as Shrimati Indira Gandhi remains in the saddle, so long as our party is there, which is committed to the ideals of anti-imperialism and peace, there can be no slideback in our foreign policy nor in our international relations. It is also significant that none of the critics have brought forward any worth-while alternative framework of foreign policy. Such an alternative has never been brought forward in this country so far. Even now nothing has come before us. I hope that we will be able to project not only a better image of ourselves abroad, but that we will be able to normalise our relations with powers like the USA and China and also re-inforce our already exist-

ing cordial relations with the Soviet Union.

Certain references were made that the Policy Planning Division of the E. A. Ministry may be closed down, now that Mr. D. P. Dhar has gone to the right place he belongs to. It will be a tragedy if this were to be done. Foreign Policy cannot be based on any kind of 'ad-hocism'. There has to be a proper perspective before us. There has to be planning-ahead which is very necessary. Therefore, it is vital that this Policy Planning Division should continue manned by distinguished and competent personnel.

Before I conclude, I would like to pay my tribute to the Foreign Secretary who has just retired, Mr. T. N. Kaul, who has played a very notable, constructive, effective and I would say also, admirable, role in the offices that he filled. We should not be ashamed of saying this, because, as you know, officials are not named here. But I would like to pay my tribute and say that he has played a very big, and outstanding role, in the conduct of our foreign policy, and I am sure, we, all of us, appreciate this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the Unattached Independents, Mr. Krishna Menon has taken more than double the time allotted to them. Therefore, you would at least be brief. I know you are anxious to participate in the debate, waiting here for so long. But, please be brief.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: For no fault of mine. He was given 27 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please don't waste time, kindly go on.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): It is not the function of the Opposition to appreciate anything which the Government does. I make an exception as far as the foreign policy of our country is concerned.

It is heartening to note that by and large, the foreign policy of our country, for quite some time, is being conducted very intelligently, very courageously and very bravely.

[Shri S. A. Shamim.]

I do not know to whom the credit goes, whether it goes to the Planning Minister or to the Foreign Minister, but in any case, the Government needs and deserves congratulations.

In this context, I was more amused than amazed to hear my hon. friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. My hon. friend's grouse is that we are friendless; because there is a resolution which has been passed which does not suit us, therefore, we are friendless. This is at a stage when we have established in the world forums that we are a power to be reckoned with and we have a voice and everybody in the world supported our moral stand and our military action against Pakistan. I think that never before in these 25 years of independent India were we more comfortably and honourably placed in the world community than we are today.

If my hon. friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee means to say that the Simla Agreement according to his has failed, I must say that he is drawing wrong conclusions from the right facts. What is wrong with the Simla agreement? According to my hon. friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Pakistan has not changed, and he enunciated four planks which Pakistan had put forth, namely 'Islam is in danger, India is our enemy, Hindus are *kafrs*, and Jammu and Kashmir is an inalienable part of Pakistan'. I would like to tell my hon. friend that Pakistan has changed not only in these four aspects, but in a fifth one also, namely its physical size. The Pakistan which Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee knew on the 16th December, 1971 does not exist today. As far as the question whether Pakistan says that India is her enemy No. 1 or not is concerned, I would like to point out that my hon. friend has not been listening to Mr. Bhutto. I have been listening to Mr. Bhutto's speeches, and I have been reading his interviews, which obviously my hon. friend has not read. Mr. Bhutto has climbed down and has completely

changed. He is talking of friendship, and he says 'I am sorry for having talked of one thousand years of war, I want one thousand years of peace'. In no speech of his have I ever heard him say that Hindus were their enemies. In fact, he has praised our Prime Minister, and he is saying that he wants to have the best of relations with India. What else does my hon. friend expect from a defeated country and from a truncated country which has been talking of all blood, all war and no peace? This is the change that has come about. If Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee would have studied the phenomenon of Pakistan and what is happening there, he would have seen that Mr. Bhutto is facing the Vajpayees of his own country, that is the people of Jamiat-e-Islami. The other day, he was shot at; it was not by the People's Party, not by NAP, but by people belonging to the Jamiat-e-Islami. I do not know whether this is the proper forum or not to praise Mr. Bhutto, but the praise must be given where it is due. I admire his courage to propagate and to canvass and to convince the people of Pakistan that recognition of Bangla Desh is the only solution of the problem. He has talked of this in the context of the prisoners of war also realising that the prisoners of war cannot come back unless he recognises Bangla Desh. It is easier said than done, that we must have a posture of war and we must be very strong, but it needs great courage to fight wars. It is Generals and jawans who fight wars, but it requires greater courage to make peace, and it is the wise statesmen and wise politicians who make peace. The leadership of this country has shown courage, moral courage, I must say, at a time when we could have dictated terms. Even today, I think that it is the greatest honour to our military commanders and to Gen. Maneckshaw that today he has gone in search of peace to Pakistan; Gen. Maneckshaw who could have dictated to Gen. Tikka Khan to come to India has said 'No you do not worry, I shall come over'

