

[श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी]

This is a very serious point. The Government should not keep quiet . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am not allowing anybody. The gentleman who is not called should not stand up.

SHRI P. R. SHENOY (Udipi) : There was a *bandh* the other day in Bombay organised by the Shiva Sena and supported by all Parties. . . . (Interruptions) The Mahajan Commission's report should be implemented immediately. If that is done, it will put an end to all violent agitations.

MR. SPEAKER : I am not allowing anybody. The gentleman who is not called should not stand up.

Mr. Ganesh, Dr. Pandey, I am not allowing you. Please sit down.

12.56 hrs.

ORISSA APPROPRIATION (No. 4)  
BILL, 1973\*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Orissa for the services of the financial year 1973-74.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Orissa for the services of the financial year 1973-74."

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI K. R. GANESH : Sir, I introduce† the Bill.

Sir, I beg to move† :

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the

Consolidated Fund of the State of Orissa for the services of the financial year 1973-74, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the question is :

"That Clauses 2 and 3, the Schedule, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 2 and 3, the Schedule, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI K. R. GANESH : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

12.59 hrs.

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL  
SITUATION

MR. SPEAKER : The next item is Discussion on the International situation. The time fixed is 8 hours. The Business Advisory Committee, in view of the short time and also the limited scope, decided that the whole discussion will finish today. There is enough time.

The Minister will reply at 6 O'clock.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) :  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, 6 घंटे तो कम से कम  
मिलने चाहिये ।

It is very difficult to sit after 6 P.M.  
It is very cold, Sir.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) : It is 1 O'clock already. How can we finish it today?

\*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, Section 2, dated 20-12-73.

† Introduced/moved with the recommendation of the President.

13.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister will speak at the end. He will not speak twice. At the end he will be called at 5-30.

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : उनके लिए गुंजाइश ही कहाँ है आज ?

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI : We are also sitting on Saturday.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : It should not go beyond six. We do not want to go beyond 6 O'clock.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : (Kumbakonam) : The hon. Minister should first formally move this motion.

MR. SPEAKER : He is doing it.

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

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

Sir, as indicated by you, the time at our disposal is short and therefore I will not insist on making an opening speech. I would request the hon. Members to start the debate straightway and I will, with your permission, sum up the debate at the end and will reply to the debate and may also mention new points if any.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

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

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, there have been very significant developments in the international situation in the recent past and these developments signify a new process. You know that the war in Viet Nam—the American aggression has been defeated and American Imperialism was forced to come into some agreement with North Viet Nam and the liberation forces of South Viet Nam and there has been Paris peace agreement. This defeat of American imperialism in Viet Nam has its international

impact and the victory of the liberation forces in Viet Nam—in Laos as well as the growing victory in Cambodia—signifies that the forces of neo-colonialism led by American imperialism are becoming weaker day by day and this is strengthening the anti-imperialist democratic liberation forces throughout the world and day by day, the American imperialism is faced with deeper and deeper crisis. The most significant fact is the emergence of the non-aligned forces as a bloc which is now popularly called Third World. This third world is making a big contribution in bringing about defeat of the reactionary, colonial and imperialist forces. The recent Conference in Algiers which was attended by nearly eighty countries is the biggest Conference ever held by the non-aligned countries. They set the real tone through the resolutions and speeches of the leaders who took part in that Conference which are pointed mainly against the imperialistic forces of war, forces of exploitation and colonialism. This conference signifies how far the strength of the democratic and anti-imperialist forces has grown. This is apart from the socialist camp. It is also quite clear in the international arena that the socialist forces and the socialist countries and States are more and more coming in support of the non-aligned countries, and the two forces are combining. This is bringing about a change in the correlation of forces in the international forces and it is having its proper bearing and impact throughout the world in the course of the development of the international situation.

How the non-aligned countries have looked upon the war in Viet Nam is expressed in the resolution of the Algiers Conference. The Algiers Conference adopted one resolution on Viet Nam and also one on Cambodia. I would like to quote some portions from those resolutions. In the resolution on Viet Nam, the conference says :

"This Conference welcomes the big efforts made by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam, the sole authentic representative of the South Viet Namese people in the implementation of the Paris agreement on Viet Nam and the act of the International Conference

### [Shri Samar Mukherjee]

on Viet Nam. This Conference calls on the non-aligned countries to give and intensify their support to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam in all fields, political, military and diplomatic in its struggle for achieving a peaceful, independent, neutral and democratic South Viet Nam, proceeding to the peaceful reunification of the country and to give every material aid for the reconstruction of Viet Nam."

So, their wholehearted support to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Viet Nam in unqualified language has been voiced in the Algiers Conference. It has been categorically stated there that in South Viet Nam, the provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam is the only authentic representative of the South Viet Nameese people and they should contribute to the reconstruction of war-ravaged South Viet Nam.

Regarding Cambodia, the resolution says :

"The participants of the Conference declare that the only legitimate and legal Government of Cambodia is the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia headed by the head of the State Mr. Norodom Sihanouk, and urgently asks for recognition of this Government."

My point is that the Algiers Conference has called upon all the member-States which took part in the conference to give recognition to the Government of Cambodia headed by Mr Norodom Sihanouk and it has also been categorically stated that the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam is the sole representative. But here I find the weakness of the foreign policy of the Government of India. India was a participant, a full participant, and India was also chairman of one of the committees. India is also one of the signatories to the resolution, but I am sorry to say that up till now the Government of India have failed to give recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam.

Why? Why this delay? Why this hesitation? What is the root cause of it?

It has to be found out. Regarding recognition of the Government of Cambodia, the Algiers Conference had called upon the member-States to give recognition to the Sihanouk Government. But that recognition has not yet been accorded by the Government of India. The External Affairs Minister in reply to the debate in the Rajya Sabha told us that our sympathies lay with the Sihanouk Government. But it is not a question of sympathy; it is a question of recognition. Despite this resolution, why is the Government hesitant in giving recognition? This is one of the essential weaknesses in our foreign policy. The hesitancy comes from our Government's dependence on American imperialism.

Regarding Korea, the Algiers Conference also supported fully the efforts for its national unification. But the main hindrance to that is American imperialism which has stationed its armed military forces in South Korea. As everybody knows, the South Korean Government is a stooge government. But despite the support given to the unification move, the Government of India has not raised the demand that the American army should be withdrawn from South Korea. This is also one of the weaknesses of our foreign policy. On the other hand, recently there has been a trade agreement with South Korea under which South Korea has been given the most-favoured-nation treatment by the Government of India.

Dr. Allende could not be present at the Algiers Conference because in his own country at that time the imperialist conspiracy was afoot in its most naked form and he was sensing that the attack was coming. So he was busy fighting American reaction in his own country. The Prime Minister had made a reference in her speech at the Algiers Conference that she did not find Dr. Allende there because he was engaged in fighting a battle which was common to us. That sentiment was quite correct; the fight of the Chilean people is the common fight of all non-aligned countries and their peoples. But when Dr. Allende was murdered and the Government was overthrown by the military junta which established its fascist dictatorship there, at that time there was a session of the AICC on. But in the resolution on international affairs in the AICC, the question of Chile was not

mentioned at all. Newspapers has commented that it had some significance, because it would irritate American imperialism and that was why all reference to Chile was dropped from the AICC resolution.

SHRIMATI MUKUL BANERJI (New Delhi): The Prime Minister herself mentioned about it.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: What was the reason why the reference to such a big significant event was dropped from the AICC resolution on the international situation?

Is it by mistake? No; it cannot be considered a mistake. To any political element, it has some meaning and some significance. That has to be found out.

Moreover, the Government of India is still maintaining diplomatic relations with this Fascist government of Chile. I do not know what are their arguments in favour of that. When the entire progressive world is condemning this Fascist military junta and some of the countries have already withdrawn their diplomatic missions, the Government of India is maintaining its diplomatic mission there.

The Prime Minister has said about multi-national corporations. It is now quite well-known that multi-national corporations, particularly those which are financed by American monopoly capitalists, act in various countries as the agents of the CIA, and there were attempts on the part of the ITT to overthrow the Allende Government, but the conspiracy did not succeed; but the whole conspiracy was exposed by the American press. These international corporations are the agencies of vested interests, and they play very nefarious roles. It is admitted in the speech made in Algiers by the Prime Minister herself. She has stated:

"As the economic struggle becomes more acute the long suppressed voices of people sharpen, but with every step forward, the resistance of entrenched groups, often aligned with foreign interests, especially the faceless multi-national corporations, becomes more vehement, unscrupulous and, at the same time, more subtle and even insidi-

ous, for it is no longer overt but indirectly subversive and provocative."

This speech of the Prime Minister of India at the Algiers Conference regarding multi-national corporations. But what is the practice in India? What is the practice of the Government of India? They are welcoming multi-national corporations. Only yesterday, in the course of replying to my supplementary question, the Minister of Industrial Development admitted that "we are welcoming some collaborations. Of course, they should invest here within the framework of our industrial policy".

These multi-national corporations are such giant bodies which can topple Governments, which can bring about instability in the currencies; they can create serious crisis in the economy of a country. There was one report which was placed before the Secretary-General of the UNO. It points out that each of the top four multi-national corporations had an annual sales return of Rs. 75 billion, while in the same year, the Indian budget provided for a revenue of Rs. 31 billion; more than double of the Indian revenue, one single multi-national top corporation has got as its sale proceeds. There are other figures which I am not going to quote because I have no time. One of the widely abused techniques they employ is to transfer the pricing to avoid high there is less restrictive legislation to other countries. Because they are multi-national corporations, and they have branches in various countries, they shift their accounts to other countries where there is less restrictive legislation to avoid price regulations and to maintain their high profits. They play this type of machinations. Our Industries Minister told us that if multi-national corporation invest money here, they will have to invest under the framework of the industrial policy of our country. I am citing one example here: IBM. The IBM is a multi-national giant computer firm which has eluded national discipline all over the world. One condition is that it can operate only on 100 per cent export basis. It is selling second-hand reconditioned machines at inflated prices and this IBM has the help of a powerful lobby to by-pass the (Electronics) Commission to secure lucrative orders from rival departments of the Government.

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

IBM rejected all the four conditions prescribed by the Commission for its continued operation in India. IBM rejected the Commission's stipulation that it bring down its foreign equity from the present level of 100 per cent. That is what the Economic Times of 13 December says.

That is how multi-national corporations function. They are imperialist agents. You allow them free scope; you are welcoming them. You shout hoarse against imperialism, you are concluding agreements with the Soviet Union against new colonialism, colonialism and imperialism. But in practice what is happening is just the contrary and that is leading our economy to more and more dependence on American monopoly capital.

Take the Indian Ocean. You have demanded that it should be a zone of peace. That is the most justifiable demand. Other littoral States have also demanded the same thing. But we saw that the task force of the American Seventh Fleet brazenly entered the Indian Ocean. People have seen that in today's conditions only imperialism is a source of war and aggression. When American Imperialism sends its Seventh Fleet into the Indian Ocean, it becomes a zone of tension. Our voice should have been more vigorous in condemning the game of American Imperialism. But we do not see the Government of India raising such strong protests. On the other hand, we see from reports from newspapers four or five days ago that America has been given the responsibility of developing radar network communications in North India under our Defence Department. I raised this in the Defence Ministry consultative committee. It is highly objectionable, because the role of American imperialism is clear now. We know the role they played during the Bengla Desh Freedom struggle and during the recent Middle-East crisis. It is American imperialism that has supplied all the arms to Israel for attacking the Arab countries.

Due to American imperialism, the middle-east crisis is not being resolved. Our Government has most justifiably supported the cause of the Arab countries. But the Government of India's voice against American imperialism is

very weak and feeble. These are not isolated things. Here lies the essential weakness which reflects the weakness of the class policy the Government of India is pursuing, the policy of bourgeois and landlord. This is the only conclusion which can be drawn from this weakness in the policy of the Government of India.

The slogan of Asian security has been raised. Everybody wants security for the Asian countries and this slogan must evoke response among all the Asian countries. But in today's condition, when the relation between China and Soviet Union is not normal, when normalisation has still not been achieved in the relations between India and China, this slogan of Asian security is not at the moment practical at this stage. Not that we are opposed to it, because the slogan of Asian security covers the basic interests of all Asian countries. This security is against whom? It is against imperialism, which is the main enemy of the freedom of the world people. In that respect, for the time being, the slogan of Asian security is not so realistic.

As regards steps to normalise our relations with China, the Government of India also should take the initiative and not simply wait for further development. Whichever avenues are possible, you must try to explore them. Up till now there is a customs ban on Chinese literature coming into India. You should remove that ban. Shri Swaran Singh says, it is simply a question of time for the relations to become normal. This wait and see mood should be changed. The Government of India should explore possibilities so that the situation can be normalised.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara) :** Are you meaning we should make the first move?

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE :** It is not a question of first or second move. I am asking the Government of India to explore the possibilities. This customs ban should be removed without delay. This is one step towards normalisation.

In conclusion, I would say, the Government of India should be consistent in its anti-imperialism and should not lag behind the spirit/firmly expressed in the Algiers Conference regarding Cambodia, Vietnam and South Korea. I

can give one instance. In this month, there was a resolution in the UN moved by 33 non-aligned countries demanding recognition of the Sihanouk Government. I read in the papers that India was not one of the sponsors. On the other hand, the Indian delegate remained neutral on the question of recognition of the Sihanouk Government. Is this the way to carry forward the spirit of the Algiers Conference? This is inconsistent, contradictory and due to the fear of creating displeasure against American imperialism. That is why I demand that this policy must change.

13.30 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY -SPEAKER in the Chair]

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (Guna): Mr. Speaker, we are living today in an everchanging international situation. The radical new alignments, the emergence of new politics with the resultant shifts in the balance of power, the urge among nascent States to play a more active role in the world are all leading to this decade witnessing a dynamism and poise in international affairs hardly witnessed before. Our foreign policy makers must be able to inject a similar dynamism in our own external policies; otherwise, dismal results would follow.

The tendency for others to take us for granted, the tendency for others to completely identify us with one particular block, the tendency for others to discount our potentials and possibilities is a serious factor in global affairs. It has been recently felt that the world has transgressed from the old concept of a bi-polar one to a multi-polar one. The recent West Asian conflict, however, has cast serious doubts on this question. Undoubtedly, each strategic region has several poles, and a region must be viewed from this angle. But the recent West Asian events clearly demonstrated the extent to which the super-powers can dominate a region, if the member-countries of that region are dependent on them economically or militarily. We must take note of this.

The recent agreement concluded during the Brezhnev visit could leave us heavily rely on the Soviet State Planning Committee for advice and guidance in our economic planning and programmes. We should take care that this does not result in our own planning

or in our economy being too closely inter-linked with the Soviet one. Let us not forget how in the 1930s Hitler's trade and economic co-operation with the countries comprising little entente was suddenly converted overnight into an instrument of complete domination. In the field of wrestling the bear hug is considered a lethal grip. The Russian bear hug can have a dual use, one inspired by warmth and the other the opposite.

I am not one who believes in criticism just for criticism's sake. I have no hesitation in congratulating our Foreign Minister for having steered clear of any mention of Asian Collective Security in the communique issued during the Brezhnev visit. But the sooner we realise that the partnership with the super-powers will always be unequal the better. Whether this partnership be with Moscow or with Washington, we must realise that we have to create an independent image. Our policy so far, especially with Soviet Russia, seems to be incensed with the thinking that the Russians are our only source of support in all fields.

The Soviet support in the last Indo-Pak war was crucial and commendable and we should rightly be grateful to them. But, then, gratitude should not cloud the fact; that in the great power balance Soviet Russia needs us as much as we need them.

After the Sino-American rapprochement, Russia needs India as a possible counter-balance to China. Secondly, to the Soviets, the Indian Ocean has become an area of tremendous importance both from the naval point of view and with regard to her western and eastern extremities. Russia, therefore, seeks an outlet into the Indian Ocean.

Moscow's trade turn-over with the Indian Ocean countries has increased from 275 million roubles in 1969 to nearly 1060 million roubles in 1970. That is, in the period 1959-70, it has increased at the rate of nearly 13 per cent per annum. The importance of this area, therefore, is not insignificant to the Soviet economy.

Further, at present, in the Indian Ocean, the U.S. is reported to be superior to Moscow, a situation which no longer exists in the Middle-East. Another reason, therefore, for the Soviet interest in the Indian Ocean could be to establish along the rim of Asia, from

[Shri Madhavrao Scindia]

the Black Sea along the mediterranean through the Indian Ocean to the Far-East, Soviet naval power consistent with its interests. We will do well to be careful not to become Moscow's Trojan Horse in the Indian Ocean. In other words, we suit Moscow's geo-political interests far more Pakistan ever could. We have a larger Indian Ocean periphery; we serve as a potential counter-balance to China. We have a future big-power potential.

Our Government must recognise these vital Russian interests in the continuance of a close relationship with our country. We must guide our policy so as to maximise the benefits which the Russians are trying to extend to us and yet minimise the long-term commitments, thereby preventing the creation of an impression that India is, in any way, subservient to the Soviet will because such an impression does not create an advantageous situation for us in the international field.

It has probably aroused further suspicions in Peking. In fact, ironically, it has probably reversed a similar sort of reaction in Peking in 1961-62 when India became a major factor in the Sino-Soviet split.

Then, our non-aligned image in the world has been shaken and we are being taken to have a close identification with the Soviet bloc. It is futile our Government's asserting that recent developments have, in no way, tied us to the apronstrings of the Russians because it is, after all, the psychological impact we create in the world that matters. We must remember that it was only when China stopped living under the Russian shadow and struck a powerful, self-confident and independent note in her postures and policies that she succeeded in creating an image which even the Super Powers had to take cognizance of. It is this image of independence that we must create in the world.

