

[Sri Sezhiyan]

ending on the 30th April, 1972, in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Niranjan Varma from the Committee and do communicate to this House the name of the member so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate a member from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Accounts of this House for the unexpired portion of the term of the Committee ending on the 30th April, 1972, in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Niranjan Varma from the Committee and do communicate to this House the name of the member so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

The motion was adopted.

12.18 hrs.

MOTION RE: STATEMENTS BY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS ON SHIPMENT OF AMERICAN ARMS TO PAKISTAN AND HIS RECENT VISIT ABROAD

MR. SPEAKER: We shall now take up the discussion under item 4. There is an alternative motion by Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, which I have allowed to be circulated. How much time will the minister need for his reply?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): About $\frac{3}{4}$ hour.

MR. SPEAKER: How much time would the mover need?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): I require half an hour for initiating the debate. At the end, I may require 10 or 15 minutes. It will depend on what the minister says.

MR. SPEAKER: I will call on the minister at 5 o'clock. After he finishes, Mr. Azad will reply.

This is a very important subject. I would request hon. members to observe patience and restraint and avoid acrimony.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

"That the statements made by the Minister of External Affairs on the 24th and 25th June, 1971 regarding (i) the shipment of American arms to Pakistan and (ii) his recent visit to certain foreign countries, be taken into consideration."

I am very sorry to move this motion, specially part (i) about American shipment of arms to Pakistan. It is to express our grave concern and resentment against the US Government, which has been sending arms to Pakistan since long, and now at this critical juncture too.

I am moving my motion on four grounds. My first ground is the betrayal of the US Government of the lovers of democracy in this part of the sub-continent. My second ground is that I hold and firmly believe that these arms are not intended or meant to refuel the guillotining and the genociding of the military machine of Pakistan but it is also meant to arm Pakistan against aggression on India. Thirdly, I want to speak to the American people and to the world at large about the indecent, unseemly political and diplomatic behaviour of USA. When our Foreign Minister was being entertained with lunch and dinner and showers of sympathy were being poured for Bangla Desh, Padma and Sunderbans were sailing on the high seas with lethal weapons for murder and butchery of the people of Bangla Desh, who refused to be a colony of West Pakistan. My fourth ground for moving this motion is that it is a definite calculated move by America to upset the balance of power in this part of the sub-continent against India, which it is doing long since 1950-51, to which I will come to later on. On these important grounds, and other grounds too, I move that the shipment of American arms to Pakistan may be taken serious notice of.

When I say this I would like to make it clear that I am not speaking against the American people, nor against the American press which is being led by the *New York*

Times which has opposed the shipment of arms since 1969. The US Administration has been following this policy for a very long time. When the then US Vice-President Nixon returned after a tour of India and Pakistan he publicly urged the President that aid must be given to Pakistan because neutralist India is behaving in an entirely different fashion. I am tempted to quote what Mr. Nixon, who is now President of USA, said then. He said:

"To withhold American aid because of the protest of neutralise India would be discouraging to those nations willing to stand up and be counted on the side of the free world."

—as if, we are not part of the free world and only America and its allies are part of the free world—

"These nations"

—meaning Pakistan and her allies—

"might then think that it was better to play the game of Indian neutralism than to throw in their lot with the free nations."

This is what the present American President, Mr. Nixon, who was then Vice-President, said after a tour of Pakistan and India, when he pleaded with the President that aid must be given immediately to Pakistan. I must say in all fairness that even then there were many influential American leaders like Mr. Normal Cousins, Mr. Lewis Mumford, Mr. Chester Bowles, Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. Dorothy Normal, Senator Fullbright and Republican Emanuel Celler who opposed American aid to Pakistan. Yet, the American Government is continuing this policy.

At this stage, when it is known that these arms are meant to butcher the people of Bangla desh, it is surprising, it is shocking, when our Foreign Minister was telling his country that there is so much of goodwill for us in the world, news flashed round the world that *Padma* and *Sunderbans* are on the high seas carrying arms from American port. We do not know the details of the arms these two ships carry but according to *New York Times*, which published the picture as well, they are carrying items of military

equipment including parts of armoured personnel carriers, eight aircraft, 113 parachutes and parts and auto-parts weighing 14,133 lbs. This is what the dock side delivery listing for *Padma* indicates. But a check list of the bills of cargo on *Sunderbans* showed that the licence covered an item indicating 28 skids. What is this skid? I tried to find the meaning of this word from the dictionary. It does not concern with any military item. Possibly wisdom is the monopoly of Pentagon or military gunta and skid also means a military item. These are being carried. Let us not wonder about the contents of the ship. It is known that they are carrying arms—arms against the Bangla Desh people who refuse to be a colony of West Pakistan. They are carrying arms against India which is trying to help democracy in this part of sub-continent.

What pains us most is that the American Government did not think it fit to tell our Foreign Minister while being given lunch and sweet talk that their ships have already left their harbours. They are sorry. They did not say a word. At the nick of the time when the Foreign Minister was to tell us that USA Government has shown sympathy, out of fear for Pakistan these things were leaked. Is it the diplomatic behaviour? Just contrary is being done to what they say. New York Times contacted the State Department and they said they did not know anything. But under the mounting pressure of evidence and exposure by New York Times the State Department spokesman, Mr. Charles Bray, on 24th admitted that two licences for exporting military equipment to Pakistan have been issued—on 31st March and 6th April—after the pronounced ban on these licences on 25th March.

No details are given about the contents but it is astounding that Asstt. Secretary of State of State Department, Mr. David Abshire, assured the sub-committee of the Foreign Relations Committee on north-eastern and South Asian Affairs that "nothing is in the Pipeline to Pakistan." Then Senator Swingto who is the Chairman of this Committee said that the shipment indicated "the State Department either did not know what was going on or deliberately misled the Committee." State Department's spokesman,

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

Mr. Charles Bray refused to answer questions that two planes given to the Pakistan international airlines to carry passengers were carrying troops to East Pakistan. He refused to answer this question. These planes meant for carrying passengers were carrying napalm bombs to throw on Bangla Desh people. Men invented the planes and the apes got hold of it to bombard the people of Vietnam and Bangla Desh. We want the Pentagon under the force of public opinion to realise that butter and bread are equally necessary for the brothers and sisters all over the world as for their own sons and daughters.

The former Consul General of USA in Dacca, Mr. Archer K. Blood before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee behind closed door called the Bangla refugee problem in India is worse than the Palestine refugee issue. But Mr. Blood's controversial report was too difficult to be digested by the American Government and they tried to suppress it.

Mr. Blood is not alone in this truthful assessment of what is going on in Bangla Desh. The American press, like the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, is exposing this black deed of the Pentagon of sending arms to Pakistan and is opposing it. There are conscientious Senators on the Capitol Hill who are protesting against this shipment and they have done this in the past too.

Senator Republican leader, Mr. Hugh Scott and Senator Fullbright, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, along with 24 Senators, are supporting the Saxby Church Amendment that the whole aid to Pakistan should be cut off, military and economic, till refugees are able to return with assurance of safety and pride in their own hearth and home.

The eloquent voice of the Kennedys is still heard. Senator Kennedy characterised the shipment, to quote him, "as double talk, incompetence or both." But the worst and the greatest comment of Senator Kennedy is:—

"US was more efficient in moving military hardware than in arranging humanitarian relief."

This is not what we Indians say, who are supposed to be against America; this is what Senator Kennedy says, namely, that the Nixon Administration, his own Government, is more efficient in moving military hardware than humanitarian relief needed so badly for Bangla Desh people.

We must appreciate fully that there are Senator Kennedys, High Scotts and Fullbrights, still there who in that part of the New World are seeing the misfortune, the butchery, the genocide, the plunder, loot, murder and rape by West Pakistan on Bangla Desh people. We appreciate them for this.

According to a State Department spokesman, American military sales of these weapons to Pakistan are about \$10 million every year and that also at subsidised rates. What are the subsidised rates? I would not say that myself. Republican Senator Mr. William Saxby has exposed the mystery of these surplus sales. He has said that the pricing policy of the Pentagon allows Pakistan to purchase the surplus arms at throw-away prices. Even at those subsidised rates they are worth \$10 million every year!

All this shows that the American Government, which professes to show sympathy, has not got even a fraction of what we strongly feel in this part of the world. Why is it so? What is the reason? The answer is not far to seek. America's Pentagon and State Department have seen enough massacres and have done enough massacres in Vietnam. My Lai is a constant prick and weighs heavily on the conscience of the civilised world.

By this Resolution I am appealing to the American people to ask the Pentagon to hold its hand in support of Pakistan, which is staging every day one 'My Lai' in Bangla Desh. My motion is not at all sponsored with any illwill. What we have seen every day happening in that New World in the name of saving democracy somewhere and in the name of saving the countries from Communism somewhere else, is a great disregard of human values and democracy, that life is worth living. Therefore I would say that it is essential that we should speak to the American people to stop this massacre, mass killing and My Lai in Bangla Desh.

Now, I come to the second and fourth reasons which are very important. We have seen or this sub-continent has seen recently elections, elections in East Bengal, elections in India and elections in Ceylon. This sub-continent and their people have given a mis-sive mandate to their Governments, to the Awami League Bangabandhu Mujibur Rahman in East Bengal, to Shrimati Indira Gandhi in India and to Shrimati Bandranaike in Ceylon, for a socialistic society which can be free of hunger and free of fear. These important incidents. these important happenings in this part of the world are an eyecore to those people who think that they are a big brother. America is a big brother and others are dwarfs to paly and sing to the tune of the big brother.

I say that this is a calculated move to frustrate the Bangla Desh people from setting up a secular Government. They have falsified the two-nation theory by their elections. Those Hindus are being pushed out, Muslims are being pushed out for, they have voted for Bangabandhu Mujibur Rahman whose six-point programme is, "We want a secular Government and a secular society. No two-nation theory. Islam, Hindusm and Christianity will all live together." It is to frustrate this that Pakistani junta is being helped by the so-called free world by shipment of arms and ammunition.

One of my important reasons is that this is to upset the whole balance of power in this part of the world. About 7 million refugees have already poured into India. That is more than a territorial threat to our country. Our priorities are being changed. We have to spend a large amount of resources in feeding the Pak citizens. Let not the world feel, when I speak of economic difficulties, that they can give us money and solve the problem. No. The Government of India are helping the Pak citizens who have become destitute and have come to this country to go back to their own country. But they are to be helped to go back under safe conditions. India cannot be a party to the massacre and butchery again of these helpless citizens. Therefore, I say that it is a calculated move by the Americans to upset the entire balance of power in this part of the world.

Some of my friends both inside the House and outside may feel that I am too harsh. Let us in a couple of minutes understand what American Government's behaviour has been towards our Government. It dates back to Truman Administration when John Foster Dulles was in-charge of negotiating a Treaty with Japan. Mr. Dulles consulted every person and every country in Asia. But not Nehru's India and India's Nehru. Mr. Dulles did not think it proper.

Hardly had Dullesian 'Faux Pas' slipped into limbo, another problem came up and that was the famine we were facing in 1951. We asked for 2 million tonnes of wheat. Well, the American Government saw the best opportunity to twist India's arm and wanted the foreign policy to be adjusted as a *quid pro quo* for wheat. The American foreign policy needs are always something higher than the fate of Indian people or the people in this part of the continent. That is why the long-extending arms of the statutert of Library at New York which is so proudly demonstrated in centimetres and metres to every traveller in the new world did not shiver under feet to see the butchery of the same liberty in the Bangla Desh.

Fourteen years after, again, we had to face the aggression of Pakistan. The American President was reminded repeatedly of the assurance given to India that the arms would not be used against India. The American President did not hear. Rather, on the contrary, they stopped the ships carrying arms supply to India on the high seas. And today, when India asked for the stoppage of Padma, Sunderbans, Kaukahli and others, the American Government said that it was a legal impossibility. There it was absolutely all formality—"Immediately stop it." But, here it is a 'legal impossibility'. Therefore, this shows the tendency of how things are being done. Mr. Speaker, we did not worry for the stoppage of ships, then. Our Keeler Brothers and Abdul Hameed with the indigenous Gnat blew into jitters the American Sabre Jets and threw into bits the Pattons. The invincibility of American arms was exposed and they were licking the boots of our Army in the plains of the Punjab. . . .
(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, I thought the American administration would still realise that we are

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

also a nation which wants to be taken into confidence in this part, not alone Pakistan. But it did not happen anything on that. The irritation continues even in the office of the present Prime Minister. When the present Prime Minister said that India expects that bombardment would stop in Vietnam, sharp came the reaction of the American Government and also the President. Cables bristled into the Indian capital with the word—I quote:

“Those ungrateful Indians.”

This happened under the present Prime Minister's regime.

Mr. Speaker, so goes the story of the American Government for the defence of democracy in Vietnam and in this part of the Continent. What a contrast? What a promise? What a hope? What an action? What a gap in the credibility of the promise and action?

Sir, I need not take the House to other parts of the Americans' help or other things. I would have given another piece of evidence how Americans are trying in the economic fields to surround us and help Pakistan but this is not the time. I would only content myself by saying that in the field of economic aid, according to the *Baltimore Sun* to quote, of Pakistan is receiving twice as much American aid per capita as giant India.” Sir, the figures speak very eloquently on this. Total aid—credits and grants given between 1945 and 1965—7339 million dollars to India and 3423 million dollars to Pakistan. The per capita aid is Rs. 108 to India and Rs. 243 to Pakistan. More than double. ‘I love my Pakistan, therefore, I give them more.’ So, I forget that. So says USA Govt. Regarding loans which we wanted, the loans given between 1958-68—India 2695 million dollars. Pakistan—1305 million dollars. Rs. 38 per head in India and Rs. 95 per head in Pakistan. $2\frac{1}{2}$ times more.

Now, Sir, what for is Pakistan using this economic aid? Mr. Speaker, for long they are using this money to purchase arms—not against China because they are their good friends, but against India and now against

Bangla Desh. Mr. Speaker, it has been difficult to believe the words of the American Government in their recent exposure of the Vietnam secrets. We Indians are not there. Neither our people nor the Members of Parliament in USA. Their own *Washington Post* says that “the United States Administration tried to keep the 1954 Geneva Conference from calling elections throughout Vietnam—North and South.” The *New York Times* has given a large display of the Vietnam secrets under one word: One thing to one ally, other thing to the other and in action just the contrary. I am not saying this. In every statement I have made, I am supported by the statement of the American senators. Their leading public men have said about this. Therefore, I say, ‘What is this democracy?’ We want to understand. We wanted to be friends since 1952, but, as I have detailed, on every occasion, we find that we have not been taken into confidence as a democratic nation and as a friend but the neutralist India and the free world have always been differentiated.

The recent joining of America in the ping-pong diplomacy club is also a pointer as to what the American intentions are on this sub-continent. A smile, Mr. Speaker, is always infectious. But the smile on the face of a dragon is pernicious and this infectious smile from the dragon's mouth of the new world administrators is much more dangerous. And, therefore, ping-pong diplomacy only indicates what type of democracy China is. This Ping-Pong diplomacy indicates what the American Government wants to do. Do they want to serve democracy? The table-tennis teams of Britain and America are not to play games; but their eyes are on the 800 million people, for market for their goods, so that their whole harvest can flourish.

You must have seen, Mr. Speaker, the recent statement that Mr. Wilson was taken for a joy ride when Pakistan aggressed on India. When I moved a motion to Quit Commonwealth our friends were susceptible. They said, no, powerful Wilson is a great democrat, a great labour leader, and he must have slipped somewhere, but he did not amend for it, till we could know indirectly through a book that the pro-Pakistani elements in his Foreign office took him for a joy-ride. Now the lesson is quite clear that

the military dictatorial junta are suppressing real democracy in Bangla Desh.

My motion is intended only to bring to the notice of the American people the need to desist from such action which really go against the very desires that they cherish.

If you see Mr. Swaran Singh's statement laid on the table, you will see that America has equated India and Pakistan. It says: "They expressed the hope that restraint would be continued on both sides." This is the 17th June statement issued by the American Government after our Foreign Minister's visit. Where is the question of equation? Still, it mentions like this. There is another statement which says 'The United States appreciate the efforts of Prince Sadruddin Khan, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.' A nice way of complimenting.' Mr. Khadilkar will be able to say about this. It is known to this country what Mr. Sadruddin Khan, an International civil servant, has been doing in Pakistan. He has huge investments in West Pakistan. A long list has been published recently. It is most unfortunate that the American Government is seeing the whole thing with a coloured glass. We have seen that the American Government are doing it since 1951.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to see the Arab world's stand. we have supported them and to some of them on their very existence. Mr. Malaviya has just returned from Damascus from the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference. He did not find one man to support and speak to him. It is high time, Mr. Foreign Minister, we decide how in the national interest of India and also of Bangla Desh, and for the security and peace in the sub-continent, how we should act in foreign policy in Arab world.

It is in this background that I would like to say a few words on the second part of the Motion. The policy of India in the last few months, since this happening in Bangla Desh, has been to make an all-out effort to help and support the people of Bangla Desh. We may differ possibly on the aspect of recognition of Bangla Desh. You may say that recognition may bring immediate dividends. But Government and we on this side—some

you—feel that we have been doing everything to support the people of Bangla Desh.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Only some of you.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: No, some of you not.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I said that because he said 'some of us on this side.'

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: I am thankful to him for the correction. He also carries wisdom with him.

We all feel—in that I include him also—that Government has been doing its level best for the people of Bangla Desh. I must say that the restraint exercised by the Government of India under the leadership of the Prime Minister has definitely brought dividends. I ask a fair question: what would have happened had India gone on with the extreme step in the beginning? Knowing, as we do now, the reaction of world opinion, the Americans and their allies would have all sympathised with West Pakistan.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Unfortunately, my hon. friend is not acquainted with developments at the initial stage.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: I do not yield.

I know Shri Samar Guha feels differently and strongly. But I would request him to hear the point of view of myself and my friends on this side. What we say is that if we had gone with the extreme step in the beginning, the entire world opinion—if not all, may be some may only be left out—would have gone in favour of Pakistan and the lie of Pakistan that India wanted any opportunity to crush Pakistan would have gained credibility abroad. Therefore, I say that our Prime Minister correctly assessed the situation and followed a policy of restraint.

What are we doing now? Our External Affairs Ministry went round to those countries. We have clearly told them that the bloodshed and coldblooded genocide in Bangla Desh has disturbed peace and security in this part of the world, on the sub-continent.

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

The world has been told in unmistakable terms that there is much greater provocation than violation of territorial integrity and territorial aggression. It has been conveyed to world opinion that India's patience has been exhausted and she may be compelled to take extreme steps. We have not been lagging behind in helping or in expressing our opinion or preparing, for that matter, for any step which we may have to take under compulsion.

Our Minister of External Affairs made a statement on the floor of the House after his visit to Bonn, Paris, Ottawa, Washington and London. We now know that these countries have been made to realise that the immediate solution is not a military solution but the cessation of military action immediately in Bangla Desh. I would request my Government to continue to press upon world opinion that security, peace and harmony in this part of the world has been threatened. Let the international community be made to realise this.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Swaran Singh—go back.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: This sort of remark shows how seriously he is looking at this. I speak with my heart but he speaks with his tongue. I speak with an awareness of the sympathies which we have for Bangla Desh. I would tell the Prime Minister and our Government that the world powers must be told that the flow of refugees to India from Bangla Desh must be stopped. Let them not say that they are sending us relief. The relief that they are sending is less than 10 per cent of what India is spending on refugees from Bangla Desh. Therefore, we have to emphasize that these people have to go back to their hearths and homes, but we cannot allow them to go back to be butchered. Therefore, conditions must be created in Bangla Desh for their return, and therefore it is essential that world opinion must force West Pakistan to come to a political settlement with the chosen representatives of Bangla Desh. India must always support the stand of the Bangla Desh people under the leadership of Banga Bandhu Mujibur Rahman. Whatever settlement is acceptable

to them we shall support. Therefore, I would say that we should go on making efforts in this direction.

The Foreign Minister says that he found the Capitals to be very favourable saying that there should be peace and harmony and the refugees should go back to Bangla Desh. I would like to know if any Government was prepared to take up the matter in the United Nations General Assembly or Security Council. Let not their words of sympathy be like the lunch being given in New York while at the same time sending ships with military equipment to West Pakistan. Let their words carry meaning, and meaning will be carried only when they go to the world forum to tell Pakistan to stop this bloody action.

With these words I move this motion. Our Government and all our people are on the side of Bangla Desh. Let the Government, under the Prime Minister's leadership, continue to make efforts seriously to bring about a settlement favourable and acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh under Mujibur Rahman.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Vajpayee.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Similar motions were tabled by us.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Almost at the same time a similar motion was given.

MR. SPEAKER: The motions were in identical terms as this motion and that is why they are not moved. Of course, those who gave notice will also participate.

13.00 hrs.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (स्वालिपर) :
अध्यक्ष जी, विदेश मंत्री महोदय अनेक देशों का दौरा करके भारत लौटे हैं। स्पष्टतः वह अपनी यात्रा के परिणामों से खुश हैं। उन्होंने यह दावा किया है कि बंगला देश के सम्बन्ध में विश्व के जनमत को, विशेषकर जिन देशों की उन्होंने यात्रा की, उनकी सरकारों को वहाँ की स्थिति के बारे में बताने में और बांगला देश की समस्या का एक राजनीतिक हल निकालने में, उनका

समर्थन प्राप्त करने में विदेश मंत्री को सहायता मिली ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, और भी मंत्री विश्व के भ्रमण पर जा रहे हैं । ऐसा लगता है दुनिया की किसी राजधानी में हमारे दूतावास बंगला देश की स्थिति के बारे में दुनिया के देशों को, वहां की जनता और सरकारों को उपयुक्त जानकारी देने में विफल रहे हैं । विदेश मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि न्यूयार्क टाइम्स में जो खबर छप गई हथियार लेकर पाकिस्तान की ओर आने वाले जहाजों के बारे में, उसकी जानकारी वाशिंगटन स्थित हमारा दूतावास कैसे प्राप्त कर सकता था । वह यह भी कहते हैं कि दूतावासों का काम जासूसी करना नहीं है । तो क्या अब बार वालों का काम जासूसी करना है ? लेकिन न्यूयार्क टाइम्स का संवाददाता यह पता लगा सका कि पाकिस्तान को हथियार जा रहे हैं, इस तारीख को जहाज निकलने वाले हैं, उन जहाजों में क्या-क्या सामग्री थी । हमारे दूतावास को भी इस तरह की जानकारी प्राप्त होनी चाहिए । अगर हमारे दूतावास इस तरह की जानकारी प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते तो कहना होगा कि हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय, और हमारी विदेश सेवा अपने कर्तव्य पालन में विफल रही है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां-जहां विदेश मंत्री गये हैं, उन सब देशों की सरकारों ने कहा है कि बंगला देश की समस्या का राजनीतिक हल होना चाहिए । हमारी सरकार भी यही कहती है । अभी श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद ने भी कहा कि राजनीतिक हल होना चाहिए । प्रिंस सदरुद्दीन भी, जिन्हें बंगला देश से आये हुए विस्थापितों की चिन्ता नहीं है, कलकत्ता में अपनी संपत्ति की चिन्ता ज्यादा है, यही कहते हैं कि राजनीतिक हल होना चाहिए । मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि राजनीतिक हल से क्या अभिप्राय है । विदेश मंत्री दुनिया की राजधानियों में गये थे, मास्को में तो उन्होंने दुनिया के आम मसलों पर भी चर्चा की । उन्होंने हिन्द-चीन के बारे में

चर्चा की, निःशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में चर्चा की, पश्चिम एशिया में जो स्थिति पैदा हो रही है, उसके बारे में चर्चा की । उनकी यात्रा केवल बंगला देश तक सीमित नहीं रही । मगर मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या उन्होंने इन विषयों के साथ मास्को में यह भी चर्चा की कि जिस राजनीतिक हल की चर्चा की जा रही है, उस राजनीतिक हल का रूप क्या होगा ? क्या उन्होंने दुनिया के इन देशों से भी पूछा और अगर नहीं पूछा तो हम अपनी सरकार से पूछना चाहते हैं कि बंगला देश के संदर्भ में जिस राजनीतिक हल की चर्चा की जा रही है, क्या बंगला देश की जनता को यह हल स्वीकार होगा ?

जिस छ-सूत्री कार्यक्रम की चर्चा की जा रही है, वह छ-सूत्री कार्यक्रम 25 मार्च से पहले बना था । तब से लेकर अब तक पद्या में बहुत-सा पानी बह गया है और पानी नहीं बहुत-सा रक्त बह गया है, आंसू बह गये हैं । 25 मार्च से जो अत्याचार ढाये जा रहे हैं, जो कल्लेआम किया जा रहा है, क्या उसके बाद भी बंगला देश की जनता पाकिस्तान के अंग के रूप में किसी हल को स्वीकार करेगी ? पाकिस्तान राजनीतिक हल की चाल चल सकता है । वह बंगला देश में कठपुतली सरकार बना सकता है । मुस्लिम लीग, जमाते-इस्लामी और जो डरे हुए, आतंकित लोग हैं उनका सहारा लेकर एक सरकार गठित करने का नाटक रचा जा सकता है । और तब ब्रिटेन और अमरीका के सत्ताधीश कह सकते हैं कि पूर्व बंगाल में एक सरकार बन गई है, इस्लामाबाद के सैनिक तानाशाह स्थिति को सामान्य करने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, शुरूआत हो गई है, जैसे-जैसे वक्त बीतेगा समस्या हल हो जायेगी और मामला दब जायेगा । बंगला देश के कार्यवाहक राष्ट्रपति हैं श्री नज़रुल इस्लाम, उन्होंने भी हाल में कुछ शर्तें रखी हैं । विदेश मंत्री ने वह शर्तें देखी हैं या नहीं ? उन्होंने कहा है कि हमारी चार शर्तें हैं । वे शर्तें इस प्रकार हैं—पहली शर्त है शेष मुजीबुर्रहमान और अन्य जनप्रतिनिधियों की रिहाई, दूसरी

[श्री अटलबिहारी वाजपेयी]

शर्त है बंगला देश पर बलात् कब्जा कायम रखने वाली पश्चिमी पाकिस्तानी सेनाओं का वापस जाना, तीसरी शर्त है स्वतंत्र तथा सार्वभौम बंगला देश को मान्यता देना और अंतिम शर्त है गत तीन मास से बंगला देश की जनता ने जो अत्याचार सहें हैं उनके बदले में पूर्ण क्षतिपूर्ति करना ।

जब भारत सरकार राजनीतिक हल की बात करती है तो क्या ये शर्तें उसके सामने हैं ? या भारत सरकार बंगला देश पर ऐसा राजनीतिक हल थोपना चाहेगी जिसे बंगला देश की जनता स्वीकार नहीं करेगी ? अगर बंगला देश में पाकिस्तान की सेना रहती है और अगर बंगला देश पाकिस्तान का हिस्सा रहेगा, तो फिर कोई विस्थापित वापस जाने वाला नहीं है ।

प्रधानमंत्री के इस आशावाद का क्या आधार है कि जो विस्थापित आये हैं वे छः महीने में वापस चले जायेंगे ? पूर्व बंगाल से देश के बंटवारे के बाद एक करोड़ 80 लाख लोग आ चुके हैं, तब केवल हिन्दू आये थे । आज हिन्दुओं के साथ मुसलमान आये हैं, ईसाई भी आये हैं, मगर आये हैं डर से, भय से, आतंक से । कत्लेआम हो रहा है । खेत-खलिहान नष्ट कर दिये गये हैं । जमीनें, मकान जला दिये गये हैं । जवान बेटियों पर सामूहिक बलात्कार किये गये हैं । छोटे-छोटे बच्चों को हवा में उछालकर संगीन की नोकों पर झुलाया गया है । जिस पाकिस्तान ने यह पाप किया है वह जब तक बंगला देश में रहेगा, तब तक कोई विस्थापित वापस जा सकता है ? कोई वापस नहीं जाएगा और अगर वापस नहीं जाएगा तो देश का हाल क्या होगा इसकी हम कल्पना करें ।

कोई यह नहीं कहता कि आप पाकिस्तान से लड़िये, मगर पाकिस्तान ने हमारे खिलाफ लड़ाई शुरू कर दी है । हम पाकिस्तान पर हमला करें, यह सवाल नहीं है, हम पाकिस्तानी

हमले का जवाब तो दें । बेचरबार करके साठ लाख लोगों को हिन्दुस्तान में भेजना यह हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ हमला है । ये लोग हमारी अर्थ रचना को विभ्रंशित कर देंगे, यह हमारी राजनीतिक स्थिरता को खतरे में डाल देंगे । यह साम्प्रदायिक शांति के लिए भी समस्या पैदा कर देंगे ।

पश्चिमी बंगाल की विधान सभा भंग हो गई, राष्ट्रपति राज होने वाला है । त्रिपुरा में विस्थापितों को रखने की शक्ति नहीं है । जितनी आबादी त्रिपुरा की है, उससे अधिक विस्थापित आ गये हैं । असम में दूसरी तरह का तनाव पैदा हो रहा है । मेघालय की स्थिति से हम लोग आंखें नहीं मूंद सकते । यहां 60 लाख लोगों का आना, जिनकी तादाद एक करोड़ तक जा सकती है, यह हमारे ऊपर हमला है । हमें इस हमले का प्रतिकार करना चाहिए ।

मैं विदेश मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि कौन-सा राजनीतिक हल उनके दिमाग में है । क्या वह समस्या का समाधान करेगा ? क्या उन्होंने दुनिया के देशों से यह भी पूछा कि अगर पाकिस्तान ने ऐसा राजनीतिक हल नहीं माना तो दुनिया के देश क्या करेंगे ? अमरीका ने जवाब दे दिया है । वह पाकिस्तान को मदद दे रहा है । ब्रिटेन के बारे में भी मुझे कोई गलतफहमी नहीं है । श्री डगलस ह्यूम हमारे विदेश मंत्री से कुछ कहते हैं, अपने हाउस आफ कामंस में कुछ कहते हैं । दुनिया के जिन देशों ने पाकिस्तान को आर्थिक सहायता देने के सवाल पर निर्णय करना टालना स्वीकार किया है, वह भी यही कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को कोशिश करनी चाहिए बंगला देश की समस्या का राजनीतिक हल निकालने की । आज पाकिस्तान के प्रेसिडेंट ब्राडकास्ट करने वाले हैं । वह ढाका में कठपुतली सरकार खड़ी कर देंगे, वह एक राजनीतिक हल पैदा करने का आभास उत्पन्न करेंगे और ब्रिटेन और अमरीका उनका साथ देंगे ।

मुझे ब्रिटेन और अमरीका के दृष्टिकोण के बारे में कोई गलतफहमी नहीं है। ब्रिटेन पाकिस्तान का पिता है। अमरीका पाकिस्तान का पोषक है। मैं श्री भागवत झा आजाद की इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि हथियार दे कर उन्होंने दोनों देशों के बीच सन्तुलन बिगाड़ दिया है। अमरीका और ब्रिटेन की नीति है दोनों देशों के बीच में सन्तुलन न बिगाड़ने देना, पाकिस्तान की पीठ थपथपाना, जिससे वह भारत पर नियंत्रण कायम रख सके, रेस्ट्रेंट कायम रख सके। इसीलिये पाकिस्तान को सैनिक सहायता दी गई। इसीलिये जब-जब भारत पर हमला हुआ, ब्रिटेन और और अमरीका को हमने पाकिस्तान की पीठ थपथपाते देखा। लन्दन और वाशिंगटन वही खेल खेल रहे हैं जो पीकिंग खेल रहा है। उनके भरोसे बंगला देश की समस्या हल नहीं होगी।

सोवियत रूस से हमें कुछ आशा है, लेकिन विदेश मंत्री का वक्तव्य कुछ ज्यादा जानकारी नहीं देता। राष्ट्रपति पोदगोरनी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया था, जो पत्र मेजा था याहिया खां को, उससे हमें कुछ आशा बंधी थी, लेकिन यदि विदेश मंत्री कुछ और बात करके आये हों तो वह सदन को विश्वास में लें कि दुनिया का कौन-सा देश हमारा साथ देगा।

पाकिस्तान को हथियार मिल रहे हैं यह खेद की बात है, रोष की बात है, लेकिन यह हथियार न भी मिलते तो क्या पाकिस्तान के पास हथियार कम हैं बंगला देश की निहत्थी जनता को दबाने के लिये? अमरीका, रूस और चीन सभी तो पाकिस्तान को शस्त्रास्त्र देकर उसका मण्डार भर चुके हैं। अगर मास्को की नीति में परिवर्तन होता है तो हम उसका समर्थन करेंगे। अमरीका के दो चेहरे हम से छिपे नहीं हैं। मैं अपने कम्यूनिस्ट मित्रों से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि अमरीका लोकतन्त्रवादी देश नहीं हैं। अमरीका लोकतन्त्रवादी देश है, मगर अपने घर में, बाहर वह डिक्टेटरशिप को पसंद करता है। (व्यवधान) अगर घर में अमरीका लोकतन्त्रवादी न होता

तो न्यूयार्क टाइम्स ऐसी खबरें न छाप सकता। इजेबेस्टिया या प्राबवा ऐसी खबरों को कभी नहीं छाप सकते। लेकिन क्या हम विदेशों के भरोसे बंगला देश की समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं?