searching for peace; he could have dictated and he could have talked the way Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has been talking. But thank God, we have not leaders—like Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. In that case, we would have had a perpetual state of war, and after we had finished Pakistan, we would have had to fight Burma and then we would have had to fight Nepal and so on, and this country by and large would have been continuously fighting wars, and the programme of Garibi Hatao, socialism and uplift of the poor etc. would all have gone to the backstage.

It is understandable if Mr. Bhutto blows hot and blows cold in the same breath. He has his own difficulties, and I appreciate his difficulties in that sense. After all, he is the leader of a defeated country. He is the leader of a defeated army. Our only demand from Pakistan was that Pakistan should have a democratic set-up. To that extent, Mr. Bhutto is making earnest efforts. Let us help him. I know that the Simla agreement is running into difficulties. But I know that these difficulties are transitory. These are transitory because there is no alternative to the Simla agreement. Mr. Bhutto knows it, and Shrimati Indira Gandhi knows it that the Simla Agreement was not a concession made to Pakistan. Of course, it was an act of magnanimity because we could have sidetracked the issue and we could have lost the goodwill which we had in the world. The Simla Agreement was only a recognition of the fact that we really wanted friendship with Pakistan, Pakistan cut to size, and I am sure that the minor difficulties whether of Thakur Chowk or of any other chowk would be solved also within a fortnight.

I am reminded of the Prime Minister's speech where she said that some people have a vested interest in a perpetual confrontation with Pakistan. There is no need to remind my

friends as to who are those people who have that vested interest.

I must, at the same time, confess that while we have shown magnanimity on major issues, we have not shown the same amount of statesmanship and wisdom in regard to the question of the prisoners of war. Without going into legal quibbling or the legal position, the fact of the situation is that there has been an erosion in the fund of goodwill which we had in the world as far as the prisoners of war issue is concerned. Eye-brows are raised and fingers are pointed at us accusing us that we have overdone it as far as the prisoners of war issue is concerned. Whatever may be the legal position concerning the joint command, this country must make an honest effort to get this issue solved, even if it be by making a unilateral offer on our part to repatriate the prisoners of war. I think we have sufficient influence with leaders of Bangla Desh to convince them that this particular aspect of the situation is costing us too much materially and in terms of goodwill. The sooner this human problem is settled, the better.

As regard the relationship with the USA, just now my hon. friend, Shri Vajpayee, was very angry that Gen. Manekshah's photograph appeared along with Gen. Tikka Khan's. I was also angry when Shri Vajpayee granted an interview to a Pakistan journalist. I was also angry when he wanted to meet Mr. Bhutto who is the real murderer in Bangla Desh.

The language of diplomacy is slightly different. If tomorrow Pakistan recognises Bangla Desh, I am sure the Commander-in-Chief of Bangla Desh and Pakistan will meet and pose for photograph together. Tikka Khan for us is not an individual; he is a symbol. That symbol was buried when Bangla Desh was born. Therefore, what is left of Tikka Khan is bones and flesh. If you want to talk in the language of modern

[Shri S. A. Shamim.]  
 diplomacy, you will have to adapt yourself to modern ethics.

Therefore, I would request my friends who are talking of a perpetual confrontation with the USA to be realistic enough to recognise reality. That reality is that there are no permanent friends or permanent enemies. If the USA has realised that the policy pursued by Nixon was a betrayal on the values which were accepted by Lincoln, if America has realised that it is time to make a friendly gesture to India, we should not hesitate to reciprocate. It needs greater courage, moral courage, to make friends than to make enemies. You can make enemies by expression of hatred. But for making friends, the voice must come from the depths of your soul. I am sure the leaders of this country, inspite of bunglings on the home front, in spite of rising prices, in spite of corruption, will at least try to put the image of this country in a proper frame before the world community. I am glad the Prime Minister, the External Affairs Minister and Government are doing their best in this regard.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Pupri): I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to express myself on this important subject.