Our needlessly hasty and unbalanced statements during the recent West Asian conflicts have, in no way, strengthened the image of independence. Barring a few, the only countries which were quick to make statements and express unqualified support to the Arab world were those countries which are known to be attached to the Soviet bloc. I do

hope that this pertinent fact and India's alacrity in denouncing the Israelis was merely a co-incidence. In a situation like that of West Asia, one can only play a constructive and useful role if one is either of the two positions. Either one must be in a position where one of the combatants is dependent on one and, therefore, susceptible to pressure or, alternatively, one must be in the position of neutrality and respected by both the countries. India can never be in the first position. Unbalanced statements render her ineffectual in the alternative role.

There can be only two reasons for the partisan stand that we adopted. First, to ensure that our oil supplies in the Middle-East remain uninterrupted and, second, to decrease the likelihood of Arab support to Pakistan in the event of any future conflict in South-East Asia. But, as far as oil is concerned, only in the last Consultative Committee meeting, Sardar Saheb explained to us the figures and from that I say that only a small portion of our needs is supplied by Saudi Arabia and Iraq, the major portion coming from Iran. And with regard to the second possible reason, by excluding us initially from the list of exemptees from the oil embargo, the Saudi Arabians clearly demonstrated total disregard of our support to the Arabs. Conversely, by including Pakistan in this list of exemptees, the Saudi Arabians demonstrated a clear preference for Pakistan which, I think can be taken as indicative of the likely stand the other Arab countries will take an Indo-Pakistan issues. The scant respect shown to us by the Saudi Arabian action demonstrates how little our opinion matters in world forums.

The Arabs are undoubtedly justified in their attempt to recover territories occupied by Israel in the 1967 war. In six days in 1967 Israel had won a war but not a peace. Peace, Sir, will only endure if it is a peace of conviction and not just of expedience. And this is largely dependent on Arab willingness to acknowledge the realities and recognise and accept Israel as a part of the Middle East. We do sympathise with the Arab sentiments in that large chunks of their territory are under Israeli occupation. But whilst expressing this sympathy, we should also appeal to the Arabs to recognise Israel.

The crux of the problem is to ensure the return of the Arab land whilst guaranteeing Israel its security. It is in the interest of both the countries that this conflict be resolved. The constant threat of war is a serious drain on their economy which the Arabs, more than Israel, can ill afford.

Another dangerous policy which was evidenced in the Middle East crisis was the attempt by the super powers to rule by proxy. What was disturbing was not simply the fact that the super powers more or less resolved the issue amongst themselves and pressurised the adversaries to come to terms, but what was more disturbing was that they armed them in the first place and continued to do so during the war. One comes away with the impression that the whole episode was almost stage-managed by Moscow and Washington. Col. Gaddafi was not far wrong in describing this as an operata war.

The role the super powers played and the effectiveness of their politics holds its own lessons for the rest of the world, especially for potential interference areas like South Asia. The growth of nuclear power has decreased the likelihood of a direct clash between the super powers. But, Sir, it has increased the probabilities of indirect clashes in world trouble spots. By arming the adversaries with limited conventional weapons, the super powers leave them militarily utterly dependent on them. The super powers have, therefore, through these techniques manoeuvred the other countries into position of *de facto* nominees. This detente between the super powers is leading to their collusion and creation of conflicts which, in turn, are resolved by them. And, I feel, the future is going to witness many such areas where other countries will be sacrificed at the altar of detente.

I feel that the army of Iran has to be viewed against this backdrop. The cancer of the Indo-Pakistan conflict and the military renaissance of Iran have increased the potential for super power involvement in the region. The stability of the region is dependent on how the balance is kept between India, Iran, Afghanistan and Iraq on the one hand and Iran and Pakistan on the other. Iran on whom we are heavily dependent for almost 70% of our oil needs is, I feel, suspicious of a potential—Indo-Iraq axis. Therefore, Indo-Iraq

relations will always have a direct bearing on Iran-Pakistan relations. The basic fulcrum of the regional political balance will be India-Pakistan relations.

The super-power policy of maintaining a parity between India and Pakistan might have become obsolete in their view but it seems to have been taken up by other influential countries of the region and the neighbouring regions.

The recent report in the *Times of India* of 12th December on Arab oil funds for the setting up of a Pakistan arms industry based on French know-how is a further proof in this regard. This step would also free the Gulf States' dependence for arms on Washington and, at the same time, would help to some extent re-establish India-Pakistan parity. It is a further proof...

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

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA : I was told that I would have 18 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That was on the basis of 8 hours for the discussion. Now, that the time is reduced to 6 hours, your time is over.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) : There is always an understanding that as far as the Parties are concerned, they will have enough time to express their views.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar) : Why Parties, why not Members?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am in the hands of the House. If the House decide that every member should be allowed to speak as long as he likes, let the House decide so. I am entirely in the hands of the House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Then we will have full eight hours.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let us not lose our tempers. I am entirely in the hands of the House. Let the House decide. If they want 8 hours, let it be 8 hours and I will go accordingly. If it is 6 hours, let it be so and I will go accordingly. I know on a subject like international situation, it is quite easy to make a three-hour speech.



[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

Who cannot do it? But let the House decide.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): This is a matter of give and take. This morning it was all discussed. Another two minutes the hon. Member wants. Let him be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is all right. If it concerns this particular member, the question is solved, but like a bad coin the problem will crop up again and again.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Then you decide it in your wisdom.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: And this report in the *Times of India* is a further proof of maintaining an equation between India and Pakistan.

But the main focus of interest in our part of the world has become the strategic position of the Indian Ocean around which one-third of the world's population lives and through which 40% of the world's petroleum trade passes. It is reported that America has already deployed nuclear weapons in the Indian Ocean directed against rival powers. Why should we allow the peaceful Indian Ocean area to be converted into a cockpit of fight between the two major military powers endangering the life and liberty of the Asians and the Africans who have even otherwise to struggle hard to make both ends meet individually and as nations. We have declared the Indian Ocean an ocean of peace but the Govt. must take steps to translate this into reality. Talks should be immediately commenced between Indian Ocean countries. The Soviet Union gets port privileges at Vizhakatnam, the Andaman and Nicobar islands. In all they have anchorage privileges in eight ports between Yemen and Singapore. In addition they have full base facilities in three other ports. The Americans too have facilities in five ports from Thailand to Baharein. It is reported that they are also giving finishing touches to a 19 million dollar naval station and communication centre on the British-owned island of Diego Garcia which is approximately 1200 miles from the southernmost tip of India. The despatch of the US Task Force to the Indian Ocean is a clear indication of Washington's desire for an even more active role in the Ocean area. It is high time we took the lead in curtailling this rivalry. The last Indo-

Pak war has left us the dominant power in South Asia. It is a pity that our Govt. has failed in exploiting this to India's interest. We must take the initiative in creating an atmosphere amongst the Indian Ocean countries which acknowledge the danger of super power rivalry and which must result in the severe restriction of port facilities automatically providing some brake on fleet activities in the area. Our national leadership must broaden their vision beyond 'buggy' politics if we are to play our leading role in the world. We have the potential of becoming a vibrant economy; we have the potential of becoming the leader of the newly developing countries; we have the potential of becoming a nuclear power. But these potentials are allowed to sink under an ocean of slogans, the only diet our Government has managed to produce in 26 years, to appease the hungry appetites of the masses of India. Our Govt. must recognise and exploit these potentials and act on them. Only then can we place India in her proper perspective in the global arena.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): I have listened attentively to the speeches of the last two speakers from the Communist (Marxist) party and the Jan Sangh party. My Marxist friend has not really questioned the basic postulates of our foreign policy, though he has questioned some of the individual decisions. Our Jan Sangh friend however has questioned, of course in very guarded language realising the psychology of the people of the country, some of the big postulates of our foreign policy. Whatever may be the views of my friends of the Marxist (Communist) party or the Jan Sangh I can express this view almost with the unanimous approval of this House, that so far as our foreign policy is concerned we can look back the year that we have left behind with a great amount of satisfaction. Not only the achievements in the field of foreign affairs had been conducive to the interest of the country but it has served the creation of healthy climate of peace in the Indian sub-continent and has also vindicated the stands which we have taken all along.

Coming to some of the criticisms of the Marxist party friends, he said. India has not raised its voice in the Chilean affair, because we did not want to irritate American imperialists. I say with all the emphasis at my command

that this party and this Govt. are not at all apprehensive of irritating any imperialist power. We have raised our voices whenever we felt that any power had done something which is not conducive to world peace or is against human values.

So far as the Chilean question is concerned, we have expressed our unqualified condemnation of the atrocities that took place in Chile. We were not for it; we condemned it. But there are some countries which have really stood by the oppressors of Chile and one of these countries is the country from which my Marxist friends get their inspiration. If I am correct. There is a report that some countries asked their embassies not to render assistance to the refugees of Chile. One of the countries—let me not name it—is a country from which also my Marxist friends get this inspiration. (*Interruptions*). I have made this allegation; let them contradict it authentically if they can.

I also want to point out that not only on the question of Chile but also in the past on the question of Middle-East, the question of Suez, or so far as the question of Korea, is concerned, India has not hesitated to express its views. I say that India has never hesitated to express its views in absolutely clear terms against the imperialistic designs. My Jan Sangh friends questioned the basic postulate of our foreign policy of Indo-Soviet relations on the ground that our image in the third world is getting tarnished because of our relationship with the Soviet Union. It was said that the recent agreement would leave us reliant on the Soviet camp. These arguments are not new; we have heard these arguments since the time when our relationship with the Soviet Union has become cordial.

Let us make it very clear that the history of the last few years has proved that the relationship between the Soviet Union and India is on equal terms and it is mutually beneficial to each other. The recent Conference has proved that our image in the third world is not tarnished because of our relationship with the Soviet Union. In fact, before the visit of Shri Brezhnev the presses belonging to my friend and also to the western friends created these false rumours and made this false propaganda that Shri Brezhnev will try to persuade

Indian Government to give concessions for bases in the Indian Ocean.

But, Sir, the subsequent events have proved that no such concessions were asked for because the Soviet Union knows that India is a country which cannot be forced, as one may like it, to do a thing. Nothing of this thing came out. These presses and those powers know that India is a country which can guard its own interests. We know that this type of propaganda has been made in order to create a cleavage between us and the Soviet Union. And therefore, this type of propaganda from our Jan Sangh friends is nothing new to me or to us—we are prepared to face it. In fact it appears that the propaganda, to a great extent, resembles the propaganda of the Chinese official news agency 'Hsien Hua' which, expressed its views almost in similar terms. I have come to know that in the Chinese News Agency or in Pakistan's news agency the most quoted politicians are the leaders of the Jan Sangh party; they are the most favoured and the most quoted politicians and therefore, we can really expect and we do expect such types of criticisms which, I think, have really no foundation or basis. With the Soviet assistance, the Soviet-India cooperation which culminated in 1971 treaty has really helped this country not only to face the crisis that we had to face in 1971 but is helping and has helped this country really to create a basic economic structure in this country. There are certain basic features in the Indo-Soviet economic cooperation to which I would like to draw the attention of this House. It should be kept in mind that there is a qualitative difference between the assistance that has been rendered by the Soviet Union and the assistance of some of the imperialistic powers. What is the qualitative difference? They are: firstly, the assistance is multi-dimensional; it has many a facet like the technical assistance, equipment and so on and so forth. But, what is more important is that the Soviet Union has helped us in building the infra-structure of the industrial development which the Western countries have always tried to prevent.

14.00 hrs.

Also, it should be kept in mind that for the Soviet assistance—economic assistance—we need not have to make payments in sterling or in dollar. Therefore, our foreign exchange reserve is

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

not spent on it. Also, everyone knows that Soviet assistance has helped us in strengthening our public sector. The strengthening of the public sector means that thereby we can fight the colonial and neo-colonial forces and the reactionary forces that are growing in this country. We know that these reactionary forces are really apprehensive of these growing bonds of friendship between the Soviet Union and India, because if India can really have a strong economic base, based on these public sector undertakings, the rightists will have no foothold. Therefore, I pity my Jan Sangh friend, when he questions the basic postulates on which the Indo-Soviet friendship has stood. I congratulate the Foreign Minister on this growing strength, and also our revered Prime Minister for strengthening the Indo-Soviet friendship, the credit for which will undoubtedly go to the architect of our foreign policy, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, because at a time when the words 'Socialism' and 'Soviet Union' were to a great extent taboo in many of the countries, he tried and succeeded in helping to create a friendship between India and the Soviet Union.

I would now like to draw the attention of the House to certain significant aspects of our foreign policy to which of course reference has been made by my Marxist friend. The first thing to which I would like to refer is the growth of the non-aligned forces in this world. Only a few years back when we talked of non-alignment, there were the super-powers and the great powers that tried to ridicule this very concept.

I had the privilege of attending recently a conference in Moscow, namely the World Conference of Peace Forces, where more than 3500 delegates from 144 countries and 117 governmental and non-governmental organisations participated. As an Indian, I was proud to say that all the delegates and all the representatives and organisations spoke in one voice about the necessity of non-alignment. Today, a large number of countries are coming round to this idea which was ridiculed earlier by many countries and the efficacy of which was doubted by many countries. The growth in the number of participants in the Algiers Conference is ample evidence of it. Today, the world has realised that the third

force or the non-aligned force is a force which shall have to be reckoned with. I feel that in the coming days, on the question of world peace and easing of international tensions, undoubtedly, the non-aligned nations will play a dominant role, and India will always be able to take a great pride as the initiator of this concept.

The question of collective security has also been referred to by my hon. friend. Undoubtedly he talked about Asian security, and he agreed with that policy, but he said that the time was not opportune. But the idea of Asian security has not been spelt out in detail by anyone. But it is a fact which I think will be admitted by everyone in this House that today Asia is a place in which security is the prime need of the day. Because of the various agreements and various understandings, Europe has become a much better place to live in than Asia today. But because of the unfortunate tendencies and the imperialist manouvres, Asia and Africa continue to be hotbeds of tension. The prime necessity today is for the Asian nations to come together and create an atmosphere by which the efforts of the colonial powers through their neo-colonial manouvres can be frustrated. It is only possible when greater amount of understanding comes between the Asian nations that there could be greater amount of economic co-operation because the colonial powers are today trying to exploit the economic weaknesses of the under-developed Asian powers. It is on the mutually beneficial understanding and agreements of the Asian powers that we can hope to have lasting peace in Asia. Therefore, what has been sought for, when we talk about collective security, or Asian security is understanding and co-operation amongst the Asian nations. We are aware from this side of the House that without the participation of China, the question of lasting peace in Asia cannot be thought of.

Therefore, from this side of the House, our External Affairs Minister and the Government of India have expressed their readiness to improve relationship with China. But better relations cannot be a unilateral business; it is a bilateral business, and unless China resounds, in spite of the fact that we do hope to achieve it, we cannot achieve it. Therefore, when we talk of Asian security and Asian peace, we

know that China will have to be a party to it. We do hope that China will realise this and join in our effort to create a better atmosphere in Asia, with that expectation, I conclude my remarks and congratulate our Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister for successful implementation of our foreign policy.

**SHRI B. R. SHUKLA (Bhraich) :** Our foreign policy has been from its very inception always guided by two basic principles, the policy of non-alignment and the principle of co-existence. This wisdom of these two principles has been assailed in this House and outside by different parties. Reactionaries and rightists in this country assail it on the ground that we are going to enter into the bloc controlled by the Soviet Union. The other opponents criticise it on the ground that we belong to the American lobby and American imperialism. I think these two extreme views of the critics of our foreign policy vindicate our position that we belong neither to the Soviet bloc nor to the American bloc but we are a non-aligned nation having an independent foreign policy. Our non-alignment does not mean political or international isolation, having no connection with the problems facing the world today. We have decided that we shall judge every question, every international situation on its own merits.

Today we find these two principles of our policy vindicated by the attitude of the USA, USSR and China. Our Marxist friend criticised us by saying that we could not raise our voice in regard to Chile because we are afraid of American imperialism. This is a weak argument. May I remind him very sincerely and categorically that we recognised China long long ago when America wanted to create another China? Now China and the USA have come together and done precisely the same thing we did 25 years ago.

We are a developing nation going through the process of a developing economy. Therefore, we have natural affinity and aspirations with all those countries which are struggling or were struggling against neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid. Therefore, there is no wonder, no surprise, that we cast our lot with the aspirations of the Soviet people who stand for progress, solidarity and peace all over the world; they

are not a war-mongering nation, but a nation committed to world peace and the rise of the underdog. Therefore, we have entered into a treaty of peace, friendship and solidarity with the USSR. If anybody has cared to go through the wordings of the agreement, he will find it incorporated in unmistakable language a guarantee for mutual respect, sovereignty and non-interference in the social systems of each other.

Therefore, where is the question that merely because a treaty has been concluded between the USSR and India for co-operation in the technological, scientific and cultural spheres, therefore, we have become the stooge of western imperialism? In all fairness we should say that even the Government of U.S.A. has not viewed this agreement in the perspective in which the young friend belonging to the Jan Sangh party has expressed his views. Even the USA Government is not of the view that this has made us stooges in the hands of the Soviet Government or our policy of non-alignment has in anyway been affected. Therefore, my submission is that all these fears are unfounded.

