

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

Captain of the aircraft received some injuries. 4 passengers and the Captain were taken to the hospital and all but the Captain have been discharged.

The aircraft in its approach phase duly crossed the reporting point over Secunderabad, approximately 26 miles from Palam. The aircraft was cleared by air traffic control for a straight in landing. The aircraft reported crossing the outer marker at 0059 hrs. IST, and landing clearance was given. About two minutes later the air traffic control officer saw some flames near the beginning of runway 28 and immediately alerted the safety services who rushed to the site. The Duty Officer simultaneously alerted the city fire services and hospitals.

Immediately on receiving information of the accident I rushed to the site accompanied by the Secretary in my Ministry. The Director General of Civil Aviation along with his officers, and the officers of the International Airport Authority also arrived at the scene. I was informed that the aircraft had struck the Middle Marker hut and that the chowkidar on duty there had also been injured and is in hospital. I was also informed that all the Landing Aids were in operation at the time of the accident.

Almost all the passengers had been taken to the airport restaurant where I spoke to a number of them. I also visited the Willingdon Hospital to see the injured persons including the Captain of the aircraft.

I am sure, the House will join me in expressing its deep regret over the accident and wishing the injured persons a very speedy recovery. It is indeed fortunate that there was no loss of life.

A Court of Inquiry is being appointed to investigate the circumstances and causes of the accident.

17.15 hrs.

MOTION Re: INTERNATIONAL  
SITUATION—*contd.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now resume the discussion on the international situation.

Shrimati Mukul Banerji.

SHRIMATI MUKUL BANERJI (New Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to begin by appreciating our Government for the Joint Economic Agreements signed recently with Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. These Agreements will create scope for faster industrialisation of our country and lead to self-reliance on essential matters. It has also extended the area of peace through mutual understanding and friendship which will help in releasing tension in other parts of the world.

Some people have criticised our Government and have expressed their apprehension that India is surrendering to the Communist Bloc and is fast coming under the clutches of the Soviet Union. I can only say that this sort of suspicion and fear is expressed through mental weakness and lack of understanding of the world situation today. It is logically not possible that any two countries should be at par in strength in every respect and then only they should sign Agreements with each other. Such Agreements are signed with the spirit of mutual cooperation and on the basis of mutual benefit.

17.16 hrs.

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

In order to make our country strong and well-developed in industry, agriculture, science and technology, etc., it is necessary that we borrow knowledge and also money and material and, in return, we give to others whatever we have in excess. The expression of such fears that we may surrender our Independence or national interest in any manner is not only baseless but it should also be condemned as immoral because it has a demoralising effect on the people.

One of the main criticism offered is regarding the idea of Collective Asian Security Plan made by Mr. Brezhnev during his recent visit. Let us be clear that this is just a friendly suggestion from a friendly country for consideration and it is not a mandate on us. India's primary concern in Asia is to build close friendship and cooperation with all her neighbours and other Asian countries and all her steps should be directed to this principal objective. Asian Security idea or any other suggestion coming from any quarter should be judged in this context.

Is it not interesting, Sir, that when the rest of the world, including all the Super Powers have started openly recognising the strength and stature of India in every sense, a section of our own people are trying to project their Motherland as weak and vascillating? One does not develop immunity through segregation. No country, even the smallest one, can exist and grow in isolation today and, certainly not a big country like India. We must expose ourselves to various challenging ideas existing in the world and yet develop according to our own genius and aspirations. That is the ideal of India and there lies her salvation. The world is fast changing and any country which wants to progress must keep pace with this fast moving world. Otherwise, we shall be outdated and outmoded. The Opposition which criticises the Government in such matters should do well if they read the signs of time.

Indo-U.S. relationship has also gone through a marked improvement. In his speech before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in September, 1973, Dr. Henry Kissinger recognised India's role as of special importance in the developing world whose growth and stability is essential to peace and stability in South Asia. The critics of our Government should at least learn to respect the country from what others say about us. The Settlement of the question of P.L. 480 funds is one of the major steps towards cementing our relationship with U.S.A. Moreover, Dr. Henry Kissinger is expected to visit India in the next month and it can be hoped that there would be further smoothening of relations between these two great democratic countries.