श्री के० डी० मालवीय (डुमरियागंज) : थोड़े दिन में और आप उनको जान जायेंगे।

श्री भटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : श्री मालवीय डेमस्कस गये थे, वह जितना जानकर आये हैं उतना ही काफी है।

अगर हम चाहते हैं कि बंगला देश की समस्या का सन्तोषजनक हल हो, तो फिर दुनिया के देशों पर निर्भर रह कर यह हल प्राप्त नहीं किया जा सकता। हमें अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना होगा। अगर सरकार बंगला देश को मान्यता प्रदान कर देती तो शायद स्थिति आज अलग होती। अगर 25 मार्च को नई दिल्ली निर्णय कर देती तो शायद इतिहास की धारा बदली हुई दिखाई देती। हमें भूलना नहीं चाहिये कि समय पाकिस्तान के पक्ष में है। वह डरा रहा है, दबा रहा है, विश्व की राज-धानियों में पूर्व बंगाल में घटने वाले अत्याचारों की स्मृति धीरे-धीरे धीमी पड़ जायेगी, मुख्य प्रश्न से ध्यान हट जायेगा और राजनीतिक हल की खोज होगी। वह राजनीतिक हल बंगला देश की जनता के गले के नीचे उतारना मुश्किल होगा।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर अवामी लीग के मित्रों को रिहा नहीं किया गया, या उनके हाथ में शासन सत्ता नहीं सौंप दी गई, या पाकिस्तान ने पोलिटिकल सोल्यूशन, जिस तरह के पोलिटिकल सोल्यूशन की यह वक्तव्य मांग करता है, स्वीकार नहीं किया तो भारत क्या करेगा? मैं नहीं समझता कि भारत के सामने और कोई रास्ता है। एक ही रास्ता है और वह यह कि हम बंगला देश की सहायता करने का फैसला करें। यह सहायता केवल नैतिक

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

नहीं, भौतिक भी होनी चाहिये। पाकिस्तान ने हमारे ऊपर युद्ध लाद दिया है, हमें पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण का प्रतिकार करना चाहिये। इस लिये बंगला देश को मान्यता देना जरूरी है क्योंकि मान्यता देने से सहायता देने का काम कानूनी हो जाता है और हम सरलतापूर्वक मान्यता दे सकते हैं। अगर सरकार के सामने कोई दूसरा विकल्प है तो उसको भी सरकार स्पष्ट करे और सदन को विश्वास में ले।

आज संकट की स्थिति है और देश का मन बनाना जरूरी है, मगर देश का मन बनाने से पहले सरकार का मन बनना चाहिये। मेरे सामने पैट्रिऑट का अंक है। पैट्रिऑट उनका पत्र है जो प्रधानमंत्री के निकट समझे जाते हैं। इस पैट्रिऑट के सम्पादकीय में एक बात कही गई है:

"Answering them to the satisfaction of the people, however, will be difficult as long as divided counsels continue to confuse the government."

यह बात कही जा रही है कि विदेश मंत्री बंगला देश पर कड़ी कार्रवाई के खिलाफ हैं क्योंकि विदेश मंत्री को डर है कि लड़ाई बंगला देश तक सीमित नहीं रहेगी, पाकिस्तान द्वारा पंजाब में भी लाई जायेगी। बंगला देश के सवाल को रक्षा मंत्री के खिलाफ प्रचार करने के लिये भी प्रयुक्त किया जा रहा है। इस सदन को विश्वास दिलाया जाना चाहिये कि विश्व के जनमत के जागरण का काम किया जायेगा, लेकिन अगर हमें अकेले बढ़ना है तो हम अकेले आगे बढ़ेंगे। बंगला देश रवीन्द्र का देश है, काजी नजरुल इस्लाम का देश है। रवीन्द्र कवीन्द्र ने हम से कहा था:

ऐकला चलो रहे,
यदि तोर डाक मुने केउ न आशे
तबे ऐकला चलो रे।

अकेले चलो कर्तव्य मार्ग पर, अकेले चलो बंगला देश के लोकतन्त्र की रक्षा के लिये। हम पाकि-

स्तान की अखडप्ता को कायम रखने के लिये बेंचे हुए नहीं हैं। 1947 में भारत बंट गया, आज घड़ी की सुई पूरी घूम गई है और पाकिस्तान बंट रहा है। इस बटवारे में हमारा हाथ नहीं है, मगर अगर पूर्व बंगाल की जनता पाकिस्तान से अलग होना चाहती है तो हम उसे पाकिस्तान का हिस्सा रहने के लिये मजबूर नहीं कर सकते।

हमें मदद देनी होगी बंगला देश को अकेले के बल पर। अगर दुनिया के देश हमारे साथ आते हैं तो उनके साथ, और अगर वह मूक दर्शक रहना चाहते हैं तो उनकी अपेक्षा करके। अगर वह हमारे रास्ते में बाधाएँ डालते हैं तो उनकी ब्रह्मा करके बंगला देश के मुक्ति संग्राम को हमारी पूरी सहायता चाहिये। अगर विदेश मंत्री इस चर्चा के उत्तर में सदन का समाधान कर सकें तो बड़ा अच्छा है, नहीं तो मैं चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि देश की जनता के धैर्य का बांध टूट रहा है। जो कहानियाँ आ रही हैं, आँसू और रक्त में डूबी हुई कहानियाँ वह भारत की जनता को उद्बेलित कर रही हैं। लोगों को शांत करने का एक ही तरीका है कि उन्हें विश्वास हो कि सरकार पीछे नहीं हटेगी, राजनीतिक समाधान के आवरण में सरकार कमजोरी नहीं दिखायेगी, बंगला देश की मुक्ति के लिये जो कुछ हो सकता है करेगी। अगर विदेश मंत्री यह आश्वासन देंगे तो जनता शांत हो सकती है, सरकार का समर्थन कर सकती है, नहीं तो जनता को मजबूर होकर सरकार को सही कदम उठाने के लिये विवश करना पड़ेगा।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, this US behaviour reveals only a fraction of the misdeeds. We are talking about three shiploads; it could be 33 as well. No doubt, they are shipping through different dummy countries also. I quote from a testimony. Testifying before the Joint Committee of the US Congress Mr. Chester Bowles, former US Ambassador to India, referring to Pakistan's effort in recent years to secure additional tanks, disclosed

that it was the US Government which had asked one by one West Germany, the Belgians, the Italians and finally the Turks to sell American tanks and armaments to Pakistan for a price.

I want to ask Shri Swaran Singh one question. He has a big establishment of foreign intelligence and a director too. What was the foreign intelligence doing? We have seen their failure during the last refugee influx, before the last elections in Bangladesh and thereby we were caught napping. We have got this huge and elaborate establishment not only here but also in different countries, including in Washington. We want to know whether the foreign intelligence unit of the Government of India in the United States had given you prior intimation about the misdeeds of the American Government.

Capitalist countries like USA will always make hay while the sun shines. They are always faced with the problem of finding buyers for their weapons which are not modern for their own use. They want to dump them elsewhere. Well, about the subsidised prices I really cannot say anything because it could very well be compared with the "stock clearance sale" where the price is increased many times and then a small cut is made. I really do not think they give at subsidised prices. When there are two countries fighting, two governments fighting, they go to the extent of providing gas bombs to one and gas masks to another. And that is their policy and that is their principle. This Government—definitely it has been proved—works under a subsidiary alliance otherwise how could you yield to their pressure and behave so shably with countries like Vietnam, Cuba, Algeria and G. D. R. in matters of diplomatic relations and also trade relations.

Sir, I say the United States Government has deliberately misled the Government of India and the External Affairs Minister in failing to appreciate the actual U. S. attitude, has shown utter incompetency and failed to perform his duty in his recent mission. I say again that the External Affairs Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh even after extensive publications in the papers on the U.S. misbehaviour in Vietnam failed to understand that he was dealing with the Government of

United States who always do double or multi dealings.

Sir, they want to have a world-wide economic empire, rob raw-materials and dump finished goods. Our Government as a whole has failed to appreciate and formulate policy planning to cope with the situation. Sir, it has shown utter inability to formulate suitable policy and shown lack of boldness and plenty of indecision has been exhibited. Sir, our unanimous resolution in this House which had worried Pakistan. We cooperated with the Government which had roused hope in the minds of the people of Bangla Desh, the Indian Press and the Radio which had exhorted beyond their description. Well, Sir, this has all resulted in nothing but historic betrayal of the people of Bangla Desh. But where we had no commitment in a country like Ceylon—it was an internal matter—you had gone out of your way by spending Rs. 5.3 crores, by sending defence forces to fight side by side, shoulder by shoulder with the British colonial forces. You have to explain here under what authority you did so and who had authorised ?

They are withdrawing arms from Mukti Fauj fighters which they had taken over from Pakistan fighting forces. I would like to know why is it that you are recovering those arms from Mukti Fauj fighters. Also they have sent a secret circular to Meghalaya asking for restricting the entry of refugees which is most inhuman and unfair. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us what it is? Finally, talk of the U.S. Radar Station in India is worrying us most and we want to know more about that. We want the Government to recognise the Government of Bangla Desh; give them material help so that other Governments may be aware of our serious attitude towards Bangla Desh and take a lead from us.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA (Domaria-ganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to give my whole-hearted support to the manner our Government is conducting the affairs in Connection with what is happening in Bangla Desh. I want to speak with great restraint because I am feeling very strongly on the whole issue before us and whether it is my friend, Shri Samar Guha or Shri Vajpayee I advise them also to use restraint. I have

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

many points of agreement with them. But I see no alternative to support the line that the Government has pursued when our Foreign Minister went to some countries to tell them what the problem really is which is faced by India.

We should now take measures for establishing direct rapport through direct contacts and appeals with the people of America and Britain. Their two peoples, who rushed to Europe in 1939 to safeguard and protect the fundamental rights of human beings, that is, of freedom and sovereignty, who supported their governments then, ought to tell their governments now that the manner in which they have been overawed by Yahya Khan's Government is neither American nor even British in character and basic pattern because people always support the fundamental rights of social justice and the movement for freedom.

I have no doubt that democracy is being betrayed today not so much by some of those nations which have not had much liking for democracy, freedom or social justice but more so by those governments which always spoke very loudly in support of democracy. The fact is that today they are trying to build a balance of power in the sub-continent of Asia which, in their opinion, should be against India. This struggle for balance of power against India is the most fundamental thing for which some Western governments are today manoeuvring.

13.27 hrs.

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

I wish to tell the peoples of those Western governments that, although their Govts. have been professing democracy and freedom, which men like me never believed because we knew that they did not stand for social justice, democracy or protecting human rights of the developing nations, today is the testing time of all those professions for which they talked.

But some thing more is happening. [There is a conflict growing between the peoples and the governments in these countries of the West and also in the post-Nasser Arab world.

I am quoting here the press comment of a country where I have just recently been and from where I do not bring very happy reactions about which I do not wish to say. I am like many others of my friends committed and devoted to the fundamentals of Afro-Asian solidarity, unity among our peoples and for upholding the cause of economic and social justice for all the peoples of Africa and Asia. Therefore I do not wish at this particular time to be provoked by the situation which might displease those people but I must quote from a paper from Damascus. This is from *Al Thwra* of the 27th March, 1971. It says:

"The use of guns for the solution of political differences in East Pakistan will lead to a civil war whose price the Pakistani people will pay dearly.

The fact that the Central Pakistani authorities began to implement what they had threatened to do, that is, to reimpose military rule, because of the failure of political parties to agree on the wording of the Constitution which would organise political life in Pakistan, indicates that the Pakistani military authorities were not serious about giving up their rule. This brings back to mind what Ayub Khan had done years back when he used as a pretext the existence of certain differences to nullify the Pakistan elections and maintain the military rule."

The Syrian press representatives told me that the story and the tragedy enacted in Pakistan is known to them. I personally feel that the love and bases for democracy and its utility are not as much appreciated today in the Arab world as it should have been because most of them are military dictators.

But I am not going into it nor I have to discuss here the merits of democracy. It is for their Government themselves to make up their mind. But what is happening in our country is my concern and about which attention has been drawn by our Prime Minister. These six to eight million people who have come, and who are continuing to come, will be a problem which will be unbearable for India. The consequences of this will be very serious for our country. I am not a member of the Government. I do not

know what the mind of the Government is and how they are going to act. I am however afraid the Government will be compelled to a situation where this challenge will have to be taken up by our own country, where people will have to be taken into confidence on a day sooner than later. This problem of refugees cannot be borne by us any more. We cannot destroy the economy of our country and no country howsoever pampered by interested parties can be allowed to distort our future. It is impossible. We cannot do it. These 6 to 8 million people must go back. And whatever may be the consequence, the Government has to create a condition by argumentation, diplomacy, or otherwise including inviting delegations from other countries to see that our country is cleared of refugees and favourable condition be created when these people are asked to go back or are sent back. We have to think seriously about all these matters. I may also add a word to my friends from the Opposition that unrestrained outburst of emotions cannot help the situation. There is practically no difference between the objectives that we in the Parliament want as Members of Parliament and of the Government. They are very well aware of the complicated problems that are facing us today as a nation to feed these people—hungry people feeding hungry peoples as the Prime Minister said. Therefore, time today is for us to restrain ourselves so far as Pakistan is concerned. Our advice to the Government should be as to how this question of sending back these people has to be solved. Sir, in Damascus, I explained to the delegates of Afro-Asian Conference that we all understood well and believed in the principles of non-intervention in the affairs of other country. We never wanted to interfere. We never bore ill will to Pakistan. I also told them that it is Yahya Khan's regime which was destroying Pakistan. Many of them understood this problem. But not one of them was prepared to support our total stand. I think what we are doing has to be our own job. And once we start acting in order to safeguard the interest of our own nation. In order to go ahead on the lines to which we are committed, in order to send back these people to their own country by creating that condition, other countries will understand our action. There are lots of delegations going round the world. Regarding a political solution, I do not know what is

going to be in this basket of political solution. Our Government has to be very careful. What items have to come into this basket in order to make it a picture of political solution has also to be seen very very carefully. The problem for us is that these people must go back and democracy established for the return of people. A condition of safety and security has to be created by them; not by us. We are not to act for their safety and security because they are foreigners to us. But they must go back to make our life happy and to make us go ahead on the lines we have set for ourselves. I have been to foreign countries and people there understand and appreciate our stand. But somehow or the other, our language of peace is not understood by my friend Mr. Piloo Mody and many others. . .

SHRI PILOO MODY: Do you understand?

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: You will not understand it. I know. They believe in a system which is pulling them back. It is the money from mysterious sources which is pulling the reactionary world back. And so long as monopoly and imperialist design go on distorting the vision of the people of many countries which have emerged from colonial rule, this situation is likely to remain complicated. I, therefore, support the stand of the Government and hope that they will in the very near future create conditions by which these refugees will go back.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are discussing a matter which the British Liberal Journal, and *Guardian*, editorially described as follows:

"On existing evidence, this international calamity is more grave than any since the U. N. was formed—in spite of Korea, Vietnam, Palestine and Biafra." In the same editorial comment dated 19th June, the *Guardian* says:

"Must the world mutely accept what Yahya Government is doing? Is India to be left in desperate difficulty? Is there no further remedy and redress? To save the refugees from cholera, famine and destitution is the first priority. To save those still in East Pakistan is no less urgent."

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Answers have got to be found to this business and we are discussing this matter because of the statements which the Foreign Minister has made. And the reports which he has brought back emphasize two things which are of the gravest concern to our people and that is that, perhaps, we are backsliding in so far as Parliament's commitment to the nation is concerned and, perhaps, in so far as the question of the recognition of Bangla Desh goes, we are giving that up as a bad job. That is to say, what was an inevitable corollary of this Parliament's unanimous Resolution is being put into the scrapheap by the Government of the day and the other is that the Government has neither guts nor credibility. We are a country where 1 in 6 of human beings lives and we behave as if we are craven, cowardly and chicken-hearted. We behave as if we are waiting upon the good pleasure of this power or that power and bring back the reports of the sort which the Foreign Minister has brought.

I do not say these things only because the Minister might, say, I have a tendency to vituperate. We are not interested in vituperation. We all should say with one voice that in so far as war with Pakistan is concerned, we do not want it. We have never wanted that kind of thing. We always wanted to be friendly with Pakistan. Even now we want to be friendly with Pakistan. But at the same time, the Government cannot merely get away with it by pursuing a policy which it is pursuing at the moment.

Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan is no enemy of Pakistan. Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan is no war-monger. But he is saying all the time: Recognise Bangla Desh---that is the basic aspect of the matter; give assistance to the freedom fighters of Bangla desh to which we are pledged in this Parliament. Let us do that. If there is a risk, you minimise that risk. Go abroad and talk to all the chancelleries of the world; minimise and eliminate that risk. Pakistan will not dare go to war against India if India pursues a courageous and principled policy in this matter.

What is happening? Mr. Swaran Singh comes back with a report, and we are given a slap in the face by the U.S. arms shipment to Pakistan. A paper like the *Statesman*

prints the facsimile of a document dated 28th May, 1971 which shows very large American transactions in regard to arms purchases by Pakistan, much after March 26.

We know that history has given a designation to Great Britain, that is, the title of "perfidious Albion." But in the sphere of perfidy and treachery, the United States takes the cake. There is no doubt about it. With the United States we have a relationship which so many of us have described as a subsidiary alliance. But of course, Sardar Swaran Singh is very quiet. He is a protocol-perfect Foreign Minister. He is an incapable person. He is a highly talented man cut out to be a very efficient Civil Servant, but has been forked into political power. As Foreign Minister he seems insensitive to the winds of change that are blowing all over the world and is unable to cope with the problems which crop up. It is not merely his personal capacity or incapacity. It is the matter of an entire Government which is intellectually sterile and ideologically destitute but which is highly talented so far as political manoeuvring is concerned. But as far as foreign affairs are concerned, it cannot tackle the problems that are coming up from time to time.

To-day I have seen in Parliament House a telegram that even the little island of Malta gives a notice to the United States that its ships will not come into the island of Malta. 'We have been considering the whole matter of our relationship with NATO'. Malta has courage, but we don't have the courage. We do not even make a real official protest against arms shipments by the United States. The Minister only requests! According to his statement he makes a 'request' that America being the paragon of democratic practice, should stop doing the kind of damage that she is doing to our country!

Are we going to be content with this sort of thing? Are we going to be content with the pat on the back which the United States, the UK and even a person called Sadrudin Aga Khan give us saying, 'You are very good in relief operations. The Government of West Bengal and the Government of India are doing very well as far as giving relief to people is concerned.' But is that the end of the story? Are we interested only in getting

a little more money? It is coming in trickles—less than 10% of what we need for relief purpose. But are we going to be content if they give us a little more by way of relief? No. We have to solve the basic aspect of the matter and that is what is important.

The Minister goes abroad. Scores of them go abroad. What is the idea? Why do we forget our national commitment? Why is the matter of recognition being low-lighted altogether? Let us remember that recognition doing not necessarily involve war. Who said that recognition involves war? When the Provisional Government of Free Algeria was recognized by some countries, did war follow with France? When we recognised Indonesia even at the time when Holland was fighting Indonesia—Holland did not recognise Indonesia till November 1948—did we have a war with Holland? Recognition does not necessarily mean war. There is no doubt about it.

I feel there is one important aspect to which reference was made by my friend, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, for example. Our Foreign Services have behaved in a manner which I find very difficult to describe. I have a feeling, Sir, that most members of our Foreign Service are very proficient in Anglo-Saxonism and I am quite sure they follow the lead of the Anglo-Saxon powers. I see for instance that our Ambassador in Washington was not even present at his post when Jaya Prakash Narain was there. He was not even present in Washington. He was busy otherwise. I had occasion to say it earlier also and that our Permanent Representative at the United Nations behaved a great deal better, maybe for certain other reasons. But our Ambassador in Washington is hardly doing his job. He was not even present when Jaya Prakash Narain went to that city. Jaya Prakash Narain in his stature and his standing is worth more than the whole lot of our Ambassadors and High Commissioners who we do not even know how important it is to back up the efforts of Jaya Prakash Narain. Journalists from Ghana and elsewhere have reported that our Embassies did not give them adequate information. Our friend, Mr. Keshav Dev Malaviya, comes back from Muslim countries, from Cairo or Damascus or somewhere. He says that they are not speaking up. I have not yet seen one instance

of really effective propaganda being put out by our Foreign Service in countries in that part of the world. The Muslim *Jehan* was not disturbed when Syria could not stay with Egypt in the UAR. The existence of 20 or so Arab States does not disturb the international free masonry of Islam. But the grand principles of Islam in regard to the brotherhood of man and in regard to social discipline which is behind the movement which Mujibur Rahman Khan in East Bengal leads with the help of Maulana Bhasani and so many others, a movement which is linked up with the best of the principles of Islam and also of democracy, which is now being experimented with in a manner which is unprecedented in history, were never put across as a proposition to these countries where Muslims are dominant, and the result is that the deep democratic upsurge in East Bengal is not understood at all.

That is why there has to be a realisation of the importance of the fight in East Bengal, in Bangla Desh, because it gets together all sorts of people. I hope the leadership of the whole movement will not remain concentrated only in the hands of the Awami league, but that the others who are there, the National Awami League, Maulana Bhasani's section and the other section, the Communist Party of Bangla Desh, and the local resistance leadership would all join and would be of help in the matter of the achievement of a free Bangla Desh.

We should have and could have recognised Bangla Desh earlier, sometime in early April, but the Parliament Resolution was thrown into the scrap heap. We did not even take diplomatic steps when in Dacca our Deputy High Commissioner was out of commission, not working at all. We did not even register our diplomatic disapproval by recalling our Deputy High Commissioner. Today he is a prisoner in Dacca, he is starving and in different ways treated so badly. And, when a man called Mehdi Masud is sent from Delhi to represent Pakistan as Deputy High Commissioner, we accept him, we treat him in a V. I. P. manner. Why should we do that? I do not understand. You don't go to war if you ask your own Deputy High Commissioner to come back. But we did not do it. We did not recall our Deputy High Commissioner from Dacca.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

The External Affairs Ministry's mouth-piece, the Indian and World Affairs, a fortnightly, printed only one article on recognition, by Tek Chand, who was a Member of the First Parliament. He produced the Prohibition Report. He is very well known; in club circles people used to say, let us go and have a Tek Chand! He has written an article attacking recognition, saying that it was not a possibility. The only article which came out in the official fortnightly of the External Affairs Ministry is an article opposing recognition, while recognition is the only logical step after our Parliamentary resolution.

In these circumstances when we are dealing with a matter of the gravest importance, it is necessary that our country behaves with courage, our country must behave with some imaginative understanding of the issues at stake.

Pakistan can no longer resume its old existence and that is something which we have got to remember. Bangla Desh has launched a kind of movement which we are pledged to assist. I do not understand what the Prime Minister meant when she said: "We should not allow the people of Bangla Desh to be exterminated." What are we going to do about it? Are we going to be overwhelmed by the refugee problem? It is an overwhelming problem but we are not going to be left with this problem all the time. We have to have a solution of this problem. Therefore, we have to go ahead. We have even to show the world the way. Only if India recognises Bangla Desh other countries come into the picture. Otherwise the other countries will say, it is a complicated question and therefore, when India has not recognised Bangla Desh, it is not necessary for us to do so.

That is why this kind of a political solution which is being bandied about has got to be clarified a great deal more. We cannot let down the great freedom movement in Bangla Desh. If that requires us to take some risk, we have to take it. We should be prepared for it. Pakistan must not continue to have the initiative in its hands. Pakistan has already foisted on us a more-than-war situation. We don't want war; nobody wants war; we shall never go out of the way to have

war. Are we going to be in a position where war is foisted upon us and we are made to appear before the world as if we were to blame?

That is the sort of thing—the plot now going on—against which we have to defend ourselves. Purposeful action has to be taken. Courage is the most essential part of statesmanship. Do the thing you fear and then the death of fear is certain—that is what somebody had said. We have to have some fearlessness, not this craven, cringing, callous attitude which the Foreign Minister is showing. Everytime he makes a statement, he puts his foot into a very expressive part of his anatomy. Everytime this happens. He made a statement towards the end of March. The whole House was in uproar against him and the Prime Minister had to say something else about it. Next time he makes a statement he does not use the word 'Bangla Desh'; when there is a shout from different parts of the House, 'Say Bangla Desh, Bangla Desh', he answers condescendingly, 'All right; I am ready to say 'Bangla Desh', if that pleases you.' That is the kind of attitude which he has shown all the time.

I say in conclusion that this attitude I cannot describe as characteristic only of the Foreign Minister. He represents his Government. His Government is answerable to this country. His Government must stand by the commitment which Parliament has made to our people. That commitment is the recognition of Bangla Desh and courageous action to follow thereafter, avoidance of war by all possible means, but at the same time to bring about a situation both by means of propaganda and by our own principled action which would bring about a solution which we are all trying to see brought about.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): We have before us two statements of the Minister of External Affairs and a number of joint statements issued from different capitals of the world. One of the statements of the Minister gives an account of his tour and the impressions he has gathered. That is in two parts. One part spells out the stand which the Government of India has taken with respect to the question of Bangla Desh refugees. The second part spells out his evaluation as to how different countries have reacted

to the stand the Government of India have taken. The next statement is with respect to the arms supplied by America and it spells out the reaction of the Government of India. The question before us is whether by consensus we register our approval of the stand the Government of India have taken with respect to these different issues. May I say at the very start that I wholeheartedly support the stand taken by Government as being the most responsible, the most statesmanlike and, judging by the results fairly the most effective stand which the Government could take under the circumstances obtaining now.

There is no doubt that the question of Bangla Desh has ceased to be an internal affair of Pakistan. It has become an international issue, not merely because of the refugee problem but because of developments starting from the elections passing on to genocide, resulting in the refugee problem, which according to the Government and the people of India, is in effect an invasion, not armed, of Indian territory.