There remains another question; that India and Pakistan had been placed at par by the Iranian Government. May I remind those who hold this view that even during the Indo-Pakistan war, the oil supply of Iran to India was not stopped or was not reduced. Therefore, even when we were engaged in a bitter struggle with Pakistan, the Iranian Government had not in anyway treated us unfavourably in matters of oil supply. Thanks to the quiet diplomacy of our Foreign Minister, his realistic approach, his visit to that country and there return visit of the dignity of that country, our relations with each other have improved. Therefore, there should be no apprehension, no fear, against Iran. The test of failure or success of the foreign policy of our government is whether we have alienated our friends, whether we have alienated the sympathies of friends and whether we have made more enemies in the world. My submission is that the powers that were friendly with us have become more friendly. The countries which were hostile apparently, have become less hostile. Those who misunderstood our policy have a better appreciation of our stand. Even the strained relations which existed between USA and India

[Shri B. R. Shukla]

in the past few years have improved. But, at the same time, the irritants existing between these two countries have, if not completely disappeared, been at least reduced to a very appreciable extent.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : For example ? (Interruption) PL 480 agreement, etc.

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA : I expect a more friendly relation with my neighbour who is sitting beside me.

Our relations with Nepal are cordial and happy and it is precisely because we have adopted a policy of non-interference in the internal matters of other countries. If we were very zealous, very ambitious to implant our system into the system of our neighbour, probably Nepal would have sought refuge or help from anywhere else.

Similarly, so far as Indian sub-continent is concerned, our policy has been very successful. The era of confrontation, the era of medieval rivalry, power struggle, of spheres of influence, are rapidly yielding place to an era of co-operation all over the world. Those concepts are dying out very fast, and therefore, an international community based on science, technology and culture is coming into being. In this context our policy has been realistic, combined with social idealism; we have not budged an inch from the basic policy. We have made only marginal adjustments here and there.

Only one word about Pakistan. Some people say that our conclusion of a pact with Pakistan at Simla and Delhi has not been very successful because there are sometimes unfriendly utterances in Pakistan by the dignitaries and authorities there. These are more in the nature of utterances for home consumption and resort to psychological diversion rather than against us.

SHRI H. N. MUKHERJEE, (Calcutta—North-east) : We are having this long overdue discussion on international affairs in this House. I say it has been long overdue because so many very important events have happened in the recent past. We have had the non-aligned conference at Algiers and then we have had the united States attack through its proxy, Israel, on Arab freedom,—Arab freedom which is one of the principal keystones of the arch

of human freedom anywhere today. Then of course we have had recently the visit of friendly foreign dignitaries like the visit of Mr. Brezhnev; that visit was by no means an event of ordinary importance, followed up as it was, almost immediately by the visit of Czechoslovak leader Dr. Husak. A situation has come about where the Parliament of India should be apprised of whatever new perspectives the Government consider now to be open before them or whatever new initiatives India is going to adopt in the near future and in a more effective manner than hitherto. I therefore welcome this discussion and I do hope that it would be a productive and fruitful one.

We are one-sixth of mankind and our country with its geo-political situation has a certain responsibility also to the world. Perhaps we can claim, thanks mainly to Jawaharlal Nehru that at least in so far as our foreign policy by and large is concerned, in spite of many weaknesses, many deficiencies and set-backs and lacunae, fundamentally this country has tried after Independence, except for a few unpleasant interludes, to pursue a foreign policy of peace, a foreign policy that would bring about an addition to the sum total of human freedom and human happiness. And if we are to deserve that role which rightfully is India's in the perspective of history, then I think we have to be a little more active, a little more reflective and a little more genuinely cognisant at the same time of the ideological implications of our decisions and of the objective reality about it.

I wish therefore that our foreign policy is formulated and sought to be implemented, not in the dull, wooden, mechanical rule-of-road fashion which sees to be customary with our foreign office, but with some imagination and some apprehension of the new idea which the Brezhnev visit must have underlined even to the half-blind, that we live in a different kind of world and in this world if India has to pull her weight, she must go on acting on a principled basis, sometimes braving whatever unpleasant consequences might follow. This reminds me of what my friend, Shri Samar Mukherjee, mentioned a little while ago about Chile. He conceded and we all know that the

Prime Minister made some very good statement about Salvador Allende. The Prime Minister occasionally makes very good statements even about Cuba's Fidel Castro, but the trouble is, in the AICC session which took place almost immediately after the martyrdom of Salvador Allende, some young members of the AICC tried to put in a word about Allende's death in the resolution, but they were, according to the press reports, dissuaded from doing so by the advice of, among other people our friend, the Minister of External Affairs. This may or may not be so—the question of dissuasion—but the question remains that no mention was made. Ever since that time, in regard to our relations with Chile, the Foreign Office has made no pronouncement or gesture, not even tried to recall our Ambassador or make any kind of gesture internationally understandable as a reprimand so as to speak on the Fascist gangsters who have taken hold of the administration and the entire life of that unhappy country. I wish—this is in passing—that we can make amends by offering posthumously to Salvador Allende the Jawaharlal Nehru prize for international understanding, which is in the gift of the Indian Council of Cultural Affairs, of which my friend, the minister, is the boss. As we did in the case of Martin Luther King, I wish we can make amends by making this award posthumously in the name of Salvador Allende, the President of Chile.

At the present moment, except for Chile and what is going on so far as the still unquenched war in West Asia is concerned, except for those two aspects, broadly speaking, the world picture seems to be promising. The European Security Conference and its aftermath may give rise to some optimistic calculations about that continent. The Arab showing against Israel, assisted of course by the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, is certainly something to feel happy and proud about. The peace meets which have taken place in different parts of the world particularly, in Moscow, have also been a phenomenon one has to make a song and dance about.

But there are still many problems in regard to which our country's Government should have to take some very serious notice. In Indochina, the position still remains bedevilled by the action of the US Government and their

protege in Saigon. India has to pull her weight, even though India seems to have almost abdicated her responsibility in that part of the world in spite of having been the Chairman of the International Commission. We have not yet recognised diplomatically the Provincial Revolutionary Government in South Vietnam, when there is no earthly reasons for that action. We have not yet recognised the Sihanouk regime although, as Mr. Samar Mukherjee pointed out a little earlier, in Algiers we appeared to be in favour of the Sihanouk regime. But we have not proceeded further. There was a meeting in Paris about a fortnight ago—some of us might have gone there, but we could not make it—where also it seems hundreds of organisations and representatives of many countries made a decision in favour of the Cambodian picture being changed, so that genuinely representative and popular elements may come into the scene. India has not made any move in that direction. Possibly, in spite of whatever my friends on the other side have said, that is due to the fact that even though India never behaves so crudely as to toe the line of the US Government in a naked, unshamed fashion, we are overwhelmed, we are afraid and apprehensive of treading on the toe even of a rather damaged US Government. Otherwise, we would not have entered into the kind of agreement that in the Finance Minister almost on the sly has entered into in regard to the PL 480 transactions, because at one time they passed off their agricultural surpluses, which they could do nothing about, and for all the kind of assistance which they give, they have got back a great deal more than their *quid pro quo*. And instead of genuinely freezing the entire operation and almost forgetting all about it, we have permitted them to go ahead, till God knows when, to control our economy and they control our economy in a particular manner, as all of us know.

A reference to multi-national corporations is now being made in international forums, even by respectable persons, Kurt Waldheim and his colleagues in the United Nations. They are talking about multi-national corporations like IBM and other people, which have got a grip over the economy of underdeveloped countries like ours. The UN estimate is about 14,000 to 15,000 million dollars, representing the amount

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

of only all the advantage they got from developing countries, because of unequal trade. These multi-national corporations, with their kind of octopus-like grip over the semi-colonial economies like ours, they are a menace to be dealt with. They have shown their power in Chile and elsewhere, and we are afraid of the United States, which is the main protector and champion and representative and symbol of these multi-national corporations.

China, of course, does pose a rather peculiar and sometimes perverse problem. Even though I agree we should go all out, to the extent possible, to make friends with her, some of China's activities are so dismal and almost despicable—I say despicable in relation to China befriending the fascist junta in Chile; I find China thriving at dissections in our part of the world in the Asian continent, I find China giving a good chit to NATO and other organisations, talking about the balance of power, China even opposing the idea of India and other countries wanting the Indian Ocean to be really and truly a zone of peace; China is behaving in a perverse fashion; there is no doubt about it—but, all the same, I have the expectation, though I may not live to see it, like the prodigal son, China will come back to the socialist fold and the fattened calf would be there for China on that occasion. But, in the mean-time, let us try and make the best use of whatever opportunities that we have and I am sure that when the implications of a nation like collective security for Asia are truly preponderant, and not hidden away because of some kind of embarrassment which may strike some people in our country and elsewhere, if the genuine connotation of an Asian mutual security is explained, then China would be really and truly very much there in the map in a picture of Asian security which we should assist to build up.

This reminds us that in so far as the Indian Ocean zone as a peace zone is concerned, this activity is an example of what we can do in order to have something like security for Asia. The fact of the matter is that in the Indian Ocean zone it is the Americans and the British who are the villains of the piece. They are there in control of Diego Garcia and other places. For instance, in 1966 the USA and Britain concluded an agreement to build military installa-

tions in the Seychelles islands that belongs to Great Britain. Now the understanding is being implemented to build a large military base in Diego Garcia and the islands of Chagos Archipelag. At the other end of the world, in Guam in the Pacific fringe or near the Western coast of Australia, nuclear submarines are being stationed and the Seventh Fleet is moving in greater strength into the Indian Ocean and that sort of thing is happening.

As far as the Soviets are concerned, while even the Indian Government from time to time by implication appears to say that after all it is a matter where the Soviets and the Americans are competing with each other. Mr. Brezhnev himself has said that he does not regard as at all desirable a position where military fleets of great powers are for long periods sailing very far from their coasts, and he added "we are prepared to solve this problem".

But we want to sit down together as equals and do it. In this regard. . .

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

SHRI H. N. MUKHERJEE : I have to have some more time. I was given to understand. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I hate to interrupt you. But instead of 12 minutes, I have given you 15 minutes. What shall I do now? I understand your point also. You may take 5 minutes more. This is my difficulty.

SHRI H. N. MUKHERJEE : In regard to this matter, I think, there is a scheme to have in Madagascar, in next April, a meeting of all the littoral countries to discuss this question of peace in the Indian Ocean zone. That is a matter where the Soviet Union are befriending us, assisting us and championing our cause, while the Americans and British are nowhere in the picture and will not support any idea of that at all.

In regard to the Arbs position today, we hope, our Government on the whole, surely, has taken a good attitude, a strong attitude and we have to tell our friends on this side who sometimes come up with certain propositions which are rather difficult to

characterise, that it is not a question of our being irritated by Saudi Arabia. Between Saudi Arabia and this country, there is nothing uncommon. Saudi Arabia may have many reasons apart from the religious elements for disapproving of it. But that is neither here nor there.

The Arabs live in an area of the world which is strategically and economically so valuable that anything happening there is important. Napoleon in his time wanted to have Constantinople as a capital of world empire. That is a part of the world from where you can carry on operations in order to keep the world under control. If in that zone the Arabs and the Israelis, the Arabs and non-Arabs, can live in friendship with all the others, everything will be all right. Therefore, let us have a settlement there so that the Arab freedom is guaranteed and the Palestinian freedom is guaranteed.

I remember, as an old member of the Congress in those days, in 1936 and 1938, we celebrated the Palestinian Day because the Indian National Congress wanted to register support to the freedom idea. That is so terribly important to us. From that angle, we have to look at it.

I am sorry—you are so parsimonious in regard to the allotment of time—I cannot go into more details of it about which I do happen to know a little more than my other friends.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must say, I have been very generous.

SHRI H. N. MUKHERJEE: I appreciated your generosity. But still I would ask for your indulgence for a little while longer.

Here is the matter of Asian security which, as my hon. friend very rightly said, is not a cut and dried proposition—you take it or leave it. That is not a sort of thing. It has to be discussed and thought over. You proceed with it slowly but surely and steadily. But my hon. friend thought that it was a slogan. It is not a slogan. It is a matter of principle. All throughout our freedom movement, we have had this idea of Asians being together. Just as later on, the Ameri-

cans wanted Asians to fight Asians, we wanted Asians to come together.

Shri C. R. Das in Gaya Congress session in 1922, Shri Mohammad Ali in Kakinada Congress session in 1923, Shri Ansari in Madras Congress session in 1927, Shri Srinivas Ayyangar in Gauhati Congress session in 1926, all of them talked about the Asian Federation. In Calcutta Congress session in 1928 where Shri Motilal Nehru presided and Shri J. M. Sen Gupta was the Chairman of the Reception Committee, they talked about Asiatic unity.

We have got our relations with Pasha; we have relations with the movements inside Turkey; we have asked for freedom of Palestine. East or west, we have always tried to associate ourselves with them.

For Viet Nam, in 1946, in Calcutta, the students gave their blood in the streets of the city because they were fired on for sympathising with the Vietnam struggle. This is our background. We fellow Asians and Africans have been fighting for freedom. After freedom, we are together building and consolidating our freedom. That is why we want cooperation; that is why we want peace; that is why we want understanding; that is why we want security. That is why today we want an Asian where everybody will come together. Why only Asia? Because Asia has a long memory. We are a home of civilisation. Our history goes back to so many thousands of years. We have suffered for centuries under the imperialistic domination. We know what neo-imperialism is which even in this area of freedom is trying to utilise every advantage against us. The Soviet Union, most of whose territories lie inside of Asia which comprise Tadjeistan, next-door to Kashmir, naturally comes forward as a leading proponent of this idea. The Soviet Union first proposing it in 1969 is in no hurry about it. Let us consider it. Let us go ahead with it. Mr. Brezhnev says repeatedly that China is putting out an idea that we are against China; there are slogans aimed against China. Not at all. There is no idea of encircling or isolating China. China would be a legitimate and a very much welcome member of the security process. If today



[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

she is feeling perverse about it, the logic of life tomorrow will make her change her mind. But the logic of life does not change on its own. History does not move on its own. Man has to make history by a conscious process of cogitation to begin with and action to follow. That cogitation and that action is something which foreign policy should comprise.

I shall conclude by saying that we are having also thrown about this concept of two super-powers. There are two super-powers. We cannot do very much about it. Occasionally we can play a very crafty game and get into the good favour of one of the other or both, if you can manage. But that is not the idea, if you want to have a principled approach to the matter. Mr. Brezhnev himself says—and it is important that we know it—that “this new coinage of a world called super-power is unacceptable to a communist who has a class understanding; we pursue in the Soviet Union a socialist class foreign policy, a foreign policy of peace and freedom”. If that gets linked up with something else, that is a different matter. Soviet Union is an outstanding power; it has a responsibility for history and, therefore, to that extent, it has to exercise its responsibility. But it refuses to be dubbed a super-power and there is no reason why, while dubbing it as a super-power we should tar it with the same brush as we do the Americans. How do the Americans behave? That, we know in Vietnam and elsewhere, when they sent the Seventh Fleet into the Bay of Bengal; we know it very well; they make friends with China so that China can muddy the waters of the Indian Sub-continent; being hostile to Bangladesh, they use Indo-Pakistan hostility as a factor, when India wants to be friends with Pakistan. We want to be friends with Ceylon, with Burma, with Afghanistan, with China and with all our neighbours and everybody in Asia and Africa, because we act on a principled basis. It is no slogan, it is a doctrine, you might say; it is something inherent in India's fight for independence; and that is why we have to wake up our mind that in regard to that we shall do something.

Perhaps I am talking a little too seriously. I am reminded of a joke. A Frenchman was once asked why he

kissed the hand of every woman he met, and he said, “After all, you have to begin somewhere?”. Now you have to begin somewhere if you want to do something, if you want to achieve something. The Asian Security idea is something which does not require you to put up a protocol and get it signed by eleven other people. You do something slowly, surely, steadily and then win your objective. We can win that objective, but we have to remember that, today, whether we like it or not, we are on one side of the fence: we are not on the side which the American imperialists dominate; we are on the side of peace, we are on the side of progress, we are on the side of socialism. If we do not remember that, if we go by protocol and conventions produced in Geneva or elsewhere, we shall never have a foreign policy worthwhile. We should have a principled foreign policy as Jawaharlal Nehru tried all his life to evolve. Those were much more difficult days. Now you are at an advantage. Use that advantage. That is my word of advice to the government of the day.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: While probing the international situation, I would request the members to give some thought to my situation also and that is that I must give everybody a chance.

Mr. Dinesh Singh.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Do you want him to begin with your hand first?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He does not have to begin somewhere with me?

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the subject of foreign affairs of a country is really a very wide canvas, and since you have, at the very beginning, reminded me of your difficulties, I would wish to confine myself to only some of the important trends which, I think, are the guiding factors. But before I do so, I should like to say something about the statement that my hon. friend and a very senior and respected member of this House, Prof. H. N. Mukherjee, made about our foreign policy. He said that India's foreign policy has attempted to strengthen peace and human freedom and dignity and I think there can be no greater tribute to the

foreign policy of our country and I am sure my friend, the Foreign Minister will feel greatly satisfied with the remarks that Prof. Hiren Mukherjee made of his endeavours in relation to foreign affairs.

We have been talking about the changes that are coming in the seventies in the field of foreign relations and I think that perhaps the most important change which reflects changes in every other field is the *detente* that is being attempted by the United States and the Soviet Union. It is a matter of very great satisfaction that the two powers—I am advisedly not using the word 'super' since my friend, Prof. Mukherjee, is allergic to it—but the two powers which have the capacity to destroy this world several times over, should attempt to work out between themselves certain protocols, certain disciplines which will prevent the breaking up of hostilities which could engulf the entire world.

I am also conscious of the danger in *detente* which the hon. Member, Mr. Madhav Rao mentioned about a possible concert of power. It is here that the rest of the world and, especially, the non-aligned countries can play a very important part. So long as the two large powers in this world have a desire to find out a working arrangement, the other countries can very easily weave a pattern in which the decisions are not left only to the two major powers. In this connection, the meeting of the non-aligned countries in Algiers was a very important step and the contributions made by the Indian Delegation, by the Prime Minister and by the Foreign Minister are historic.