We have seen in recent past how confirmed and declared hostilities of decades have melted and new alliances have grown in the world completely believing the old idea of rigid Power blocs. The relationships between U.S.A. and China, and U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. are such examples where the respective ideological stands of their Governments could no more remain hurdles. The fact is that there is today greater consciousness among all nations for rapid progress and they realise that this is possible by releasing tensions and widening the area of peace. This is also the essence of the idea of non-alignment.

1—Last

In our own sub-continent, the Simla Agreement with Pakistan followed by Delhi Agreement have paved the way for lasting peace and progress. It has also established the efficacy of the idea of bilateralism in international affairs. Our relationship with Bangladesh continues to be as brotherly and cordial as before. Similarly, our relationship with Nepal and Ceylon has further improved and have become more cordial.

While discussing the affairs of the sub-continent, our attention is naturally drawn to the recent developments regarding Indian Ocean. This area has suddenly sprung into prominence and there seems to be a danger of its being a bone of contention between big powers. India and other peace-loving Asian countries will be interested to see that the Indian Ocean remains as before a peaceful zone free from Great Powers' presence and rivalries. All ships are welcome here except war ships.

Coming back again to our relationship with other countries, our ties with Iran have become stronger than before. At times, some doubts have been expressed regarding our friendly relations, but both the countries have not allowed their bilateral relations to be affected by any such insinuation.

Our relationship with China has yet to be normalised. Several gestures have been made by our leaders. But China seems to prefer to continue her cold behaviour. We want all the outstanding issues between us to be settled bilaterally as we have done with Pakistan. But this should be remembered by China that India is also a big country like her and no physical or military pressure can brow-beat India. Secondly, if China remembers, she was a signatory to the idea of peaceful co-existence and Panch Sheel; she must also agree that, along with her system of Communist Government, the Indian ideal of democratic socialism must be tolerated and allowed to exist as we are willing to tolerate their ideology. Only then, will it be possible to develop mutual friendship and peaceful relations between the two countries on a lasting basis.

As regards the conflict in West Asia, India was one of the first countries to support the Arab cause as we have always done. At that time some of our critics doubted our policy. But now we

[Shrimati Mukul Banerjee]

have seen how many big and small countries, hostile to Arabs, are realising the reality of the situation and are now coming forward to support their cause.

In the end, Sir, it will not be too much to say that the foreign policy pursued by our Government has met with brilliant success and much of it could be possible because of the able, steering and efficient handling of these delicate problems by our hon. Foreign Minister and our beloved Prime Minister. I congratulate the Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and also the Government for the same.

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका) : सभापति महोदय, सब से पहले मैं श्री स्वर्ण सिंह को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने हम लोगों को एक अरसे के बाद अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर बहस करने का मौका दिया है ।

जब हम भारत की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति का विचार करते हैं, तो सब से पहले यह सवाल उठता है कि हम आत्मश्लाघी बनें या अन्तर्मुखी बनें । अगर हम अन्तर्मुखी बनेंगे तो इस बात को कबूल करना पड़ेगा कि बंगला देश की लड़ाई में भारत की जीत होने के बाद हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रतिमा, हमारा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय चेहरा, और ज्यादा निखरने के बजाये इन दिनों में धूमिल ही होता चला जा रहा है, और उस का कारण यह है कि आन्तरिक मामलों में भारत की कमजोरी बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो गई है ।

यह सही है कि आजादी के बाद दस बारह साल तक भारत को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में महत्व भी मिला और ख्याति भी मिली । लेकिन इस के जो कारण थे, उन का सम्बन्ध दो महा-शक्तियों के बीच में, अतलांतकीय और सोवियत खेमों के बीच में, उस समय चल रहे संघर्ष और शीत युद्ध से था । दोनों महाशक्तियाँ, दोनों खेमे, चाहेंगे थे कि उन के बीच में मध्यस्थता का, एक ईमानदार ब्रोकर का, काम करने वाला कोई देश भी हो, और वह रोज उन वर्षों में भारत अदा करता था । जैसे ही यह शीत

युद्ध समाप्त हुआ, दोनों महाशक्तियों को किसी मध्यस्थ की आवश्यकता नहीं रही ।

उसी समय 1962 में चीन के साथ हमारी जो लड़ाई हुई, उस में हमारी फौजी कमजोरी सारी दुनिया को ज्ञात हो गई । उस समय के बाद से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में भारत का महत्व कम होता चला जा रहा है ।