International opinion has got to take note of these three developments. The first is the election that took place and the verdict of the people. Yahya Khan, as is well known, has been holding the government as an interim trustee with a commitment to the people of Pakistan to transfer power by a democratic process. He implemented that promise and called an election. The people went to the polls. The Awami League went to the polls with a definite manifesto, the details of which are very well known. The results of the elections are now known to all. The people reacted in a particular way. We all know that during 10 days after the elections Mujibur Rahman was holding the sway in East Pakistan. The stage came when the Chief Justice refused to administer the oath of office to Mr. Tika Khan. So, it was clear that for a period a new Government had come into existence. We need not recognise a different State, but certainly international opinion has got to decide whether they should recognise a new Government or not. We can legitimately say that we recognise this Government. All I am saying is that it is a point to which international opinion cannot be indifferent. We could not be indifferent. We took note of the situation, but in a mood of generosity and in our anxiety

not to precipitate matters, we withheld recognition. Not because we could not in law recognise, but because we preferred not to recognise bowing to international propriety.

Then we passed on to the next question facing these people, Yahya Khan's military junta coming with their tanks and bombs and starting a period of genocide. By the Geneva Convention of 1948 genocide is an international crime, which the members of the international community have undertaken to punish. Genocide took place, punishment had to be meted out. By genocide, the popular will was thwarted and the Government went into exile. That is a matter on which international opinion could exercise itself, but we refrained from giving any opinion about it.

Then we passed on to the next stage, the tremendous refugee influx into this country, unprecedented in the history of humanity. During the post-war period we had many instances of the refugee problem, but not like the one we are facing. In the case of Viet Nam, Korea and Palestine, the refugee problem was created because of the vivisection of those countries, and the German problem was because of the choice of the refugees themselves. But here is a peculiar situation in which Government claiming to represent the people commits genocide on them and drives out about 60 lakhs across the border to another country.

I am looking at the refugee problem not as a humanitarian question, I am looking at it as to that it really means in law. The United Nations Charter reserves the right to every country to go to war in self-defence if necessary against invasion, attack and aggression. Aggression is not defined in international law, and it is not limited to armed aggression either. By the same rationale by which United States intervened in the Cuban episode, we are entitled to intervene, and if necessary, to invade so that we may protect our country. I am not saying that we must invade. But here is a case of invasion on the land of this country by 60 lakhs of people coming here. International opinion has got to take note of it.

My hon. friend Shri Hiren Mukherjee was saying that the Foreign Minister had not

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

achieved anything by his tour abroad, nor had the other Ministers. I do not understand what exactly he means by it. He says that the Foreign Minister has back-slided on the commitment of this house. I am not aware of any commitment by this House or the Government to recognise Bangla Desh. What is, after all, recognition? That stage is passed. Recognition is a consequence of something else. Now we are in a stage where our country is invaded. We do not need a smoke-screen of recognition if at all we want to intervene. So, recognition has ceased to be of more than academic interest today.

No refugee problem has ever been settled by repatriation. International opinion is very firm on this particular point. I do not want to read out the text. Nowhere has it been settled. Mr. Swaran Singh went round and here is the statement. We have got a certain definite commitment from the foreign countries that this refugee problem has got to be settled by repatriation. That is a very valuable commitment he has got from foreign countries. No country has gone away and the only exception perhaps is the United States.

14.00 hrs.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Was not this commitment there before he visited the foreign countries?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Not in so many words. Three things have got to be emphasised: stop the flow of refugees, then their repatriation which alone is the solution and thirdly, political settlement. That alone will ensure repatriation. On these three aspects Mr. Swaran Singh has succeeded in getting the commitment of international opinion. I do not forget the fact that the United States had cleverly evaded this particular matter.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I quite appreciate the point that as a result of the visit of your Foreign Minister you got a renewal of the commitment about political solution but that commitment was made by Podgorny and by the British Prime Minister much earlier.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I am interested in the results. If my friend is anxious to under-

line the generosity of some other country and not the achievement of the representative of this country, I have nothing to say, I leave it to your sense of patriotism. I do not know what my friend Mr. Samar Guha will say about the position of the United States of America: They stop with saying: "It was also recognised that relief in itself is not enough and is not a solution to the present problem" They say further:

"An end to an early reversal of the flow of refugees is an important first step which in turn would be greatly facilitated by progress towards a restoration of peaceful conditions in East Pakistan and a political accommodation."

I am pointing out this fact and drawing a distinction between the Stand the United States has taken *vis-a-vis* the stand of the other countries. There must be repatriation and that alone is the solution. America has stopped that. They have not accepted it as a solution to the problem. The supply of arms has to be viewed against that background. Efforts at cultivation of international opinion in our favour has been affective and I must congratulate the Ministers who have done this. They were up against heavy odds. It was a hard task to attempt a break through and they have made it. The U.S. has acted in a particular way and they have supplied arms. In international law there are some stages of recognition: status of belligerency, status of insurgency, recognition of a State, recognition of Government. When the entire people were against the military junta, the democratic outlook of the United States could not even accord the status of belligerency or insurgency to them. The effect of that would be to maintain an attitude of neutrality. To supply arms to them is a breach of their assurance to this Government. They have done so unilaterally; they went back upon their word. We are now sorry that they have committed this treachery against the people of this country.

I warn America to take note of this country, I tell America, you have preferred to take note of President Yahya Khan; you should look to India where 600 million people are united as no other country has united; fastened to the principles of democracy, determined to defend the shores of their country

and ride behind their chosen leadership through a democratic process. They in their wisdom follow the path of loyalty; that affection, that attachment of the 600 million people, you do not value; but you value Yahya Khan and their military junta. This attitude of yours will have its repercussion here, and you have to take note of that repercussion.

One word more and I shall close. We are certainly facing a very serious situation. The refugees cannot be accepted here; they have got to go back there, and this enunciation we are making to international opinion. It is up to international opinion to see that the refugees go back when a settlement comes through. It is for the people of East Pakistan to decide, not for us. If the people of East Pakistan come to some arrangement, whereby the refugees will be prepared to go back, we have nothing to say. But if, as a result of the present situation, the refugees are still remaining behind, it will be our right to see and take up such measures as are necessary to see that the refugees go back in perfect safety. It is for international opinion to take appropriate steps for the purpose of doing that. If they are not doing that, they will be responsible for the explosion that will take place. In that context, America has unfortunately acted as a criminal of international peace in that it has affected the moods of and created frustration in the people of this country who will surely rally up and beat back America, beat any country. These 600 million people have got the right, got the strength, got the unity. And *Bharat Mata* has got the dynamism to stand up against this mighty dollar America and defend our country, defend the honour of this country, defend the hearths of this country, defend the 600 million people of this country, and beat the junta, or anybody who, by the right of their dollar or through their military armaments, are trying to defy and defame this country.

In the protection of our country and its policy, may I tell the Prime Minister that the people of this country and the entire Parliament will be behind her as one man to defend the honour of this country and to march forward. I support the enunciation that Mr. Swaran Singh has placed before this House and I appreciate the great achievement he has effected by his tours abroad.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Sir, I stand by what Shri Hiren Mukherjee has said here. Now, it is quite clear that American imperialism is double-faced. But still, the illusion will remain and the Government of India is so much dependent on American money that this Government of India will have no courage, despite all her verbal bravado, to stand against American imperialism. The sooner the Indian people and our friends on the other side realise the heinous role of American imperialism, the better for the country as a whole and for the people of Bangla Desh.

It is not only American imperialism. What commitment the British Government had made to our Foreign Minister has also come in the press. This is the report of the 25th June. The Foreign Secretary, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, was asked in a radio interview broadcast over the BBC, if he thought that more pressure could be put on President Yahya Khan if all foreign assistance were withdrawn from Pakistan. Sir Alec said "all this would be to create new areas of poverty and misery." This is their argument. So, they are not going to withdraw any economic aid to Pakistan.

"So, we decided that existing aid to development projects should go on, but that new aid must be considered in the light of a political settlement."

So, this commitment is double-faced. They are giving hopes to India and they are doing their own business with Pakistan. In today's papers it has come out:

"USA not halting economic aid to Pakistan."

The consortium have decided that they will continue the aid to Pakistan, but temporarily the aid is not going there because, as the newspaper report says:

"The informal decision was taken after a mission from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund reported after a visit that Pakistan was in administrative and economic shambles."

They are not in a position now to utilise the economic aid and that is why for two or three

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

months, economic aid may not be given. So, through his statements, our Foreign Minister is creating an illusion that some political settlement will come through the intent of these imperialist powers.

Which type of political settlement is in the minds of these powers should also be clear. When our Foreign Minister was in England, a joint statement came out saying:

"It was accepted that a political solution must be found which was acceptable to the people of East Pakistan. However, it is not clear whether the type of political solution envisaged in the joint statement means the same to the two Foreign Ministers."

So, it is not clear whether the British Government is envisaging the same political solution as India is envisaging. It says further:

"The British Government maintains that it is not for it to say that the representatives of East Pakistan with whom Yahya should seek a settlement must necessarily be the elected representatives of the people."

So, they are for setting up a stooge government and then they will declare that a civil Government has been established in Bangladesh. They will say, there has been a political settlement and that will get the support of the imperialist powers. There is no intention on the part of Pakistan Government to have any political solution.

It has come out in today's papers:

"The economic adviser of Yahya Khan has categorically stated that they do not believe in this type of political solutions."

Another news has appeared that they are calling the National Assembly and 22 Awami League Assembly members have indicated that they would respond to the call. That means, Pakistan Government is trying for defections inside the Awami League elected members. The Government of India is expert in generating defections. This is the way followed by the capitalist countries. But Pakistan also is employing the same method. Already some elected members have been

murdered. The rest are underground and they are finding no immediate prospect of achieving full independence for Bangladesh. They relied so much on the recognition of their government by the Government of India and their full moral and material help, including arms. The behaviour of this government during the last three months; the way they have dealt with the question of recognition, the raising of the slogan of political solution, the issue of joint statements with American, British and other governments which constitute the Aid-Pakistan Consortium, all these have created demoralisation among the people of Bangladesh about the immediate prospect of Bangladesh getting completely liberated and becoming sovereign. If this trend continues there is every likelihood of some more defections. Already out of 167 Awami League Assembly members if you deduct 22, the number comes to 145 which is less than a majority in a House of 300 members. If there is more defection, the Pakistan Government will be able to call the Assembly with the help of the defectors. Also, those who are underground cannot attend the Assembly meeting. So, they can make a show of some form of political solution. Also, there is likelihood that Pakistan Government may declare new elections or bye-elections and under military rule they may get their stooges elected because the people would not go to vote for the traitors. So, under the guise of democracy they will be fool world opinion because our government have issued joint statements with other governments that there is a civilised government established in Pakistan. If you go through the joint statements circulated here, what is the impression created among the people by these joint statements? They create the idea that even the Indian Government want a solution within the framework of Pakistan. Even the term "East Bengal" was not mentioned in the joint statement; it speaks of "East Pakistan" which categorically shows that they are nationals of Pakistan. So, they must go back, return back to their own State. If you sign a joint statement that they are nationals of Pakistan what is the meaning? The meaning is quite clear that you want them to go back to Pakistan. That does not, by any stretch of imagination, mean that you want an independent sovereign Bangladesh.

So, by the stand taken by the Government of India they are doing the utmost harm to the freedom struggle of the Bangladesh people and you are creating confusion among the masses. That is why after three months we see that the government has retreated, has backslided from its earlier position of 31st March. What was the understanding given to use? The understanding was that day by day the Government of India will advance towards the stage of recognition. But by the way joint statements have been made, serious doubts have been created among the people regarding the purpose, intention, honesty and integrity of the Government of India. It is a policy of drift and the drift is causing serious harm to the cause.

Now you are talking of 7 million refugees coming here. This huge influx of refugees is not an isolated event. It is directly linked or associated with the freedom fight which is developing or taking place in Bangladesh. Had there been recognition by the Government of India of the sovereign provisional government and had all possible help been given to the freedom-fighters, then the fight would have advanced to such a stage that people would have felt confident and remained there and this big flow of refugees would not have taken place. There would have been refugees coming but this flow would not have been there. It is true that in the statement it has been stated that some condition should be created where the refugees who are here can feel confidence to go back. But if you become a realist in today's conditions only if the Bangla Desh becomes sovereign and independent completely free of Pakistan only in that case the confidence can come among the people and certainly in that condition they will go back. There is a report that nearly one lakh of refugees are daily coming because mass butchery is going on and there is no intention on the part of Pakistan Government to slacken it. That is why the situation is so much serious. The Government of India are afraid for people getting arms and they are tied to American imperialism. That is the basic weakness of the Government. Out of fear they are resorting to wholesale repression on West Bengal and more than one lakh warrants have been issued, thousands have been arrested, the elected Assembly has been dissolved and a reign of terror is

there. By creating a reign of terror within the country no Government can help any other Government. That is the essential weakness in the policy of Government. That is why we demand that recognition must be granted without delay and all possible help must be extended to the freedom fighters including help with arms. We are opposed to war. Talk of war will be a handy weapon in the hands of Yahya Khan to mobilise world opinion. We are opposed to those who are talking of war. But it is true that the independence and sovereignty of the Bangla Desh is entirely dependant on the struggle of Bangla Desh people. They have formed the Government and our task is to recognise that Government and help the freedom fighters. Then alone the conditions will be created for refugees to go back.

DR. V. K. R. VARADARAJA RAO (Bellary): Mr. Dy. Speaker, Sir, I think the country today is facing a very serious situation and I would suggest that all of us whichever side of the House we belong to should look at this problem not from a party point of view but from the point of view of country as a whole. And it is from that point of view I somewhat deplore the observations made by my hon. friend who just concluded his speech—attacking the internal policies of this Government. I have no objection to his attacking the internal policies of the Government but I say as far as this particular problem is concerned let us keep the other things out and concentrate on the use of Bangla Desh.

Sir, there can be no two opinions about the fact that what the United States Government has done is wrong. I do not think even the most vocal friends of the United States in this country will be found to support the action they have taken. I should like to say only this that to the extent that this export of Arms from United States to Pakistan is still a reflection of the old policy of balancing India and Pakistan and keeping a certain balance of power on the Indian sub-continent, in so far as it is a reflection of that attitude, I think, the United States Government should realise that time has come to change that attitude. Whatever reality there may or may not have been in that position in the past, it does not exist any more and, I think, they should take note of our opinion, of world

[Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja Rao]
opinion and of their own interest in the security and peace of this region.

They have had enough experience of what happened in Vietnam. They are still experiencing it. They have a real interest in the peace and security of this region. Therefore, in their own interest of maintaining peace and security in this region, I suggest that they should now call a halt to their previous assessment of the balance of power in the Indian sub-continent and take steps to see even at this late stage that this flow of arms to our sub-continent is stopped. I do not think it is impossible. I hope, our Foreign Minister will speak in strong language, quietly and privately of course, to the United States Government to see to it that before those arms reach the coast of Pakistan something is done to intercept and stop them from reaching there

Coming back to this question, I do think in spite of disagreement from some of my friends who have spoken from the side opposite to me, that the visit of the Foreign Minister has certainly succeeded in setting the issue in perspective. I do not say, he has achieved a miracle; that he has been able to convert the Western countries' governments to our point of view. I do not think so. I doubt whether it was his objective. I think, his main objective was to counter the kind of impression that was being created that, on the one hand, it was an internal problem of Pakistan, a view unfortunately still held by our Arab friends and many people still think that this is secession and is an internal problem of Pakistan and, therefore, should be treated as an internal security problem, and on the other the impression prevailing in the world that refugees were coming to India which was a poor and a good country which could not afford to feed all these refugees; therefore, they must issue appeals, collect dollars and help the Indians to feed the refugees. This was more or less the kind of public opinion that existed in the Western parts of the world before the Foreign Minister undertook his tour. I do not think he would make any bigger claim than to say that his intention was to make the foreign governments aware that, firstly, this was not an internal problem and, secondly, that it was not a problem of getting millions of

dollars for feeding the refugees but it was a much bigger problem, a problem of peace and security of this part of the world. A much bigger part of the world than the part of the world where peace and security have been threatened and war has been going on for the last seven or eight years, that I think was the objective behind the Foreign Minister's visit if I understand him aright and I think he has succeeded in that object.

I think, it is crystal clear today in Washington, London, Bonn and elsewhere that this was not an internal problem. How could it be an internal problem? I do not know how they could have thought so. Is apartheid in South Africa an internal problem? All those coloured Africans are citizens of South Africa. Apartheid is condemned by the entire United Nations. Is it an internal problem? If Bengalis are going to be oppressed and suppressed by non-Bengalis, is it an internal problem? Or, in Rhodesia they have got a majority which is not being allowed to rule: a minority rules. The United Nations has taken it up. How can it be an internal problem? I am glad, therefore, that an atmosphere has been created and I would like to tell the Foreign Minister that time may come, just like the issue of apartheid and Rhodesia, when this issue may have to go to the United Nations. This is not an internal matter but it is a matter concerning all the people of the world.

As far as we are concerned, it is a fact that the refugees who have come are not Indian citizens. We do not want to keep them in this country, no because we do not have any love for them. We are prepared to help them as much as possible, but they belong to a neighbouring country and they have got every right to go back. Their fathers, grandfathers, great grandfathers have lived there for thousands of years. They have their property there. Their memories are there. They belong there and they have got to go back. I am glad, the Prime Minister made an unambiguous statement—probably she made it in Srinagar—that the refugees will go back. There is no question of our keeping them for all time to come. I think, this must be understood.

I am not a person who talks very much on politics but I am a patriotic Indian citizen

and I know something about the affairs of this country. No section of this country is going to be satisfied by a flow of dollars. They are not looking for one billion, two billion or five billion dollars from the United States. The Americans are prepared to spend 40 billion dollars on their own wars and another 20 billion dollars on Space Research. We cannot be bought of by a few billion dollars. We do not want the dollars. If they come, it is well and good. If they do not, all right. But the real problem is that these refugees have come to us and they have got to go back. They do not belong to this country. They are our guests. We are very happy that we are in a position to help them to the best extent that we can. But they are our temporary guests. They have got to be restored to their homes. And this cannot be done unless there is a political settlement.

I am very glad, Sir, that there is lot of discussion in this House on this political settlement. And I must say, though this may or may not be liked by all people on my side of the House, that I would be in agreement with certain sections of what Shri Vajpayee said. And I would request the Foreign Minister to spell out what is meant by this political settlement because we have known in the past that independence meant many things, dominion status meant many things and socialism even today means many things. What is this political settlement? Political settlement cannot be a stooge settlement and it cannot be the setting up of Quilising Governments in Bangla Desh. Political settlement must in the first place mean the release of Sheik Mujibur Rahman. That army should go out from all house tops. Without his release, there can be no settlement—no question of 22 Awami League Members being brought in and an Assembly meeting. Firstly, the release of Sheik Mujibur Rehman and negotiations with the Awami League which scored a substantial majority in the Elections. If they want Bangla Desh, then Bangla Desh. If they want independence, then independence. Political settlement has to be arrived at not with us. It has to be arrived at with the people of Bangla Desh. And if the Pakistani Authorities have treated them so badly that the people of Bangla Desh want no more connection with them, it is their funeral. But I do say that the political settlement has

to be between the Government of West Pakistan and the people of Bangla Desh. As far as we are concerned, we want a political settlement because without the political settlement we cannot find conditions which will enable the refugees to go back.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know what is happening on all our border areas. We cannot tolerate this. And it is an invasion. It may not be an invasion in the technical sense of soldiers coming into our country. But 60 lakhs of people have been driven into our country in this particular fashion. I am not only talking of the economic consequences, social consequence, cultural consequences but possibly the communal consequences. This is an invasion. I am prepared to call it an invasion of different type. There used to be infiltration; there used to be invasion. Now this is a new way of invading the country by forcing a large number of citizens to flee to the neighbouring country, to stay there and create problems. Therefore, Sir, this is not an internal problem of Pakistan. It is a problem of world conscience. I would also say it is now becoming an Indian problem because India is vitally interested in the political settlement. Perhaps, I think the External Affairs Minister is quite right because in tune with the traditions of our country from the days of Maha Bharata—Krishna went to Duryodhana knowing full well that war will still take place to show how anxious he was for peace—we want to convince the world that we want to give them a chance. Now they cannot plead ignorance of the situation. Political settlement is not a smoke screen. It is not a make-believe. The crucial problem of the political settlement is whether the refugees in India will be willing to go back or not. That is the crucial test of the political settlement.

Therefore, Sir, we must spell out the political settlement. I would earnestly request the Foreign Minister because he has not done it so far in authoritative terms on the floor of the House. I would like to request the Foreign Minister to say on the floor of this House in categorical and unambiguous terms what we understand by the political settlement, and what it is that we will accept as political settlement, and not these funny interpretations that may be given to this expression by the British Diplomats or the

[Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja Rao]

American State Department or its Advisers. India must clearly go on world record as to what we mean by "political settlement". Once the Foreign Minister clearly says what it is, I think, the whole country will stand behind him, not only our party but all the other parties. If a political settlement does not come about, I also want to join my friends in saying that we are not going just to be brow-beaten.

I know we are not a very strong country. I know we are 600 million people. The people alone do not count. We are not a major military power. But we cannot forget that we did fight a great Empire and we were able to fight it and, practically, brought it down to its knees without having large supplies of arms and ammunition. We have the spirit. The spirit can be roused. It can be stimulated. It can be nurtured. It can be solidified. We are interested in Bangla Desh. It is going to solve many problems for us, not only in terms of the freedom of Bengalis who live in East Bengal but in terms of the age-long, centuries-old, communal problem in this country. Of course, the Foreign Minister can use much more cautious language. He holds a more responsible position than I do. But he must make it clear in unmistakable terms. I do not mind what language he uses. We are not prepared to wait indefinitely. If the solution does not come within a reasonable time, then we will be compelled much against our will to take unilateral action. If that action brings us into trouble, if that action means going through the hell, as the Prime Minister said it the other day, we are prepared to go through the hell, if it becomes necessary. I think we should make it quite clear.

I have a feeling that many of the foreign people still think that Indians are soft, non-violent, goody-goody people and all that, that they are so tolerant, that they shout and talk and, after sometime, they will quiet down. It is for us to make it clear that India is not going to be cowed down. It is a matter of life and death. If a settlement acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh which will also include the question of refugees to go back with dignity is not reached within a reasonable time, then we should make it

clear that we as the Government of India will be prepared to take our own action for the purpose of bringing about a settlement.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras North): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are discussing the Resolution adopted by this House moved by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and the statements made by the External Affairs Minister, Mr. Swaran Singh.

Sir, the second paragraph of the Resolution says:

"Instead of respecting the will of the people so unmistakably expressed through the election in Pakistan in December, 1970, the Government of Pakistan has chosen to flout the mandate of the people."

I think, this explains the character of the Government. And the last paragraphs says:

"This House records its profound conviction that the historic upsurge of the 75 million people of East Bengal will triumph. The House wishes to assure them that their struggle and sacrifices will receive the wholehearted sympathy and support of the people of India."

This explains, I think, the conviction of the Government of India.

Now, at the outset, I must say, no political leader in this country, no political party in this country, nor the Government of India is for the disintegration of Pakistan. We are for the integration of Pakistan. What is going on today is not the creation of the Government of India but the creation of the Government of Pakistan. If this fact is considered by the capitals of the world, I think, 50 per cent of the trouble is over. But I doubt very much whether we have succeeded in impressing upon the capitals of the world and the international community this aspect of the issue.

Unfortunately, Mr. Swaran Singh has been put on fire this morning by certain political parties and a substitute motion has also come condemning the External Affairs Minister. So far as I am concerned, my sympathy goes to Mr. Swaran Singh for the simple reason that he did his very best to impress upon the

Government of the United States about power issue, the Bangla issue and the magnitude of the influx of refugees. But the Government of United States did not heed. I am not surprised about it. The very disclosure of certain classified top-secret documents by Prof. Ellsberg is a revelation that the Government of the USA is not only prepared to hoodwink the peoples of the world but the people of USA also. So you cannot expect from such a barbarous, faithless and unscrupulous friend a certain amount of understanding about our problems. So, I think Sardar Swaran Singh is in a way exonerated from the charge.

But some other friends and Ministers also toured the world capitals to acquaint those governments of the Bangla Desh problem. Among them is my friend, Mr. K. D. Malaviya. According to newspaper reports, he failed miserably to impress. But if you go through them, what did happen in Damascus in the tenth session of the Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Committee Organization? That explains something about the intention of the Government of Pakistan. As was expected, Pakistan representative blamed India for East Pakistan situation and accused her of interfering in the internal affairs of Pakistan. I could understand this much accusation. But, the representative has gone further and said and he even made a suggestion that India is a vast country and could as well keep the refugees. That explains the malicious intention of Pakistan.

Now, the position is clear. We have sent abroad so many Ministers and so many delegations to impress upon the world powers and our External Affairs Minister has gone to so many countries and has come back. Apart from that, the Sarvodaya leader Jaya Prakash Narain has toured some of the countries of the world. But, what is the attitude of those countries and after having studied those attitudes, what is the decision that the Government of India could possibly arrive at? That is the question. I entirely agree with Prof. Mukerjee when he said that Jaya Prakash Narain is neither a Communist nor a Capitalist. He is a sober-minded politician. After having toured all over the world, Jaya Prakash Narain at Kula Lumpur, while talking to the Press, said that the right

thing for India to do now was to recognise the provisional Government of Bangla Desh. I think the Government of India may take into consideration what Jaya Prakash Narain has said.

Another startling report that appeared in the press very recently is the budget presented by the Economic Adviser of Pakistan Government. 50% of Pakistan's budget has been allotted for defence. I don't think this allotment for defence preparation is against the Bangla Desh. It is against someone-else, I hope the Government of India would keep in mind why such a preparation is being elaborately made by Pakistan. If Pakistan's economy is in shambles, it is nobody's botheration, it is the funeral of Pakistan. But here Pakistan is doing its maximum for the military preparation. For what? For attack. Against whom? I think it may be projected against India. This also, the Government of India, is expected to take note of.

Another important fact to which I want to draw the attention of the House is this. The United Nations Commissioner for Refugees, Prince Aga Khan, has recently said that he cannot give or the United Nations cannot give any guarantee for the safety of the refugees going to Bangla Desh. That itself is another proof to explain that he is very critical about the intention or the motive of the Government of Pakistan. In case these people are pushed to Bangla Desh what is waiting for them is nothing but butchery. That is explained by his total denial of giving any guarantee on behalf of himself or on behalf of the UN.

In these circumstances what we are expected to do is the question. In the morning we had a meeting with the Prime Minister. Our Foreign Affairs Minister was also attending it. In short, if I am permitted to speak what happened and transpired, it is this. She said she was clear about the issue, the net result is we are confused ultimately. What the Government of India is prepared to do in the interest of the country, in the interest of diplomacy, etc. they may not be expected to disclose, but the people of the country want to know as to what is the real attitude of the Government of India. We can't drag on this issue for long.

[Shri K. Manoharan]

Daily I am told, the refugees are given Rs. 3 worth, food and other things. How long can we continue this, is the question. Already a provisional figure has been given to the country. It may need Rs. 300 crores. Rs. 300 crores, according to me, for a limited period. Within the limited period, if such things are not stopped, what will happen? It would definitely be a strain on our economy. I want to know what action the Government of India is contemplating to send back the refugees. I agree with Mr. Jaya Prakash Narain. It is high time for us to recognise Bangla Desh. I agree with Prof. Mukerjee. Recognition does not mean declaration of war. Recognition does not mean, we are antagonising Pakistan, or we are preparing ourselves to wage war against Pakistan. War, according to me, according to the people of India, does not solve any issue. War is a crude projection of savage thinking, not only of this country, but any country in the world. We are wishing complete tranquility and peace with our neighbours, especially with Pakistan. Once Pakistan has created this problem, it is our job to see that our interests are protected. We must find a solution. We must act now. Unless this is done, I am afraid, the ambitious plan of the Government of India to build this country as a socialist country would not succeed and our plans would come to a collapse.

Therefore, I request the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister to understand the magnitude of the problem. What prevents them from recognising Bangla Desh? We have been told, once recognition is given, the countries of the world may come to the conclusion that it is the creation of India. Already Mr. Swaran Singh has explained that world opinion is in favour of India. I am differentiating between the two, between the Government of the countries of the world and the people of the world. So far as USA is concerned, I am not going to attack the people of the USA. The people of USA like us, are for peace. The people of Britain are for peace. The people of Soviet Russia are for peace. The people of India are for peace. I request the Government to take us into confidence and tell us what they are going to do about it. We are for peace; we are for integrity; we are for sovereignty. When we find that the integrity of the country

is threatened, the sovereignty of the country is questioned, we must rise like one man. We will defend the integrity of our country.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Down with Hindi imperialism.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: I am convinced that in the midst of seriousness there are some clowns who are creating some sort of situation to divert the attention of the people of this country.

This is my humble suggestion: the only way out is to accord recognition to Bangla Desh and boost the morale of the people of Bangla Desh. Once Bangla Desh is recognised, you can send armies, you can give moral and material support to that country.

One word regarding 'political settlement'. I cannot understand what you mean by 'political settlement'. There are so many divergent views expressed. Political settlement means anything from formation of a government headed by Mujibur Rahman to setting up a Puppet regime which is going to be installed by the Government of Yahya Khan. If what has appeared in today's papers is an indication, Yahya Khan may try to hoodwink the nations of the world and say: here is a government representative of the people of Bangla Desh, a democratic government; so the problem is solved.' But I am sure the nations of the world are not going to be hoodwinked by such kind of a puppet regime which is going to be installed by Yahya Khan. What is warranted by the terrific and explosive situation on the part of our country is to accord immediate recognition to Bangla Desh.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam): The unkindest cut inflicted by the US by the shipment of arms to Pakistan has, to a very large extent, overshadowed or eclipsed the significant achievements of our Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh. By his tour of very many western capitals, he has been able to consolidate enlightened and informed opinion in those countries against certain Establishments which have entrenched themselves against the real issues involved which we have been trying to focus on the Bangla Desh question. For instance, take the case of UK. Authoritative spokesmen

of public opinion have come out in support of our cause not only at nongovernmental level but even at the governmental level. The British Government has come forward with a statement that only a political settlement of the problem can meet the situation. In the same way, the Canadian Government has come forward almost echoing the stand taken by Great Britain. Again the Netherlands Government has come forward saying that no further aid should be given to the Pakistan Government. The significant achievement of Sardar Swaran Singh is that he has been able to drive home to thinking people in the western world, the intelligentsia, people with ideals, that here at stake in India is not a limited issue but an all-comprehensive issue where the battle of freedom and independence is being fought on the soil of Bangla Desh.