Non-alignment is not a new concept. Under the Indian philosophy a form of non-alignment has always existed. But non-alignment in its application to international affairs has had a positive result in the regulation of international system, which is now accepted by all countries including those which opposed non-alignment vehemently once upon a time. Therefore, there is now a great opportunity for the non-aligned countries to begin to work out amongst themselves and outside, including the major powers, systems in which it would be possible to resolve international disputes peacefully and in a friendly manner.

Non-alignment is not merely a political concept. Behind it is the concept of international co-operation and peaceful co-existence and it is in the field of international co-operation that I feel that non-alignment has to make a still more positive contribution. International co-operation is important because the world is getting increasingly divided between the rich countries and the poor countries and the widening gulf will inevitably lead to a widening conflict. It is in this respect that the non-alignment countries can, in co-operation with others, start to build systems in which there would be a narrowing of the gap between the rich and the poor. It is not an easy process. I am aware of the tremendous difficulties that lie in trying to persuade any one who is rich, to share his prosperity with the poor. But a consciousness has to be created that his richness in isolation is a liability, that it has to be shared with those who have the capacity to produce further wealth and share the richness not by any measure of charity but by a concerted act of cooperation.

Another important matter, I think, that needs to be mentioned is the visit of Mr. Brezhnev to India. It is important not only because a friend from a very friendly country visited us, but because it reflects a certain trend in our relation with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is a major power in the world today. That Soviet Union should wish to cooperate with countries in different regions of the world to strengthen peace is a very welcome step, and I would interpret Mr. Brezhnev's visit to India in this light. He came here not only to consult with us on bilateral issues about which also I am sure, there was enough opportunity, but he came to assure us that the Soviet Union's friendship with India is not a limited arrangement but that it is a wider field of consultation, that Soviet Union is interested not only in her European friends, or in the new arrangement that she is making with the United States, or in some other parts of the world, but that she is positively interested in what is happening in Asia and in India's welfare.

Mr. Madhavarao Scindia mentioned about some dangers of our getting too close to the Soviet Union and thereby he implied that we had also to strengthen our relations with the United

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

States. I think it would be quite wrong to say that India has in any manner tried to ignore the United States. The other day the Prime Minister has made it quite clear that it was India's desire to seek American friendship as much as it would seek the friendship of any other country, but that friendship is not a one-way traffic. It has to be reciprocated. I think it would be appropriate for us to spend a minute or two over the nature of our relationship with the Soviet Union and with the United States. Our friendship with Soviet Union has been based on certain identity of interests, between our two countries. If we take our minds back, from the time of our Independence on very issue of national importance to us, of vital importance to us, we have had the support of the Soviet Union in the international forums. Whether you take the question of Kashmir or Goa or Bangla Desh, or the question of decolonisation and assistance to developing countries the Soviet vote has always been with India; on the other hand we have not yet been able to find identification with the US on specific interests to us. In all these issues which I have referred to, the vote of the U.S. was not with us. It was with the imperialist and the colonial countries or it was with our adversaries or with those who had opposed our policies.

It is obviously desirable to build a sound foundation of friendship with the United States as we have built up with the Soviet Union. But, this would be possible only if there is a will in both the countries to sit down and identify their interests and see how best they could be promoted.

When I was talking about the visit of Mr. Brezhnev, I was reminded of the question of Asian Security which came up earlier in the House. I think that it is a matter which we should see in its total implications. Frankly, I am not terribly enamoured of the word 'security'. I wish it is possible to use some other word which would connotate more positively the concept of cooperation. However, we are not concerned with the words as such but with the ideas behind them. What is of real importance for us is to see how Asian cooperation can be built up. I think a very good case was built

up by the hon. Member, Prof. H. N. Mukherjee of the need for Asian co-operation and Asian identity.

I think that the Asian security that is generally talked about is really a question of bringing the Asian countries together—not in the sense of any military arrangements but in a wider sense of cooperation. And I think that this cooperation between the Asian countries is possible if we are able to make use of the surpluses of Asian countries in the developmental processes of all Asian countries. This would, I think interpret in the greatest measure the word 'security' in its wider sense. When we are making use of each other's resources for our development, it would, in fact, mean that each Asian country would have a share in the prosperity of other Asian countries. In that wider concept, security acquires a meaning. I have no doubt that China would also become a participant in this process. The hon. Member, Prof. Mukharjee talked of China as the prodigal son and offered it the fattened calf. We need not offer the fattened calf to them, they would, I hope be pleased to accept only their share of whatever is available from the Asian countries as a whole.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to add to your troubles and I would, therefore, sit down.

श्री शशि भूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आज, हम ऐसे दौर से गुजर रहे हैं, जब दुनिया में शान्ति की ताकतें काफी संगठित और मजबूत हो रही हैं। हम देखते हैं कि आज दुनिया में एक तरफ साम्राज्यवादी ताकतें हैं और दूसरी तरफ शान्ति की ताकतें हैं, और दुनिया इन दो हिस्सों में बंटती जा रही है।

जब हम अपने देश में अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद से लड़ रहे थे, तो रशिया के विभिन्न देशों में जो फ्रीडम फ़ाइटर्स, स्वतंत्रता सेनानी, अपने देशों को साम्राज्यवाद से मुक्त कराने के लिए संघर्ष कर रहे थे, हमारी हमदर्दी उन के साथ थी और उन लोगों की हमदर्दी हमारे साथ थी। जब हमरा देश आजाद हुआ, तो उस के साथ साथ हमारे पड़ोस के देश भी साम्राज्यवाद से आजाद होते चले गये। आज भी सुदूर पूर्व में मेरा मतलब वियतनाम से है—

साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ जो आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी जा रही है, उस में हम शुरू से ही स्वतंत्रता सेनानियों की मदद करते आ रहे हैं।

भारत की हमेशा से यही नीति रही है, उस पर हमें गर्व है और हम ने उस को कभी बदला नहीं है। जो लोग आजादी के लिए लड़ रहे हैं, चाहे वे अफ्रीका में हों, लेटिन अमरीका में हों और चाहे अरब देशों में हों, जो साम्राज्यवादियों द्वारा दबाई हुई अपनी धरती को मुक्त कराने के लिए संघर्ष कर रहे हैं, हमने हमेशा उन की मदद की है। हमारे देश को इस बात का गर्व है कि जो अन्याय करते हैं, जो आततायी हैं, हम ने हमेशा उन के विरोध में कदम उठाया है।

विश्व में जो शान्ति की ताकतें हैं, चाहे वे समाजवादी देशों में हों और चाहे नव-विकसित देशों में, जो साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ रही हैं, हम उन के काफ़ी नज़दीक आये हैं। हम ने बंगलादेश में देखा कि वहाँ के सब लोग साम्राज्यवाद की पपेट पाक सरकार के खिलाफ लड़, हम ने उन की सहायता की और एशिया में एक नया राष्ट्र बंगला देश उभर कर आया। हमें फ़ख़्र है कि आज वह हमारा पड़ोसी देश स्वाधीन है और आगे बढ़ रहा है।

हम अपने सभी पड़ोसी देशों के साथ दोस्ती रखना चाहते हैं। कब हिन्दुस्तान ने चाइना की तरफ़ दोस्ती का हाथ नहीं बढ़ाया? जब से हम आजाद हुए हैं—और उस से पहले भी—, हम हमेशा चाइना के साथ दोस्ती की बात करते रहे, और इस दिशा में प्रयत्न करते रहे, लेकिन चाइना ने हमारी तरफ़ दोस्ती का हाथ नहीं बढ़ाया। वह हमारे देश के एक भाग पर कब्ज़ा किये बैठा है। वह सैनिक क्षेत्र में बढ़ी तैयारी कर रहा है। ब्रिटन उस को शस्त्र भी दे रहा है और उस की एयर फ़ोर्स को मजबूत करने के लिए वह

कारखाना भी लगा रहा है। अमरीका भी उस की मदद कर रहा है।

पहले चाइना की तरफ से कहा जाता था कि हिन्दुस्तान प्रो-अमरीकन है। आज हम देखते हैं कि जो कुछ वह हमारे प्रति कहता था, वह उस के खिलाफ़ चल रहा है। हम हमेशा नाटो, सेन्टों और अन्य फ़ौजी गठ-बन्धनों का विरोध और पंचशील पर विश्वास करते रहे। उस वक्त चीन हमारा मजाक उड़ाता था। आज हम देखते हैं कि वह नाटो और सेन्टों का साथ दे रहा है, कठपुतली सरकारों का साथ दे रहा है, जिन के खिलाफ़ हम सब को लड़ना चाहिए। वह पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे रहा है। पाकिस्तान में बलूच, पख्तून और दूसरे लोगों का दमन हो रहा है। वहाँ चीन किस का साथ दे रहा है, यह सारी दुनिया जानती है।

हम आज भी चीन की तरफ़ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ा रहे हैं, लेकिन उस की तरफ़ से कोई मुनासिब जवाब नहीं दिया जाता है। हम चीन के मित्र हैं। हम उस की ज़मीन का एक इंच भी नहीं चाहते हैं। वह भी हमारे क्षेत्र से हट जाये। हम चीन से कोई ईर्ष्या नहीं करते हैं। अगर वह तरक्की करता है, तो हमें खुशी होती है कि एशिया का एक देश तरक्की कर रहा है। लेकिन चीन हमारी हर तरक्की से ईर्ष्या करता है और हर बात में हम से प्रतिद्वंद्विता करना चाहता है। सारे चीन में भारत के प्रति नफ़रत का वातावरण पैदा कर दिया गया है, जब कि हमारे देश में कोई भी चीन के साथ नफ़रत नहीं करता है। मुझे पिछले साल चीन जाने का मौका मिला। मैंने देखा कि वहाँ सरकार की तरफ से लोगों को ऐसा बना दिया गया है कि वे भारत से नफ़रत करें। इस के मुकाबले में हमने हमेशा चीन के साथ दोस्ती रखने की कोशिश की है। हमारे देश में जो लोग पहले चीन के साथ दोस्ती का विरोध करते

## [श्री शशि भूषण]

ये, वे भी निकसन के पीकिंग हो जाने के बाद चीन के साथ दोस्ती की बात करने लगे हैं। हमारा रवैया नहीं बदला है, लेकिन चीन ने अपना रवैया बदल दिया है।

जैसे हम ने वियतनाम की जनता का समर्थन किया है, वैसे ही हमने आजादी के लिए लड़ रहे कम्बोडिया के लोगों का भी समर्थन किया है, जो अपने देश को विदेशियों के चंगुल से मुक्त कराना चाहते हैं। सिंहनख की सरकार के साथ हमारी पूरी हमदर्दी है। साथ वियतनाम के एक बहुत बड़े हिस्से पर पी० आर० जी० का कब्जा है। उस को दुनिया के बहुत से देशों ने मान्यता भी दी है। यह ठीक है कि हमारा बड़ा देश है और वह धीरे धीरे कदम उठाता है, लेकिन मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि वह दिल्ली में पी० आर० जी० का एक इनफ़ॉर्मेशन आफ़िस खोलने की अनुमति फ़ौरन दे दें, जैसे कि हम ने पहले अलजीरिया की आजादी के लिए लड़ने वाले लोगों को यहां एक इनफ़ॉर्मेशन सेंटर खोलने की अनुमति दे दी थी। मंत्री महोदय पी० आर० जी० को जल्दी से जल्दी मान्यता करने की तरफ़ भी कदम बढ़ायें। हम चाहते हैं कि वहां शान्ति हो और पेरिस समझौते को पूरी तरह लागू किया जाये।

15.00 hrs.

मैं विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान इस तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी गोवा का अधिकृत विशप पुर्तगाल में है—जो पुर्तगाल का विशप है, उसके अधीन गोवा का विशप है। गोअन विशप पुर्तगाली विशप के अन्तर्गत एक छोटे डायसीज़ का विशप है। हिज़ होलीनेस पोप बहुत से कार्यों में हमेशा भारत को मदद देते रहे हैं, चाहे वह बंगलादेश का मामला हो और चाहे शरणाथियों का सवाल हो। हम पोप से चाहते हैं कि वह पुर्तगाल से भारत के विशप की मुक्ति दिलायें। विदेश मंत्री उन का ध्यान फ़ौरन इस बात की तरफ़ दिलायें कि हम किसी

भी रूप में—धार्मिक रूप में या किसी दूसरे रूप में—अपने देश में पुर्तगाल का दखल नहीं रखना चाहते हैं। गोआ के क्रिस्चियनज़ की भी यही आवाज है। भारतीय विशप की कांफ़रेंस के लिए, और यहां के कार्डिनल के लिए भी, यह बड़ी एमबैरेसिंग सिचुएशन है कि गोआ का विशप पुर्तगाल में बंटा है। यहां का बिशप भारत के विरोधी पुर्तगाली बिशप के अधीन है। यह हमारे राष्ट्र के स्वाभिमान का प्रश्न है। और पुर्तगाल वैसे तो मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट भी गोवा से अपने यहां बनाए हुए है, किमी को फारेस्ट इन्वार्ज बनाए हुए है। तो वह साम्राज्यवादी पागलपन उन का अफ़ीका और दूसरे देशों से धीरे धीरे समाप्त होता जा रहा है, लेकिन हिज़ होलीनेस मे आप खास तौर पर इस बात के लिए दरखास्त करें कि हिन्दुस्तान में गोवा का विशप स्वतंत्र होना चाहिए और जैसे और बिशप को अधिकार हैं ऐसे ही उस को भी होने चाहिए। यह मैं ध्यान दिलाना चाहत हूँ।

हिन्द महासागर में खाम तार मे हम देखते हैं कि अमेरिकी बेड़े काफी सरगमी हैं और उन से हमें खतरा पैदा हुआ है। हिन्दुस्तान कोई एक साधारण ताकत नहीं है दुनिया में। आज हम फांजी तौर पर भी चौथी ताकत हैं। तो आज हम हिन्द महासागर को यह नहीं चाहते कि अशांति का अड्डा बने। लेकिन हमारे क्षेत्र में अगर विदेशी जंगी जहाज आएंगे तो हम उस के बारे में सोच और उस के बारे में कोई कदम उठाएँ तो गलत नहीं होगा। जो शांति की ताकतें हैं खास तौर से जो अरब सागर के किनारे के देश हैं, हिन्द महासागर के किनारे के देश हैं, अरब गल्फ़ के किनारे के देश हैं उन सब से जो शांति चाहते हैं हम को इस संबंध में सम्पर्क बनाना चाहिए। उन की कान्फरेन्स बुलानी चाहिए ताकि हम देखें कि दस क्षेत्र को शांति का क्षेत्र रखा जा सके। लेकिन आज हम देखते हैं कि चाहे ब्रिटेन हो चाहे अमेरिका हो दोनों के इंटरैस्ट इस

क्षेत्र में बहुत हैं। वह चाहे ईरान को मदद देते हो, साउथ आफ्रीका को मदद देते हो, साउथ वियतनाम को मदद देते हों, चारो तरफ हम देखते हैं कि साम्राज्यवादी ताकतों के अंकुश काफी गहरे हमारे इस शांति के क्षेत्र में हैं। उस के खिलाफ हमें कदम उठाना चाहिए और अपनी तैयारी रखनी चाहिए क्योंकि बगैर तैयारी रख हुए यह संभव नहीं कि साम्राज्यवादी ताकतें शांति की बात से अलग हो जाय। हमेशा कहीं न कहीं उस का मुकाबिला करना पड़ेगा।

एक चीज में और कहना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक अरब राष्ट्रों का सवाल है हम हमेशा से अरब राष्ट्रों के साथ रहे हैं आजादी के पहले भी और उस के बाद भी। हमें उस पालिसी पर गर्व रहा है। जहाँ तक ईजिप्ट की सीमा पर और सीरिया की सीमा पर इजरायल का कब्जा है वह खत्म होना चाहिए और इस बात के लिए हम ने उन को समर्थन दिया है। हम चाहते हैं कि और भी समर्थन हम उन को देते रहें। इस बात का भी हमें फ़र्र हासिल है कि जब भी हमारा चाहे बंगला देश का प्रश्न आया था और दूसरे प्रश्न आए अरब राष्ट्रों ने कभी हमारा तेल रोका नहीं और हमारे संबंध उन से अच्छे बनें यह मैं खास तौर से उन से दर-खास्त करना चाहता हूँ।

आखीरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारा विदेश प्रचार विभाग है उस को और मजबूत होना चाहिए। यद्यपि उस के पास साधन कम है लेकिन उन्होंने अच्छा काम किया है। अच्छा हो कि पख़्तून, बिल्लोच, बर्मा, सिंहली और दूसरे पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों की ज़बानों में भी अपने देश का प्रचार वह कर सकें क्योंकि बजाय इस के कि हम यूरोप में अपना प्रचार करें, पड़ोसी देशों में प्रचार होना चाहिए। तो उन को और साधन दिए जायें इस दिशा में वह कदम उठाएँ, यह मैं चाहता हूँ।

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN** (Wandiwash): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in the last two years, the international situation has

completely changed. Politics has become so unconventional in international affairs that our country is not in a position to cope up with the situation. Very recently during Mr. Brezhnev's visit, we concluded two important agreements, the economic and trade co-operation agreement for 15 years and the agreement on co-operation between Planning Commission and the Soviet State Planning organisation. These agreements are an aftermath of the 1971 treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation.