At the outset, I would like to congratulate the people of Vietnam who are on the threshold of victory, though a negotiated one. Similarly, I would like to congratulate the people of West Germany giving resounding support to their Chancellor's policy of *ostpolitik*. The contemporary scene of international politics is fast changing: The enemies of yesterday are becoming friends and collaborators of today. We have to view the foreign policy of our country in this context. Multi-lateral ties in terms of economic co-operation are what we are witnessing in a western Europe in the shape of European Economic Community.

New economic forces are emerging with which we should have very good and friendly relations. I am glad that our Government is making all efforts in that direction. Similarly bilateralism is another catch word in international politics today, whereby every country is bypassing United Nations and coming to mutual agreement to safeguard its interest.

In our sub-continent the situation has fast changed in our favour and the emergence of Bangladesh is a positive factor in the sub-continent. The role that the Indian leadership has played in this context deserves our congratulations. The Simla agreement has been signed in a very auspicious moment. I do not understand why Simla agreement is being attacked. It was necessary not only to ensure that the people of the sub-continent lived in peace, it was also necessary to assure our neighbouring states that India had no ulterior designs and that India was not going to grab the territory of smaller nation of Asia or bring them into its orbit or overlord them or dominate them. After a bloody war we did sign the Simla agreement and by signing the Simla Agreement we demonstrated to the world that we are prepared not only to come to terms with Pakistan with whom we have fought three wars in a short span of two decades. But we are also prepared to give an assurance to the people of South Asia and give a 1 to the propaganda that India was out to grab or dominate the smaller nations of Asia. The Simla agreement and Indo-Pakistan relationship should not be viewed in the normal traditional framework of international diplomacy. India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are members of the same family. We were one nation and one country but we were separated by political compulsions of the imperial dominations and if we view our relationship with Pakistan or Bangladesh in the traditional framework we are sure we shall come to the same conclusions as our friend Vajpayee came. With

Bangladesh and Pakistan we should always be prepared to negotiate, not by compromising our national dignity or honour but we must be prepared to give reasonable concessions both to Pakistan and Bangladesh. As I said we were part of the same family and I hope that a time will come when Pakistan, Bangladesh and India will unite and present a totally united confident picture to the whole world.

The second factor which is very important is our relationship with the Super Powers and the role of big powers in this sub-continent. So far there have been two major powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union has played a very constructive and stabilising role. The result of that policy has been the outstanding agreement at Tashkent. Whether it failed because of Pakistan or due to something else is a different matter. During the Bangladesh crisis we have seen how helpful the role of the Soviet Union has been. The Soviet policy and help has been very useful in regard to the establishment of Bangladesh and the Indo-Soviet Treaty of peace and friendship is another outstanding example of how the Soviet Union is playing a constructive and stabilising role in the sub-continent. Therefore, to compare the role of the Soviet Union with that of the other super-power, United States, is not to my mind very proper and fair.

17.45 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

श्री कुकम चन्द कछवाय (मुराना) :  
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आग की व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ। गृह मंत्री वक्तव्य देने वाले हैं। यह डिस्कशन कल पर रखिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इन का फिनिश कर देने दीजिए। आग याग गणपति की बात क्यों नहीं कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: I do not know why Mr. Kachwai is so allergic to the mention of United States....

MR. SPEAKER: He is not allergic to you. He wants the Minister to make the statement, because the time fixed for it was 5.45. All right, Mr. Pant.

17.46 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. INCIDENTS IN  
 DELHI UNIVERSITY

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir, on 6th December, about 3000 to 4000 students went in a procession to the Central Office of the University shouting slogans against the University. It is a matter of deep regret that in pursuance of an ill-advised design to occupy the University Offices, some students started pounding on the doors of the Vice Chancellor's office. The glass windows of the offices of the Pro-Vice Chancellor and Registrar were smashed. Some students forcibly entered the room of the Dean of Students Welfare. The Vice Chancellor requested police assistance apprehending more serious violence. On the arrival of the police, some students indulged in intense stone throwing at the police. The police had to resort to the use of tear-gas shells to disperse the crowds. On dispersing, some students burnt one bus and partially damaged another. A DTC booth was also burnt. Ten persons were arrested in the course of these incidents.

The Vice-Chancellor has made an appeal to the students and teachers to realise the gravity of the situation and ensure that peaceful conditions are created for the normal functioning of the University. I would earnestly request all sections of the House to give no countenance to those who would resort to violence or threats of violence and to cooperate in the restoration of normalcy in the University.