SHRISAMAR GUHA: I am sorry to interrupt him. But nowhere in the statement or in any of the communiques is there a word about the freedom struggle of Bangla Desh. I just wanted to draw his attention to it.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: The achievement of our Foreign Minister is that he has been able to get all things into documentation, in joint communiques issued in one country after another, he has drawn the attention of the thinking world to the serious developments that are taking place in the sub-continent. In my personal assessment, this is a significant contribution.

I had occasion to spend three days on the borders of West Bengal. I was able to see so many camps where lakhs of refugees are staying. The sight there is really pathetic and heart-rending. I exchanged views with many evacuees and I found in them a steely determination to go back to Bangla Desh. They are not here to take the doles of the Indian Government or any other Government. They want to wage a relentless battle against oppression in their country. Some of our friends probably feel that these refugees are going to be here permanently. After meeting these brethren who are fighting for democracy and freedom, I can authoritatively say that the bulk of them want to go back to Bangla Desh because they are fighting the battle of freedom and democracy. That is the real situation.

In human history no such massive exodus of people has taken place. I have been taught by my religious mother about the exodus of the Israelites from the cruelties of the pharaohs as the greatest exodus of the world. There are Governments run by Christian Democratic Parties in Italy, Germany and other countries and they are deriving inspiration from the New Testament that describes this exodus; but that is nothing compared to this massive exodus and dispersal of millions of people for no fault of theirs. Their only fault is that they voted for Mujibur Rehman who offered them secular ideas, principles of democracy and socialism. So, I appeal to the conscience of the Western Governments to help these millions of people who are being butchered by the violence of the Pakistan military, people who are struggling for their lives. I have seen, along with some honourable Members of this House, tens of thousands of people stretching themselves on the roads near the various camps. From across the rivers, this military machine of Pakistan has been shooting them down. When women were coming out, their babies were shot down, and their young girls were taken away. This is the background against which the unkind cut of the United States has to be viewed. Even now the Christians there train their children to shed tears at the exodus of the Israelites, but what about this cruelty perpetrated with the very arms of that Christian Government of the United States? It is against this background that we have to see the situation in Pakistan.

The problem of refugees, mighty, massive though it be, is only a procedural issue, a concomitant of the cruelty inflicted on the people of Bangla Desh—by the "rope of Democracy". The problem is not going to be solved by mere relief and rehabilitation. We need the assistance of other countries because it is a humanitarian problem. But this massive problem has been thrust on us by Pakistan at a time when we Indians were trying to unite ourselves on the issue of the abolition of poverty. We have given a commitment to our people who have suffered under Imperialist power for centuries, to abolish poverty. We have risen to a man and had taken a decision under the enlightened leadership of our Prime Minister that we will make an honest effort to abolish poverty.

[Shri Henry Austin]

When we undertook this battle, here comes a situation the like of which the world has not seen so far. When we are struggling for economic emancipation of the poor, here comes the mighty power, the United States, calling itself a sister democracy, assisting the war machine of the dictator of Pakistan, a country which could never implement democracy or democratic process in the last 23 years, which is spreading the message of dictatorship and totalitarianism. This is the greatest tragedy of the age. So the situation is not one to be solved by relief and rehabilitation. We may perhaps accept help from other countries but the basic question is this: why have these millions of people come to this country? Have they come here to occupy our lands and live here on our doles? No, they have come here because they know that here is a country which respects democracy, which respects the higher values of life.

15.00 hrs.

I had occasion to speak with three or four M.Ps. of Bangla Desh on the borders of West Bengal. They were in the border and they told us that every minute that they spent there was wasted. They wanted to be on their holy land of Bangla Desh and do away the Government that is suppressing democracy there. When I heard the determination of those people I felt what mighty people they were and I thought that we should all go to their aid because here are 75 million people struggling for democracy. Even as these M.Ps. of Bangla Desh thanked us for the massive sympathy that was shown by India, they told us: you are thinking of six or eight million refugees who have come to India but what about 69 or 70 million people in Bangla Desh? They are equally refugees because they do not want to live under a military regime. How to solve this basic, substantive problem? For this we have got to mobilise public opinion. Everyone knows that India is not a warmongering country. When Kashmir was attacked, when India was attacked, when similar situations arose in other parts of the world, we always wanted peace and our message was for peace, for a peaceful settlement. Nobody wants war. Then how can we continue in this situation? It is here that we want the support of

the other countries and apolitical solution can be achieved by consolidating and mobilising internal public opinion. I had prefaced my observations by saying that Sardar Swaran Singh has taken a new step in organising public opinion. At non-governmental level opinion is really consolidated in every part of the country and the machinations of international power politics cannot preserve its consolidated position; it has got to melt before the opinion organised by the intelligentsia and journalists and the idealists the world over. Even as public opinion is melting that in Great Britain, in Canada and in Netherlands, other countries will also follow suit. I believe that this should be the solution. I wish to appeal to the Opposition leaders. We can easily say that recognition will solve the problem, as if it is the panacea for all our ills. Our Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister are treading a delicate path and we have to give them our support, our understanding and sympathy and appreciate the delicate nature of the situation. We should all stand united and mobilise public opinion; then I am sure political solution will be achieved. I do not want to dilate on the content or the nature of the political solution that will help repatriation of the refugees. Today when we are discussing this problem, let us put up a united stand, whether we are in the Opposition or on the ruling side, and focus attention on this problem of Bangla Desh. When once we stand united I can assure you that world opinion will follow suit.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I concede the point made by the previous speaker that this is not the time to settle accounts with the Government but to decide upon a national policy which might prove to be a rallying point for the nation. The Government has almost lost sight of the national consensus that had been evolved earlier on this issue—that has been very much in evidence latterly. We find now, that as a result of the systematic policy of the Government, we are landed in an unprecedentedly difficult situation and a terrible mess. This is so because the Government could not identify or define the national interests in the emerging Bangla Desh situation. And this has happened right from the very beginning.

However, I would readily agree, without any reservation or qualification, that the

six-nation tour of the Foreign Minister was absolutely necessary, whatever its result. But, it must be admitted, at the same time, that it has not met with the expected success or the desperately-needed response from the important countries which he visited.

It has also been a case, to my mind, of delayed diplomacy of the Government of India, which again is quite in keeping with the thoroughly inadequate approach of the Government to the whole situation. Perhaps, Pakistan had already covered much of the ground before the hon. Foreign Minister and a host of other Ministers of the Government of India descended to descend upon the world capitals.

It has been rightly emphasised by many hon. Members that the human tragedy on such a vast scale had not occurred in our recent memory. Since perhaps Hitler's extermination of the Jews, it had been the most heart-rending episode of genocide in history. It has been rightly emphasised by my hon. friend, Prof. Mukerjee, that it is an international calamity the like of which we have not seen since the founding of the United Nations Charter. Perhaps no people in the world had paid such a heavy price for independence as the people of Bangla Desh.

Yet what has been the response of the international community to the call of humanity, what has been their response to the awful tragedy which is still continuing—not that it has been a matter of the past?

A few things, to my mind, are quite clear after the odyssey of the Foreign Minister to the foreign capitals of the world.

India, thanks to the policy of the Government, now seems to have acquired the status of a taken-for-granted nation in the world. Pakistan has to be caressed, cajoled and pampered, and India has to be sympathised with and commiserated. That seems to be the attitude of the countries of the world.

Secondly, the international community does not consider it an international calamity even now, of a colossal magnitude. It still considers it essentially a matter relating to the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan. Let us be quite clear about it. And therefore all

this hesitancy and reluctance or the part of these Governments to do what is their duty by the humanity. In any case, it is quite clear that they do not feel very strongly about this human tragedy nor have they been stirred to their depths by it; they continue to think in terms of the old power pattern in this region, and they would do absolutely nothing which would do injury to this power pattern.

Impliedly, there is also the sinister acceptance of the condominium or the 'sphere of influence' idea of China in this region. The fear on their part is mainly governed by the apprehension that there might be Chinese intervention in the affair. Therefore, it can be said that the countries of the world have impliedly accepted the sphere of influence of China in this region.

Pakistan, it is also very clear, has much greater manoeuvrability in international affairs. In fact, this manoeuvrability is truly fantastic, for it can easily get away with the worst crime against humanity. Not only this. It can secure what ever assistance and support it requires from the countries of the world to pursue its pastime of genocide.

So far as a political settlement is concerned, I have no manner of doubt in my mind, that what the countries of the world think is a settlement to the satisfaction of President Yahya Khan and not to the satisfaction of the people of Bangla Desh. Unless we get out of the mind all these illusions or delusions, we can not face this issue squarely.

I was a little surprised that the Foreign Minister did not say in his statement much about the response that has been made by the UN. The UN still continues to be inhumanly mute, passive and impotent. It does not even care to ensure conditions in which the convention on genocide could be fulfilled. So the convention on genocide remains an exercise in rhetoric or demagoguery.

The international community is also not prepared to do anything to help India to defend herself against the new-style Pak aggression. As I have emphasised on an earlier occasion, it is nothing less than an

[Shri Shyammandan Mishra]

aggression by Pakistan and this aggression has to be vacated. There does not seem to be any inkling from the statement that the countries of the world have agreed with the Foreign Minister of India that India has a right to defend herself against this aggression.

I am also surprised at the attitude of the two super powers. The attitude of one super power is, indeed, unmistakably pro-Pakistan, an attitude of active aid and abetment to the genocide by Pakistan. But the attitude of the Soviet Union also, as is evident from the communique issued after the meeting of our Foreign Minister with his counterpart, is quite disappointing. Let us not hope that they are going to be of much help in this matter. Relatively, I might say, the attitude of Canada and UK has been more forthright and encouraging.

Now that it is fairly clear that India is being rapidly driven to the last course—and the drama might proceed with the inevitability of the Greek tragedy—what are the courses indicated to us? In a moment, I shall make a few suggestions.

Government cannot hibernate in a world make-believe or feed the people on illusory hopes. The political and social fall-outs of the situation are going to be enormous. My suggestion is that the Prime Minister should address an appeal to the countries of the world through this Parliament that the situation is soon going to cross the limit of tolerance. I would have advised her to undertake a trip to the capitals of the world to sound the final warning, but since our Foreign Minister has come with a very disappointing response from them, I would not suggest that course. I would also like the Prime Minister's appeal to be directed to the UN to do something positive to stop the killing, to restore peace and do all that is necessary to satisfy the people of Bangla Desh. She should ask the major powers, particularly the major aid-givers, to apply their economic power to stop the madness of Pakistan.

I also do not quite understand how we can think of sending any delegation to the UN General Assembly when this great body is not active in the manner in which it should

be. Its Security Council has not thought it necessary to do anything.

Finally, I would like this Government to do something positive to show to the US Govt. that the people of the country are definitely displeased with them. The least that the Government of India could bring itself to do in this matter is to recall its Ambassador for long consultation. Keep him here—not that I ask the Ambassador to be finally recalled. Let him be called for long consultation and let us not send him back till they revise their stand and there is proper response from that Government.

The Government should also refuse any aid for refugee rehabilitation from the United States, because we cannot take poison from one hand and petty pittance from another.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my colleague, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has put the case against the US supply of arms to Pakistan most admirably. He has pointed out to the House how United States has been using double Standards in its dealings with India and Pakistan and how over a period of time it has been trying to support Pakistan against India. Now what I shall try to place before the House is where do we go from there.

The Foreign Minister's latest tour of the capitals of some of the important western countries and the Soviet Union has shown that the problems that we are facing have a common root, the malaise is an integral whole, while we are trying to grapple with different faces that it presents itself with. Whether it is the question of US supply of arms to Pakistan, or the question of repression and butchery in Bangladesh, or the denial of democracy throughout Pakistan, or the forcing out of refugees and other problems on us, the basic problem remains the same. The real issue is the attempt of the West to maintain the balance of power between India and Pakistan in South Asia. Let us not forget that it was these powers which carved out Pakistan and created it only in the hope that it will be an effective check against India, that the balance of power would be so arranged that they will be able to tilt it as and when they like.

Then came the events in Bangladesh which exposed the weakness of Pakistan. A State established on colonial intrigue based on religious bigotry and hatred, maintained by the force of arms against the democratic urges of the people, cannot be a viable unit and it cannot last. It must either adjust itself, bend to the wishes of the people or it will break up. This is the position they were faced with in Pakistan a few months ago.

When the Bangladesh problem hit the headlines all over the world, India and Pakistan watchers held their breath. They were watching and waiting to see what we were going to do, whether we could act decisively and whether we would act decisively. It is my submission, Sir, that in those very valuable days, weeks and months that followed the peoples' uprising in Bangladesh we deliberated, we collected testimonials of good behaviour and patience but we failed to act decisively, which could have turned the tide. Because of this, Pakistan has regained its vilidity and Pakistan has again been able to establish that it can be an effective check and balance India. Therefore, we notice a swing back in those countries which were waiting and holding breath and not making any commitment. Suddenly they realised that Pakistan is still active, they can prop it up, they can support it and they can make it a growing concern. Of course, they knew that there will be embarrassments. There have been embarrassments, whether it is the question of genocide, or the butchery and repression, or the flood of refugees that have come here, or the critical public opinion at home and of the press, but these are not situations that they have not dealt with before. These are situations which these countries are quite used to. Take Vietnam, for example, where they have been doing this for a long time and where they are only now being exposed. Still they continue because they feel that over a period of time if they go on telling lies, if they go on forcing their will, may be others will agree. These are not new tactics. As you know, Sir, Hitler also tried them with considerable success for a period of time. The West also know that they can always show generosity, they can always on humanitarian grounds send money for the refugees and that will not be anti-Pakistan, because these are still Pakistani nationals whom they are basically assisting. But the

real question is: what are they willing to do for India? What is it they are willing to do to get to the bottom of the basic problem and I am sorry, Sir, the Foreign Minister's two statements do not give any reply to this question as to what are they willing to do to find the solution—not in terms of giving some money to run the refugee camps but how are they going to solve this problem that has arisen. It is in this context that the discussion today becomes relevant specially as in about an hour's time President Yahya Khan is due to make a statement to give his idea of a political solution. Therefore, it becomes all the more important for us to keep our objectives straight in mind as to what is it that we would wish to see in Bangla Desh.

My friend, Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad, said that we should not have acted earlier. I am afraid I cannot agree with him. He said if we had acted earlier then maybe the world opinion would not have been with us. But what is our objective? Is it to collect testimonials from the world or is the objective to establish certain values to see that the democratic urges are fulfilled, to prevent large numbers of people from being killed as they were killed by Pakistan; to prevent millions of people from having to leave their homes as forced to do by Pakistan. If the choice was presented to me between these two I do not see that there could be any option.

We have, Sir, refugees today—large number of refugees—and they still continue to come. What is it we are going to do and this is really the crux of the matter? I entirely agree with my friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, that we need to impress on the world community that this line of duplicity of supplying arms on the one hand and showing sympathy on the other is not going to work out and I have every sympathy with my friend, the Foreign Minister. About the time he came back home to make the announcement that the United States had agreed not to give arms to Pakistan contrary disclosures were made. I only hope they were not engineered in that way. These disclosures came and again they put us in the same difficulties.

Now, the question which is uppermost in everybody's mind is how do we persuade the international community to act. There is no dispute that we have to try and get the international community involved. But

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

how are we going to get the international community involved and failing the involvement of the international community what is it that we are willing to do? So far as the question of arms is concerned it is not a new issue. It is not very long ago that a distinguished President of the United States, President Eisenhower, assured our Prime Minister then, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, that United States Arms would not be used against us. We did not have to wait very long to see that these Arms were used against us. They have always been used against us and yet the United States did not do anything. And this is really the point. When we have an assurance from a Government—from the President of a country—and these assurances are not kept what is it that we ought to do? Should we sit back? Should we take it as something which is normal or should we react or react strongly as my friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, advocated? Here is a solemn assurance given to us once by the President of United States, and again by the President of the United States I hope when the Foreign Minister met him or at least by the Secretary of State of the United States and no sooner the Foreign Minister lands in India the news is entirely different.

Unless we are able to have an effective voice in the world and are able to implement our decisions, I am afraid, this is the kind of situation we are going to have to live with. The United States will come forward with assistance, a lollipop of \$ 70 million, for the refugees. They can even say that they will give more assistance. But that is not the real point. The point is: Are we going to allow ourselves to be bullied by them, whether it is the question of arms to Pakistan or of relations with North Vietnam or of their cultural centres or anything else? We have got to make adjustments in which the United States or any other government will wish to implement the assurance that it gives us; otherwise, it will have no meaning. International relations as such will cease to have any meaning either for them or for us. This is no friendship that on each occasion you deceive a friend. What is the value of this friendship? What do we keep it for? It is much better to try to come to an understanding on what will be the content of friendship. Friendship cannot be built on deceit.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Every nation will come to you for friendship after you achieve Bangla Desh's freedom and become the supreme power of the whole of South East Asia. You do seize that opportunity. Ask the Government.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: My fear is that if we allow the situation to continue, we may be sucked into an armed conflict by Pakistan at a time and place of their choosing, just as we have been burdened with the refugees by the deliberate action of Pakistan. This will be a tragedy for both of us. Wars have never solved problems; they have only created new problems while preserving the old ones and even accentuating them. But for Pakistan the use of force has come naturally. They have used it against us three times and got away with it. Therefore, they have got to be taught to learn that this kind of use of force will not pay them. That is why I say that the time has come when we need to show a little more firmness to Pakistan and to our friends so that we are able to reach an understanding which will be real and on the basis of which we will be able to forge new associations.

The only question arises as to what happens if Pakistan fails to carry out its obligations, take back the refugees, create conditions in which the refugees would wish to go back, reach an agreement with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who is the real representative. .
(*Interruption*)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You are talking in terms of Pakistan here. Pakistan in Bangla Desh is dead long ago.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Whatever has survived; I am not going to quarrel over it.

Must we wait for Pakistan to take the initiative? Must we always rely on Pakistan to put us in an awkward position? Would it not be a proper thing, at a suitable time to be naturally decided by the Government, for us to entrust this job to the representatives on Bangla Desh and to ask them to ensure that conditions are created in Bangla Desh in which the refugees can go back?

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUERIA (Maragao): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of External

Affairs for the success that he has achieved on his trip in Bonn, Paris and Ottawa. I think, Foreign Minister Sharp of Canada deserves a special word of praise for paraphrasing the interest in Bangla Desh so well. This is what he said to the Canadian Parliament:—

“the preferred settlement . . . would be one in which those individuals who have been elected pursuant to the recent election in Pakistan should be given the responsibility of governing Pakistan, particularly East Pakistan.”

With reference to the rest of his visit, I am afraid, I cannot be so indulgent.

Let us first look at the question of American arms shipments. We were told that there would be no further arms. We were told this and our diplomats in America would not even keep a watch on the Pakistani ships in American ports! Then, we were told that there was a loop-hole with reference to “past authorisations.” from later news we find that the loop-hole is even a bigger loop-hole than the previous loop-hole.

Sir, America gave Pakistan the Patons for 1965. What has it given them now? The Hon. Minister says in his statement that Government appreciate and share the concern of all sections of this House about the arm shipments. And I must say that the Minister of External Affaris has hardly expressed even a small fraction of the indignation that we all feel, that this blatant deception has been practised on him and on this country.

He has appealed only to the principles of democracy and freedom of the American Government. It may be conceded, Sir, that they believe in democracy and freedom in their own country. But do they foster democracy and freedom elsewhere in the world? It they do, what is this game of ping-pong about?

Sir, see the statement of the State Department of June 17. “US officials expressed hope that restraint would be continued on both sides.” Sir, by what stretch of imagination can it be said that Pakistan has been practising restraint? And we placed the Statement before this House without any comment. Why are we afraid of the Americans?

Contrast this statement, Sir, with what our Ambassador Mr. Jha said:

“An angry Indian Ambassador, Mr. L.K. Jha told WETA Radio Station in Washington—‘We believed your Government’s assurances that no further military shipments to Pakistan would be made and that there was nothing in the pipeline. We had no reason for not believing them. Now I do not know what to believe. This has destroyed our belief in anything your Government says.

I am sure, Sir, that Mr. Jha made this statement without asking the South Block. If he has sought permission, he would not have got it. It is for easier to take it than to dish it out.”

Let us take the visit to Russia. Let us look at the Joint Statement. Our Hon. Minister and the Russians spoke first about Soviet-Indian friendship and strengthening peace in Asia and world. Than they agreed, that war should be terminated from Indo-China, a political settlement reached in West Asia, European security ensured, and disarmament achieved. Only after all this did they speak about Bangla Desh.

I want to ask the hon. Minister whether is it a fact, Sir, that of all our friends it is only our friends, the Russians, who have told us to practise restraint not only today, not only next week, not only next month, but in any kind of future and conceivable situation? Is this true? My information is that this is so.

Let us get back to the Joint Statement. Our Minister impressed upon the Russians the burden that we are facing with reference to refugees. Unfortunately, Sir, he returned empty-handed. We got a few planes? Yes. But no substantial aid. Why are we afraid of the Americans. Why are we subservient to the Russians?

Five countries, Sir, are vitally interested in the events in Bangla Desh—Pakistan, we, the Americans, the Russians and China. Let us look briefly at what each one of them is doing to protect their own interests.

Sir, Pakistan is interested in maintaining its economic colony in East Bengal. So,

[Shri Erasmo De Sequeria]

it unleashes a repression and a genocide. They do not wait to gauge world opinion. They do not care for what we think. They protect their own interests. The Americans are interested in maintaining the military strength of their Pakistani allies. So, they supply arms to Pakistan. They do not care for world opinion. They do not care for us. They protect their own interests.

The Awami League leader, Mr. Mujibur Rehman and his followers are too suber for the Russian palate. In a long struggle, their real friends would have a better opportunity to rise to power. A state of high flux in our disturbed north-east would also be welcome. So, what do they do? They say to us, don't intervene, and they do not give us aid for refugees. They do not care for us. They protect their own interest. Their own interest takes precedence over their friendship with us.

The Chinese want even a longer struggle. So, they tacitly support repression, knowing full well that their thought is the standard textbook for wars of national liberation. They want Chittagong as a naval base, and it matters little to them whether they get it from an emaciated Pakistan, or an activist Bangla Desh. They Certainly do not care about us.

How can we ever hope to have our legitimate sphere of influence if we cannot protect even our own vital interests in our immediate vicinity? It was our vital interest that freedom at our door-step should not have been repressed by genocide. We allowed it to happen. It was in our vital interest to stabilise our north-east. We have missed the bus. It was in our vital interest that we should not have been burdened with 6 million refugees. Still, the refugees are here, and we have to look after them.

This Government has been elevated to a certain status. I call upon the Government to descend from that elevation and plant both its feet firmly on the ground. Let us tell the world that it is vitally important to us that conditions should be created to enable 6 million refugees, that we now have to look after, to go back to their country, in peace

and safety. Let us tell the world that we want this within a specified period. Let us specify the period. Let us tell the world that we do not want to go to war. We will be far happier if they can achieve these conditions themselves. But if they cannot, what choice do they leave us? Only then the world will pay heed.

Only then will this nation be looked upon as the nation that it really is.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the U.S. Administration has a peculiar knack of supporting dictatorial and reactionary regimes all over the world and it has also another knack of turning its friends into enemies.

At this juncture in Asian history, when millions of people are trying to escape from slavery of dictatorship, in Bangla Desh the U. S. Administration had got one great opportunity in Asia to revive its image which was taid in the Vietnam war. But, unfortunately, the U.S. Administration has lost this great opportunity. I think, after the people of India and Bangla Desh and the whole of humanity have taken serious objection and have even condemned the action of the U.S. Administration as they spoke so sweetly to our Foreign Minister on the one hand and sent armanents of death and destruction to Pakistan, the U.S. Administration will take note of the condemnation of the world community.

15.40. hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY *in the Chair*]

There are certain specific points which, I think, should be highlighted. There is no dispute about Bangla Desh. So far as I am concerned, I am quite clear that it is just like a dawn. When it has dawned, it has become a fact. Bangla Desh is acknowledged as a fact in—almost all over the world by the people and the press and even the newspapers in Western countries are using the word 'Bangla Desh' more and more than even the people in our country are using. And it has come to stay. The paradox of the situation to-day is perhaps that we have recognised the Government of Bangla Desh

in all its aspects but are not using the word 'recognition.' One thing should be made clear from the beginning. It is not a conflict between India and Pakistan. It is the struggle of the seventy million people of Bangla Desh to save themselves from oppression and from a dictatorship which used to keep them in bondage for the last 23 years. Therefore, this is a revolution by the people of Bangla Desh. People fought against the Fascist Hitler in those days and today we find the reincarnation of Hitler in Yahya Khan and when Yahya Khan has taken up the task of annihilating one million people in Bangla Desh and he has set a target to kill 2 million people, I hope the freedom loving people of the whole world will come to the assistance of the valiant Freedom Fighters of Bangla Desh and its suffering people in this difficult hour. In the Second World War when the people were fighting the Fascist Hitler and Germany in those days, attempts were made by the Fascist countries to set up puppet governments. History repeats and it is no wonder and surprise that Yahya Khan also to-day tries to set up a quisling government in Dacca with a handful of obliging politicians and if Yahya Khan sets up a quisling government, I am sure the people of Bangla Desh will not tolerate it. Therefore, we keep our options always open. We have always stood, India has always stood, against all sorts of imperialism and colonialism, either it is American or of any other brand. We cannot tolerate colonialism in any part of the world. Sir, it is not a conflict between India and Pakistan. It is a fight against colonialism. It is a fight against colonial domination. It is a fight for the same objective which India has fought in the past and has won.

I would try to point out three points and I hope the Government will try to see if there is any way to find a solution. Mr. Kargill, Director of the World Bank's South Asia Department, who came with the joint Mission to see Bangla Desh has said in his report:

"They found a continuing reign of terror in East Bengal conducted by West Pakistani troops there; the shattering of urban life, with some towns having left with only 10% of the population; paralysis of economy, demolished transportation network; active guerilla resistance by those

favouring an independent East Pakistan, and a strong likelihood of wide-spread famine this autumn."

The report is quite clear that the Freedom Fighters of Bangla Desh are fighting the battle and they must succeed in the end. I am sorry that some friends here or in this country are defeatists. They say that the battle is lost. Sir, the liberation wars can never be lost and it will continue. . . (Interruptions) Mr. Samar Guha, let us try to help them. You are helping. I am very happy.

I am quite confident that with the support of the freedom-loving peoples all the world over and the entire nation and the Government of India the liberation struggle that the Mukti Foj volunteers are to-day fighting in Bangla-desh will triumph. If one million people had been killed and young women raped, the conscience of the world, I am sure, will not be a silent spectator at these horrors.

Today world community is coming to its senses. If our Ministers are going abroad, it is not simply for lunches and dinners. I hope world community is trying to listen to what our Ministers have to say. It is not that we have not succeeded. We cannot say that Pakistan only is succeeding in everything, and we are failing. It is not so. If we say that those persons who have been instrumental in killing many millions of people are succeeding, it is not a kind word for anybody who loves democracy. We should not always go with a defeatist mentality. 6 million refugees have come to us. It may go on increasing. The point is this: Is there enough space in India to keep them. I suggest that 25 miles area from the border in Bangla Desh can be kept free where these 6 or 7 million refugees can be settled. They will be settled there; they will live there. I hope Government will take this up in right earnest to reserve 25-mile border in Bangla Desh so that these refugees could be settled there. I hope in this the world community and the Government of India will come together and find a solution.

I do not find anything incongruous in this kind of solution. It is a question of having 25 miles of free territory where you settle the persecuted people. The entire world community will come to your rescue and the

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

Government of India also will come to your aid. I hope these things will be taken into consideration.

The entire approach of the western powers is to see that only the Asian countries engage themselves in internal quarrels. If you analyse the figures, you will see this. From the Second World War, till 1969-70 the six or seven industrialised countries of the world have helped about 52 under-developed countries with the following items:—

- 9000 combat aircrafts
- 2500 transport aircrafts
- 4000 training aircrafts
- 2000 helicopters
- 15000 tanks
- 10000 armoured personnel carriers
- 3000 armoured cars
- 300 warships
- 800 petrol crafts
- 400 amphibian vessels, submarines and other equipments.

Therefore, these big powers were foisting their arms on the third world countries. They wanted to consolidate their peace and they wanted to sell their arms to the Asian and African countries so that they may fight with each other and keep the cold war alive. We should invite the attention of the countries of Asia. Why should the Minister go to Washington alone? Why can't he go to Rangoon, Indonesia and all round us, in Asian continent? We have to build up our case. We have to expose the game of the world powers. We love peace; we want to be in peace with our neighbours. For Bangla Desh, we have a special responsibility. As defender of peace, we have to help them. For all practical purposes, there is emergency there. Therefore I would suggest this. Why cannot Government set up a National Emergency Council, where all interests will be there, to see what is happening from day to day? Almost emergency is there in the eastern region. The present situation, although it is not a war actually, is almost a war-like situation. Therefore, for all practical purposes, there is national emergency. The situation may develop into something serious in a week or a month. We have to be prepared

for it and be ready for it. We have to see that our sinews of war are geared up so that we meet the situation effectively.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Chairman, to begin with, I must register my protest against, and condemnation of, that the US Government has done on the assurance that it had given to our Foreign Minister. Either there must have been some considerable misunderstanding on the part of our Foreign Minister, which is not unusual, or there must have been some considerable misunderstanding on the part of the American Government about what our Foreign Minister wanted, which is also not unusual, because after reading several reports from several papers, I have still not been able to construe as to what is on those ships that were supplying arms to Pakistan.