Sir, we welcome these agreements as far as these are restricted to economic and trade co-operation. But certain misgivings have been expressed, and I think it is for the Government and particularly the Minister of External Affairs to clear these matters. An opinion has been expressed whether we will be equal partners in these agreements, and whether India will slowly become a Soviet satellite because of our economic dependence on a super power. Again, a question has been asked whether we will continue to command the same respect which we used to command among the non-aligned or the third world.

As far as my party is concerned, I think this will depend upon how we are going to implement these agreements and how we are going to utilise this economic aid which comes from Russia. If we use this aid from Russia or other countries and become self-reliant in the next five, ten or 15 years, certainly we can be equal partners, but if we think the brother is there to help us wherever there is shortage, certainly we will become a junior partner and USSR will think that she will be our big brother.

We are not happy at the way Mr. Brezhnev's visit was handled by the Government as well as the ruling party. To say the least, it was not in consonance with our democratic traditions. In our country, with a different political system, the Opposition party always accuses the political party which is the ruling party, of political interference in government. Whenever a member of the ruling party approaches an official and gets something done, we always from the Opposition—or, for example, in my own State, the other parties in the Opposition—accuse the ruling party

[Shri G. Viswanathan]

of using the Government machinery for its own purposes. This is not the case in the Soviet Union. We must be aware, especially our Congress friends should be aware of the fact that we inherit a different political system. But how was the visit of Brezhnev used in this country, especially here in the capital? You started forming committees with Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma at the head. I have nothing personal against him. But he is the President of the ruling party. You want to imitate everything which is available in the Soviet Union. That is a trend which is bad for this democracy, because we have a different system here. The Prime Minister is the person who leads the country. Instead of that, you wanted to put the Congress President in her place. Ultimately, they did not take it to the logical conclusion of signing the agreement between Brezhnev and Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma. Fortunately, that did not happen. I want the Government to ponder over this.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Do you think that Brezhnev would have signed the agreement with Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma?

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : At least, in the future, I think the Government will avoid such awkward situations.

Sir, more co-operation with the Soviet Union is certainly welcome, but it should not be at the cost of other friends and other countries. I want to emphasise that even if the basket is good, do not put all the eggs in one basket.

The recent agreement which my hon. friend mentioned just now, between our Government and USA on the PL 480 funds on the one hand, and the agreement between the European Common Market, or the ECC countries and India on the other, are a welcome feature. I think we have to pursue this certainly with the countries where our economic interests also lie.

Everybody is talking about the Indian Ocean. All of us want that this should be kept free from super-power rivalries and that it should be an area of peace. I want to know from hon. Members how we are going to do it.

Can we persuade or dissuade them? Can you prevent the Soviet Union or American ships from entering the Indian Ocean? Can we do it alone? If it is to be done, it has to be done by all the littoral States. And here, India should take the lead, convene a conference of all the littoral States of the Indian Ocean. Unless we join together and oppose, you cannot oppose the super-powers entering and having a power rivalry in the Indian Ocean.

Prime Minister Nehru used to take a lot of more interest in external affairs. I hope the present Prime Minister also allots more time and takes more interest in the External Affairs of the country, forgetting DCC and PCC and dissidents and Belgaums and Meeruts and UP and Orissa, so that India will play a more positive role, especially in Asia. Except the Asian countries everybody is interested in Asian security. Russia when it goes to Europe, it says : we Europeans must be united against American Imperialism; when it comes to Asia, it says : we Asians should solidly stand together and oppose all the other countries. I want the people of Belgaum to learn this from the USSR so that they can claim to be both Maharashtrians and Karanatakas. I am happy that the Prime Minister did not yield to the pressure to sign the Brezhnev doctrine on Asian security. Prof. Mukharjee argued very well; even Brezhnev could not have argued better. Our country is in a position to take care of itself in normal times.

15.11 hrs.

SHRI SEZHIAN in the Chair.]

What are we going to do when our relations are not so close with our neighbours? Is our friendship with USSR alone enough? What is going to be our attitude towards China? It is almost a big power. And our future relations with Pakistan? We entered into an agreement with them at Simla. I do not think that alone is encouraging. Repatriation is not going on at the speed at which we want it to be done. I say we have enough raw materials in this part of the world; we have enough oil in the Arab soil, we have enough technology in Japan. If all the countries in Asia join together, and if India can play a vital

role in consolidating the Asian countries, Asia will become a major economic power like the present European Economic Community. After getting American aid they are now in a position to differ from Americans on the West Asia policy. We should be in such a position, whether we take aid from the United States or the Soviet Union. As a party to the Simla Agreement, I hope Pakistan will be reasonable enough to expedite the repatriation so that diplomatic relations between the two countries could be restored. Then we will have a peaceful life. Pakistan has not yet recognised Bangladesh. I hope wisdom will dawn on Mr. Bhutto and he will recognise Bangladesh, so that all the three can sit together and discuss the problem as brothers and live a peaceful life.

In West Asia, we are glad that Israel and Egypt are going to the Conference Table from the battle field. I want to know from the Government what our role has been in bringing the parties together. It has been nil. We did nothing except to express our solidarity with Arabs. We are correct when we ask Israel to vacate the occupied territory, but without improving our relations with Israel, we can never play a useful role as far as West Asia is concerned. Having only one party with us, we can never play the role of mediator in West Asia policy.

As regards China we all expect that Mao-Tse-Tung will smile atleast on some of our junior officials so that we can give a better interpretation. He smiled two or three years ago. We are not expecting any smile now. I believe that China thinks because of our agreement with the Soviet Union we are against China. The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs have made it clear that we have nothing against China. When we are entering into these agreements with the Soviet Union. I want the Government to send some senior officials to Peking so that they can talk to them and explain to them the agreements so that they might be convinced that these agreements with the U.S.S.R. are not to put China in a corner.

As far as our relations with our neighbouring countries are concerned, what happened to the talks that were

going on between our country and Sri Lanka over Kachchativu? Very recently, one of the Ministers announced in the Sri Lanka Parliament that they are exploring oil in Kachchativu. When there is a dispute over a particular island, how can Sri Lanka go and explore oil there? I want the Government emphatically to object to it, so that until the talks conclude, no body goes there and utilises it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): Or we can go there jointly.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: That is also a reasonable suggestion which Government should consider.

I am very happy that our relations with both Koreans have improved and our diplomatic missions have been upgraded to the ambassadorial level. I want Government to take more interest in some of the small Asian countries so that we will have more influence in Asia when we go to the UN or other international forums.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY (Raiganj): Sir, in primarily confining myself to Asia, I would like to say, Asia does not command a positive unity as Christendom had in Europe in the Middle Ages. It possesses a negative kind of unity in that all Asia was under western or foreign domination during the last three centuries. Even China had become in the words of Dr. Sun Yat Sen "a hyper colony, a colony of all nations" although formally China never lost its freedom in the way that India did. Consequently, we, the Asian countries, have common attitudes towards colonialism and racialism, with a strong reluctance to be treated as pawns on the chessboard of western power politics. There is a strong realisation amongst us that it is the right of all people to be masters of their own destinies and to exercise their sovereign rights in implementing the progressive socio-economic transformations of a society.

Two hundred years of Asian history shows that parallel with the industrial development in Europe, European nation States, while pursuing their own narrow selfish interests, have subjugated Asian and African countries, having at their command the technological benefits of the Industrial revolution.



[Shrimati Maya Ray]

They did this not only to enhance their political prestige by carving out empires for themselves but also to exploit the natural resources of these countries and to create markets for their finished goods. This debilitating process led to a total destruction of the indigenous industries of these subject nations.

After the second world war, a new era dawned in Asia which saw the collapse and recession of imperialism and colonialism in the East, and which left in its wake a divided Asia impoverished, distraught and apathetic. Asia was faced with two gigantic camps encircling the world, the Western Bloc and the Communist bloc. In this condition, Asia did not have the requisite strength to form a third bloc. We knew this and we were aware of this. But nevertheless, there was a thread of determination woven into the pattern of our common thoughts that is our determination to resist any further recurrence of imperialist or neo-imperialist machinations and intrigues and our determination to cooperate with one another as best as we could. In this context, we saw the formulation of the *Panchsheel* principles being the essence of the Bandung Conference. Some of the principles of the Bandung conference, among others, were: Renunciation of use of force; respect for the sovereignty and inviolability of borders; non-interference in internal affairs of a country and development of economic and other cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. These principles are positive principles, with emphasis on economic cooperation, bilateral and multilateral for mutual benefit. These principles, moreover, have been accepted by the non-aligned countries and have even found place in the recent Sino-Japanese Agreement of September 1972. No country can take exception to these ideals. Unfortunately and regrettably, the Bandung spirit did not last because of the lack of unity amongst us, the Asian nations.

This lack of unity has been responsible for the great set-backs in Asia, Western Asia. As for example, take the Arab States. If the Arab States were not so hopelessly disunited, they could have withstood against the mi-

nute Israel, in spite of the massive backing by mighty America.

Coming to our own sub-continent, Pakistan succumbed to the American policy of military pacts, which history has already condemned as dismal failures. They obtained millions of dollars worth of sophisticated military weapons, of course, periodically deployed against India, in the name of containing Communism. Had Asians resisted falling prey to obvious western machinations, the history of this sub-continent at least would have been different and the progress in this sub-continent would also have been more spectacular and speedy.

We cannot but mention the emergence of alone Bangladesh as a sovereign State and the subsequent events which have amply demonstrated the utter folly of such policies and the utter futility of relying on foreign patronage and strong arm methods, instead of meeting the legitimate demands, aspirations and sentiments of the people.

Even now, neither they, nor others in Asia have learnt their lessons as yet. There are many of us who are not prepared to refute the suicidal policy of being tied to the apron-strings of super-powers. I am afraid, I do like Professor Hiren Mukherjee, I do make use of that terminology because they are super-powers in comparison with Asian countries like us.

The ever constant supply of sophisticated weapons to under-developed nations, whether in West Asia, South East Asia or South Asia, is the biggest factor in the escalation of tensions by creating rivalries and dissensions among Asian countries, thereby preventing peace, tranquillity and prosperity, so desperately needed in Asia for our own progress.

This policy of supplying arms is also, I may add, a lucrative source of wealth to the already affluent nations, but every civilised person is entitled to ask, at what price, at what terrible cost? For more atomic bombs to be exploded experimentally in Asia, perhaps. One wonders whether the first nuclear bomb ever to be dropped could not have been detonated on a capital in Europe rather than on Nagasaki and

Hiroshima in the East. Perhaps it is a vague indication of the esteem in which the Asiatic is held by the westerner. The nagging doubt will always persist in the minds of Asians that all horrifying experiments will initially be made on the Asiatic guinea-pig and Asians will be well-advised to be chary and not to forget this terrible fact.

To revert to Europe immediately after the second world war, so far as the western powers were concerned, their sole aim was, of course, to contain communism. With this in view, military blocks such as NATO, SEATO, CENTO and ANZUS were set up to surround Russia and diminish its influence on under-developed countries. Russia, in turn, answered this by the Warsaw Pact. We were faced with a world divided into two colossal camps confronting each other with guns and a nuclear balance of terror. It has taken two decades for these powers to realise the futility and hazards of their actions.

Then we gradually saw that the stage of confrontation disseminated into a period of thaw. Military blocks have begun to erode. The Western European countries have converged on a regional basis to form the European Economic Community and are acting collectively.

These are remarkable events that have taken place in Europe in the recent past. A new era has opened out in Europe too after 25 years. Even the hardened cynic may yet take heart. But we must remember that it has taken 25 years for the evolution of the concept of acting collectively to emerge in a concrete form in Europe where historic animosities have given way to conciliation. Relationships based on cooperation have emerged between France and Eastern Democracies, between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Peoples Republic of Germany and other communist countries of Europe. Finally, we see a detente between the Soviet Union and the United States which has broken through the iron curtain and established relations on the basis of cooperation and co-existence of differing ideological systems, thus vindicating the long cherished concept first propounded by no less a person than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Further, the barriers between the two differing social systems are gradually being eliminated by the Helsinki and Geneva Conferences. Thus, although detente precariously has been established in Europe, Asian and African countries are still in a state of turmoil.

While guns have ceased to be heard in Europe, they continue thundering in Asia aided and abetted by the vested interests of the Western world. I do not speak lightly of War. I have personally spent the most impressionable years of my life in the midst of the conflagration that took place in Europe 27 years ago. That was between 1939 and 1945. I still have the horrifying memories of the nights we spent when the civilian population in London was battered by bombs from the Nazi Luftwaffe. Those nights were one long nightmare. In the morning one saw smoking piles of rubble, if one was fortunate to survive. One saw a limb of a little child lying on one pile of rubble while trunk of a human being had been thrown in front of one's door-step. What colossal waste of human life and waste of human endeavour.

Sir, you will forgive me if I have digressed a little just for a moment. But these memories are not to be forgotten. The sound of a siren even today evokes the most terrifying memories in my mind at least and these memories are not lightly erased.

Then, Sir, these Asian countries are beset with common problems, the greatest being, of course, economic backwardness. The efforts of Asian countries have been to modernise rapidly in conformity with the times, in the last quarter of a century. But our efforts have been subtly impeded and obstructed by a new method of neo-colonialism as opposed to the outright blatant brutal colonialism of the past. This conduct of the Western powers has plunged the Asian continent into strife and despair. The old game of "divide and rule" is being played to the full for the benefit of just a few.

After the termination of the Second World War in 1945 while the European countries were engaged in reconstructing their shattered economies and forging ahead. We in Asia have been sucked into the vortex of continuing upheavals and strife although already cruelly overburdened by being over-populated and

[Shrimati Maya Ray]

under-developed countries in comparison with the West. This is the state of affairs which inhibits the full development of Asian countries.

How are we underdeveloped countries of Asia to judge, evaluate and assess the conduct, the motives and the sincerity of the behaviour of affluent nations of the Western Hemisphere? We can but judge them by their overt actions. We can but judge them on each issue on its own merits without any pre-conceived dogmatic approach. This has been consistent with our own behaviour: all along and in consonance with the basic philosophy of non-alignment.

We have never joined any grouping of countries directed against anyone nation. Our stand all along has been that peace and security can only be established on a firm footing in this region on the basis of individual and collective economic strength, not on military pacts of any kind. It has been proved that military alliances suit the interests of only one or two dominant powers and shift with every change of interest of those dominant powers.

On the basis of these principles, independent India in 1946 gave high priority to anti-colonialism, anti-racism, and freedom from Western influence. In this context, let us take America's attitude. The Americans were ambivalent on colonialism and they regarded colonialism as a waning force. They were more anxious to secure cooperation of a revived Western Europe with the need of Asian independence only to the extent that its people would have a stake in their own future, such that they would not be vulnerable to extremist forces; that is, Asian countries cooperating with the West rather than total independence as such.

Though America stood for freedom from colonial rule in a qualified sense, they wanted economic dependence of Asian countries as well as their being politically within her orbit. They have attempted to perpetuate this limited freedom by supporting corrupt regimes, totally out of tune with aspirations and desires of those under-developed countries.

This, then, seems to me to be the overall American goal. They have forgotten unfortunately that a new age was

born in Asia with the attainment of India's independence; they have forgotten that a resurgence has occurred in Asia to prevent any rebirth or recurrence of colonialism in any disguised garb; that we desire a new and unconditional freedom from external pressures to allow ourselves the right of free, independent and unimpeded development; only respect and observance of these aspirations and standards will ensure the defusing of potentially explosive situations in Asia.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has territory which stretches across vast part of both Europe and Asia. They have, therefore, the advantage of having a sense of belonging to both Europe and Asia. They are able to understand, and sympathise with, the Asians in that they shared a history of the fight against Imperialism. The newly emerging States of Asia found a greater bond of active support rather than mere lip sympathy in their efforts to remove deep-seated social and economic disabilities. Such goals can only be achieved in these regions if they are free from tensions. The Soviet Union for decades have struggled for the reduction of armaments. As far back as 1928, when Mr. Litvinov, the Soviet delegate to the League of Nations after the first World War was vociferously advocating not only reduction but complete disarmament to create a climate of confidence in those days and to reduce tensions in the world. Today the Soviet Union has signed the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. Dialogues have been continuing for limitation of strategic arms. The Soviet Union and the USA have agreed to consult each other if there is a danger of nuclear war. Recently, there has been a Soviet Resolution passed in the General Assembly of the United Nations for a ten per cent reduction in defence expenditure of the Big Five, to be utilised for development of backward countries. Finally, they have imposed a cut of ten per cent in their own budget demonstrating their sincerity in these beliefs.

It is in this background that we have to discuss the concept of Asian Collective Security. This concept is not to be rejected outright because it has been advanced by Mr. Brezhnev, nor is it to be rejected outright because the critics in the Western world and the Western Press have imputed sinister

motives to the idea, suggesting a military import to attain hegemony over under-developed countries. The thesis on which it is based is almost Indian in origin with the basic philosophy of international relations as expounded by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru and elaborated time and again by our present Prime Minister. This thesis does not have any military content because in the ultimate analysis it is not military strength that safeguards peace but enduring policies.

The policy of narrow, selfish interests with balance of power based on military blocs, is not conducive to peace and security but rather that of deliberate co-operation and friendliness with our neighbours. This concept envisages a system based on co-existence irrespective of differing socio-political systems from which no country in Asia is excluded. This also upholds the principle of non-alignment, meaning non-alignment with military blocs. *Not* non-co-operation with other countries and in fact perfectly consistent with the Panch Sheel principles of Bandung.

The idea of Asian collective security cannot obviously mean total disarmament in the practical sense and this question cannot arise now in the Asian context today.

We, Asian countries, must prove mature enough to safeguard our interests.

We must be beware of intimidation from neo-colonialists who still wish to continue to exploit us and treat Asiatics like puppets by pulling strings whenever it suits them to serve their own ends and purposes.