द्वितीय महायुद्ध के बाद जो सबसे बड़ा अन्तर्विरोध इस दुनिया में रहा है, अगर मौलिक दृष्टि से देखा जाये, तो यूरोप और अमरीका के विकसित राष्ट्रों और एशिया, अफ्रीका और लेटिन अमरीका के अविकसित और पिछड़े राष्ट्रों के बीच में जो अन्तर्विरोध है, वही बुनियादी अन्तर्विरोध है । अमरीका और रूस के बीच वाला अन्तर्विरोध लम्बान की दृष्टि से बुनियादी अन्तर्विरोध नहीं था ।

मेरे नेता, डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया, बहुत साल पहले कहा करते थे कि बुनियादी तौर पर जो जफ स्टालिन और हेनरी फोर्ड भाई भाई हैं । उस समय लोग उन की बात का अर्थ नहीं समझते थे । लेकिन आज हम लोग देख रहे हैं कि ब्रेज्नेव और निक्सन इतने ज्यादा करीब आ गये हैं कि, जिस अन्तर्विरोध का मैं ने उल्लेख किया है, तथा रूस और चीन के बीच में जो अन्तर्विरोध उत्पन्न हुआ है, उस की तुलना में अमरीका और रूस के रिश्ते बहुत ज्यादा मित्रता के रिश्ते हो गये हैं ।

किसी भी देश की वैदेशिक नीति को सफलतापूर्वक चलाने के लिए या तो उस के पास फौजी शक्ति होनी चाहिए, या आर्थिक और औद्योगिक सामर्थ्य होना चाहिए, और यदि ये दोनों शक्तियाँ नहीं हैं, तो कम से कम आदर्शों और मूल्यों की नई शक्ति होनी चाहिए । आज मैं विदेश मंत्री से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या विगत 26 वर्षों में भारत ने कुछ नये आदर्शों का सृजन करने का प्रयास किया है । वैदेशिक नीति को चलाने का किसिंजर का भी तरीका है कि शक्ति भी है और पुराने ढंग की कूटनीति भी है, जिस तरीके को रूस ने भी अपनाया है ।

लेकिन 1917 में जब रूस में क्रांति हुई, तो लेनिन के पास न फौजी शक्ति थी और न औद्योगिक और आर्थिक शक्ति थी, मगर फिर भी लेनिन की नीति अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में अपना एक अनोखा महत्व रखती थी, और उस का कारण यह था कि नये आदर्शों का सृजन करने का काम लेनिन ने किया। मैं अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत ने इस तरह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में नये आदर्शों का सृजन करने का कोई काम नहीं किया है। पुर्तगाली साम्राज्यवाद के तहत आज भी जो उपनिवेश हैं, और दक्षिणी अफ्रीका के जिस सारे इलाके पर गोरे साम्राज्यवाद का राज्य चल रहा है, क्या उन इलाकों को राजनैतिक पराधीनता से मुक्त करने में भारत की वैदेशिक नीति को सफलता मिली है ?

इस अन्तर्विरोध का दूसरा पहलू आर्थिक है। मैं श्री उन्नीकृष्णन् के साथ इस बारे में सहमत हूँ कि राजनैतिक पराधीनता तो एशिया, अफ्रीका और लेटिन अमरीका के बड़े हिस्से से खत्म हो गई है, लेकिन पिछड़े 26 वर्षों में आर्थिक पराधीनता और शोषण बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। 26 साल पहले दुनिया के अविकसित देशों और यूरोप तथा अमरीका के विकसित देशों के बीच जो खाई थी, वह खाई आज और ज्यादा चौड़ी और गहरी बन गई है, और इस लिए लम्बान की दृष्टि से मैं कहूँगा कि मेरी राय में भारत की वैदेशिक नीति इस मौलिक कसौटी पर खरी नहीं उतरी है।

जहां तक भारत का अपना सवाल है, क्या विगत 26 वर्षों में हम ने अपने देश में आर्थिक और सामाजिक शूर-बराबरी, असमानता, को समाप्त किया ? अपनी आर्थिक प्रगति तेजी से करने के बारे में, और मुल्क को आत्म-निर्भर बनाने के बारे में, क्या हम लोगों ने कोई नया आदर्श विश्व के सामने पेश किया है ? जब तक हम लोग यह काम नहीं करेंगे, जब तक