I am told India is developing an agency like the CIA and the KGB, and it is known as RAW—I do not know what it means. I am told we have several of these agents of ours, 'Cow-boys', named after the head of the branch, Mr. Kao. When we have got them in those countries, why cannot they supply us with information which should be available really to anybody as to what is on board these ships which are being loaded in public in New York, a big harbour. Nobody seems to know what is being supplied. The American Government is rather cagey about what is has supplied. Therefore, I am inclined to suspect the supplies that are on those particular ships, and I think it is a condemnable behaviour from any point of view.

As Shri Dinesh Singh, and I think also Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad said, we had similar assurances in the past from the US Government. These assurances have been broken. While speaking on my own adjournment motion on the supply of Soviet arms aid to Pakistan, I made this point very categorical, and I think it needs reiterating, that when governments deceive us in this fashion, there must be something wrong not only with those governments but also with us. As far as the US Government is concerned, it is not only deceiving us, it is deceiving its own people, as my hon. friend, Shri Manoharan, said. It is something that is inherent in their system: their Government tries to deceive

their Senate, the Senate tries to deceive the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives, in turn, tries to deceive the President, and they all try to deceive the people (*Interruptions*). These friends may not understand it. This is what is commonly known as democracy. It is only in a democracy that one organ of government and another organ of the same government will try to play game with each other, each trying to put through its own point of view; it is only in a controlled and guided democracy such as we are trying to create in this country that everybody must think alike.

Now I would like to come to the question of Bangla Desh. I do not think this Government has ever defined as to what are its long-term interests *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. I do not think it has ever bothered to think that this entire issue of Bangla Desh and the refugees are intimately tied in with our own attitude towards Pakistan. I do not think anybody knows: I do not think the Government knows, I do not think the Foreign Minister knows, I do not think the Prime Minister knows and, therefore, I do not know.

I do not know what is the objective of this Government. It has defined a policy *vis-a-vis* Bangla Desh. It says it is a conflict between Pakistan and Bangla Desh. At least they have come to the point where they differentiate between the two. They say it must be settled consistent with the aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh, creating conditions for the return of the refugees with security, dignity and honour. I do not think there is anybody in the world who disputes the objectives of this Government. I do not think there is any country in the world which says that it should not be so. Other countries are in the fortunate position of being able to say so and then forget about it, but unfortunately, because of the presence of something like 60 lakhs of refugees in our country, it is not possible for us to forget it. And with what pious hopes was this explained by some with their tongue in their cheeks; Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao at the top of his voice, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad with great reasonableness, Shri Dinesh Singh in his undertones, Shri Vajpayee with his drama, Shri Shyamnandan Misra with his reasonableness, they all say that these people must go back, but has anybody ever asked the refugees if they want to go back? Are we in a

position to send them back? I know that this Government, in the past very often, has tried to put tooth paste back into the tube and our Foreign Minister has been doing this for years, but I do not think that this is going to happen. Even if such conditions are created in Bangla Desh, I do not think that it is going to happen.

I would like to warn this Government. I do not want them to go into a war thinking on the one hand that they are going to find some solution of the problem and be struck up with the refugees simultaneously for all time to come, because this would be getting the worst of the deal. Therefore, a certain amount of reasonableness has to be applied.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer):
Restraint.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I wish they know the word "restraint" meant. Then, they would not be shouting in this fashion. Please use some restraint.

Although the Government does not define how it is going to achieve this objective, I find all that they are trying to do is to send a lot of delegations abroad. Travelling abroad has now become the privilege of Parliament and we have all manner of Ministers travelling abroad, trying to explain to other people what could be better explained by our legations abroad. I am unhappy to point out to this House that Muslim Ministers have been sent to Muslim countries. I thought that we had finished with our elections and it was not necessary to do this sort of thing. Or, is it that we are going to have a repetition of what happened at Rabat. Shri K. D. Malaviya came back from Damascus. I do not know what he was doing there, anyway I thank him because he brought me some chocolates. I am told Shri Fakruddin is rather ill, he has got a chill or some such thing. In the circumstances, I do not know what he is going to do. Then we have our durable Mr. Swaran Singh. He can travel anywhere all the time, nothing ever happens to him. He is the most durable Minister that this country has produced. On his return from another luxuriating trip over five or six Capitals of the world, he has produced this document and he has pattend himself on the back for having produced these statements.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I never patted myself on the back. I do not want any pat from you either.

16.00 hrs.

SHRI PILOO MODY: If you just read the statement that he made, which incidentally is not in the joint statements, you will find he is patting himself on the back. I would like to pat him on the back for only one reason, and that was the statement that was issued by the Deputy Prime Minister of Canada. This was the one statement which was not a joint statement and that is why perhaps it was a good statement. This is what the Deputy Prime Minister of Canada said in their Parliament:

"All of us are pressing for a political solution. It is the only possible way of dealing with the present situation. Unless there is a political settlement in Pakistan, the refugees are going to remain in India and continue to be a thorn on the side of peace. . . ."

thorn on the side of peace, not India.
". . . thorn in the side of peace, if I may put it that way. Therefore we are all working with everything at our command and using every possible means of impressing on the Pakistan Government the need for a settlement, one that is democratic and made under civilian control."

At least he is impressing on the Pakistan Government. He goes on:

". . . the preferred settlement, of course, would be one in which those individuals who have been elected pursuant to the recent election in Pakistan should be given the responsibility of governing Pakistan, particularly East Pakistan."

This is a statesman like statement. Quite unfortunately it was made unilaterally by the Canadian Deputy Prime Minister. As far as the joint statements are concerned, the less said about them, the better. I should like to go to the Soviet statement because it seems to be a full and rounded one. I think that it is worth noticing what Mr. Pran Chopra has to say about this in the Hindustan Times:

"The joint statement in Moscow at the end of his talks there on June 9 was presented in Delhi as a diplomatic triumph for India though the text was positively discouraging for this country, much more so than the statement jointly issued in London by the Indian and British Foreign Ministers. If there were any unrecorded understandings between Mr. Swaran Singh and his Russian hosts, they did not come through in the statements by Mrs. Gandhi. As recent history proves, Moscow has the power to make Islamabad see reason if it makes up its mind to do so. Therefore, if the External Affairs Ministry's optimistic interpretation of Moscow's mind is correct then Mrs. Gandhi's pessimism is not, and vice versa."

This optimistic diplomatic triumph of the Foreign Minister, which my friends were pointing out, is that after the Russians had extracted from our Foreign Minister all their propaganda regarding peace and good will towards men, termination of war in Indo-China and the political settlement of the Middle-East crisis and ensuring European security and achieving general and complete disarmament, then because there was some time left, the statement continues:

"During the negotiations was also discussed the serious situation created by the continuing stream of millions of refugees from East Pakistan. . . ."

What does it say?

"The Minister of External Affairs of India expressed his sincere thanks for the frank and clear understanding of the difficulty of this situation expressed in the message of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. N. V. Podgorny to the President of Pakistan."

He expressed satisfaction about what Podgorny had written to Yahya. The statement continues. . . .

". . . in which the conviction was expressed that the resort to peaceful methods for achieving political settlement would correspond to the interests of the entire Pakistani people. . . ."

I just do not understand. Words have meaning. You cannot put words together in this fashion and think that somebody can get any meaning out of it. Sincere thanks? For what purpose? A writes a letter to B and Mr. Swaran Singh thanks them? What is in that letter? He says that we must do things by peaceful methods. And Mr. Swaran Singh goes and thanks them again. I do not understand. This is no way of dealing with the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is your solution?

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am glad there is at least one over-eager Member. We have on our hands a large number of people whom we shall have to rehabilitate either here or in Pakistan or in Bangla Desh; we shall have to rehabilitate them. For the rehabilitation of those refugees we have to set aside vast resources. But before we approach this problem, we need certain basic information; we need information on conditions in Bangla Desh today, from week to week. We need to know what our Foreign Minister did abroad,—not merely a statement—who he met, whom he talked to and what was their reaction. And we need to know the extent of foreign relief which we receive from week to week.

I think that in sum total, the problem of these refugees of Bangla Desh is going to be a long-term one. There is no point in getting hot-headed about it. My friend Prof. Samar Guha said, recognise Bangla Desh. I would say, recognise them if it were to yield to you any result today. Recognise them whenever you think that it is going to yield any result to you. Take whatever action; we are all behind you. All I would say is that you take action and let it be purposeful, and keep us and take us into confidence and tell us, so that you can carry the country with us and not divide the country on an issue such as this.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON (Trivandrum): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I had understood the purpose of this debate, if I am not mistaken, was for us to review the result of the visit of the Foreign Minister to other countries in recent times and also to know what has emerged as a result of it. On this whole

question of Bangla Desh, there were many aspects of foreign policy which were not strictly relevant to this, and it contained many fallacies. First of all, with regard to the purposes, whatever may be in the knowledge of the ruling party, we are not to know the secret of these purposes. There is no obligation on a Foreign Minister, when he goes out, to say what he is going for. In certain Parliaments, when Ministers go out on missions, then there is a debate before that and soon after they return, so that we can know what had happened in those countries. But, since this has not happened, we would wait for the speech of the Foreign Minister to find out what he went for, or whether it was merely an exploratory visit which would also be purposeful in its own way.

Then, we come naturally to the statement made by the Mover of this Resolution, which cannot be regarded as merely a private Member's attempt, because he belongs to the ruling party and he is a man of great experience and courage. I would not, therefore, say that the gravamen or the grievance merely lies in the United States not consulting us from 1955 onwards. I say—this is not charging him—that it is a very fallacious foreign policy to think or to expect that the United States should consult us on foreign policy; it is totally damaging to any country under all circumstances. You cannot expect that she will come and tell us what she is going to do, how much of arms she is going to send to Turkey, how many bases she has got, or whom she is going to kill, or how much money on the CIA is going to be spent, or how many bombs will she drop on Okinawa tomorrow morning. We cannot get such things from them. If in this country, our Parliament and individuals expect a kind of fraternal understanding in this way, it is a misreading of the political solution.

It is quite true that in 1954, the first arms sale was concluded with Pakistan; the first large sale of arms was given to Pakistan. It proceeded from a basis of deceit and betrayal, because at the end of the Geneva Conference, while it is written nowhere, we had been distinctly assured that if the arms deal existed, it will go to pieces; that there will be no prototype of the NATO in our part of the world. But before the ink was dry on the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

agreement, SEATO came into existence, and the then Prime Minister—he did not protest—wrote to the President at that time, saying that large quantities of arms coming into this area would upset the balance and the equilibrium in these places, and President Eisenhower's answer was that these arms were not intended to be used against India—not intended to be used against India. Obviously these Patton tanks and other amphibian vehicles and so on were used against Russia from Rawalpindi! But it was not to be used against India. The Prime Minister politely replied that guns that fire only in one direction have not been made. And Ayub Khan came along in 1957 at the height of the Kashmir controversy and said that these arms were intended to be used by us on the riverine side and so on; that is all.

Therefore, there is no question that the arming of an ally is not limited by any conditions. Portugal, for instance, gave large quantities of arms ostensibly intended for the protection of western Europe; may be, part of it was used in Mozambique. They tried to use it in Goa, but they were left unused. Anyway, that is the position. Therefore, it is a very great mistake for us to cry hoarse that we were not consulted. Why should we be consulted? It is a disgrace; if we are consulted we would become part of their business. We are not their allies. We have nothing to do with their foreign policy. We are totally against it. We opposed it for a long time. But Pakistan is an ally. China also is an ally. Therefore, they consult them. It is important that we should get away from this idea.

The next point, which is probably more serious, is this. We have a habit—I include myself in it—of trying to collect the slogans and even the modes of thought of people who are against us. For a long time, we used to speak of Kashmir and India, as though Kashmir was not a part of a India. We borrowed it from other people. We have collected a lot of barbed wire very facetiously offered to us and we have got entangled. One of these entanglements is what is called “political solution.” I think it is a very incongruous word, because all solutions ultimately are political. Even if a country is

defeated in war and comes to a settlement or surrenders, that is also a political settlement. Therefore, to say “Political solution” does not mean anything, except misleading Parliament. Probably it is not intended to mislead Parliament. It is rather an illusory notion of comforting ourselves. So, we must get away from this talk about political solutions. When we talk about political solutions, several solutions have been offered by the people most concerned, namely, the people of Bangladesh and their representatives. There is the six-point programme of Mujibur Rehman; the four-point programme of the present Prime Minister. But the time is past for six and four point programmes. There can be only one point political programme, namely, evacuation of the territory by the aggressor; That is the political solution. Other political solutions will follow afterwards with regard to reparations or mutual relations. That is a future step. At the present moment, there can be only one political solution with regard to this and that is, vacation of aggression. That is the same with regard to the aggression on our territory in Kashmir. Therefore, I hope Government will find its way to forget that it has been using this word ‘political solution’, because I do not think they mean that. What they mean is, they want to be in line with the great powers—highly respectable people who talk about political and not military solution. Political solutions always follow military solutions. Sometimes, political solutions have led to military endeavour.

Then, we come to this most important question, which some people probably regard merely as a propaganda stunt. That is, recognition of Bangladesh. I raised it during the first debate here and I remain unconvinced about whatever Government have to say about the time being appropriate or there is no purpose and so on. I do not relent on this question. The most important question, apart from dealing with the refugees from day to day, is the recognition of Bangladesh, because it is the recognition of a national personality. Whether you send an Ambassador or not is another matter. But when you give recognition, you recognise the struggle. The whole world knows you recognise the struggle and the national personality of those people. It is quite true that we may not be able to do very much. But it takes away from

the sphere of illegality and clandestine organisation, about which the United States has spoken yesterday in regard to sending arms that came over here. It takes away from the sphere of clandestine operations any assistance we may give to them. If we recognise the State of Bangladesh, those who are in the Government there, whoever it may be,—I do not subscribe to one person or the other— whoever is in Government has the support of the people. That is the definition of a Government, which has the habitual allegiance of the people and which can carry out obligations. Those people would be able to secure the goods of war or economic sustenance without let or hindrance. So, now it has to be done immediately. In the context of guerilla war, this becomes extremely important. Therefore, the recognition of Bangladesh, irrespective of what the Government might have said from time to time, is something that ought to be regarded as important, urgent and essential for the next step.

The general argument, at least one hears in private, is that it might lead to war. Speaking for myself, I do not think this country should initiate war, either against Pakistan or any country in the world. But if war is forced on us by acts of aggression, naturally we will meet them to the best of our ability; either we will win or we will lose, but there is no alternative. But I cannot see any earthly reason why, if we recognise Bangladesh, people should wage a war against us.

Regarding the withdrawal or ousting of our diplomatic representative from Dacca, as regards the void or vacuum which we have to fill there is no Pakistan in East Bengal; there is no State there. The only presence of Pakistan is in the shape of bombs, in the shape of napalm bombs, aeroplanes, rifles, rape, plunder and things of that kind. They are the only things present in East Bengal, and not a civilised State, and therefore we are entitled to fill them in factual terms but I will go a little lower step than that. If the recognition has not been possible and they find a change difficult, at least we should take all the steps pending that.

There is a great deal of complaint about our Ambassador not saying this, that and the other. May I say that I am old-fashioned enough to say that we should not criticise

these men who do hard work in foreign capitals, who are not here to defend themselves? I know some of them. There are some duds. There are some taken from the Audit Service or the Supply Department. But even there the fault is of the government; not anybody else's. If you send as diplomats men of experience and they do not do well, that is another matter. But what can they do if they do not get clear guidelines? The essence of diplomatic propaganda and publicity is not merely distributing glossy covered paper but to convey the essence of your policy in the day to day conversations with their opposite numbers. But when the country has no policy, what are they to convey? Ambassadors cannot make policies. Some Ambassadors have done so in the past, that is, in the early days of our independence. Today it is not possible. Therefore, if the government have a policy, and that policy must follow basically the resolution passed by this House, namely, sympathy and support to Bangladesh, then it is either being hypocritical or talking with the tongue in the cheek when people are fighting for their survival and getting killed, and killing in turn, and proclaiming an independent State and if you say in this Parliament in all solemnity "we support them but it will fall short of recognition."

This, I think, is a greater betrayal than what Eisenhower has done. Now what is the use of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad complaining of Presidents and statesmen from Eisenhower to Dulles, Kennedy, Rusk and Johnson and this gentleman, Mr. Nixon? They have betrayed their own people. So, why do we complain? They are telling lies to their own people and Pentagon all the time. Therefore, we should not waste our time and try to reform the world or hope that we will be able to dismantle the 3,700 posts that they have in other countries. We have a comparatively small problem and we should not get entangled in phrases like political solution. or it is only the concern of the people of East Bengal. What concerns the people of East Bengal concerns us because of our geographical contiguity. Whatever happens on our immediate border ceases to be an internal matter of another country. Suppose a person gets a venomous snake or a wild tiger in the house next door to me and there is very little to protect me from it, then the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

fact that the tiger or snake is in his house does not make it only his domestic matter.

This is exactly the position, so far as we are concerned. We have every right to say that the condition of the influx of refugees into India is something that is created by Pakistan deliberately. That is to say, they have created conditions of terror from which they have to flee. Shri Dinesh Singh and various other people said in all righteousness that we will receive all the refugees. Nothing of the kind. There is no option. If the refugees come across the frontier, there are only two things open to you; either you let them in or you shoot them with machine guns; there is no other way. This country, whatever the government, will not permit the machine-gunning of large numbers of people who come in. About what may happen in future, there are so many things to happen in the future. After all, we are 560 million and another 6 million would not make a lot of difference. We can starve together and we can have equal distribution of poverty.

There are certain aspects of this refugee problem to which the government should apply its mind. These refugees are individuals and they are citizens of Bangladesh. I do not want to elaborate on this matter in an open forum like this but they should have facilities to enable them to implement their independence. If, for example, the security of this place has to be maintained, it has to be maintained by the refugees or by policing which will enable them to use their strength somewhere or other. I think the Foreign Minister will have to interpret this in what ever way he wants.

These brave people cannot merely be the receivers of whatever assistance we can give them. They must be enabled to enter into a life of their own, not necessarily absorption into our polity, in order that when they go back, as I hope they will go back, they will not go back as misfits to human society, and in the meanwhile both politically, socially and otherwise they should have the realisation that their main concern is the liberation of Bangla Desh which means a type of conduct which I do not want to pronounce in so many words. I do not want to say anything more. It would be wrong in this country

to talk in terms of war. War is no remedy at any time. War is a calamity. If it comes we should meet it as best as we can. I cannot talk in terms of preparedness. We have people who for the last 300 to 400 years have not waged wars. We have fought only outside for the British. We have not seen in our territory war, I believe, after the battle of Wandiwash and, therefore, we have to take into account conditions of our people and embark on it if it is necessary and there are various parts of our own territory still under foreign occupation which we have not regained. If we must go to the enterprise of war we should do so for regaining them.

So far as recognition is concerned Pakistan will have neither legal nor any other justification for waging war against us for we have recognised in fact what is true. Recognition is not a creative act. We only recognise Bangla Desh which is merely a formality. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this recognition would lead to the change of the whole situation. If a country next door recognised the existence of Bangla Desh our friendly countries may not immediately follow suit but at the same time they will not have the touch-me-not attitude. I am right in saying we have shown less practical concern in regard to Bangla Desh than in regard to Mozambique, Angola, etc. We should not seek to divert our anger against countries who do not take the same view. We are, therefore, this time called upon to make the people in Bangla Desh who are fighting, who are in danger of being killed next moment, who have great anxiety and whose one concern is the liberation of their land make them feel that there are some other people who recognise them as people. That is the meaning of recognition. In this context it is recognition of a national personality.

The Prime Minister and the Government have gone a little way farther. They speak about the time. I think privately or publicly everybody says Pakistan cannot go back; this Prometheus cannot go back or in Piloo Mody's phrase you cannot put tooth paste back into the tube. Therefore, we have to enable other people outside to recognise Bangla Desh. There is no lack of receptivity. If the policy or an approach is not received

well by another country, well it is not always merely that the policy is bad but our image is poor, that the attention paid to us is not what it should be and our business is to promote it. Our treatment of the refugees and our refusal to take back bad treatment if the High Commissioner of Refugees come here and talk in this way. He will be called upon to answer. What has this Government done to invoke any of the international machinery? International machinery has been left un-touched during the last three or four months—the colonial committee or placed this item on the agenda or approached the High Commissioner of Human Rights. We have not placed a charge on the Secretary General in regard to the speeches made by these people. We have the right to say the High Commissioner of Refugees is very good man, he has drawing room manners but he has vast economic interest in Pakistan. He should be super-human if he is not going to be affected by it. Anyway, he should not only be upright but should appear to be so. That is not possible in these circumstances. I say to the Foreign Minister, not by way of criticism, if the whole field of international operation were to be activated that to a large extent lies dormant, the use of proper machinery or personnel and choice of time is of vital importance.

श्री सतपाल कपूर (पटियाला) : चैयरमेन साहब, हमारे सामने जो समस्या है जिसको कि श्री भागवत झा आजाद ने यहां पर रखा मैं उसकी पूरी ताईद करता हूं। अमरीका ने आज पहली बार ये हथियार नहीं भेजे हैं बल्कि आज दुनिया में जहां जहां भी झगड़े हो रहे हैं हर जगह अमरीका के हथियार जाकर वहां के हालात को खराब करने का सामान पैदा कर रहे हैं। वियतनाम में अमरीका ने अपने हथियार दिए हैं और नयी समस्या पैदा की है। यह ठीक है कि अमरीका के लोग अमनपसन्द हैं लेकिन अमरीका की सरकार वहां के हालात खराब कर रही है। इस एरिया में हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर, पाकिस्तान में और लंका में एलेक्शन्स हुए तो उसमें क्या साबित हुआ ? इन तीनों मुल्कों के एलेक्शन्स से एक ही बात इस्टैब्लिश हुई कि वहां के लोग रेडिकल चेंज चाहते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में डिमोक्रेसी मजबूत हुई,

लंका में डिमोक्रेसी कदम जमें लेकिन पाकिस्तान में अभी डिमोक्रेसी के कदम जम भी नहीं पाये थे, डिमोक्रेसी के पैदा होने के पहले ही उसको कुचल दिया गया। अमरीका का उसमें शुरू से हाथ रहा है। तो कोई पहली बार अमरीका ने यह काम नहीं किया है। पाकिस्तान के लोगों को डिमोक्रेटिक राइट मिलने के बाद और वहां पर चुनी हुई सरकार होने के बाद भी उनको पूरे अस्तिवार नहीं दिए गए। इसमें भी मैं समझता हूं अमरीका का पूरा हाथ है और आज वे अपने नंगे रूप में हमारे इस एरिया में जंग के हालात पैदा कर रहे हैं। अमरीका पाकिस्तान में, बैलेन्स कायम रखने के लिए हथियार नहीं भेज रहा है बल्कि इस एरिया में बैलेन्स बिगाड़ने के लिए ऐसा कर रहा है। अमरीका बंगला देश को एक दूसरा वियतनाम बनाना चाहता है जिसको बचाना हमारे लिए बहुत जरूरी है। अगर इस सवाल पर पूरी तरह से हम गौर नहीं करते और दुनिया के लोग इस मामले में अपनी जिम्मेदारी नहीं निभाते तो यह हमारी गलती नहीं है बल्कि हमारा फर्ज है कि हम दुनिया के लोगों को यह बता सकें कि अमरीका बंगला देश को एक दूसरा वियतनाम बनाना चाहता है। इस सिलसिले में हमें क्या करना है, हमारी तरफ से कोई ऐसा कदम नहीं उठाया गया जिस पर यह कहा जा सके कि हमने इस मसले को कम्प्यूज किया है। पाकिस्तान गवर्नमेन्ट की यह सारी कोशिश थी कि वह दुनिया की इंटरनेशनल कम्युनिटी को बताये कि बंगला देश का मसला कोई मसला नहीं है और बंगला देश का मसला पाकिस्तान का अन्दरूनी मसला है। हमारी तरफ से जितनी कोशिश हुई, हमारे एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर ने बाहर जाकर एक ही बात कही कि बंगला देश का मसला पाकिस्तान का अन्दरूनी मामला नहीं है बल्कि बंगला देश एक जिन्दा सबूत है, बंगला देश कायम हो चुका है और बंगला देश एक इंटरनेशनल प्रोब्लम है। आज दुनिया के लोग और दुनिया के मुल्क बंगला देश को पाकिस्तान का अन्दरूनी मामला नहीं मानते बल्कि वे इसको पाकिस्तान के मामले के बजाये बंगला देश को एक जिन्दा मसला समझते हैं और उसको हल

[श्री सतपाल कपूर]

करने के लिए हमारी तरफ से जितनी कोशिश हुई उससे दुनिया के किसी मुल्क में, जहाँ पाकिस्तान ने यह कोशिश की कि दुनिया में वर्ल्ड कम्युनिटी को यह बता सके कि वह पाकिस्तान का अन्दरूनी मामला है और उसमें हिन्दुस्तान दखल दे रहा है, पाकिस्तान ने ऐसा अटेम्प्ट किया लेकिन दुनिया के किसी मुल्क ने इस बात को नहीं माना बल्कि हर जगह से यही आवाज आई कि इस प्रब्लम को साल्व करना चाहिए। इस प्रब्लम को साल्व करने के लिए क्या कुछ करना है, उसकी क्या पोलिटिकल प्रब्लम्स है और उसको किस पोलिटिकल ढंग से हल करना है उस पर वर्ल्ड के तमाम लोग अपना माइन्ड एप्लाइ कर रहे हैं। तो मैं समझता हूँ हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी की पहली सक्सेस यह रही है कि हमने आज इस प्रब्लम को पाकिस्तान की अन्दरूनी प्रब्लम नहीं रहने दिया बल्कि एक लिबिनिम प्रब्लम की तरह से दुनिया के सामने उसको पेश किया है और आज दुनिया का हर आदमी और मुल्क, सरकारी तौर पर और गैर सरकारी तौर पर इस बात को मानता है। और जो मुल्क गैर सरकारी तौर पर नहीं मानते, बा उन की सरकार उन लोगों की ज़ुमाइन्दगी नहीं करती। आज दुनिया के आगे सब से बड़ा सवाल यह है कि जितना बड़ा इंकलाब, कुर्बानी, रिबोल्यूशन बंगला देश में हुआ है इससे पहले तबारीख में नहीं हुआ। रूस का इंकलाब हमने हिस्ट्री में पढ़ा, भारत में भी इंकलाब की लड़ाई लड़ी गई, लेकिन इतना बड़ा मास ऐक्शन हमें देखने को नहीं मिला। अगर इतने बड़े मास ऐक्शन को पाकिस्तान, अमरीका कुचलना चाहता है तो कुचला नहीं जा सकता। बंगला देश की प्रोबलम को हम हल कर पाते हैं या नहीं, लेकिन बंगला देश के लोगों को कुचला नहीं जा सकता। यह जो खून बड़ा है, औरतों, बच्चों और आदमियों का कत्ल हुआ है, इन का खून जाया नहीं जायगा। बंगला देश को दुनिया को समझना पड़ेगा, और भारत के लोगों को ही नहीं बल्कि दुनिया के तमाम लोगों को तत्सम

करना पड़ेगा और जो मुल्क आज हमारी बात नहीं मान रहे हैं, या अमरीका के लोग या कुछ और लोग हमारी बात नहीं मान रहे हैं तो वहाँ के लोग उन को माफ नहीं करेंगे। मैं आपकी मार्फत अमरीका के लोगों से भी अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा वियतनाम के इश्यू पर उन्होंने अपनी सरकार की मुखालीफत की, वियतनाम में हथियार भेजने के खिलाफ वहाँ पर एक तहरीक चलायी उसी तरह पाकिस्तान में हथियार भेज कर एक नया वियतनाम पैदा करने के खिलाफ उन लोगों का फर्ज है कि वह अमरीका में तहरीक चलायें। आज दुनिया जाम उठी है, उसको सुलाया नहीं जा सकता। इसलिये मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हालात को हम ने काफी हद तक सुधारा है, इसको और सुधारने की ज़रूरत है। मैं समझता हूँ सरकार पूरी तरह चौकसी रहेगी।

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the happenings in Bangla Desh have shocked the conscience of the world.

So far as I am concerned, I would say that since West Pakistan has a dictatorial military rule and when the Bangla Desh people wanted to have a democratic representative form of Government, it was not surprising that the military junta should come with a heavy hand on the innocent people, massacring them, killing men, women and children. But I am really surprised that the United States Department has entered into a deal and supplied arms cargo to Pakistani military junta. Now, it appears that the American people have forgotten, specially the State Department, all about their Declaration of Independence and the principles enunciated therein, that it is an inherent right of every individual to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, by supplying arms to Pakistan, the State Department I do not think has forgotten that these arms will be utilised a new by military junta of West Pakistan against innocent persons to massacre and kill them. The action of the State Department to me appears to be a *bania*-like a business-like, action. They have entered into a deal; they

have sold the arms and at the sametime they have given some money in charity for the purpose of helping the refugees. On the one hand, they have made the profits, on the other they have allotted some amounts for refugees as a charity. This is a *hanla* method of dealing with the world. Therefore, this is also the method they have adopted.

Coming to the question as to the purpose and utility that have been achieved by the External Affairs Minister's tour of different capitals, I may summarise the result of his tours. Sir, three points emerge out of the statements made and the communique issued from different capitals of the countries. These three points are: (1) that there has been now awareness and realisation of the stupendous problem created by Pakistan. (2) That Pakistan must own its responsibility as to what has happened in Bangla Desh and more especially, towards the refugees. The third point that has emerged is that Pakistan and the world powers must find out a political solution acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh and power must go to the representatives of the people.