We, Asians, have more reason than Europeans, for peace and tranquillity and stability—for it is here that turbulence still prevails. It is here that peace and security has a greater meaning for implementing the plans for economic development and social welfare for the vast majority of mankind. The unfinished revolutions of the majority of countries in Asia have still to be completed. Until this is completed and until it is accomplished and the Asian States reach economic and technological standards of the western world, no lasting or enduring global peace can be attained. While one massive society of

mankind has the foresight to realise this fact, another huge section of mankind is still to be convinced that the Asian Collective Security is not an utopian dream but a concept based on realities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman as also Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): In the beginning, I would like to get out of the way a few relatively smaller, nonetheless, important points. It is somewhat exasperating to find that in almost all the important capitals of the world we have public servants as our Ambassadors. Earlier, more or less, the rule used to be, I say, that all these important capitals of the world would have non-officials as our Ambassadors. But what do we find to-day? In a row starting from Washington, our Ambassadors are all public servants; in Washington you have a public servant, a retired man, probably on extension; in London, you have got a public servant, retired and on extension; in Paris too, you have got a public servant, so also in Moscow and Tokyo and other important capitals of the world. This is the contribution that this new regime is making to the diplomacy of the country. I take strong objection to it because this implies an assumption that public men are no good for these jobs. They had done exceedingly well earlier and there could be no reason why they could not be entrusted with these responsibilities.

Secondly, I would like to refer to the role of a very distinguished ex-public servant, Mr. P. N. Haksar. We have watched with great admiration the role he has played in the past and for the care and devotion and the dedication with which he served the Prime Minister during some difficult days. I have also no doubt that whatever diplomatic tasks are assigned to him, he will certainly discharge them with great distinction and ability. But it beats me completely how without taking the oath of secrecy, he can be engaged in many diplomatic tasks which require access to files, more so, to secret files. Therefore, I would like to say that if he undertakes formal delegations under the State with due oath of secrecy, then I will have absolutely no objection to his taking part in those activities. But, if my memory serves

[Shri Shyamnandan Misra]

me right—otherwise, I can be corrected—he has been probably signing on our behalf some of the important treaties and protocols too. How is it happening is a mystery to me.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, it also appears to me somewhat strange that the hon. Foreign Minister and the hon. Prime Minister should try to satisfy the House, after their participation in some important conferences or visits to important capitals of the world by merely placing the communique on the Table of the House. I think it should be a duty squarely placed on their shoulders to come before the House and report in a much fuller way than that they have been doing in the past. Recently the Prime Minister attended the Non-aligned Conference at Algiers for which we even postponed our no-confidence motion, but the Prime Minister did not care to give us a fuller report on that conference. In fact, the practice should be, Mr. Chairman, that before the Prime Minister or the Foreign Minister goes to such conferences, they should hold consultation with the leaders of various groups. That is what happened during the time of Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. I still remember how, before going to Tashkent, he had held very intimate and full consultations with the leaders of the opposition and with the executive committee of his own party.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :**  
Those days are gone—gone with Shastriji.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :**  
Then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to welcome as indeed it has been done by some hon. Members who preceded me, that the issue of POWs from Pakistan has been amicably settled. We hope that the residue of the problem would also be amicably settled. We fail to understand why this matter was not settled earlier and why POWs were not repatriated soon after the conclusion of the hostilities. You might have retained the war criminals, but there was no sense in retaining those persons who have now been repatriated, after a long time. And that in fact meant a great loss to our exchequer.

Probably we have spent about Rs. 25 crores which you could have spent for hospitals, schools

and so on. And this is what the Government's policy has proved to be — it has absolutely no sense of utility or value when it is dealing with such problems. If it had made a spontaneous gesture soon after the conclusion of the hostilities that would have won the hearts of the POWs as well as the hearts of the Pakistanis.

Mr. Chairman, we also agree with the stand of the Govt. of India with regard to the correct stand towards the Palestinian Arabs and the people of the Arab States by the aggression committed by Israel. We are fully and unreservedly in favour of the vacation of the aggression of the area. But how to find a just and durable settlement is the question. I do not know whether the views of the Government of India on this issue are complete. I wonder whether the Government of India have given thought to the way in which durable peace could be brought about in that area. One arm of equation is right as it goes but the other part of equation is not there. And so I say that the Government of India have not given full thought to the problem of peace settlement in the Middle-East.

We find so far as some hon. Members on this side of the House are concerned that there is some anxiety about the existence or about the continuation of the existence of Israel. In this very building in the Central Hall of Parliament, Mr. Brezhnev said that he wanted a settlement between the Arab States and the State of Israel.

I think that should set at rest all anxieties about the existence of Israel. Even the war aim of the Egyptians and the Syrians was limited to the vacation of aggression committed in 1967. So, on that score, we do not have much to trouble about.

What are the other main issues in the international affairs to-day? And how do we deal with them? One question that has been very much discussed in this House is the Asian Security Plan as propounded by Com. Brezhnev (*Interruptions*) May I say that if my hon. friend Shri Unnikrishnan wants his name to be added to it, I have no objection.

**SHRI H. N. MUKHERJEE :** 'Comrade' implies a certain mutuality.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :** So far as I see it, the best contribution that can be made on this subject of Asian Security Plan is that one should keep mum about it; one should not speak on this. I was not present at the time when my hon. friend, Com. Mukherjee spoke on this subject. There is at least some mutuality between him and me. We after all belonged to the same common inheritance. There is therefore mutuality between Prof. Mukherjee and myself that could be assumed to an extent.

The point I am trying to make is that we would better not comment on this subject which is not known to anybody including the hon. Foreign Minister of India. I am sure it is not known to anybody full. This seems to be everything to everybody. It excludes China it includes China; it is against China; this is in favour of China and it is everything. So I say that it seems to be everything to everybody that we might think of. When Swift was asked about his religion he said that he was everything arian. Similarly it seems to be everything to everybody and so far as we see it this has not come in the form in which it can be weighed in a scale or examined on a Bunsenburner. When it comes to foreign policy, the hard realities of the country's national interests will have to be examined on a Bunsenburner and weighed in a scale. But, that is not the case so far as this plan is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the most deplorable fact that seems to be emerging in the international situation is the condominium of the two super powers, the contours of which are very clear to us now, particularly, after the Middle-East crisis. That had clearly highlighted that these super powers can make war or can stop war and none else can match them. Even the middle powers do not matter at all. Indeed the Almighty U.N. or the all important of U.N. also does not seem to be mattering in the international affairs. Therefore, I have said that a fact of terrible significance seems to be emerging in the emergence of this condominium on the international scene; the spheres of influence of the two super powers in the international scene. I have a fear and this shows that the U.N. itself might be rendered redundant at this rate very soon. We felt very much heartened when the hon. Prime Minister raised her voice

both in Algiers and in Canada on this very subject, and our permanent representative, Shri Samar Sen, also spoke against it very clearly when he was speaking on the solution in the Middle-east after the cease fire. It was probably at that time that the cease fire was discussed in the U.N. I do not want to weary this House with quotations from the speeches of the Prime Minister. But one or two words probably require mention. The Prime Minister urged the non-aligned nations to resist all attempts to order the world to suit the interests of a few countries.

She invoked the spirit of rebellion against all assumptions of superiority and against all attempts to dominate or dictate. This is what she said at Algiers. That was what the Prime Minister said at Algiers and she repeated the same theme when she was speaking to the Canadian Parliament. Mr. Samar Sen also as our loyal representative at the UN voiced the same feeling when he was speaking on the Middle-East situation.

But allied to this, another fact is emerging and that is that this *detente* between the two superpowers is now clearly a permanent *detente*, and in fact, the Soviet Union has gone to the length of saying that Dr. Kissinger may be said to be acting on her behalf in the Middle-East. This is what has been reported in the observer May 1, with your permission and with that of the House quote what the correspondent of the *Observer* Mr. Stephen had to say? The *Observer* said :

"A staggering answer in Moscow to the question 'Why take a back-seat?'"

The question put by the correspondent to the Soviet official was 'Why take a back-seat?'. The official there said that he could say that 'Dr. Kissinger is acting in the Middle East on behalf of Russia'. That was what that official said. He was a very important official who said that.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN** (Badagara): Who was that official?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :** An official in the Soviet Union, an important person in the Soviet Union. This was an interview which took place between the correspondent of the *Observer*

[Shri Shyamnandan Misra]

and the Soviet Union official. He was a very important person. It may be that he was an official, or he was not. But why everyone is an official in the Soviet Union. He further went on to say that this *detente* was not tactical but it was based on the permanent and objective facts of the nuclear relationship between the two superpowers and so, it was going to be permanent. So, the two superpowers are now acting as one. The unity between the two superpowers is no less complete and unbreakable than it was during the Second World War. Let my hon. friend Comrade Professor Mukherjee bear that in mind, that the United States could be expected to act on behalf of the Soviet Union and so he should also entrust me with the task of representing him on certain occasions.

Then, I come to the subject of the visit of Mr. Brezhnev to this country. What exactly was the impression that was left on our mind after the visit of this distinguished friend from the Soviet Union? The impression is that a very kind and generous friend had visited this country, and in fact, some friends had gone to the length of almost saying that a kindly Papa had descended upon India in the most difficult times that she had to face.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN : Who said so? We have not said so.

SHRI A. K. M. ISHAQUE : That is sick thinking of a sick mind.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : I am giving also the basis on which one could say it. It was said that we had a very difficult food situation and they had helped us to solve this problem. We had a difficult energy situation and they had offered to give us petrol and kerosene. We had a difficult newsprint situation and they have offered to give us newsprint. It was also said that our economy was suffering from stagnation and they had tried to lift it from stagnation: our planning was encountering so many kinds of difficulties and they had promised us so much help that our Fifth Five Year Plan might be expected to have a smooth sail.

These are all true and I can find absolutely no fault so far as the approach of the Soviet Union is concerned. But this is also true that our dependence on the Soviet Union is going to pass the permissible limit. That is what I would like to warn the country against.

I may not be getting very nutritive food in my house and probably my hon. friend, Shri Vajpayee, can offer me a more balanced diet. It is very generous of him to do so, but if I go on taking my food at his house every day, there are certain consequences which are bound to follow.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : For me also.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Then I was asking myself : what impression was created when President Nixon visited China? Was the same kind of impression created in China when President Nixon visited that country? There is a world of difference. Nobody felt that a very kindly patron had descended upon the Chinese scene. If we are proud citizens of this country, we must also understand the position of the Chinese who think that there is absolutely reciprocity and mutuality between the two. There must be a degree of mutuality; but when the disparity between the GNPs is so great, when your dependence upon them in the military field is so great, one has to beware.

You are now going to integrate your plan over a long period of 15 years or so.

Mr. Chairman, one can ask me a very legitimate question : Did you not depend upon the Americans to a great extent in the past? But at that time the complex web of international relationship was neutralising the evil effect of that dependence. There was not this un-dimensional relationship. Our foreign policy did not function in one dimension. It is now increasingly functioning in one dimension. For that I do not blame this great power, the super-power, the Russians. We have reduced ourselves in such a way, we have weakened ourselves economically and otherwise in such a way that we are bound to depend upon them overmuch.

So this is something which very much scares me, and I would like to be on guard against the increasing dependence upon any super-power.

Now about the two plans, the production plans, being co-ordinated. It has been said that there is going to be a co-ordination between the two production plans of the two countries. What is sought to be interpreted as co-ordination is, to my mind, an euphemism for integration. This is going to happen. Earlier, we were accustomed to hearing the concept of aid the with strings, but now a new equivalent of this is being propounded—aid with co-ordination or integration. This 15-year time horizon was never contemplated when we had a much larger measure of assistance even from the U.S. At that time, the 15-year time horizon was never in our view.

If the two plans get so much integrated over a period of 15 years, what would happen if a crisis overtook one country? The crisis automatically gets reflected in the other country. We just cannot do that (*Interruptions*). I note the distinguished presence of my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta. This is very typical of him, because after having got some good teaching from comrade Brezhnev, he is now taking a back seat on many important occasions!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I am closing in two minutes.

16.00 hrs.

So, it appears to me that this integration of the two plans would not be in the interests of both the countries, and for our country in particular. We would not have access to all the information because you know that that country is much more security-minded than our country is, and they have got a much greater control over their economy than you have. They would have access to all the information that this country is capable of giving.

Finally, I would like to say that on the oil crisis, India must raise its voice. While embargo on oil is going to prove counter-productive, I do not know where exactly we happen to be. Are we on the grey list of the Arabs or on the black list of the Arabs or on the green list of the Arabs? We would like to know where we are so far as the oil embargo is concerned. But since the Arabs happen to be our friends, we

must tell them in a friendly and sincere way that this oil crisis is going to prove counter-productive and the peoples of the world are being put to great difficulties because of the policies that they are pursuing at the moment.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, when one surveys the international scenario, the most striking phenomenon one notes is the emergence or the ushering in of an era of *detente* and conciliation. If one takes a historical retrospect of the international situation, one would find that in the earlier part of our freedom, the architect of our own foreign policy, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, had a synoptic vision of the things to come, and he evolved a formulated foreign policy, the postulates of which are now being advocated by the so-called super powers or leading powers of the world.

There were critics in those days when Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, drawing from his experience of our own country and from a very detached analysis of the international situation saw, whether from an enlightened self-interest angle or from the general altruistic angle or as based on humanism, that the most important desideratum for the world, or for mankind itself, was peace. Therefore, when he made a clarion call for peace, at that time, the defenders of our foreign policy did not evaluate its significance fully. Today, the quest for peace and consolidation of peace has become the primary task of politicians or diplomats the world over. It is in this context that we have to evaluate the foreign policy as is being formulated today.

What is actually the most important position today? Europe, in spite of its claim for culture and advancement and progress, has traditionally been the hotbed of war, troubles and tensions. And in the past nearly 25 years or so, they have fought how many world wars, you know. They have fought two world wars and today that very hotbed has come to accept the principles for which our foreign policy stood, and when Comrade Brezhnev visited our country, he was trying to tell us of the shape of things that were emerging in Europe. Today, in Europe, the quest for peace is hearing its ultimate goal. I do not want to trace the whole concept of peace and the various processes and steps taken to achieve it, but the Geneva talks



**[Dr. Henry Anstin]**

which are currently going on are also going on well. These trends in International relations are not to be interpreted in the narrow traditional ways of power rivalry or balance of power or super power machinations. It is to be interpreted in terms of demands of the broad masses of people who clamour for peace because they have seen the sufferings of war. When the hot-beds of international tension are emerging as areas of peace we should welcome them. It should not be interpreted, as my friend said that it is a kind of condominium of super powers. We should not project the very concept of super powers. If we properly assimilate the concept of non-alignment, we will find that it is not a negative policy nor is it aimed against any country. It was the original contribution made largely by our own people, a policy of asserting our independence, avoiding wars and expanding the area of peace. These are the basic postulates of non alignment.

In this background when we analyse the international scene we find that the prospects of peace are becoming consolidated and deepening and the quest for peace is articulate. This is the most striking feature of international relations. Related to this is the question of collective security of Asia. It is not a new concept adumbrated by the Soviet Union or Mr. Brezhnev. Prof. Mukherjee pointed out that it is part and parcel of our formulations even from the early 1920s.

The outstanding statesmen of India and leaders of the Freedom Movement have been advocating a policy of Asian Confederation. They were thinking of various ways to bring the Asian countries together. Immediately after Independence in 1947, Pandit Nehru took the lead in convening the Asian Relations Conference which was followed by so many other conferences such as the Bandung Conference. This quest for bringing Asian nations together was there and the initiative was taken by our country. When Mr. Brezhnev in the wake of the emerging peace situation in the West has put forth some suggestions for further consolidation of peace in the world, in the continents of Asia and Africa, we should not have any feelings of inferiority. We should actually be proud of our own original contribution. Why should you imagine that it is somebody else's creation? It

is our own creation. That is the spirit in which I would request friends to take it up when we consider the question of collective security for Asia. We have to realise this and see the problem. Even in Europe it has been sought for centuries. After so many wars peace conferences and so many exchanges of views, this idea has emerged. You cannot just say that peace should emerge and the consolidation of Asian countries should emerge over-night. We have projected an idea; the Indian National Congress had projected that idea. Mr. Brezhnev is projecting this idea. It is to be churned. This idea of security has to be discussed. That is why we are discussing it, and examining it. Perhaps we can learn by the experience of other countries. West Asia has emerged as an important area in international relations. When one speaks about the situation in Asia, we have to take notice of the situation in West Asia. United States has been committed to a policy of preserving Israel for its own foreign policy goals. There is vested interest for them. Juxtaposed against this is the aspiration of the people of that area who had been inheritors of a great culture. They want to assert their independence and unfold their personality and develop towards their own natural destinies. If attempts are made to frustrate the aspirations of those people, we have to raise our voice. India has done it, because of our geopolitical situation and also because of our self-interest. This situation is there and naturally some kind of solution has to emerge. We have taken a positive stand with respect to the West Asia conflict.

Another area which militates against the possibility of consolidation of peace in Asia is our own sub-continent. Our foreign policy has been so shaped as to preserve our own entity. We have conducted our foreign policy so deftly as to defeat the desires of the United States in collusion with many other powers, in the background of the Seventh Fleet blackmail. We have overcome those difficulties and it is a magnificent contribution of our foreign policy. When one criticises the Soviet Union or our attitude to it, one has to take into account the foreign policy goals of the country with which the protagonists of this view want us to align. One has to be very alert and careful. In the interest of brevity, I am not dilating on it. Coming to Iran,

there again our foreign policy has immediately shown our initiative. Our Foreign Minister visited Iran and their Foreign Minister came here. We are trying to sort out the problems. A shrewd observer knows that even at the height of Indo-Pakistan conflict, in spite of the ever-friendship of Iran with Pakistan, Iran did not cut their oil supply to us. Actually 50% of our oil import is from Iran. All this shows that we have been trying to consolidate the position. Immediately after the war with Pakistan, we have taken postures of peace to normalise our relations with Pakistan. These are major achievements towards Asian solidarity.