अन्दरूनी कायापलट नहीं होगी, तब तक भारत को वैदेशिक नीति दुनिया में कारगर नहीं हो सकती है।

जब भारत आजाद हुआ तो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की रचना हो चुकी थी। संयुक्त राष्ट्र-संघ की रचना का आधार था कि द्वितीय महा-युद्ध के बाद जो यथास्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई थी उस यथास्थिति को बनाए रखना। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के चार्टर में इसका प्रयास किया गया था। पिछले 26 वर्षों में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति में इतने बड़े परिवर्तन हुए हैं लेकिन उस के अनुरूप संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का जो चार्टर है उस को बदलने का प्रयास भारत ने नहीं किया, उस में पहले नहीं की। क्या आज आर्थिक और औद्योगिक शक्ति को देखें तो ब्रिटेन और फ्रांस की तुलना में जापान और पश्चिमी जर्मनी ज्यादा शक्ति-शाली नहीं है ? लेकिन जापान और पश्चिमी जर्मनी का आज सुरक्षा परिषद् में कोई स्थायी सदस्यता प्राप्त नहीं है। अभी अभी इन वर्षों में वह संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में प्रवेश कर पाए हैं। लेकिन फ्रांस और ब्रिटेन तौलनिक दृष्टि से कमजोर होते हुए भी उन को सुरक्षा परिषद् में वीटो का भी अधिकार है और सुरक्षा परिषद् की स्थायी सदस्यता भी उन को मिली हुई है। इसी तरह से लोक-संख्या की दृष्टि से देखें तो हम चीन के बाद सब से बड़े देश हैं। मेरा यह कहने का मतलब नहीं है कि भारत को इस के बारे में पहल करनी चाहिए कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में नये लोगों को वीटो का अधिकार मिले या नये देशों को स्थायी सदस्यता सुरक्षा परिषद् में मिले। क्योंकि बीच में डा० किसिजर आदि लोग यह सुझाव देते हैं कि जापान को भी लिया जाय। भारत को मौलिक रूप से संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के चार्टर में परिवर्तन करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए जिस से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जातीय व्यवस्था समाप्त हो, किसी भी राष्ट्र को वीटो का अधिकार नहीं हो और किसी भी देश को सुरक्षा परिषद् में स्थायी सदस्यता न मिले। इस तरह की कोई पहल भारत ने 26 वर्षों

## [श्री मधु लिमये]

में नहीं की। अगर वह भविष्य में करेंगे तो मैं मानूंगा कि कोई बड़ा परिवर्तन भारत की नीति में हुआ है।

तीसरे खेमे की आलोचना मेरे मित्र ऊनी-कृष्णन् ने की। लेकिन उन से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस माने में ऐटलांटिक पैक्ट के देश एक फौजीगुट मिलिटरी ब्लाक के रूप में आते हैं या वारसा पैक्ट के देश आते हैं उस दृष्टि से तीसरे खेमे की कल्पना यह फौजी कल्पना कभी नहीं थी। तीसरे खेमे की कल्पना वैचारिक कल्पना थी, वह सर्जनशील कल्पना थी। आप उस को फौजी कल्पना में परिवर्तन करना चाहते हैं तो आप उस कल्पना के साथ बड़ा अन्याय करते हैं। जैसे जैसे लोग कांग्रेस पार्टी में चले जाते हैं वे पुरानी सारी बातों को भूलने लग जाते हैं। इसलिए मैं उन को तो माफी करता हूँ।