These are the three points which have emerged out of the statements or the communique made at different capitals of the world. Now, it is realised that the present situation in Bangla Desh is a grave problem, that it is an internal problem of Pakistan and the problem of insecurity and safety of the people is created by Pakistan herself. India has nothing to do with it. Millions of refugees have fled and come to India as a result of Pakistan's refusal to recognise the rights of the people, their elected representatives and hand over power to them. India cannot keep these refugees who have been sent out because of the action of Pakistan. We cannot keep them on the Indian soil for a long time. Whatever may be the solution, in the ultimate analysis, the refugees must go back to Pakistan. When I say that they must go back, I do not want to suggest that they must be forced back or thrown out of India. By all means, no force should be used. But the fact remains that the refugees must be sent back.

So far as the second point is concerned, it is realised that the refugee problem is the creation of Pakistan. Pakistan must own the refugees as their own citizens. India, as

I said, has nothing to do with this problem or the creation of the problem. Pakistan has always been, time and again, carrying on propaganda that India harbours ill-will towards Pakistan and the Pakistani people. But, now the world at large, and more especially, the Bengali people have realised that India has not created the problem of the refugees or the problem of insecurity and lack of safety in Bangla Desh. This propaganda of Pakistan is given a complete lie. In the beginning after 25th March when these troubles started in Bangla Desh, Pakistan started a campaign of vilification against India saying that India has created this problem. For some time, some people believed this propaganda campaign by Pakistan but now, Sir, the world has realised that there is no truth in the propaganda carried on by Pakistan.

The last point which the world has accepted is that unless there is a political solution, there can be no solution to the Bangla Desh problem.

16.40 hrs.

[*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*]

In order that the refugee influx may be stopped and the refugees may return and go back to Pakistan, it is the duty of Pakistan to create conditions so that the refugees can have a sense of security and a sense of safety when they go back to Pakistan. Unless these conditions are created, I think it is very difficult either for us or for the world to send the refugees back to Pakistan. In order to achieve this, power must be given to the elected representatives.

Now, Sir, I was one of those who have said that the political solution—it is not a shallow solution as I realise the world situation and the complications created in Bangla Desh—as the Canadian Prime Minister in his communique said in so many clear words, means handing over power to the representatives of people of Bangla Desh. Now, the military junta from West Pakistan is trying to set up a puppet government. I don't think by establishing a puppet government or government of its agents, people will take it to be a political solution. Neither India will take it to be a political solution for the creation of a congenial atmosphere to enable the return of refugees and for creating these two conditions.

[Shri R. D. Bhandare]

Now, a suggestion has been made as to why should we not recognise Bangla Desh. When we say that there ought to be a political solution and power must be transferred to the elected representatives of the people, what else do we mean? Is there any other meaning which can be imported to the phraseology that a political settlement must be there?

Then also, it is, I hope, not suggested seriously that we must start war. I agree with Mr. Krishna Menon when he said that war can never solve any problem. War is a curse. I entirely agree with him. Therefore, India should not fall into the trap of those who carry on the propaganda that India should start war. If at all we want to have a proper real solution, a lasting solution, then the military junta must give the power to the people and the world must force the Pakistani military junta to have a democratic set up and accept democratic values. The world, therefore, must move in that direction.

With these words, I have done.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I never cherished the idea that but for the recent mission abroad by the Foreign Minister, his picture will be painted in near future as good salesman of the pitiable portrait of a confused and emasculated Government of ours. Nor do I also cherish the idea that he will be dubbed in the future as another Chamberlain in the groomlin of the tragic days of Munich episode because, willy-nilly, consciously or unconsciously, he has got into the trap of political solution of Bangla Desh issue within the frame-work of Pakistan.

I would have been happy if his picture could have been drawn as a defender of the revolution in Bangla Desh when he went abroad. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to do so, because going through the documents nowhere to I find that he projected, the crux of the problem of national revolution in Bangla Desh. Nowhere in any discussion with any government did he raise the issue of the freedom struggle in Bangla Desh or the reality of the existence of Bangla Desh and of their Govt. of People's Republic there. Not even in any document is there a

word that he could extract from any foreign power any condemnation of the genocide in Bangla Desh. When he had a talk with U Thant, Secretary-General of UN, he had at least expected that according to the charter of human rights, he could commit him to raise the issue of genocide in the world organisation. There also he failed.

Only one picture emerges of his mission abroad; that is the picture of a global beggar for the refugees of Bangla Desh. Even there, I should say he has not fulfilled that task, because according to our estimate, about Rs. 400 crores will be required for six months to discharge our liability for the refugees and while according to Government's own admission, only Rs. 30 crores in cash and kind have come and perhaps a few more crores may reach us. So there also he has not succeeded.

A lot has been said in this House in condemnation of the action of the US Government in shipping arms to Pakistan. I was not so much surprised about it because I have no illusion about the Anglo-American powers; so I did not feel much disillusioned. The USA has developed a peculiar psychology of vicarious pleasure in seeing India in trouble except during the days of the Sino-Indian conflict. The reason is that India refuses to toe the line of the foreign policy of the USA.

About the UK, their Government has not been able to forget that they were the rulers of India for 200 years. It is they who created Pakistan; it was as a result of the Act passed by the British Parliament that Pakistan came into existence. Therefore, it is a horrifying prospect for them to see Pakistan face a national revolution in Bangla Desh as a result of which Pakistan will be dismembered. Therefore, I have no illusion either about the USA or about the UK, or their satellite powers.

But I am really disillusioned about the communist countries because I had great expectations from them. When Mr. Podgorny sent a note to Yahya Khan, he raised hopes in many of us, but it was not followed by the expectation that was roused. My expectation from the communist countries was because they have been the defenders of the anti-colonial, anti-imperialist, and national liberation movements all over the

world. They have done a lot for the national liberation movements in the African countries, they are doing a lot for the liberation movement in Vietnam. What has happened to the conscience of the communist world? Considering their past performance, it was expected that not only Russia but the 13 Communist countries would come forward not only with a forthright condemnation of the genocide by Pakistan but with immediate recognition to the people's Government of Bangla Desh and also giving them all kinds of effective help, so that they can complete the task of ousting the army of occupation of Pakistan as also consolidate their national freedom. But today there is no free conscience in any country of the world. If you look at the U.S.A., it has its commitments in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. It has also its commitment in Israel. It is now having ping-pong diplomacy with china. So we cannot expect that the free conscience of the U.S.A. will work. I would congratulate Senator Edward Kennedy and the 122 Members of the British Labour Party and the free press of U.S.A. and U.K. for condemning the atrocities committed by Pakistan in Bangla Desh. The UK have their own problems in South Africa and Rhodesia. How can they support Bangla Desh? Even Russia has propounded the theory of limited sovereignty for East European countries. They have their commitment to the Arab countries. How can you expect Russia to have a free conscience? How can you expect these countries to come out to help the revolution in Bangla Desh?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Are you equating Russia with the U.S.A.?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I said I had better expectation from the communist countries.

All these countries are dealing with the problem of Bangla Desh not objectively, but subjectively. It is out of subjective considerations that they are propounding the theory of a political solution.

I am sorry that our Foreign Minister has done a great dis-service to the cause of the Bangla Desh revolution. On going through the joint communiques issued from Moscow,

Bonn and other Capitals of the world, I find the words "East Pakistan" always used in these documents. In this House no Minister had the courage to use the words "East Pakistan." When they use the words "East Pakistan" and "Political solution" together, what does it mean? It means political solution of Bangla Desh as East Pakistan, i.e., political solution within a framework of Pakistan. Let Mr. Swaran Singh or any other Minister or a galaxy of Ministers go round the world and canvas for that type of political solution within the framework of Pakistan, but let them remember that those people who are for the liberation of Bangla Desh, will never accept any kind of political solution within the framework of Pakistan. I do not know if you have met them, if you have seen them. They have lost their sisters, their wives, their parents, their brothers, their near and dear ones. These young men who are fighting on the liberation front have developed intense hatred for Pakistan.

The original concept of Pakistan was that "P" stood for Punjab, "A" for the Afghanistan i.e. Frontier province, "K" for Kashmir, "S" for Sind and "tan" for Baluchistan. So, let Pakistan live in West Pakistan as per the original idea of its geographical contour. The people of Bangla Desh have raised the banner of revolution. What right have you to use the words "East Pakistan" against the ambitions of the people of Bangla Desh? You have allowed the seal of the suzerainty of Yahya's regime to be put on the people of Bangla Desh by allowing the use of the words "East Pakistan". It was better that you should not have used these words in the joint communiques.

I can understand if this was done by Great Britain, America or Russia or any other country because they are still thinking in terms of a united and integrated Pakistan. Therefore it was natural that they could not use the word Bangla Desh or East Bangal. Why did you also use that word? If they did not agree to use the name Bangla Desh, you could issue a separate communique using the name Bangla Desh. Therefore I feel that our Foreign Minister has done a great disservice to the cause of freedom of Bangla Desh.

A lot has been said about how we should deal with the problem of Bangla Desh. I

[Shri Samar Guha]

want to say that I am not one to say that we should go to war with Pakistan although Pakistan has given many causes; it has already committed aggression on India by sending millions of refugees and by dozens of incursions on our territory. They have given enough provocations to India for sending our Army into Bangla Desh. But still there is no necessity whatsoever for sending our army into Bangla Desh. I remember the situation there upto the third week of April. Except Dacca, Chittagong, Khulnan, Rajshahi and Jessore the whole of East Bengal, Bangla Desh, was in the control of the Mukti Fauj. They had need for arms. I rushed to Delhi with some lists. From anywhere in the world they wanted some field artillery, light machine guns, anti aircraft and anti tank guns— from anywhere in the world. They said that only two divisions of the Army were there and they could finish them if they had these arms. From Jessore, they could control the seven districts flanked by river Padma; that was what they said.

There would have been no need now to tackle with the problem of refugees. Many people do not know that most of the Muslim refugees who have come, constitute young men, particularly of school, college and university students. Their parents have forced them out of their homes because they were the main targets of Pakistan army. If you go to the frontier even now, you will see what a brilliant fighting force they are. They are ready to die and they say: give us weapons to die for our freedom and give us facilities to die; we do not want any other help but arms. Some members said: let there be police action against Bangla Desh. There is no need for police action. Nor is there any need to demand territory from them to settle the refugees, nor even to have the 25 mile free zone, as Mr. Panigrahi suggested. If you are determined to see that the objective of the freedom struggle in Bangla Desh is achieved, you have two alternatives: either to go to war with Pakistan or, if you want to avoid war, the other alternative is to give immediate recognition to Bangla Desh Government.

After giving recognition, you can very well give all kinds of help to them: arms, training and all kinds of facilities and during

this monsoon they will complete the task of achieving and consolidating their own freedom. There you have lagged behind. I do not know what will happen. I have great apprehensions as to what political, declarations would be made, what type of political solution would be made by Yahya Khan. At least 15-20 Members of the National Assembly of Pakistan have been killed by Pak army and 30-40 M.L.As. are in Pakistani jail. It may so happen that at pistol-point some 20 or 25 MLAs may be forced by Yahya Khan to support his plan. Then, what will happen? That means, Yahya Khan's regime will constitute the majority in the National Assembly of Pakistan. If they form a government, what will happen? You will then say that it is an illegally constituted government of Pakistan. That would mean the butchery of the aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh.

17.00 hrs.

The only reply today, here and now, if you were to give a counterblast to Yahya Khan, is this. Here and now, let the Government declare that they recognise Bangla Desh. Let the Government recognise the People's Govt. of Bangla Desh. That is the only answer, and the only right answer before Yahya Khan can announce the formation of an illegally constituted government for Pakistan. Here and now, today, recognised Bangla Desh, and that will be a counterblast to Yahya conspiracy against Bangla Desh. It will boost the morale of the people, the morale of the defence forces and the morale of the patriots. You must help them to maintain their morale, their revolutionary spirit in spontaneity, and keep the revolutionary mood of the people and of the defence forces alive. These are the most important factors for the success of freedom struggle of Bangla Desh.

You have allowed time to go in favour of Pakistan. We cannot give any more time to Pakistan. Recognise Bangla Desh and that is the only alternative to avoid war with Pakistan. I think even at this late hour, the Government will have that sagacity, the wisdom, to welcome the revolution in Bangla Desh by recognising the People's Republic of Bangla Desh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Do not call by loud voices. I see you are standing. Now, I request the hon. Minister to wait for a few minutes. Shrimati Sheila Kaul.

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL (Lucknow): Mr. Speaker, Sir, once again, the United States has shown itself in its true colours by playing a double role on us. It is a shameful and disgusting act on the part of the United States to allow the ships, *Padma* and *Sunderbans*, to leave their shores, full with the cargo of the United States military equipment for Pakistan. We who have returned from a visit to the refugee camps of Helencha, Basirhat, Salt Lakes, Sahara and a number of other small refugee camps only last night, have seen for ourselves the plight and the sufferings of the East Pakistan refugees. The Government is trying, and has extended as much help as is possible to those refugees. But the trek of the refugees continues. While we were going on the roads, we had to stop the car because we saw so many refugees on the way,—crippled, and some with children in arms. There were many old people also walking along the road. We stopped the car and asked the refugees why they were coming out, because there was not much of a comfort that we could give them. They said that it was better to die in peace than to die every minute in Pakistan. There is terror, brutality, arson and loot in Pakistan.

Mr. Krishna Menon was saying that the refugees should be put to good use. I would like to say that people who are in the education field, like teachers and doctors, have been made use of very much. A daily allowance of Rs. 15 is given to the doctors for attending in the refugee camps.

We condemn the giving of military equipment by the United States to Pakistan. This will perpetuate the miseries and sufferings of the refugees. There are more than six million registered refugees in India, and perhaps a few million unregistered floating refugees.

I cannot understand the rationality of the view expressed in the papers today that India should be duly compensated by land from Pakistan on which the refugees could be settled. The refugees are our guests in distress and we should not bargain. We should see that they return to their homes where they can lead their lives in peace. But just now they are in distress and they know they have got a great friend in India. Everywhere we went they expressed their gratitude to us for taking them in.

I agree with Shri Azad that we should have waited to assess the world opinion. But now we have seen that the world opinion is with us and it is time for action. Is it possible for us to spend hundreds of crores every month for an indefinite period, without jeopardising our plans? The refugees are receiving doles and have also started working in some places on low labour rates. This has started local tension. Before all these problems reach greater dimensions, we must decide and act now, for time and tide wait for no man.

श्री जांबुवंत धोटे (नागपुर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो भी वक्त मुझे दिया गया है उस वक्त के अन्दर मैं तकरीर कर नहीं सकता हूँ इसलिए मैं अपना सारा वक्त, परराष्ट्र मन्त्री जी को, जोकि विदेशों का दौरा करके आये हैं, अपनी और से देना चाहता हूँ, और दे देता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आप कितना टाइम लेना चाहते हैं? आप बोलिए, आपको सुनने के लिए सब का दिल कर रहा है।

श्री जांबुवंत धोटे: अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हमारा देश एक भयानक अवस्था से, एक गम्भीर हालत से गुजर रहा है। हमने जो आजादी हासिल की, असंख्य बलिदानों से हमने जो आजादी हासिल की उस आजादी को हासिल करते ही हमने इस देश को दो खेमों में बाँट दिया। अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवादियों ने और दुनिया के सारे साम्राज्यवादियों ने एक खेल खेला और हमारे देश के दो टुकड़े कर दिए—एक को पाकिस्तान बनाया और दूसरे को भारत बनाया। उसी वक्त

[श्री जांबवंत घोटे]

से इस भारतीय खंड के दो खेमों में एक प्रचण्ड वीचर खड़ी हो गई। ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवादियों का यह जो खेल था उसके शिकार हम उस वक्त थे और आज भी बदकिस्मती से शिकार हो रहे हैं आज भी बदकिस्मती से हम ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवादियों के शिकार हो रहे हैं। आज की हालत आप देख रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान, अमरीका और चाइना—इन तीनों की आइडियोलोजी एक नहीं है। पाकिस्तान की वेस मजहब है, अमरीका एक साम्राज्यवादी देश है और चाइना एक साम्यवादी देश है। ये तीनों देश हमारे खिलाफ पाकिस्तान की तरफ से एक षडयन्त्र रच रहे हैं और उस षडयन्त्र के हम शिकार होने जा रहे हैं। उस भयानक षडयन्त्र के हम शिकार बनते जा रहे हैं। हमारी जो विदेशी नीति है उसके बारे में बहुत कहा जा सकता है और कहा गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आजकल हमारा पड़ोसी देश जो बंगला देश है वह चीख रहा है, चिल्ला रहा है। हमारे पड़ोसी का घर जला दिया जा रहा है, फूंक दिया जा रहा है और उस घर के मासूम बच्चे मून दिए जा रहे हैं, मसल दिए जा रहे हैं, कुचले जा रहे हैं। मां, बहनों की रहमत, असमत लूटी जा रही है, इंसानियत का कत्ले-आम हो रहा है। मां-बहनों पर बलात्कार करके उनके पतियों के सामने चीरा जा रहा है, बच्चों को काटकर उनकी माताओं के ऊपर उछाला जा रहा है, फेंक दिया जा रहा है। बंगला देश हमसे मदद मांग रहा है चीख चीख कर, चिल्ला कर मदद मांग रहा है और हम बिचार कर रहे हैं। हमारी अवस्था बही हैमलट की है, टु बी और नोट टु बी। ऐसी अवस्था से गुजर रहे हैं कि मान्यता दें या न दें। मान्यता देने के पहले हमारे पर-राष्ट्र मंत्री, कई और मंत्री और कई व्यक्ति सारे संसार में घूम रहे हैं, विश्व की यात्रा कर रहे हैं और सारे देशों से कह रहे हैं कि तुम बंगला देश को मान्यता दो। वे राष्ट्र हमसे कह रहे हैं कि बंगला देश तुम्हारा पड़ोसी है, पाकिस्तान भी पड़ोसी देश है, ऐसी अवस्था में बंगला देश

को स्वयं मान्यता देने के बजाय आप हमारे पास आते हो और हमसे मान्यता की बात कहते हो। एक समय था जब बंगला देश को मान्यता देकर जो भी मदद कर सकते थे करते और सारे संसार को बताते कि हमने मान्यता दी है बंगला देश को आजादी के लिए, इंसानियत के लिए हमने उसको मान्यता दी है। उस वक्त संसार के कई देश मान्यता देने के लिए आगे बढ़ते।

जब हमने आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी, नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस जो हमारे देश के ही नहीं वरन संसार के महान सेनापति हुए, जब उन्होंने आजादी की लड़ाई छेड़ी, आजाद हिन्द फौज बनायी और आजाद हिन्द सरकार बनायी उस समय दुनिया के कई देशों ने उस आजाद हिन्द सरकार को मान्यता दी। और आज बंगला देश में वहां के लोगों ने अपने नुमाइन्दों को 98 प्रतिशत वोट देकर चुना, वहां प्रजातन्त्र का निर्माण हुआ उस पर पाकिस्तान का बर्बरतापूर्ण आक्रमण हुआ, फौजी हुकूमत ने आक्रमण किया बंगला देश पर, अब हमारा फर्ज हमारे सामने खड़ा होता है। जिसके बारे में बंगला देश कर के बार-बार हम कहते हैं, वैसे तो शब्दों में हमने मान्यता दी, हमारी सारी प्रोसीडिग्स में और सारे देश में बंगला देश शब्द लगातार आता है, शब्दों से मान्यता देदी, अब हमको कृति से मान्यता देनी है। पड़ोसी का घर जलाया जाता हो उस वक्त बाहर के देशों में जाकर हम कहें कि फायर ब्रिगेड भेजिये तो इससे काम नहीं चलेगा। फायर ब्रिगेड हमारे पास ही है। हमारी जो अपनी शक्ति है, ताकत है उसके अनुसार बंगला देश को सहायता करना यह हमारा फर्ज है।

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून की बात की जाती है। बाहर जब भी ऐसी अवस्था संसार में हुई उस वक्त क्या हुआ? प्रिस सिहानुक कम्बोडिया से बाहर गये, वहां से भाग गये, एक क्रान्तिकारी सरकार वहां बनी, सिहानुक साहब चीन भागे और उस वक्त उनका राज्य नहीं था, लेकिन जब चीन में गबे थे, तो उनको चीन और रूस ने मान्यता दी, यद्यपि उनका राज्य उस समय

नहीं था। इसी प्रकार अल्जीरिया के बारे में भी हुआ। तो कम्बोडिया और अल्जीरिया के सवाल पर सारे राष्ट्रों ने मान्यता दी। लेकिन हम मान्यता देने से हिचकिचा रहे हैं। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कानून जो है, ये सारे अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कानून और सारे कन्वेंशन बंगला देश को हमें मान्यता देनी चाहिए, इसके लिए हमारे पीछे पड़े हैं। ऐसे वक्त भी हम हिचकिचाते हुए पीछे हटते हैं। एक बात मैं समझता हूँ कि विश्व युद्ध का खतरा खड़ा है हमारे सामने। सारे पश्चिमी राष्ट्र, यूरोपियन कंट्रीज खास तौर से विश्व का महायुद्ध इस संसार में हुआ तो उसकी युद्ध भूमि हमारा भारत देश होना चाहिए, इसके लिए सोच रहे हैं, इसके लिए विचार कर रहे हैं। हो सकता है कि ऐसी अवस्था में तीसरा महायुद्ध भी छेड़ा जाए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा कहना इतना ही है कि आज बंगला देश को मान्यता देने के अलावा हमारे पास दूसरा कोई रास्ता नहीं है, बंगला देश को सहायता देने के अलावा हमारे पास कोई और चारा नहीं है। हम बंगला देश को मान्यता न दें तो भी पाकिस्तान हमारा दोस्त हो सकता है क्या? यह सवाल है। हम बंगला देश को मान्यता न दें तो अमेरिका और चीन हमारे मित्र नहीं हो सकते। इसलिए बंगला देश को मान्यता देकर दुनिया का जो बहुत बड़ा खेमा है, उसको हम मित्र बना लें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, कमी न कमी राष्ट्र को अपने जीवन में रिस्क उठाना ही होगा। हमारे देश को एक रिस्क उठाना है। कमी न कमी राष्ट्र को रिस्क उठाना होता है। यदि राष्ट्र ने यह रिस्क नहीं उठाया तो इतिहास और तबारीख उस राष्ट्र को कभी क्षमा नहीं करते, कमी माफ नहीं करते। ऐसी अवस्था में युद्ध का वक्त भी आये तो भी हमें उसके लिए तैयार रहना चाहिए।

आज सवाल सिर्फ मान्यता देने का है, आज सवाल सिर्फ बंगला देश को मान्यता देने का है। हम बंगला देश को मान्यता दें। हम युद्ध नहीं

करना चाहते हैं, हम शान्तिवादी हैं। हम महात्मा गांधी का नाम लेते हैं। लेकिन बंगला देश को मान्यता देने से यदि हमारे ऊपर युद्ध लाद दिया जाता है तो हमारे देश को युद्ध के लिए भी तैयार होना चाहिये। नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस ने इस देश को सिखलाया है। नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस की आजाद हिन्द सेना को और आजाद हिन्द सरकार को उस वक्त भी संसार के कई देशों ने मान्यता दी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हमारी जो इस देश की नेता हैं, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी, उनमें हम नेताजी की तस्वीर देखना चाहते हैं। हम देश की प्रधान मन्त्री में नेताजी की तस्वीर देखना चाहते हैं, हम उनमें झांसी की रानी देखना चाहते हैं और जब वह नेताजी बनकर, झांसी की रानी बनकर आगे आयेंगी तो सारे ही पक्ष, सारे ही दल, इस देश की सारी जनता उनके पीछे बढ़ेगी, उनका साथ देगी, बलिदान देगी। इस वक्त बंगला देश को मान्यता देने के सिवाय हमारे पास कोई चारा नहीं है। जितना भी वक्त होगा, खतरा बढ़ेगा, जितना भी वक्त जायगा उतना ही हम खतरे में पड़ जायेंगे। चाइना, अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान हमारे खिलाफ षडयंत्र करते जायेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इसलिए बंगला देश को मान्यता देकर, उसको हर प्रकार की सहायता देकर, सैनिक सहायता देकर ही हम इस षडयंत्र से बाहर निकल सकते हैं अन्यथा हमारे सामने कोई मार्ग नहीं है। कोई रास्ता नहीं है, हमारी सारी अर्थ व्यवस्था का ढांचा खोखला हो रहा है, टूट रहा है।

SHRI AHMED AGA (Baramulla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not a pessimist. I am not an over optimist either. I believe in realism and I, therefore, believe and advocate that there must be a proper understanding of the issue and a proper appraisal because only then we can take a very correct attitude.

The point that I want to make is that we are told that there is a free world and that

[Shri Ahmed Aga]

free world wants others also who are yet not committed otherwise to be a part of the free world. But I doubt it. There is a third world. I have grave doubts if the free world has ever tried to bring in to their fold any country in the third world.

If we see what has happened in the third world during all these years, we find that they have created a sort of an ulcer in the form of Israel in the Arab world. They created Vietnam problem by putting up a puppet government in South Vietnam. They have always tried to create trouble in the third world and not allow us to develop.

Even in Pakistan, after the partition of the country, they did not allow democracy to grow. They installed Iskander Mirza who was a bureaucrat and through him they brought in Ayub and then came Yahya Khan. Pakistan has never seen democracy. They have yet to know what democracy is. Therefore I do not believe that we can depend much on their assistance or support who call themselves free world.

I can understand that the Foreign Minister's tour did create a sort of awareness in the countries which he visited about the magnitude of the problem. But even so I find that only the Acting Prime Minister of Canada talked of a political settlement with the elected representatives. I find that the USA is not withholding economic aid pending a political solution in Pakistan and the Consortium did not adopt the position that it should withhold aid for political reasons. Talking about Britain, on 23rd the British Information Service says:

"Her Majesty's Government's policy remains that projects already in hand in Pakistan must continue in so far as this is possible."

All these things indicate that they are not very serious so far as our troubles are concerned and we must, therefore, rely upon our own efforts and on our own selves for going ahead and for solving the problems that face us.

Bangla Desh will have to face its own problems and pursue its own fight for its libe a-

tion. That fight, we have to understand, as we are told and as we understand, is a quarrel between East Pakistan known now as Bangla Desh and West Pakistan. But in West Pakistan I would limit it to the military regime of West Pakistan because I do not think that West Pakistan is actually fighting East Pakistan. It was the Ayub military dictatorship and the Yahya military regime now which are trying to crush them.

We had elections in Ceylon, India and Pakistan. In all these three elections the people's mandate was for development and progress. We have a democratic government; we followed the mandate of the people and set up a government like that. In Ceylon the same thing has happened. But in Pakistan the Yahya regime did not want the people's government to come into power. Yahya's regime is also a puppet in the hands of those who call themselves the free world, in the same manner as they have in South Vietnam.

Therefore I say that this is a fight that Bangla Desh has got to do without hoping for any assistance coming from those countries which call themselves the free world. It is true that we are also faced with 6 million war evacuees—I do not call them refugees because their country is Bangla Desh—and they have got to return to Bangla Desh. But before they return we have got to ensure that there is a political solution.

Here I might again refer to the statement of the British Information Service. I do not find anywhere that, even after he talked with the Foreign Minister, it talks about a political solution. The only talk about political settlement was of the Canadian Vice Premier.

I would again say that for these reasons it is difficult to rely on them. Now, I am reminded that only a few months ago, about 4-5 months ago, when we were fighting for elections, that I read in papers that Prof. Scot Nearing came to India and he said that the American policy was that Asians must fight Asians. I think, it is very true. They have always tried that we must keep on fighting each other, thereby going on weakening ourselves.

Again, going to the question of Bengla Desh, I would like to point out how misunder-

standing is created. I find that Biharis were not treated well there. Why? They did not want that Indian Muslims should have any sympathy with Muslims in Bangla Desh. These are things by which Yahyas intended to create a sort of trouble over here.

There is an opinion here that in the Arab world also, there has not been much of response to the movement of Bangla Desh. I would like to give an instance of Jordan who is receiving help from the NATO countries to crush the Palestine freedom fighters. Even the Arab countries are divided. Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Turkey and Iran are in the camp of CENTO powers. It is only Iraq, Syria and Libya who are actually fighting the Israelis. Turkey and Iran are supplying oil to Israel. So, we cannot say that there is anything like Muslim about this question. There is an attempt that there is something Muslim about it. There is nothing Muslim about it. This is the point I would like to make with all emphasis at my command. There is nothing Muslim about it. Therefore, I say, when Biharis were thrown out here, there was a misunderstanding about it. Majlis-e-Mushawarat and Janate-Islam are supporting Yahya Khan. They do not represent anybody. I may also add for that matter what Mr. Baburao Patel who was a Member of the Lok Sabha says in *Mother India*:

"His 'rebellion'

—that is. Mujibur Rahman's—

"... is rightly described by General Yahya Khan as 'treason'. . . Mujib is a traitor to Pakistan. . . "

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

SHRI AHMED AGA: An attempt is being made that there is anything Muslim about it. I emphatically say that there is nothing Muslim about it. We have been having democratic system here. We support Bangla Desh. Why? Not because of any other reason. But because they are now coming to a sort of democratic system of Government. Mujibur Rahman and others whoever are elected are going to have a democratic set-up. Therefore, I support Bangla Desh because, I feel, if Bangla Desh becomes a

democratic country, it is possible that West Pakistan may be able to have democracy in that part of Pakistan. With these words, I support Bangla Desh movement which is fighting for democracy and progress.