In Vietnam, our foreign policy was in defence of the right of the progressive forces. Even against the onslaught of the United States, the determined will of the suppressed people there ultimately triumphed. So, we have taken a definite stand in the interests of Asia and in deference to the aspirations of the Asian people, we are fighting the reactionary forces. Whether it is Vietnam, Cambodia or any other Asian country, we have taken a definite stand in the interest of Asian solidarity.

Another big thing is the relationship between Soviet Union and China. One of the cardinal principles of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy formulation was the invincible friendship between China and India, the two major powers of Asia. But owing to various reasons, the details of which I do not want to dilate upon for want of time, we could not maintain it, and tensions have arisen. I am sure if China also is motivated by considerations of Asian solidarity and putting up a strong edifice against western imperialism and neo-colonialism, I am sure these misunderstandings will vanish and India and China will be able to come together in the interests of Asian solidarity. Indian friendship with the Soviet Union need not necessarily be a stumbling block in normalising transgressing her ideological formulations in cultivating friendship with other countries like United States and in having rendezvous with NATO powers. These three or four trouble spots are there in Asia. We want to consolidate peace in Asia and have stability and I am sure this question of collective security in Asia will be conceived in the anvil of our quest for peace and our

concern for the building of abiding peace in our own interest and in the interests of others.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra and some others have made observations about our friendship with Soviet Union. Speakers after me will reply to that. I am sure our friendship with the Soviet Union is not based on some kind of unequal power situation. It is based on the strength of the two people inhabiting these two countries. We are one-sixth of the world's population and Soviet Union is also an important nation. Two-thirds of the Soviet Union is in Asia.

Naturally, if we take a keen interest in the Asian problem, it is only because it is an Asian problem. I do not think that a country like India would play a second fiddle to anyone, particularly in the background of the independent foreign policy that we have followed so far. Our friend, Shri Krishna Menon, who was one of the formulators of the independent foreign policy, is here and I am sure he will corroborate this. I would say that the independent foreign policy which we have formulated have been implemented by our country upto this moment. It has stood the test of time and it has got appreciation from the comity of nations because it has served the best interests of the country.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN** (Badagara): Mr. Chairman, Sir, for quite some time now it has been my fortune, or misfortune, to follow my friend, Professor Shyamnandan Mishra, in this House. I do not know whether I would be condemned to this fate in future also. He has said so many things which are patently absurd and wrong. I shall examine some of them a little later.

I welcome the opportunity provided by this debate to have a look at the international situation since a very seminal year of significance is about to come to an end. The year 1973 had a significance for the world and for our country from more than one angle or context. Because, when the history of this decade comes to be written, this year will be known as the year when the forces of peace and *detente* asserted themselves, may not be completely and decisively but I am sure that the year will go down as a land-mark in the history, because *detente* as a principle

## [Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

has become an axiomatic factor governing international life, as we have seen during the recent West Asian crisis and almost on every important international issue. This year will also go down as a great year when the forces of freedom, though not completely, fought to triumph in Vietnam, when these forces asserted and changed the face of history and the world. This year has also witnessed the tragic events in Chile where freedom was snuffed out. There was also the assertion of human spirit in Guinea-Bissau and resurgence of the forces of freedom in the Portuguese colonies of Africa.

Coming back to our own internal problems, this has been a very bad year for us, but internationally I would say this has been a good year for this government and our country because this was a year of considerable satisfaction, whether it was Mr. Brezhnev's visit to this country or our own contribution in Algiers or elsewhere. Also, coming back to our sub-continent—somebody objected to the word "sub-continent" and said that we should use the word "peninsula"; I would prefer the word sub-continent—it is a better political expression it has been a year when the spirit of Simla succeeded and the Delhi agreement paved the way in solving the outstanding human problems left over by the 1971 conflict. So, Sir, I would say that the spirit of *detente* has arrived and its response is conditioned by factors of major technological breakthrough in many fields and also of nuclear parity, a realistic appreciation of balance of Forces and power equations. But let us not forget that the most constructive contribution to this has come from the freedom-fighters throughout the world. Here I would like to pay a tribute to the people of Vietnam, but for whose struggle this *detente* would never have arrived. **Some Hon. Members may raise their eyebrows on this point. I think, I do not want to go into any length on it. But I am absolutely confident that it was a great struggle that went on in Vietnam and it was the spirit of the struggle of the Vietnamese people which forced imperialism to see reason and also to come to terms with the Soviet Union. Let us not also forget that the people of Vietnam fought their struggle for freedom with Soviet arms. It is the weakening hold of imperialism that has**

forced them to have a *detente* with Soviet Union. I would contend that this is also as a result of the policy of this country, our own policy of non-alignment, about which a mention was made a little while ago. A major architect of this policy of non-alignment Mr. Krishna Menon is here with us and, I hope he will say something about it. The policy of non-alignment was enunciated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the wake of freedom. He rejected the bloc concept. He did not want to have a third bloc. A major fight that went on in this country, if ever there was a fight—I do not think there was a fight; but people like me and Shri Madhu Limaye at one time fought for a third camp in world affairs. I do not contribute to that any longer. I have realised that it is an absurd proposition! There can be no third block, no bloc concept. It is an irrelevant absurdity.

So, I think, this has been a great contribution of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru which has today found fruition in the assertion of the forces of *detente*. It is not just a brave new world of Mr. Kissinger. Shyamnanda Ji said that Mr. Kissinger spoke for the Soviet Union also. I am not here to say whether he spoke for the Soviet Union or anyone else. But it is not a brave new world just produced by Mr. Kissinger.

Out of his hat! This is a historical development which has reached a new useful phase of development for mankind. But that does not mean that the problems of millions of people all over the world have been solved. The problems of development or even the problems of national liberation have hardly been solved. But, I hope, these forces will help to solve the problems of mankind, problems of grave concern, of food, shelter, security and freedom.

The West Asia war underlines what I have said. If the 22nd October, ('73) Resolution of the Security Council was a reflection of its spirit, the other side of the coin was that the Arabs were able to put a brave fight against Israel which still continues to be a state of imperialism in the heart of Asia.

Also, about oil, and about which a lot of crocodile tears are being shed here—it has emerged as a political weapon. This is not only a weapon of some Sheikhs; it is also a weapon of the emerging world. It is also a weapon of natural resources put against these forces which are trying to black-mail other people into subjugation. That means, oil as a natural resource, is of prime consideration for West Asia. This assertion has to be welcomed, whatever might be our temporary difficulties in this country or elsewhere. But the fact that these developing countries can use it as a tool is of considerable significance.

Coming back to Vietnam and the Indo-China problem which still remains, I would say, it is one of the most vitiating spots and spoiling the international landscape. I must express my concern over the Cambodian developments. I hope, the External Affairs Minister, in his reply, will clarify our position to Cambodia though it has been done through a vote in the United Nations.

Still there are many doubts left behind. But more important than that is the attitude of this country to the P.R.G. Government and more important is as to what attitude we shall take to the forces that have emerged in Vietnam to which the mankind owes so much for the freedom and also to the forces of national liberation for the entire humanity.

Do we just sit tight or just remain satisfied by our producing legal arguments or quibblings over the fate of millions? Whether they represent 25 per cent or 30 per cent, that is not the question. The crucial question is: What is the significance and logic of the developments in Vietnam? What are the consequences to the international situation? Where do you stand? Do you stand on this side of the fence for the forces of imperialism or do you stand for the forces of freedom on the other side? That is the question which, I think, the people of this country and the government have to answer. If that is so, I am sure that you will have to recognise the PRG. I have great respect for the Minister of External Affairs, I have great respect for his wisdom and for his very keen mind and

awareness of the situation all over the world. I only hope that he would not only be a witness to history but also try to mould history in his own way. And I would also appeal to the Prime Minister that we must come forward and say what other alternatives are there, short of recognition, if there are any. I consider this to be a very crucial question, and I hope that Sardar Saheb will be good enough to say something on this because this has been there for a very long time on the agenda before the Government.

In Algiers there was an event of considerable significance for the non-aligned world which strengthened the forces of anti-colonialism and national liberation and where our Prime Minister played a great role and made a constructive contribution.

But, Sir, for this country more important possibly than any of these has been the visit of Mr. Leonid Brezhnev about which a lot has been said before. I beg to submit that this was a visit of great significance not only because of the mature relations that we have achieved between the two countries, not only because it involves about 800 million people of this world but geo-politically as well as in every other conceivable term it has a tremendous role to play in the world. The success of his visit, I submit, is not an accident but it is a culmination of, or I would say a new phase in, the evolution of Indo-Soviet relations both before and after Independence. Before independence, there were many like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who thought that the Russian revolution marked a great event, not only a great event but possibly a break from the barbarities of the past and a new beginning for mankind. And there were the others in this country whose successors are here—Shri Shyamandan Mishra, Shri Madhavrao Scindia and so many others—who thought that it was a challenge that the Russian revolution posed before the forces of privilege and property, and before the people who subjected the other countries and condemned them to slavery; they were the people who stood for them in this country also. So, I am not surprised that my friend, Madhavrao Scindia, talked about the bear-hug having experience in 'shikar' and things of that kind. Maharajas know more

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

about bears. I would not venture to say anything. But I would like to say that ours is not a small country that can be put in somebody's pocket; it is a country with 560 million people. And here are some gentlemen coming and telling us, 'Beware of this bear-hug'. Do you think that it is possible for Mr. Brezhnev or Mr. Nixon or any one to give such a hug so that we will disappear in the Indian Ocean? It is impossible. I would only say that like Bourbons they have neither learnt anything nor forgotten anything; and they are condemned to this fate. I only hope that they will learn from the mistakes of the past and stop this anti-Soviet hysteria which they are trying to let loose.

It is a very interesting phenomenon that, when Mr. Brezhnev was here, not a word was said, but two or three days after he had left, columnists like my friend, Mr. Nanporia, have come out saying: "There is something more than what meets the eye in this visit". In this visit something possibly has gone beyond their imagination. Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra said about the understanding of the Planning Commission with Gosplan. If only he had bothered to go through that agreement, I am sure he would have changed his mind, because specific and concrete details have been spelt out in the tasks of co-operation. I do not know how this country's interests have been mortgaged or its options lost or how its sovereignty has been eroded by this agreement, whether for five years or ten years or 15 years. He also basically misunderstands the character of the Soviet economy and its relations with other economies when he says that we did not have such an agreement with the United States of America. I do not know what he wanted to know or do?

Now, a controversial theme has been introduced about the system of collective security for Asia. Yes, it is true that our distinguished Soviet guest who, in his address to Parliament, to us in the Central Hall, did dwell upon elaborately on the theme of collective security in Asia. I do not think in the international relations and world diplomacy. Mr. Brezhnev was the first person to introduce this theory of collective security?

I do not understand the hysteria that is going on in the name of the so-called Brezhnev doctrine. The whole point of the collective security, as has been elaborated, is that Asia continues to be riven with differences, Asia continues to be plagued by all kinds of problems of peace and security, and so here is an Asian country whose title to be an Asian country cannot be challenged by facts of geography, nor by any other logic which has come forward with an idea and placed it before the world and particularly, before you. It is for you to consider what kind of form it should assume. But the basic idea underlying it, as has been evidenced by their own pronouncement, is not that it should be a military alliance, nor should it be a form of alliance against anyone-else because I have heard myself during the last Peace Congress in Moscow the distinguished Soviet representative, no less a person than the Editor of *Pravda*, who counts very high in the Soviet hierarchy, coming and telling us, "We do not want this to be an alliance against China. Please do not misunderstand. We do not want anyone to give up non-alignment." They have also given their support to all the documents which we produced there which explains the same thinking. But, here are some gentlemen sitting on the other side of the Benches, coming and telling us that this is a dangerous bear-hug and this is something more, 'so be careful'. It is for the people of this country to consider it for whatever it is worth, consistent with our policy of non-alignment, independence and also without closing any of our options. There is nothing wrong in examining an idea.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention something about our Ambassador to the United States. He happens to be a very close friend of mine and for whom I have always had the highest esteem, that here is somebody who has made great contributions towards our foreign policy and conduct of our diplomacy. But if reports appearing in a section of the world press and also in the Indian press are to be believed, here is our Ambassador trying to talk to the big multi-national corporations and, according to the reports, he has invited them not only to invest in India but also to invest in the core sector! It will be a bad day

for this country if Ambassadors make the foreign policy of a country. I do not know whether these reports are correct and I do not know whether our policy regarding multi-national corporations, whose role was condemned by our Prime Minister only in the last Algiers Conference, has undergone any change during the last few weeks. But I think the Government of this country owes us, owes it to this House to explain whether these reports are correct or incorrect; if they are correct, whether this policy has changed and, if so, whether the Ambassador for whom personally I have nothing but admiration and high esteem and affection, has been allowed to run around like this and talk to multi-national corporations because, as I said, Ambassadors can never make policy, and it will be a bad day if Ambassadors make policies.

**SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON** (Trivandrum): It is regrettable that this debate making posters and projections of our foreign policy in regard to the world should come at the far end of the session. Therefore, it is inevitable that the time is also cut down, but it does not diminish in any way its importance to us or to our Missions in the world. I have also a personal regret that I could not hear the Foreign Minister in the beginning of the debate. I hear that he did not make any speech. Had he said something in the beginning, probably that would have avoided the necessity of some unfortunate observations that have been made from whatever part of the House.

Now, time does not permit one to go either into the historical background of many things or to cover the whole field of foreign policy and international affairs as such. And, I would confine the greater part of my observations within the time that is there, to the two main items broadly called Collective Security for Asia and the other, what is called, Peace in the Indian Ocean, which I will do at the end.

But, it would be a great omission if I did not refer to two other observations that have come not from the Government perhaps quite directly, but in the House, because the purport of foreign policy is counted as one in the face of the world. Even if we reject

the observations against the Government policy as are made sometimes, especially by the ill-informed parts of the Press, they may be taken as representing a major section of opinion in the country, and therefore, the observations that were made as regard to the visit of Mr. Brezhnev as an attempt to carve up the world is, if I may say so, with great respect, a reflection of political immaturity. Because, it is not possible for anybody to carve up the world to start with; the United States is trying hard and failing very badly. And therefore nobody else will be able to do it.

Our relation with the Soviet Union did not begin yesterday. Certain persons in positions of responsibility try to present this as an exotic growth. It is part of the normal healthy development in which the people of the country and the people of the Soviet Union have played a considerable part.

And I would only say that I had my little expression of happiness and satisfaction that a leader of the Soviet people had come to this country which is the originating place of Non-alignment and which had all through the post-independence period, projected, what may be called, not peace policy, but a peace-minded policy. That orientation has not changed.

Before I refer to other subjects I would like to say that I want to dissociate myself with any adverse observations of an unthought-out character about our representatives abroad. I think it is highly improper that ambassadors who cannot answer for themselves should come under criticism here, not even as an individual, as Mr. Unnikrishnan and some others said, — it is another matter, — but, as a class of people who come from the services, as being anti-national or they don't do this, that or the other.

It is my personal experience and the experience of great many people that these men and women who work for us abroad in conditions of very great difficulty and isolation, very often, in the comparatively elementary development of our country, cannot, have the advantage of communication in the way as some others have. And, what is more, the colourful part does not come to them, when some Minister drops in and signature takes place. They are the

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon]

people who contributed a great deal to international co-operation. And, if an ambassador is not good, or performs in an adverse way, sooner or later, he will have to come back or go somewhere else. May be, there will be a problem for the Home Service. But, fortunately for us, with perhaps very rare exceptions in the past, — there have been no instances where people drawn from the Services have been either reflecting an anti-national, lackadaisical or callous attitude or negligence, or have not learnt their lessons, or, have not done their work. Nothing of that kind. We owe a debt to them and I am sure the Foreign Minister, when he comes in his turn to speak, will inform the House fully of the contribution that our Diplomatic Service makes, because, they are the people who cannot answer, and parliamentary traditions are that they cannot answer, because, that is the policy.

Regarding the visit of Mr. Brezhnev, I have already mentioned, and it is not necessary to repeat what has been said in the House.

I would like to say only this that it is of some significance that he found time and thought it necessary to visit this country which, as I said, is the originating place of non-alignment and also, in the post-independent period, has sponsored the idea of Asian co-operation. In doing so, he, has at no time, so far as I know and so far as our knowledge is concerned, even expressed anything at the end on the question of collective security.

It is a great mistake on this side as well as from the other side of the House to say that there have been occasional expressions of the view that when two super powers form blocs, they mean danger to the others. I feel that it is an expression of political immaturity. But, it is natural — not very well founded, at the same time—that there is a certain suspicion that when a bloc of nations become powerful, they will dominate over somebody else. Unfortunately, that is the experience of the world. But, after the emergence of the Soviet Union, that is to say, to-day, a socialist country — one may never agree with them in this or that particular matter — the emergence of a democratic country has made it impossible for places to be swallowed up

Why is it that the U.S., in spite of its 4,700 bases all over the world, does not speak of spheres of influence to-day? What is more to-day it speaks of spheres of contracting in this way and on this, I would make only one more observation. That is, we who have expressed at least to the best of our ability and without comparative lack of strength, have been exponents of non-alignment and that particular policy, whatever may be the deviations that may have taken place, has not changed so far as our Government is concerned. It still stands; we still profess that. Why? Non-alignment is an anti-bloc policy, that is, the policy of national independence and a policy of peace, a policy of non-interference. *Detente* is the same. That is to say, the beginning of the liquidation of bloc policies; bloc policy is a war policy and here is a non-aligned country saying that when two people get together, they might be swallowed up. This, I think, is highly regrettable that it should come from us.

May I now proceed to mention two other matters? One is that it will not be long, perhaps, it will be before the rising of Parliament, during this session or the meeting of Parliament during the next session, that our Government would find it possible to give recognition to those who have been fighting for liberation in this world.

Non-recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam is a blot on us. They do not lose by it because, they are the fighters and so they did not ask for our permission to fight. They might have hoped for our goodwill but they did not seek it. I think it is a mistake for us to procrastinate it and drag it on saving whether, when they have an office, there would be fifteen persons or thirty persons, we will have to count that. It is they who led the liberation movement of the world whether it is in the battle fields of Cambodia or in Vietnam. If they are good enough for the conference table at Paris, the great Mr. Nixon and his representatives, have talked to them on a plane of equality and with whose cooperation the waging of the war could take place. I think a country like ours which always believes on its own old liberation movement — quite rightly so — should not allow itself to drag it on any more.

But, I would like to express my gratification at least in regard to the Middle-East, our policy, irrespective of the nuance and irrespective of our approach towards this or that particular matter, has broadly remained the same. That is to say, we resisted imperialism in the Middle-East whether it was in the old days or now or in the days of Gandhiji; he said that 'Palestine belonged to the Palestinian people and France belonged to the French people. We have not wavered from that old position. And what is more to-day is that we say that those who are the aggressors — whether they be the aggressors in the Arab countries or on our frontiers — and, whoever be the aggressors, should vacate the aggression immediately.

If there is aggression, there is only one thing that they can decently do. One thing that they can do in consonance with peace is to vacate aggression. We find this word vacation of aggression very often in the U.N. But, has this vacation of aggression been carried out? Therefore, our policy in the Middle-East is one of resistance to imperialism. To-day, it may be American imperialism with a front of Zionist imperialism in the Middle-East — it is an unfortunate area which is the old way to Asia — in spite of the fact that Suez Canal is not so strategically important to-day as it might have been some years ago. Therefore, our policy in this world is a proclamation to the world that we stand in the vanguard, irrespective of our internal party differences or whatever else they may be and irrespective of our approach to this question or that question, we stand as proclaimed opponents to imperialism in the world. Where imperialism lives, no good thing lives. It is no use talking about peace where there is an empire. That is why we have resisted by word or by other action, the existence of these numbers of bases all over the world which are intended on the one hand to encircle the Soviet Union and on the other to tell the non-liberated people 'We are here', that is, to tell the Arab people 'If you do anything a little more than this, then the American fleet is here'. That is what it means.

From this, I now go on to two other matters. I think that it would be an error on your part and mine if we were to look upon collective security again as an exotic growth or as a pipe-dream or a mere phantasy or anything of that

kind. It is part of the political developments that must take place. Ever since the emergence of nations in the 17th century, there has been an attempt towards collective grouping of nations. It is quite true that in the 19th century and in the early 20th century, it has turned sour. After the little pact at Geneva, we came to the Locarno Pact. Everyone undoubtedly hailed it as though it was collective security. But as cynics said at that time, the forge that was made by the imperialist nations of the world at that time was not collective security but security to collect or to secure what had been collected, and that was used as in the case of the Atlantic Charter, when Sir Winston Churchill told us 'This is not to apply to the Indian people,' in the same way as it was said in many legal texts that this is not to apply to the colonial people. It was that sort of thing that had happened.

Now, we come to this present position where not only at the Asian conference and in 1946 but even much earlier, as many people have said, and at Bandung also, we had subscribed for Asian co-operation at the same time uttering a warning to ourselves against what might be called compartmental national organisations. We did not want to isolate ourselves as a compartment. It was not possible to do so. It is our good fortune and a reflection of the times that the most powerful nation, on Asian nation with a large Asian constituent area, namely the Soviet Union, is one of these Asian powers; it may be that their capital is in Leningrad, and she has several ports in the Baltic and she has a great say not only in European affairs but also in world affairs on account of the power she has; it is the liberation of her people which has made her a power. Czarist Russia was far more backward than British India. She today has no illiteracy and what is more, and I say it without any qualification, she is the most potent single factor for peace in the world. I do not belong to that party, nor am I talking about ideologies or anything of that kind.

First, let us take this collective security question. My submission, if it is not to be a pipe-dream, any more, as rightly other people had also said at one time, is, whether it finds immediate approval or not, we must make a start somewhere. After all, we did not start off with all the ex-colonial countries to



[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon]

come in when we proclaimed non-alignment. We accepted it because of historical circumstances, and we found other non-aligned nations coming in gradually one after another, till today we have formed the most powerful vocal nation in the counsels of the world.

My submission, therefore, is that the most essence of this collective security is non-aggression. That was the same thing as what Panditji told a long time ago to the Pakistanis, namely 'No war, all settlement without war'. That is non-aggression in the diplomatic phraseology. So, here we are as India with our neighbour in Bangla Desh, with our neighbours in Nepal and Bhutan, with neighbours across in Indo-China or people who have come closer with whom it is possible for us to form collective security agreements. And it is not only those over here only, but we have a non-aggression agreement with the Soviet Union, as I said, the most powerful of the Asian grouping of nations. We have a non-aggression agreement with Iraq. We have the same posture with regard to some of the Arab countries. We certainly are in a position to expect that from the new Vietnam, and I have no doubt, with Cambodia when it is liberated in the same way. It is quite true that in the case of Burma, there have been changes of Government, which probably reflect a different position from what was there twenty years ago. But still there is no reason to hope that there would be any animosity to this.

People say that the Malaysians will not come into the collective security agreement propounded by Mr. Brezhnev. Why anticipate all these things? We had a welcome event that the Kingdom of Thailand came forward to recognise Bangladesh, largely the work of our diplomats in the place and often the posture that our Government has taken, that we do not recognise friends and enemies in that political sense where peace is concerned. A great event it has been, though not so much noticed. Here what was practically an American satellite tied up in that economic system, came forward to recognise Bangladesh very early, much earlier than some others did.

So we have a bloc of countries here, India, Bhutan, Nepal, Iraq, may be Burma perhaps and Indo-China. And now Korea has been recognised. There

is a possibility that way. So you will get a large number of bilateral agreements between these countries. I am not suggesting that we should form a bloc in the hope that other people will be afraid of it. Bilateralism has been accepted and proclaimed by us as one of the essential ingredients of our foreign policy, and specially after we recognise the PRG, it will be a big step in that direction. Liberated Vietnam is a very solid ally in this way. It is possible to make a start with a group of non-aggression agreements of this character. They may vary in detail, but generally the basis of non-aggression and non-interference is the kind of thing that is part of our foreign policy which every school boy recites in this country.

That probably would be the beginning of a collective security in a world, where in this continent, the largest block of humanity is in China. While personally I have no objection to the External Affairs Minister saying now and then that our doors are open — we have opened it once; if they want they can come in — to say too often this kind of thing is likely to be misinterpreted. Aggressors have a habit of regarding courtesy as submission. The British did. Whenever you spoke to a British Minister or official with politeness, he thought this man was begging. That is part of the disease of the overweight of power.

Therefore, if this grouping in this way of countries on the basis of non-aggression and non-interference, that is to say, we shall settle our affairs peacefully, could be projected, we would make a beginning and it will be necessary for the world to recognise it. After all, changes do take place. Today Japan is willing to recognise that the Arabs are entitled to the freedom of their homes. May be oil has something to do with it, but the fact is that the policy has changed. Therefore, there is no reason for us to fear that even a powerful country like Japan, which still is held down by the consequences of the second world war, would not become a part of it perhaps in the hope of gaining a place in this group of nations. All these nations may get attracted to this. Anyway, it is worth trying. After all, you have, as Shri Mukerjee said, to make a beginning somewhere. I think that probably is the beginning of collective security in Asia. And it also proclaims at the same time

that it is not against anybody in the sense that some of these countries that I mentioned have western military or alliance connections. We are not against them that way.

Since time is running out, I will proceed to the other point, about the Indian Ocean as an area of peace. Here again I hope I would not be misunderstood. I think we should be careful, speaking about these things without a sense of reality. We are today governed, so far as the sea is concerned, by our signature to the Convention on the Law of the High Seas. The high seas are open to every nation in the world. All that we protect, unfortunately by the decisions of that time, is six miles of our territorial sea and a pseudo-political claim to our continental shelf. My submission, therefore, is that while it is a good slogan, while it is a good sentiment—and I do not think the UN Resolution means anything more than that; I have heard talk about a 'Polish corridor', and about the atomic free zone—the Rapacki plan—you cannot keep these oceans free of warships unless you have the power to do so. We are a littoral State and India has a coastline of over 3,400 miles, and of all the littoral States we are not most powerful. That is to say, we cannot by a resolution keep out the navy of other people. The navies of other people keep out because there is no vacuum here in the present conditions of the world. If there is a world disarmament it is a different question. Equally we cannot also speak about the American navy and the Soviet navy in the same breath, as our experience shows, about the Mediterranean; the Americans said, when on the first occasion, the Soviet Navy went over the Dardanells to the Mediterranean, "What business have you here? This is no English Channel or an inland sea." So, the freedom of the seas or what is called the peace area of the Indian Ocean has to be protected to a certain extent by our capacity at least to assess what is happening. I do not think I am saying anything that I should not say; today we have not got the capacity to know what is happening in the Indian Ocean. We read in the newspapers that the American navy has moved and so on; and that is all. We have no patrols; we have no ships to patrol. The navy is the weakest spot in our defence system. We are a State with a responsibility to our other Indian Ocean coun-

tries. I think from this desire to keep peace here, we should move on.

Sir, the sea is always neutral. It is only when you put ships on it that it becomes something else. Therefore, this is what we should do. We have to build up the strength of our littoral States. When the Minister of External Affairs addresses this question at the next what is called the Freedom of the Seas Conference which is supposed to be held in Chile but which the Americans decided otherwise—it is to be held somewhere—we have to peg our claim in regard to our territorial sea. When the naval guns can shoot about 19½ miles, six miles of territorial sea is nowhere.

Secondly, when we are trying to mine oil—not only we but everybody wants to mine oil from the continental shelf, we are entitled to project our continental shelf which is part of our own land. The continental shelf is merely a continent just under water; it is just like a man going to a bathing-place and dipping himself under the water; it is not that he is finished; he is down there. The continental shelf is part of our territory. And we should be in a position to protect our continental shelf and also to protect ourselves from aggression.

After all, even in recent years, we have been reminded of the fact that there are other people who use the sea against us. I do not want to go into the names of them. But there it is. Our power on the sea is not for aggressive purposes. It is the same with regard to our army. We have a considerable army not in order to invade anybody, not even to liberate anybody. We did not go to liberate Bangladesh; we went there because we were invaded and otherwise we would have been in danger. That was the only reason. Therefore, when we talk about the Indian Ocean being an area of peace, it should not be as something of a unilateral, pacifist character. The facts of Nature have to be recognised. The facts of this world have to be recognised. Unless we have the power, not necessarily naval power—unless we have the political power, the prestige and position to say, "This is our area; do not come in here," then only, in extreme circumstances would they come in. Therefore, we should develop our

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon]

naval strength and our understanding of what has happened in those seas.

Not so long ago, an American naval establishment and so on came there for sounding the depth of our seas. They know every inch of it. Of course, they said Indians have been asked to co-operate. We did co-operate, and there was one officer whose business was to clock the time when the device banged at the bottom. That was his business in sounding the depth of the sea. We are co-operating in that way and that is our effective part.

These are the two things, or the two main points. One is the collective security in Asia and the second is the freedom of the seas. The second one is an immediate one, because we shall be soon going to the conference and even this question of the territorial sea of six miles would become a very crucial matter for us. It starts there. Peru has 200 miles in this respect. I am not saying that we should have 200 miles. But we should have a sufficient distance from our coast where ships armed with naval guns do not go there. As we have come to the stage of nuclear-powered ships, this is even more important than at any other time.

17.00 hours.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola) :** If there was any area in which our country had reason to be legitimately proud, I would submit that it is the area of foreign policy, because we have consistently succeeded in pursuing a policy which has been admired throughout the world. We are gaining more and more friends all over the world on account of our foreign policy and this must go to the credit of the captains who are piloting the ship of foreign policy.

I come to the critics of our foreign policy. They are mainly from the sector which like an ostrich has a tendency to put its head under sand. Take organisations like Jan Sangh. I must submit somehow I have always felt that organisations of this mentality have not advanced beyond the era of Sivaji, Rana Pratap and Guru Gobind Singh. Everything in their assessment is in terms of Hindu versus Muslim. In respect of the foreign policy they have the same slogan RSS boys used to say

हिन्दुस्तान हिन्दुओं का, नहीं किसी के बाप का

During the last war which we had with Pakistan the slogan was :

जहाँ हमारा खून बहा, वह ज़मीन हमारी है

They do not understand how dangerous these slogans are. The blood of jawan was spilt even in Bangladesh. Do they mean to say that that land must belong to us? That is what they said in the Rann of Kutch. The moment you have friendship with Arab countries they would criticise us and ask us to beware and they would say; these are muslim countries, they will never be our real friends. The moment you try to have friendly relations with Pakistan and you say that we have no designs on an inch of any foreign territory and therefore we must vacate, they say; why do you pursue that policy? Their policy is so narrow-minded. They say that we must have no compromise or understanding with a country like China, till they vacate every inch of our land; no talk with China. But the moment Mr. Kissinger went to China and started having a dialogue with China, the whole thing softens down; we have to be realistic now! We have always said that we do not want enemies anywhere. In this context, I wish to refer to what our Foreign Minister told us. He quoted one of the famous thoughts of Mao Tse-tung and that thought was that China was in need of enemies. Who can be the most satisfying and convenient enemies? These would be nearby countries particularly countries like India. As far as they are in need of enemies, they would not be eager to make friendship with India howsoever we may desire to have friendship with all: Our policy is one of wanting friends all over the world. In this context let us consider our relationship with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. For this, we must understand the basic difference between a socialist economy and a capitalist economy. As far as capitalist economy is concerned, there the Government itself is dominated by the capitalist class which controls even the armament industry. They always want areas where they can dump their second-hand obsolete arms and experiment the armaments they have manufactured. The best areas are the small countries. They did it in Vietnam in the name of containing communism. They are now thinking of trying this very strategy in Iran and the

middle-east. We can realise the danger of their saying, "In exchange of oil, we will give you arms". They will give arms to these small countries so that they may fight against each other. They say, this is done to protect these countries against Soviet Union. See this policy right from the beginning. Have you ever seen a country like USA supporting non-alignment? You know the famous Dulles policy: Those who are not our friends are our enemies. Therefore, they condemned the whole policy of non-alignment. Have you ever seen a socialist country like USSR condemning non-alignment? This is the fundamental difference between a socialist country and a capitalist country. Capitalist countries with their multinational corporations have always tried to dominate over the small countries through their arms, money power, industry etc.

What is the basic ingredient of this concept of collective security? The first ingredient is that we do not want to have any aggressive design against any country in this region. It is based on mutual trust, mutual co-operation, mutual friendship and mutual understanding. What is wrong with this concept? We know the experience of small countries like Vietnam, Cambodia, etc., right up to our neighbouring country, Pakistan. Now we see what is happening in the middle-east. We have seen that the capitalist countries have tried to make this an arena of conflicts, a practising ground for their armaments. If this is not to be allowed, what is wrong in these countries of Asia getting together and saying, "Let us have mutual agreement of non-aggression". We must dispel from the mind of even the smallest country in this region that it need not have any fear from any country in this region at least. That is the first step we can take towards the whole concept of collective security.

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** You want India to accept the Brezhnev doctrine?

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** What is your understanding of it? I do not agree that this concept of collective security is the Brezhnev doctrine. By calling it Brezhnev doctrine, you want to condemn it as if "this is something dangerous coming from someone and therefore be on the guard." You should

examine it on its merits. Instead of criticising it merely because it comes from a friendly country whom you may not like for your own reasons, you may condemn it on merit. Let us know where you find fault with the idea of being friends in this region, the entire countries of this region wanting to protect themselves against aggression. This is India's doctrine and there is no question of having any apprehension on this ground.

**SHRI R. V. BADE:** India's doctrine or Indira doctrine?

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** India today is represented by Indira. Although you may say it in a derogatory sense, I feel proud to say that Indira stands for India . . . . (Interruptions) I have described how your doctrine has not been of any help to us.

As far as our foreign policy is concerned, the spirit of *detente* that has been created in the world must now be consolidated and translated into a spirit of co-operation and that could come only in the economic sphere. The best way to consolidate this spirit is not only in a negative aspect of political non-aggression in the military sense but in the positive aspect of having economic co-operation. It is only by having greater and greater economic co-operation among the countries of this region that we can really take a major step towards greater solidarity among the freedom-loving and peace-loving countries of the world. I believe that is the basic tenet of the foreign policy which we have been successfully pursuing.

17.12 hrs.

STATEMENT RE : CRASH OF LUFTHANSA'S BOEING-707 AT PALAM AIRPORT

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AND TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): I regret to inform the House that a Lufthansa Boeing 707 aircraft crashed while landing at Palam airport at 0101 hours IST this morning. The aircraft was on a scheduled flight and was coming from Bangkok. Before giving any further details, I would like to inform the House straightaway that fortunately there was no loss of life and that all the 98 passengers and 11 crew members on board are safe. 6 passengers and the