श्री एन० एम० हाशिम (सिकन्दराबाद) :
जनाबे सदर, मैं हाउस के सामने इन दुनियाबी नुकात को रखना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर जब हम बंगला देश की इतनी बात करते हैं, उसके बारे में इतना बहस-मुबाहसा करते हैं, तो उसके पीछे मकसद क्या है या जब हमारे फ़ारेन मिनिस्टर साहब बंगला देश के बारे में दूसरे मुल्कों में तशरीफ़ ले जाते हैं, तो उसका मकसद क्या है—इन सब बातों का क्या मकसद है। हम जानते हैं कि बंगला देश के अवाम हमारी तरफ़ इस-लिए देख रहे हैं कि उनके सामने वह लड़ाई है, जो हम ने इस मुल्क में जम्हूरियत को एस्टाब्लिश करने के लिए अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ़ लड़ी। इसी वजह से वे हमारी तरफ़ मैग्नाटाइज होते हैं। वे समझते हैं कि जिस तरह हम अपनी लड़ाई में कामयाब रहे, उसी तरह वे भी हमारी मदद से अबूब और याहिया के खिलाफ़ लड़ाई में आज नहीं तो कल जरूर कामयाब होंगे। असल से बंगला देश में लड़ाई वहाँ पर जम्हूरियत को ज़िन्दा रखने के लिए है।

जहाँ तक दूसरे मुल्कों के रुख़ का सवाल है, दुनिया के सब मुल्कों की नज़र अपने अपने वेस्टिड इन्ट्रेस्ट्स पर है। उन मुल्कों को यह याद रखना चाहिए कि बंगला देश में जो लोग बाकायदा इलेक्शन कनस्टेस्ट कर के मैजोरिटी में आये, जिनको वहाँ पर हुकूमत बनाने का हक़ मिला, अगर उनको जेल में डाल कर वहाँ पर जम्हूरियत का गला घोट्टा जायेगा, तो फिर दुनिया में हर जगह ऐसे ही बाक़यात रिपीट होंगे। आज बंगला देश में जो हालात हैं, हकीकत में उनका फ़ायदा डायरेक्टली या इन्डायरेक्टली सिर्फ़ चाइना को हो रहा है। अगर यही हालात जारी रहे, तो चाइना को दखल-अन्दाज़ी करने का मौका मिलेगा, जो कि दुनिया के तमाम मुल्कों के लिए एक खतरनाक बात होगी।

[श्री एम० एम० हाशिम]

अगर अमरीका पाकिस्तान को हथियारों के शिपमेंट्स भेजता रहेगा, तो वे हथियार बंगला देश के लोगों को कुचलने के लिए काम में लाये जायेंगे। आज याहियाखां साहब वहां पर एक सरकार को इनस्टाल करने वाले हैं। वह सरकार अजीबो-गरीब होगी। आप जानते हैं कि हमारे रिजन में भी इसी तरीके से एक डिपुटी चीफ़ मिनिस्टर को इनस्टाल कर दिया गया, जब कि हम लोग राजमुन्दरी जेल में थे। आज जब मुजीबुल-रहमान जेल में हैं, बंगला देश में बन्दूक और बेयनेट का डर दिखा कर एक सरकार इनस्टाल करने की कोशिश की जायेगी। अगर हम इस मौके पर हैसिटेट करेंगे, तो दुनिया के इस हिस्से में केओस पैदा हो जायेंगे, जिनका फ़ायदा चाहना उठायेंगा।

आज से दो दिन पहले मैंने अखबारों में पढ़ा कि इक्कीस अरब मुमालिक ने यह तय किया है कि बंगला देश के वाकयात पाकिस्तान का इन्टर्नल मैटर है, जिस में किसी को दखल नहीं देना चाहिए। हमें जो कागजात मिले हैं, उनसे पता चलता है कि फ़ारेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने दूसरे मुल्कों का जो दौरा किया, वह एक अनआफ़िशल विजिट थी। उन्होंने मास्को में कई मामलों में बातचीत की। वहां पर जो बयान जारी किया गया, उसमें पांच छः बातों के बाद अख़िर में हम बदनसीबों का भी जिक्र आता है और वह इन्फ़्लक्स आफ़ रेफ़्यूजीज के बारे में है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जब हमारे मुल्क के इतने बड़े मन्त्री किसी दूसरे मुल्क में गये, तो उनके सामने दो बातें रहनी चाहिए थीं: एक तो यह कि पाकिस्तान पर किस तरह प्रेशर डाला जाये कि वह रेफ़्यूजीज को वापिस ले और बंगला देश में पोलिटिकल सेटलमेंट के लिए तैयार हो और दूसरी यह कि अगर पाकिस्तान को हमारे साथ कन्फ़ंटेशन हो, तो वह मुल्क क्या रूख अख्तियार करेगा, क्या उसकी डबल गेम रहेगी। लेकिन ये दो बातें सामने नहीं आईं। सिर्फ़ फ्रेंडशिप और कार्डियेलिटी की बातें

की गईं। क्या इसके लिए मिनिस्टर साहब इतनी दूर गये? चाहिए तो यह था कि पूरे वर्ल्ड की ओपीनियन को मोबालाइज किया जाता कि बंगला देश के लोगों पर क्या जुल्म हो रहे हैं, वहां पर औरतों को रेप किया जा रहा है, उनके बच्चों को हवा में उछाल कर बेयनेट्स से मारा जाता रहा है, वहां पर जेनोसाइड हो रहा है। लेकिन इन बातों का कोई तज़क़िरा नहीं किया गया है। सिर्फ़ पोलिटिकल सेटलमेंट की बात कही गई है।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जिन लोगों के घर उजाड़ कर, जिनको तबाह और बर्बाद कर के इस मुल्क में भेजा गया है, जिनको इस बात का डर है कि अगर वे वापिस गये, तो उनको क़त्ल कर दिया जायेगा, यह हुक्म त किस किस का सेटलमेंट कर के उन्हें वापिस बंगला देश भेजना चाहती है। वे तो दस जन्म भी बंगला देश की तरफ़ मुंह नहीं करेंगे। हां, अगर उन लोगों के हीरो को आज़ाद कराया जाये, जिस के झंडे के नीचे उन लोगों ने इलेक्शन लड़ा, जम्हूरियत और सेकुलरिज्म को जिन्दा रखा और टूनेशन ध्युरी को दफ़न कर दिया, और उसकी राय से वहां कोई फ़ैसला हो, तो उसको पोलिटिकल सेटलमेंट कहा जा सकता है।

एक तरफ़ आज अमेरिका की सरकार से पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिए जा रहे हैं, और दूसरी जो इस तरह की बातें हो रही हैं उनको कंडेम करना चाहिए। मगर साथ साथ हम यह भी अखबारों में पढ़ते हैं कि सिनेटर फ़ुल ब्राइट, सिनेटर विलियम और दूसरे और भी फारेन कमेटी के लोग हैं वह सारे के सारे वहां बलबा कर रहे हैं, पुकार कर रहे हैं, दुनिया भर की चीजें कर रहे हैं और रेजोल्यूशन ला रहे हैं, मैं दरियाफ़्त करना चाहता हूं अपने फारेन मिनिस्टर से कि क्या हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर इन सारे लोगों से भी मिले, क्या हमारे एम्बेसेडर साहब ने इनको भी बुला कर कोई ऐसी मुलाकाती बात इनसे की ताकि वहां की पब्लिक ओपीनियन मोबालाइज हो सकती। हो सकता है कि हमारे

फारेन मिनिस्टर की जबान वह न समझ सके हों क्योंकि वह बहुत बड़े लोग हैं, एक तरफ इस तरह की बातें करते हैं दूसरी तरफ हथियार देते हैं, डबल गेम खेलते हैं और हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब सीधे सादे हैं। तो कम से कम जो उनकी आवाज को जानते थे, जो सिनेटर उस डबल गेम को समझते थे, कम से कम उनको बुलाते और उनसे कहते कि हम सीधे सादे हैं, हम दयानतदारी करते हैं। पाकिस्तान अरब मुमालिक में जाकर कहीं किसी को कुछ बोलता है किसी को कुछ बोलता है। कहीं सरदार जी का नाम लेकर कुछ कहता है, कहीं वाजपेयी जी का नाम लेकर कुछ कर लेता है, कहीं हाशिम का नाम लेकर कुछ कर लेता है। अपना उल्लू सीधा करता है। हम साफ बोलते हैं, हम ने हंथी के वक्त भी आवाज उठाई थी, हम ने नार्थ कोरिया के वक्त भी आवाज उठाई थी, जब जब सच्चाई का सवाल आया हमने आवाज उठाई। मगर हम जानते हैं कि यह इम्पीरियलिस्ट पावर्स हम को काश्मीर के ईश्यू पर उलझा कर रखे हुए हैं, झगड़े में डाले हुए हैं। अगर आज बंगला देश के अवाम जो जम्हूरी हक्क के लिए लड़ रहे हैं उनको रेकग्नाइज करने में हम देर करेंगे तो जैसा कि हमारे साथी ने कहा हम को हमेशा हमेशा के लिए पछताना पड़ेगा। हमारे जबानी बात करने से और क्रोकोडाइल टीयर्स बहाने से कोई मसला हल नहीं होने वाला है। आज हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा, हर जाति पांति का आदमी वहां जाने को तैयार है।

दूसरी चीज में बताना चाहता हूं कि सारे अरब कंट्रीज में मैं चाहता हूं कि सारे लोग यहां से जाकर यहां की हालत बताएं कि यहां हिन्दु मुसलमान का सवाल नहीं है। यहां जम्हूरियत किस तरह परवान पा रही है। आप के पास तो खाली तवारिख होगी। मगर यहां इस सेक्युलरिज्म में जम्हूरियत फूल रही है, फल रही है, सुबह की अजान से लेकर ईशां की मगरिब की अजान यहां होती है, हर तरह की मजहबी आजादी है। इन सारी चीजों के बावजूद आप

हमको और उनको कैसे डिफरेंशिएट कर सकते हैं और क्यों आप इस तरह का प्रोपेगेंडा करके उन लोगों को हमसे दूर करना चाहते हैं? यह उन लोगों को बताना चाहिए और हर तरीके का नजारा पेश करना चाहिए कि लोग यहां किस तरह से जिन्दगी गुजार रहे हैं। उसके बजाय दूसरा नक्शा वहां पेश हो रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान को खत्म करना चाहता है। यह हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान का सवाल नहीं है। यह सवाल एक ही है कि यह जम्हूरियत की लड़ाई है। जम्हूरियत को जिन्दा रखने के लिए हम उठे हैं और बराबर जम्हूरियत को हम जिन्दा रखेंगे।

[شری ایم ایم حاشم (سکندرآباد) -
جملاب صدر - میں ہاوس کے سامنے ان
بلیانڈ نکات کو رکھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ
آخر جب ہم بنگلہ دیش کی اتلی بات
کرتے ہوں - اُسکے بارے میں اتنا بھس
مباحثہ کرتے ہیں تو اُسکے پیچھے مقصد
کہا ہے - یا جب ہمارے فارین منسٹر
صاحب بنگلہ دیش کے بارے میں دوسرے
ملکوں میں تشریف لے جاتے ہیں تو
اسکا مقصد کیا ہے - ان سب باتوں کا
مقصد کیا ہے - ہم جانتے ہیں کہ بنگلہ دیش
کے عوام ہماری طرف اس لئے دیکھ رہے
ہیں کہ اُنکے سامنے وہ لڑائی ہے جو
ہم نے اس ملک میں جمہوریت کو
استاپہش کرنے کے لئے اگریزوں کے خلاف
لڑی - اِس وجہ سے وہ ہماری طرف
میکلائٹا ہوتے ہیں - وہ سمجھتے
ہیں کہ جس طرح ہم اپنی لڑائی میں
کامیاب رہے - اس طرح وہ ہماری مدد
سے ایوب اور یاحیا کے خلاف لڑائی میں
آج نہیں تو کل ضرور کامیاب ہونگے
اصل میں بنگلہ دیش میں لڑائی وہاں
پر جمہوریت کو زندہ رکھنے کے لئے ہے -

جہاں تک دوسرے ملکوں کے رخ کا
سوال ہے - دنیا کے سب ملکوں کی نظر
اپنے اپنے ویسٹو انٹریسٹ پر ہے - اُن

[شری ایم ایم حاشم]

ملکوں کو یہ یاد رکھنا چاہیئے۔ کہ بلڈلا دیس میں جو لوگ ہاتھ باندھ، الیکشن کونٹریکٹ کر کے میچوٹی میں آئے۔ جنکو وہاں پر حکومت بدلنے کا حق ملا۔ اگر انکو جیل میں ڈال کر وہاں پر جمہوریت کا گلا گھونٹنا جائیگا تو پھر دنیا میں ہر جگہ ایسے ہی واقعات دیکھتے ہونگے۔ آج بلڈلا دیس میں جو حالات ہے۔ حقیقت میں انکا فائدہ ڈاریکٹری یا انڈاریکٹری صرف چائینا کو ہی رہا ہے۔ اگر یہی حالات جاری رہی تو چائینا کو دخل اندازی کا موقعہ ملےگا۔ جو کہ دنیا کے تمام ملکوں کے لئے ایک خطرناک بات ہوگی۔

اگر امریکہ پاکستان کو ہتھیاروں کے سہولتیں بھیجتا رہےگا۔ تو وہ ہتھیار بلڈلا دیس کے لوگوں کو کچلنے کے لئے کام میں لائے جائیں گے۔ آج یاہیا خاں صاحب وہاں پر ایک سرکار کو انستال کرنے والے ہیں۔ وہ سرکار عجیب و غریب ہو گئی۔ آپ جانتے ہیں کہ ہمارے ریجن میں بھی اس طریقے سے ایک ڈپٹی چیف منسٹر کو انستال کر دیا گیا۔ جبکہ ہم لوگ راج مندری جیل میں تھے۔ آج جب مجھے اللہ مہمان جیل میں ہیں۔ بلڈلا دیس میں بلندق اور بھلت کا قہر دیکھا کہ ایک سرکار انستال کرنے کی کوشش کی جائے گی۔ اگر ہم اس موقع پر ہیجیٹیٹ کر ڈیے۔ تو دنیا کے اس حصے میں کونسل پیدا ہو جائیگا۔

جن کا فائدہ چائینا اٹھائے گا۔

آج سے دو دن پہلے میں نے اخباروں میں پڑھا۔ کہ ایکس (۲۱) مہرب مسالک نے یہ طے کیا کہ بلڈلا دیس کے واقعات پاکستان کا انٹرنل سیکرٹری جس میں کسی کو دخل نہیں دینا چاہیئے۔

میں جو کافزات ملے ہیں ان سے پتہ چلتا ہے کہ فارن منسٹر صاحب نے دوسرے ملکوں کا جو دورا کیا وہ ایک ان آفیشل وزٹ تھا۔ انہوں نے ماسکو میں کئی معاملوں پر بات چیت کی۔ وہاں پر جو بیان جاری کیا گیا اس میں پانچ چھ باتوں کے بعد آخر میں ہم بدتصو کا بھی ذکر آتا ہے۔ اور وہ انڈیکس آف ریفریجسز کے بارے میں ہے۔ میں کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک کے اتنے بڑے ملکی کسی دوسرے ملک میں گئے تو انکے سامنے وہ باتیں دینی چاہئے تھیں۔ ایک تو یہ کہ پاکستان پر کس طرح پریشر ڈالا جائے کہ وہ ریفریجسز کو واپس لے اور بلڈلا دیس میں پولیٹیکل سیکرٹری کے لئے تیار ہو اور دوسرے یہ کہ اگر پاکستان کو ہمارے ساتھ کانفرنس ہو تو وہ ملک کیا رخ اختیار کرے گا۔ کیا اس کا قبل ہم دیکھ سکتے ہیں۔ لیکن یہ دو باتیں سامنے نہیں آئیں۔ صرف فریڈ شپ اور کارپوریٹ کی باتیں کی گئیں۔ کیا اس کے لئے منسٹر صاحب اتنی دور گئے۔ چاہئے تو تھا کہ پورے ورلڈ کی آپیلیشن کو موبلائز کیا جاتا کہ بلڈلا دیس کے لوگوں پر کیا ظلم ہو رہے ہیں وہاں پر صورتوں کو ریپ کیا جا رہا ہے۔ ان کے بچوں کو ہرا رہا ہے۔ اچھال کر بیلٹس سے مارا جا رہا ہے۔ وہاں پر جیلو سائیڈ ہو رہا ہے۔ لیکن ان باتوں کا کوئی ذکر نہیں کیا گیا ہے صرف پالیٹیکل سیکرٹری کی بات کہی گئی ہے۔

میں پوچھتا چاہتا ہوں کہ جن لوگوں کے گھر آج کل کو جلا تباہ اور برباد کر کے اس ملک میں بھیجا گیا ہے۔ جنکو اس بات کا ڈر ہے۔ کہ وہ واپس گئے تو ان کو قتل کر دیا جائیگا۔ یہ حکومت کس قسم کی سیکرٹری کے لئے ہے۔ واپس بلڈلا دیس بھیجتا چاہتی ہے۔ وہ تو دس جمل بھی بلڈلا دیس کی

طرف ملہم نہیں کرینگے - ہاں اگر اُن لوگوں کے ہیرو کو آزاد کرایا جائے جس کے چھلنے کے نیچے اُن لوگوں نے الیکشن لڑا - جمہوریت اور سیکلوریزم کو زندہ رکھا - اور دو نشن تھوڑی کو دفن کر دیا - اور اس کی رائے سے وہاں کوئی فیصلہ ہو تو اس کو کوئی پالیٹیکل سہیلمنٹ کہا جا سکتا ہے -

ایک طرف آج امریکہ کی سرکار سے پاکستان کو ہتھیار دئے جا رہے ہیں اور دوسری چو اس طرح کی باتیں ہو رہی ہیں اُن کو کفہم کرنا چاہیئے - مگر ساتھ ساتھ ہم یہ بھی اخباروں میں پڑتے ہیں سلیٹر پھول برائیت، سلیٹر ولیم - اور دوسرے اور بہن فارا کمیٹی کے لوگ ہیں وہ سارے کے سارے وہاں بلوا کر رہے ہیں - پکار کر رہے ہیں - دنیا بھر کی چیزیں کر رہے ہیں - اور ریزو لیوشن لا رہے ہیں - میں دریافت کرنا

چاہتا ہوں آپ فارن ملہسٹر سے کہ کیا ہمارے فارن ملہسٹر اُن سارے لوگوں سے بھی ملے کیا ہمارے امپیسٹر صاحب نے اُن کو بھی بلا کر کوئی ایسی ملاقاتی بات اُن سے کی تاکہ وہاں کی پبلک آپہلین موویلٹیز ہو سکتی - ہو سکتا ہے کہ ہمارے فارن ملہسٹر کی زبان وہ نہ سمجھ سکے ہوں کیونکہ وہ بہت بڑے لوگ ہیں - ایک طرف اس طرح کی باتیں کرتے ہوں دوسری طرف ہتھیار دیتے ہیں - ذیل گیم کھیلتے ہیں - اور ہمارے فارن ملہسٹر صاحب سیدھے سادھے ہیں تو کم سے کم جو اُن کی آواز کو جانتے تھے - جو سلیٹر اس ذیل گیم کو سمجھتے تھے - کم سے کم اُن کو بلاتے اور اُن سے کہتے کہ ہم سیدھے سادھے ہیں - ہم دیانت داری کرتے ہیں - پاکستان عرب ممالک میں جا کر کھیں کسی کو کچھ بولتا ہے کسی کو کوچہ بولتا ہے - کہیں سردار جی کا نام لہکر کچھ کہتا ہے - کہیں راجہائی جی کا

نام لہکر کچھ کر لیتا ہے - کہیں ہاشم کا نام لہکر کچھ کر لیتا ہے - ایسا آلو سیدھا کرتا ہے - ہم صاف بولتے ہیں - ہم نے ہلگری کے وقت بھی آواز اُٹھائی تھی - ہم نے ناروتھ کوری کے وقت بھی آواز اُٹھائی تھی - جب جب سچائی کا سوال آیا ہے ہم نے آواز اُٹھائی - مگر ہم جانتے ہیں کہ یہ امپیرلیسٹ پاروز ہم کو کشمیر کے ایشو پر اُلجھا کر رکھے ہوئے ہیں - جھگڑے میں ڈالے ہوئے ہیں - اگر آج بڈلا دیس کی عوام جو جمہوری حقوق کے لئے لڑ رہے ہیں - اُن کو ریگنگٹھ کرنے میں ہم دیر کرینگے تو جیسا کہ ہمارے ساتھی نے کہا ہم کو ہمیشہ ہمیشہ کے لئے پچھتانا پڑیگا - ہمارے زبانی بات کرنے سے اور کروڈائیل ٹھہر بھانے سے کوئی مسئلہ حل نہیں ہونے والا ہے - آج ہندوستان کا بچہ بچہ ہر جاتی پاتی کا آدمی وہاں جانے کو تیار ہے -

دوسری چیز میں بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ سارے عرب کلتوریز میں - میں چاہتا ہوں کہ سارے لوگ یہاں سے جا کر اُن کو حالات بتائیں کہ یہاں پر ہندو مسلمان کا سوال نہیں ہے - یہاں جمہوریت کس طرح پوراں پا رہی ہے - آپ کے پاس خالی تاریخ ہوگی - مگر یہاں اس سیکولہزم میں جمہوریت پھول رہی ہے - پھل رہی ہے - صبح کی آذان سے لے کر عشان کی مغرب کی آذان یہاں ہوتی ہے - ہر طرح کی مزہبی آزادی ہے - اُن ساری چیزوں کے باوجود آپ ہم کو اور اُن کو کہیں ڈفرینسٹ کر سکتے ہیں - اور کہوں آپ اس طرح کا پزایہ کھڈا کو کے اُن لوگوں کو ہم سے دور کرنا چاہتے ہیں - یہ اُن لوگوں کو بتانا چاہیئے - اور ہر طریقہ کا نظارہ پیش کرنا چاہیئے - کہ لوگ یہاں کس طرح زندگی گزار رہے ہیں - اس کی بجائے دوسرا نقشہ وہاں پیش ہو رہا ہے - کہ ہندوستان پاکستان کو ختم کرنا

[شری ایم ایم حاشم]

چاہتا ہے - یہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان
کا سوال نہیں ہے - یہ سوال ابی ہی
ہے - کہ یہ جمہوریت کی لڑائی ہے -
جمہوریت کو زندہ رکھنے کے لئے ہم آگے
ہیں - اور برابر جمہوریت کو ہم زندہ
رکھنے -]

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA (Maharajganj):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister has repeatedly stated that she wants to stop the exodus of refugees and to make the land of Bangla Desh safe for the return of the refugees to their homes. So far, she has been hoping to achieve this by trying to move the world conscience to assert itself so that the big powers may bring pressure on Yahya Khan to change his ways. She sent her Foreign Minister, Mr. Swaran Singh and other Ministers to various world capitals. They have done useful work. But, I am sorry that they have not succeeded in achieving the purpose for which they were sent. The American Government has not been moved at all and they are still supplying arms to Pakistan and they are saying that they will not stop economic aid to Pakistan. There is thus no change of Yahya Khan being forced to stop genocide by any persuasion.

What then is the alternative? The only alternative is this. If you want to stop the genocide, if you want to send back the refugees, if you want to make their return safe, you will have to send your troops on a mission of mercy to East Pakistan. There is no other alternative. You must not be afraid of it. If you had done this in the week following the 25th of March, the course of history would have been different.

At that time, all the international journalists had been brutally expelled from Dacca and had told the world harrowing tales about the genocide in Pakistan and that about a million people had been killed in cold blood in the very first week. At that time, if we had recognised Bangla Desh and sent our troops on a mission of mercy, the entire situation would have been different today. Even now the only possible course is to immediately recognise Bangla Desh and send our troops on a mission of mercy. Also there

are thousands and thousands of refugees here, young men, patriotic and ready to fight for their country. We should train them in the use of arms and equip them with arms to enable them to get back to their country to fight for their freedom. Then they can go back to their homes without fear and do what they should do. These are my suggestions which I hope Government will consider.

श्री रामदेव सिंह (महाराजगंज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी वैदेशिक मंत्री विदेशों में घूम कर आये हैं। मैं न्यूयार्क टाइम्स को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ, वह अगर दुनिया के सामने इस रहस्य का उद्घाटन नहीं करता तो दुनिया को पता ही नहीं चलता कि पूँजीवादी सरकारों का चरित्र क्या होता है। एक तरफ हमारे वैदेशिक मंत्री से हाथ मिलाया, बातों की ओर वे भी प्रसन्न होकर वापस आये, दूसरी ओर पाकिस्तान को हथियार भेज कर उन सिद्धान्तों की हत्या की, जिन सिद्धान्तों की दुहाई अमरीका देता है। यह कोई आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है—दुनिया के पूँजीवादी देशों का यही चरित्र होता है, जो अमरीका दिखा रहा है, दुनिया के सामने प्रदर्शन कर रहा है।

हम इस बात को आज मानते हैं कि हम आज दुनिया के राष्ट्रों को प्रभावित नहीं कर सके, उन्हें जगा नहीं सके, बंगला देश के पथ में उन की भावनाओं को जगाने में हमारी सरकार असमर्थ रही है। हमने उस दिन कहा था, जिस दिन हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने बिरोधी दल के नेताओं को बुलाया था, हमने सुझाव दिया था और बाजपेयी जी ने भी सुझाव दिया था कि शरणार्थियों की जो बहुत बड़ी संख्या आ रही है, उसको आने दें, लेकिन उन नौजवानों, उन छात्रों, उन लोगों को जो अपने देश के लिये लड़ने के वास्ते तैयार हैं, उनको हथियार दीजिये, हर साधनों से सुसज्जित कर के, उन्हें वापस भेजिये ताकि वे अपने देश की आज़ादी की लड़ाई में लड़ सकें। लेकिन आपने ऐसा नहीं किया। आज तक भारत सरकार का बंगला देश के बारे में क्या स्टैंड है—यह समझने में पूरा देश असमर्थ है, समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि भारत

सरकार बंगला देश के बारे में क्या करना चाहती है ।

हमारे वैदेशिक मंत्री दुनिया के राष्ट्रों में घूमे, रिफ्यूजीज आ रहे हैं, हमारे ऊपर बोझ पड़ रहा है, बस इतनी चर्चा उन्होंने की, पैसा मांगा, हमारी सहायता कीजिये । लेकिन बंगला देश में जो नर हत्या हो रही है, याहिया खां का जो नर संहार चल रहा है, उसको बंद कराने के लिये क्या दुनिया के राष्ट्रों की कोई आवाज उठी है ? रूस अकेले अगर चाहता तो पाकिस्तान को मजबूर कर सकता था, अमरीका चाहता तो पाकिस्तान को मजबूर कर सकता था, लेकिन आज दुनिया का कोई भी राष्ट्र आगे बढ़ कर उस नरसंहार को बन्द कराने के लिये मजबूत आवाज भी नहीं उठा रहा है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि जब इतिहास याह्या खां पर इसके लिये दोष डालेगा, तो यह दोष इस सरकार पर भी डालेगा । एक तरफ याह्या खां नर संहार कर रहा था, दूसरी तरफ हम तमाशबीन बन कर तमाशा देख रहे थे, कुछ कर नहीं सके । अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप पुराने स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम के सेनानी रहे हैं । गांधी जी ने जब 1942 में करो या मरो का आन्दोलन छेड़ा, उस समय पत्रकारों ने उनसे पूछा—एक तरफ जापान इधर आ रहा है, दुनिया में युद्ध छिड़ा हुआ है, दूसरी तरफ आप स्वाधीनता का बिगुल बजाने जा रहे हैं, इसका क्या नतीजा होगा, क्या आप अन्दाज करते हैं ? गांधी जी ने कहा—मैं सब कुछ बरदाश्त कर सकता हूँ, मैं हिन्दुस्तान को खून में देख सकता हूँ, लेकिन अब मैं इस देश में अंग्रेजी साम्राज्य को बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकता हूँ । इस तरह से आज हमारे विदेश मंत्री, प्रधान मंत्री और भारत सरकार को आगे बढ़ कर कह देना चाहिए कि हम इस देश को हमशान के घाट पर ले जा सकते हैं, विनाश के कगार पर खड़ा कर सकते हैं लेकिन याह्या खां द्वारा जो नर संहार हो रहा है, मानवता का जो हनन हो रहा है उसको बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे और इसके लिए जो भी कष्ट हमारे देश को

उठाना पड़े उसके लिए उसको तैयार रहना चाहिए । समय तो बीत गया है लेकिन फिर भी मैं कहूँगा कि आप अब और अधिक विलम्ब मत कीजिए जब वहाँ के लोग लड़ रहे थे तब आप उनको हथियार दे सकते थे और बंगला देश की सरकार को मान्यता दे सकते थे । आज भी इस समय आप वहाँ बंगला देश सरकार को मान्यता दीजिए क्योंकि अगर आप मान्यता नहीं देते हैं तो आपको कोई नैतिक हक नहीं होता है दुनिया के और देशों से यह कहने का कि आप बंगला देश को मान्यता दीजिए । बंगला देश की सरकार को मान्यता देकर आप उसको सहायता दीजिए, सहयोग दीजिए, हथियार दीजिए और दूसरे साधन दीजिए ताकि दुनिया में जो अन्य राष्ट्र स्वतंत्रता के प्रेमी हैं वे भी आपका अनुकरण कर सकें वरना इस तरह की खामोशी, कायरता और बुझदिजी नये इतिहास में आपके मुँह पर कालिख पोत कर रहेगी । मैं विदेश मन्त्री जी से कहूँगा कि आप विदेश भ्रमण छोड़ कर एक मजबूत निर्णय लीजिए और बंगला देश की सरकार को मान्यता दीजिए । तब आपकी नैतिक जिम्मेदारी हो जायेगी कि बंगला देश को सहायता और सहयोग दें तथा दुनिया के अन्य राष्ट्रों से भी अपील करें । साथ ही आप अमरीका को घमकी दीजिए और ब्रिटिश सरकार को चेतावनी दीजिए कि हम आपके कामनवेल्थ से निकल जायेंगे अगर आप पाकिस्तान को मदद देना बन्द नहीं करेंगे । आप उनसे कहिए कि या तो आप पाकिस्तान के खूनी कदम रोकें अन्यथा कामनवेल्थ में पाकिस्तान के साथ हिन्दुस्तान नहीं रहेगा । इस तरह की बातों से भारत सरकार को आगे बढ़ना चाहिए । आप कम से कम एक ठोस और मजबूत कदम उठाइये तो निश्चित तौर पर इस समस्या का हल निकलेगा । आपको इसमें उरने की कोई बात नहीं है । सारा देश आपके साथ है, आप आगे बढ़ कर एक ठोस कदम उठाने की बात करें ।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): First of all I must express my thanks to Shri Bhag-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

wat Jha Azad who initiated this debate in a very comprehensive speech, well-documented and supported by quotations from foreign newspapers. He has made out a very strong and clear case, and he represented the feelings of the country.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: For what has he made out a case?

AN HON. MEMBERS: Justifying Government's inaction.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: He has made out an excellent case, if you had cared to hear.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: All the case was made out by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra only.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I want to know the case.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Let us not be lost in these skirmishes. Although I relish this type of skirmish, let us devote the time to other things.

He made out a case representing the views of the country, our strong feelings, our strong statements and our strong attitudes against the supply of arms by the United States to Pakistan. That was the case that he made out.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: That was the limited dimension? All right.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am also grateful to Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, if that satisfies him, for raising some points, for trying to gloss over the issues. Without going into these skirmishes which may be of some interest, the whole discussion before this House is about the two statements that I made, one is about the American supply of arms to Pakistan and the other, the result of my tour to various capitals of the world. In this connection, quite naturally the observations that the hon. Members made covered wider ground, and several other issues have been raised.

I shall try, briefly, to make my observations about some of the matters which have been

raised by hon. Members and I shall also try to give briefly the objectives that I had before me when I undertook this tour. . .
(Interruptions)

The hard reality that we had to face was that among a fairly large number of countries there was this unfortunate tendency to treat this situation in Bangla Desh as an internal affair of Pakistan and it was very necessary therefore to take a very clear stand about this issue; and it was also necessary to project the basic issues involved in the situation to persuade the Governments concerned and also the non-official leaders, Opposition, Press, commentators and other makers of public opinion.

It was also necessary to dispel the erroneous impression that unfortunately prevailed that it was an internal affair of Pakistan.

These were some of the basic objectives and I can say that there is a great deal of understanding, almost perfect understanding, among the non-officials, the Press people, non-official thinkers, commentators, Members of Parliament, and others.

What are these basic issues that have been enunciated here by hon. Members from time to time. I would, for the purpose of putting them on record, try to reiterate very briefly the basic issues involved in the situation.

Here is a situation which has been created by the Pakistani military regime by resorting to ruthless repression and unleashing the military machine against unarmed people with the objective of negating the results of democratic election. This is the basic issue that is involved.

We have also to keep in mind all the time that elections in Bangla Desh and in West Pakistan, in fact the elections in the entire region, were not an ordinary election but an election undertaken to enable the elected representatives to frame their constitution. The ideas that were put across by various parties in their election manifesto which contains some elements of the future set-up of Pakistan were therefore extremely relevant.

After obtaining such overwhelming support from the electorate for implementing those

items which were projected in their election manifestoes, it was nobody's concern to start any negotiations to whittle down what was contained in their election manifesto. It was for the new constituent assembly of Pakistan to take any decision about the future set-up of Pakistan. It is therefore a matter of surprise that people should have been taken in by high pressure propaganda that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's attitude was unreasonable in the course of talks which Yahya Khan had initiated with him.

As a matter of fact, President Yahya Khan in this background had no business to undertake any talks. They had won the elections on a certain programme and it was for the elected representatives, when they sit in the constituent assembly, to take any decision. Therefore, it was absolutely redundant, in fact against all principles, to have any talks whatsoever. The whole world now realises that these talks were also a smokescreen behind which military supplies, equipment and troops were moved and suddenly these talks were broken and the military oppression was resorted to. In a situation like this, when this basic issues involved, and as a result of which about six million people have actually crossed over into Indian territory, for anybody to say that it continues to be an internal affair of Pakistan is something which is totally unacceptable and absolutely unreal, and it is in this respect that international opinion has to be mobilised. To a certain extent it has been mobilised, but we have still to continue our efforts and mobilise public opinion in this respect.

About the question of refugees, I would like to say very categorically that some hon. Members who, in a moment were normally carried away either by their own voice or by their own enthusiasm, have not done justice when they said that I had gone out to ask for aid or to ask for any help in meeting the expenditure that we incur on these refugees. In fact, they said this was the main objective with which I had undertaken the tour. To dispel any feeling, if ever there was, in any part of the world—

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What is the meaning of internationalising this problem? What is the meaning of internationalising the

issue, the problem of the refugees? (*Interruption*).

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I do not want to hurt his sentiments. I do not want to provoke him. I only want him to show me at least one-tenth of the patience that I showed him when he was using all types of adjectives against me.

The point is that we had to project to the entire international community. There was an unfortunate feeling which was growing, that this is a situation in which India faces a great economic burden, that India's own plans are going awry, and therefore in such a big human problem, the problem of human suffering, if the international community can mobilise enough support to enable India to tide over this thing, then perhaps that is the answer. It was very necessary, therefore, to dispel this erroneous impression, and this does not fit in with the description that some hon. Members have said, that I had gone there to beg for aid or ask for aid. I never raised this question of aid. In fact, wherever this was mentioned, I always took the precaution to point out that this to me is a peripheral matter and it touched only the symptom and did not go to the root of the problem, and unless the root of it is tackled, by simply tackling the symptom, or touching the periphery of the problem and not the basic problem, it was no use. It should be made clear that this was one of the objectives that I had before me.

On the question of refugees, is it only a question of these large numbers? Of course, the problem is overwhelming. It causes all manner of strains, financial, organisational; and also it causes political and economic tensions. Therefore, for that reason, it is a much bigger issue, and any attempt by anybody either here or abroad, to try to quantify it in terms of money is a complete injustice and a complete misunderstanding of the problem. It is from this angle that we have to deal with this problem and project it to the international community.

18.00 hrs.

What is then the problem of refugees? We have made it clear—it was necessary to do so—because some quotations from some

[Shri Swaran Singh]

responsible people in our own country were being unfortunately quoted in foreign chanceries and foreign countries to the effect that India has got vast resources and a large population; they have in the past on many occasions taken in refugees and looked after them; on this occasion also, although it is a big problem, perhaps given the help and necessary wherewithal, India may be able to cope this problem also. This is precisely the thing which we have to negative very strongly. These are Bangladesh citizens. They have to go back to their own country. They are on trust with us, primarily on behalf of Bangladesh and secondarily on behalf of the entire international community. Therefore, we should reiterate our determination that they have to go back to their own home and hearth. They cannot go back to their home and hearth merely because President Yahya Khan makes a statement that the refugees are welcome. He did make some such statement. That was also a highly qualified statement. He said, genuine refugees are welcome. What was the effect of the statement which he made on 22nd or 21st May? After that statement, about 2½ million people have actually crossed over from Bangladesh to India. What is the credibility of a statement of this nature? When will these refugees go back and how? They can go back only if the affairs of Bangladesh are in the hands of the elected representatives. It is none else except Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. Unless he and his party are in charge of the affairs in Bangladesh, there will never be the atmosphere for these refugees to go back. Therefore, let us try to understand in depth the real problem involved. When we talk of the refugee problem, although their rehabilitation is a colossal problem, the basic problem is that they have to go back to Bangladesh. If we express our determination in unmistakable terms, there will be understanding for this. It is there to a very large measure in several of these statements with varying degree. One cannot, when dealing with the international community, impose one's own words, but this idea is broadly acceptable to all. In every statement, whether it is unilateral statement or a joint communicate, there are two things. One is, the flow of refugees must stop. It will stop only if this ruthless military action stops. Otherwise, it cannot stop. Secondly, the

refugees will never go back unless the affairs are in the hands of the responsible leaders who got such an overwhelming majority—167 out of 169 seats. This is the approach that has to be projected consistently. These objectives received fairly wide support amongst the international community. I think the essentials of the problem are such that they will continue to receive international support. I am realistic enough and I have got enough of experience not to be misled by words. Nor are these lunches or dinners of interest to me. I am a very modest eater of food and these things have never been of any interest to me. I am not like Shri Piloo Mody, who is so fond of food and who gathers so much of girth round him.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I must thank the Minister for the differentiation he has made.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The essential point, therefore, is that we have to get support for these two basic issues and the rest of our problem then falls into proper perspective.

Now a great deal has been said and there appears to be some misunderstanding, or some sliding back, as was mentioned by some hon. Member, when we used the term "political solution." I want to clarify this in a threadbare manner.

We are firmly of the opinion that continued military action will not resolve the problem. When we say that it is quite consistent with the resolution that we have adopted in which we have said that the entire international opinion should be mobilised and pressures should be put on the military regime to stop their military action and ruthless atrocities in Bangladesh. This was an essential element in the resolution which was adopted by this Parliament. When we say that military action will not result in any solution, then the other alternative is political solution.

About political solution I have not left any country in any doubt, both in the public statements, and during my talks with the leaders of those countries, governmental and non governmental. What is that political solution? The political solution is one which is acceptable to the elected representatives led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. On this issues

we should be very clear in our mind. It will not be a very good and acceptable strategy for us to spell out the content of that political solution, but it will be something for which there will be wide support when we say that this solution has to be acceptable to the people of Bangladesh; acceptable to the people of Bangladesh means a acceptable to those who have been elected with the overwhelming majority, that is, led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. Therefore, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman is the only person who, on behalf of the people of Bangladesh, can enter into a solution.

When we talk of political solution and something which is acceptable to the people of Bangladesh, this is what we mean. I am not saying anything here which I have not said, perhaps in more clear terms to the leaders abroad, whether they were official or non-official.

At the same time, I also warned them about this loose talk or vague talk of inducing a civil regime for a military regime, that it will not serve the purpose. I disabused their mind on that that this can never happen. In fact, the expression that I used was that it is immaterial if the people who exercise irresponsible and dictatorial authority wear uniform of a general, or an admiral or ordinary civilian; if he is not responsible to the people, which means not responsible to the elected representatives of the people, then it is immaterial whether the authority is wielded by the military general or by the civilian. Then again, they talked vaguely of having some government in which the Awami League elements are involved. That is again a very dangerous line on which some hon. Members have already made some comments. My friend opposite, Shri Mukerjee referred to it and so also several other members. This was precisely the danger that I also sensed. All of us sensed it here in this government. Therefore, it was very necessary for us to point out in very unmistakable terms that any regime which consists of breakaway elements from the Awami League of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, or which consists of persons who might have been won over, cajoled or coerced and thus become willing tools in the hands of the military regime, who were given the facade of the Awami League but who were really puppets or quislings of the military

regime, will never be acceptable to the people of Bangladesh.

So, these are the vital issues involved when we talk of the basic questions. Now, when we talk of the refugees being the responsibility of Bangladesh, the refugees cannot go back so long as the military regime continues and so long as these atrocities continue. As long as a government responsible to the elected representatives is not established these people will never go back.

This is the whole structure within which we have been using this expression of stopping of military action or/and arriving at political settlement. We have not left anybody in doubt. I do not know if they will be willing to go with us. I cannot make a tall claim like that. But on the first issues there is broad agreement that their flow should stop, that they are not our responsibility and that they should go back. About the rest some countries have said it openly this is not possible unless there is satisfactory political solution; some have said unless it is a political solution acceptable to the people; others have said it has to be with Awami League. These are various steps. Quite understandably you cannot get open statements from Governments even though they might be feeling that anything short of that might prolong the agony of the people.

I would like to mention one other aspect. I have a distinct feeling that there is a great deal of awareness that the position of Bangla Desh today is such that whatever military regime might try to make out, these people who have embarked upon this vital struggle for their existence, for their survival, for their liberty that they cannot be suppressed by military means. There is a great deal of appreciation and assessment on these lines. And I would like to say that if they are slowly moving from the original position of treating this as a purely internal matter when they see this is the direction in which things are moving then they also for no other reason—for sheer self-interest—start taking attitude which may later on not turn out to be entirely different from the inspirations of the 75 million people of Bangla Desh and to that extent everyone wants to keep their options open. It is a hard fact of international life with which we have to cope with; we have

[Shri Swaran Singh]

to realise that countries generally want to keep their options open. It will perhaps be unrealistic for anybody to imagine that they always go by what is just according to us or by what is wrong according to us. The interests of various countries, their short-term interests, their long-term interests, they do not want easily to sacrifice whatever may be the justice or non-justice of the case. As a matter of fact if this doctrine were accepted by the international community not as a sort of just a slogan but something in which they firmly believe, then I have no doubt that most of the troubles of the world would come to a end. We have to realise all these aspects and even the self-interest of many countries who may have interest in this region, who may have interest even in Bangla Desh, if they see that Bangla Desh is bound to come, it is only a question of time and that 80,000 or 90,000 military people howsoever ruthless their methods may be, they cannot for all times or for any length of time or for any sizeable length of time suppress by military means the flame of liberty which is now lit there in an unmistakable manner whatever the sufferings of these people may be; this thought itself is a great factor which moves them nearer towards the position of realising that the future of this area is in a direction different from what they conceive it today. This freedom struggle is bound to succeed. It is in this context that we have to view this situation.

It was one of my efforts to point out that this is a situation which cannot be bought out. Affluent countries can always have the feeling that a situation can be bought out. This was one effort and I think now it is realised. If I may also share this thought with you, even if aid comes, it will never come by our asking for it but by our taking a clear attitude. Even the quantum of aid that you will get will be much more than if you were to pass your hat round and ask for various types of help in order to look after the refugees.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Was this strategic?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This is both strategic and realistic. Perhaps he is so much

obsessed with money that anything which is out of money does not appeal to him.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You have been begging for 25 years, not me.

SHRISWARAN SINGH: To fill perhaps your coffers.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You have been stealing from us and begging abroad.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: As to the response from other countries, if I may say, on the basic issues there is understanding. Some of them are prepared to say openly; others are not prepared to say it openly. Some hon. Members say, "Give an ultimatum to the international community; tell them that if they do not do this within 15, 20 or 30 days, we will do this." I think, this will be an approach which is not justified. Whatever our country wants to do and whatever are our objectives, no one can pull them out for us. The main burden, even of refugees if all the money comes, will be ours. All this socio-economic tension that is generated, all this upheaval which our country faces, this general attitude in which almost the entire governmental machinery is switched on to look after this problem sometimes on the ground, sometimes in the international community and sometimes in an organisational manner—is all this capable of being determined in terms of money? These are problems which we have to face and unless the basic problem, the root problem, is resolved, there cannot be a satisfactory solution of this problem.

Having said that, I would very briefly like to say a couple of sentences on each of the specific questions that were raised. Three hon. Members, including Professor Rao, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad and Shri Krishna Menon, raised the question of raising this question in the appropriate UN organisation. With my long experience, which this Parliament has enabled me to obtain by going to these international gatherings, I would like to say that this is a gathering not of judges or jurists or of people who take decisions on what is spoken to them but these are governmental bodies in which, unless there is governmental support at their capitals, merely making hard or tall speeches does not take

us any farther. So, we have first to mobilise all the efforts in the various capitals and if there is support for any proposition, only then it is worth while taking it to a UN organisation.

We cannot forget that on several earlier occasions it has not been our long speeches that has saved the situation but a veto of a friendly country that has saved us on some very crucial occasions. So, I would not like to give a false sense that the United Nations or these organisations can pull us out of our troubles and difficulties.

These are very difficult questions. I am not opposed to taking it up at the U.N. But I do not believe in the efficacy of strong speeches to enable us to get the results. We have first to persuade the various Governments. These are governmental bodies. The people behind the mike are absolutely impervious to the speeches that are made. Even eloquence does not work with them because mostly it is lost in interpretation. The more eloquent speech it is, the worst it gets in simultaneous interpretation. One has to be direct and straight in making these speeches. Therefore, what matters is the attitude of the Governments. Before the man says, yes or no, he has to consult his capital, he has to consult his Government, saying, "This is the issue India has raised, Should I say, yes or no?" If his Government says, yes, he says, yes; if his Government says, no, he says, no.

We have to prepare first the ground before we take it up to the U.N. organisation by taking up this matter bilaterally at most of the capitals, and with their Ambassadors. I would say that we have initiated that process and, depending upon the support we gather, we will definitely take it up at the U.N. organisation. At the sametime, I would not leave any doubt in the minds of the hon. Members. It is good to raise it in the U.N. because the matter is highlighted, it receives publicity and it generates various types of pressures sometimes inside the countries which again have influence upon their Governments. But if anybody has any illusion about the effectiveness of the U.N. to work out a solution, I for one am not very hopeful of any such thing. There may be pious resolutions. What is the effect of this

on West Asian situation? There is a unanimous resolution also accepted by both sides. But still Israel is where it was and the international community notwithstanding the unanimous resolution has not been able to vacate the aggression.

There are limitations from which these U.N. organs, these U.N. organisations, function. I am not opposed to taking it up with the U.N. we will definitely take up. But we will take it up after we prepare the ground. This will be ancillary and supplementary to our main effort. This will not be and cannot be substitute to whatever steps we want to take in order to realise our objectives which I have tried to spell out on an earlier occasion.

Another important matter that has been raised by my hon. friend from the C.P.M. is that there is a U.S. radar station in India. I would like to say very categorically that this is an absolutely false and unfounded statement. I would like to contradict it with all the emphasis at my command.

Shri K. D. Malaviya said that delegations from foreign countries should be invited. We are already doing that. It is a good suggestion.

Then, as regards visits of Ministers to foreign countries, they have come in for some criticism. I would not like to say much about it. I would only like to say, if you expect really that by showing our face, we can convert other countries, you are mature enough not to be under any illusion on that score. But there is no doubt that if we raise it at a sufficiently high level and this is raised by a sufficiently high person in governmental authority here, it raises the level of discussion even in those countries at a very high level and some concentrated attention is given and we know precisely where we stand. This is a great advantage of taking it up at a high level. I would like to assure you that these visits are not taken in a thoughtless manner. They are necessary and they can be supplemented by other efforts also.

Some unkind word have been said about Missions abroad. The hon. Members are perfectly entitled to say the most unkind and most strong words against me. Because

[Shri Swaran Singh]

I am responsible for them and, if they have failed, I have failed, and I take the responsibility. . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I never said that. You should go once again.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: You did not participate in this debate. Why do you take it on you? I am only trying to say that these are our instruments by which we carry out our policy.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I did not want to participate because, according to me, your speeches do not help.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I do not want to have a running dialogue with Mr. Banerjee whom I regard as a good friend. Occasionally, he is off the rail, but, normally his contributions are helpful and in this particular case, I don't think we are really at cross-purposes. His objective and my objective are the same.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Metre-gauge and Broad-gauge.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: All Metre-gauge lines, Mr. Hanumanthaiya says, will be converted into Broad-gauge.

I would like to say that our missions abroad have done good work. They are our instruments and it does not do us any good to weaken the very instruments which we have to use in order to achieve our objectives.

Having said this much about my visit, now I would like to say. . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Why didn't you use the word 'Bangla Desh' in the communique and statements issued at the end of your visits?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: To-day I cannot persuade anybody in those countries to use the word 'Bangla Desh'.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It has a different political meaning, it has a different political connotation.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Don't ask me to confirm a position. I can have a talk with you separately sometime. Your intervention does not help the cause. It does not definitely help the cause. . . (Interruptions) You run the risk of injuring our cause.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Had the word 'Bangla Desh' been used, it would have definitely helped them.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: There is another matter regarding my statement about the supply of US arms to Pakistan. On that, I must say that the more I have looked into it deeply, the greater is the concern that I feel on this score and I fully support the broad approach of my dear colleague, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, supported by others that in this respect the attitude of the United States Government is, to say the least, extremely. . .

SHRI PILOO MODY: Callous.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inimical—say so.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: callous—Yes, They make one statement to-day and make another statement tomorrow. I think our Ambassador was quite right when he said that it is very difficult to accept what is said by their spokesman and by their representative. So, I would not like to give an impression that even now there will not be any further supplies from the United States to Pakistan because they still continue to say that whatever authorisations that were made before the 25th March, they are not prepared categorically to make any statement that they would take steps to cancel them. They go on saying that they do not know if everything under that is moved or not.

I think it is my duty to report to the House that I am completely dissatisfied with the explanations that have been given by the United States or by their spokesmen and the Parliament is quite right in reacting in the manner in which they have done that this is something definitely against our interests and we cannot accept the explanations which I cannot understand. Therefore, I agree with the broad disapproval that has been shown by the hon. Member.

There is one matter about which I have not replied. Before I come to that, I would

like to say one thing. A great deal has been said by several members as if we are altering our attitude if we take into consideration the resolution which was unanimously adopted by this august House. I would like to say that this is not correct. There were three elements in that Resolution. One was:

"This House demands immediate cessation of the use of force and of the massacre of defenceless people."

When we secure international support for stoppage of flow of refugees, this is definitely in pursuance of this directive which has been given by the House.

When we say—

"This House calls upon all peoples and Governments of the world to take urgent and constructive steps to prevail upon the Government of Pakistan to put an end immediately to the systematic decimation of people which amounts to genocide"—

this is precisely what we have been urging all Governments to do, to exercise all their levers. We have mentioned to them that whatever levers they have got,—whether they are levers of giving economic aid or giving military aid,—military aid in any case should stop, because this is being used for killing innocent people;—even economic aid should stop so long as these atrocities continue and so long as they continue to embark upon this policy of repressing people.

Then, Sir, about our whole-hearted sympathy and support, I do not think that the country has in any way deviated from this resolve of the sympathy and support from the people and from the Government, because, all that we have been doing is support of their freedom movement. There is no apology for that because this is what we have decided and we are continuing that thing.

About recognition, I have nothing more to say to what has already been said that we still feel that this is a matter which is constantly under review. If at any stage we feel that the situation can improve by our recognition or that objective is achieved by recognition, we will not hesitate to do that, but I might say, the present stage is not one in which I could straightaway announce that we have recognised Bangla Desh.

This covers all the points that have been raised. I am grateful to the Hon. Members for broadly lending their support to the efforts that the Government is making in order to carry out the Resolution which was unanimously adopted by the House.

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस अन्त समय में और कुछ नहीं कहना है सिर्फ यह कि मैं उन तमाम मित्रों का कृतज्ञ हूँ जिन्होंने इस संकल्प में भाग लिया। इस संकल्प पर हुई बहस के दौरान श्री बाजपेयी जी ने मेरा हवाला देते हुए जो कहा था राजनीतिक हल के सम्बन्ध में, उसका विश्लेषण सरदार स्वर्णसिंह जी ने किया। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि राजनीतिक हल का अर्थ यह है कि वही हल जो बंगला देश की जनता को और उनके नेता बंग बन्धु मुजी-बुर्रहमान को ग्राह्य हो, वही हल किया जाय। कोई ऐसा हल न किया जाय जो उनके गले के नीचे उनकी मर्जी के खिलाफ उतारा जाए। अस्तु मैं इस सम्बन्ध में बड़ा स्पष्ट हूँ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि श्री कृष्ण मेनन ने कहा कि यह बड़ी ही अपरिपक्व डिप्लोमेसी है कि अमरीका से यह उम्मीद की जाय कि वह हमसे सलाह लें। मैंने अध्यक्ष महोदय, अमरीका से कभी किसी स्टेज पर यह आशा नहीं की, और न करूंगा। ऐसे के बल पर यह उमरा राष्ट्र अटलान्टिक की लहरों पर मर-मिट कर यूरोप के धार्मिक अत्याचार के बाद स्टेचू आफ लिबर्टी के सामने नतमस्तक था। इस राष्ट्र को अपार राशि बिना परिश्रम के मिल गयी और तबसे इसने संसार की मानवता को नहीं देखा। काम इनका है, अपने दो सौ परिवारों द्वारा प्राप्त धन और उनके द्वारा चलायी गयी आडिनेंस फैक्ट्रीज में निमित्त माल को संसार के बाजारों में बेच कर एक दूसरे को लड़ा कर मनुष्यता के तमाम आधारभूत मूल्यों को समाप्त कर वह अपना गणतन्त्र चलाये—उसकी अभिलाषा यह है। अस्तु मैं उनसे कोई उम्मीद नहीं की। बल्कि हमने इस सदन का, अपने देशवासियों का और अमरीका के देशवासियों का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहा कि आज अमरीका यह हथिय-

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

यार भेज कर इस भाग में, सबसे बड़े गणतन्त्र के इस उप-महाद्वीप में उसका विनाश कर रहा है। मेरा उद्देश्य यह था। और मैं सरदार स्वर्ण-सिंह जी का कृतज्ञ हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बात पर विचार व्यक्त किये और उन्होंने मेरे सम्बन्ध में अच्छी बातें कहीं। मैं श्रीमान, कांगो के महा-नेता प्राध्यापक श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र का बड़ा कृतज्ञ हूँ कि उनको यह बात अच्छी नहीं लगी क्योंकि उन्हें यह समझ में ही नहीं आई—मेरे 45 मिनट के भाषण में जबकि मैंने इतने परिश्रम के साथ भाषण किया। लेकिन इन प्राध्यापक महोदय को यह बात इसलिए समझ में नहीं आई कि ये अंग्रेजी के प्राध्यापक रहे हैं, जरा इस बात में उनका कम देखल है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कहूँगा कि राजनीतिक हल के लिए इस देश की जनता, उसकी सरकार और इस देश के सभी जन-बासी बंगला देश के साथ हैं। बंगला देश की भूमि वहाँ के वीर, त्यागी शहीदों के खून से लाल हो चुकी है। उसकी भूमि में खाद पड़ा है आज उन शहीदों की हड्डियों का धौ हड्डियाँ वहाँ पर ऐसी फसल उगायेंगी जो फसल पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान के इन तानाशाह लोगों को समाप्त करके रहेगी। (व्यवधान) अध्यक्ष महोदय, इनको समझ में आयेगी नहीं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, जरा इनको यह सलाह दी जाय कि वे काम खोलें और मुँह बंद करें, सारी बातें समझ में आ आयेगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि बंगला देश की जनता आज अपने जीवन मरण के संग्राम में लगी है। इस देश की जनता, यहां के संसद सदस्य और यहां की सरकार हर मुसीबत में उसके साथ खड़ी रहेगी, खड़ी रही है और हम खड़े रहेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात मैं और कह दूँ सरदार स्वर्णसिंह जी को। ये संसार के देशों को, खासकर अमेरिका को यह कहूँ कि जो बार-बार वह रेस्ट्रेंट की बात हमसे कहते हैं, हमने तो रेस्ट्रेंट, सन्निष्ठाता, बिस्वाह है। हम प्रकाश करेंगे

कि इस उप-महाद्वीप में युद्ध न छेड़े जाएँ और बंगला देश की जनता के इस अरमान का समाधान बिना हथियारों सेबर—जेट, पैटन टैंक और हमारे विमानों के युद्ध के बिना ही हल हो। लेकिन हमारे रेस्ट्रेंट की कोई बात नहीं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब तानाशाह यह देखता है कि उसके सपने पूरे नहीं होंगे और पाकिस्तानी तानाशाह के सपने पूरे नहीं होंगे, उसने अपने पाकिस्तान को स्वयं मिटा लिया है। आज पूर्वी पाकिस्तान की भूमि पर लाखों लाखों के अंबार, आज पूर्वी बंगाल की भूमि पर लाखों मानवता के आधारभूत मूल्यों का हनन इस बात का स्पष्ट प्रतीक है कि पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान के तानाशाह, ये जनरल, ये कमाण्डर, ये सेनापति एक न एक दिन अपने दोष को छिपाने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान को युद्ध में घसीटेंगे। उस युद्ध की तैयारी होनी चाहिए हिन्दुस्तान के फार्मस में, हिन्दुस्तान के खेत और खलिहानों में, हिन्दुस्तान की आर्बिट्रेंस फैक्ट्रियों में। हम नहीं चाहते हथियार बनाये जायें। हम जानते हैं कि बटर और गन दोनों में कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं। फिर भी ऐसा लगता है कि पूर्वी और पश्चिमी आकाश में फिर बादल मंडरातें हैं, और ऐसा हो। लेकिन यह संसार को बता दिया जाए हम नहीं चाहते। हम चाहते हैं कि समाधान हो उनकी इच्छा के अनुकूल, लेकिन ये तानाशाह जब देखेंगे कि उनकी समाप्ति हो रही है। एक चिन्मारी मड़क उठेगी, वह समाप्त हो जाएंगे, तब फिर ये हमें मजबूर करेंगे और उस स्थिति में यह अमेरिका गणतन्त्र का सबसे पृष्ठ-पोषक, चेरिस्ड डेमोक्रेसी सरदार साहब के शब्दों में, इनको बता दिया जाए कि फिर तब उनके हथियार, उनके सेबर जेट, उनके टैंक और उनकी सारी चीजें कदम चूमती नजर आयेंगी हिन्दुस्तानी फौज के या बंगला देश की मुक्ति सेना के। मेरा इतना ही कहना है।

18.39 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, June 29, 1971/Asadha 8, 1893 (Saka).