सामूहिक सुरक्षा की चर्चा हमारे देश में चल पड़ी है। इस के बारे में सोवियत नेता से मैं भी बात करना चाहता था और कुछ हद तक बात हुई भी। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि स्वयं ब्रेज़नेव साहब ने यह कहा है, हालांकि ब्रेज़नेव की तारीफ करने का काम कांग्रेसी दल के सदस्य ज्यादा कर रहे थे जैसे ब्रेज़नेव से भी अधिक उस क्लेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी के बारे में उन को जानकारी थी, तो उनकी बात तो मैं छोड़ देता हूँ, लेकिन ब्रेज़नेव साहब का स्वयं कहना है कि मेरी कोई ठोस, निश्चित, कट एंड ड्राई योजना नहीं है। मैं केवल उस के ऊपर बहस चाहता हूँ। जब बहस चाहते हैं तो वह लोग हमारी बात और हमारे दृष्टिकोण को भी सुनें। यूरोप जैसे इलाके में जहाँ बहुत प्राचीन राष्ट्र हैं, एक एक राष्ट्र का राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तिगत स्पष्ट है और वहाँ की सीमाएँ भी अब निश्चित हो चुकी हैं, स्थिति अलग है। यूरोप में कोई प्रादेशिक झगड़े नहीं हैं। नई पोलिश सीमा को पश्चिमी जर्मनी ने और पूर्वी जर्मनी ने मान लिया है। चेकोस्लोवाकिया का जहाँ तक सवाल है उस की यथास्थिति को भी पश्चिमी जर्मनी ने मान

लिया है। यूगोस्लाविया और इटली के बीच में जो त्रिआस्त का झगड़ा था वह भी हल हो गया है। इसलिए यूरोप में इस वक्त कोई सीमाओं को ले कर झगड़े नहीं हैं। उस की यथास्थिति को बनाए रखने की दृष्टि से सामूहिक सुरक्षा की चर्चा यदि यूरोप में हो और हेल्सिंकी सम्मेलन में और हुआ क्या था, यथास्थिति को बनाए रखने के बारे में एक करार सोवियत यूनियन चाहता है, शायद यूरोपीय देशों के बीच में यह हो भी जायेगा। लेकिन एशिया की स्थिति दूसरी है। एशिया की परिस्थिति प्रवाही परिस्थिति है। यहाँ के राष्ट्रों की रूपरेखा साफ नहीं है। यहाँ सीमा के कई विवाद हैं। साम्राज्यशाही ने एशिया के देशों को छोड़ने हुए, जब उन के लिए छोड़ना अनिवार्य हो गया तो इन देशों को वे तकसीम कर के चले गए और तकसीम कर के जो योजना, जो व्यवस्था एशिया के देशों के ऊपर लादी वह व्यवस्था ठीक नहीं रही है। इसलिए सोवियत लीडरों से मैं ने कहा कि अगर क्लेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी और यथास्थिति वाली बात एशिया में दो साल पहले होती तो क्या बंगलादेश का निर्माण हो सकता था? यूरोप में इस तरह के नये राज्यों का, नये देशों का निर्माण पिछले 25 वर्षों में नहीं हुआ है। आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1947 में माउंट बैटन जिन्ना और नेहरू पटेल ने जो योजना इस देश के ऊपर लादी है उस का खोखलापन 25 वर्षों में साबित हो चुका है। पिछले 25 वर्षों में की व्यवस्था टूट चुकी है। जो घटनाएँ इस इलाके में इस वक्त भी घट रही हैं इस से पता चलता है कि जो वर्तमान व्यवस्था है उस में भी परिवर्तन होने वाला है। हाँ, अगर क्लेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी का मतलब सिर्फ यह है कि बल-प्रयोग कर के सीमाओं को न बदला जाय तो उस के बारे में कोई विवाद नहीं होगा। लेकिन उस का मतलब अगर यह होगा कि यथास्थिति को बनाए रखना तो मैं चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि सामूहिक सुरक्षा की नीति एक प्रतिक्रियावादी नीति साबित होगी क्योंकि उस में परिवर्तन की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं रहेगी। हम लोगों को प्रयास करना चाहिए

कि भारत बंगला देश और पाकिस्तान के बीच में जैसे पहले युद्ध-बन्दी के बारे में जवाहर लाल जी के द्वारा सुझाव दिए जाते थे इस वक्त भी मैं यह आवश्यक समझता हूँ कि यह सुझाव दिया जाय। वैदेशिक नीति और रक्षा नीति के बारे में इन तीन राज्यों में एक समानता लाने के लिए हम लोगों को निरंतर प्रयास करना चाहिए।

अभी भी जो पाकिस्तान का इलाका बचा है उस में क्या होने वाला है, दस साल के बाद होगा, आज कोई कह नहीं सकता है। स्वयं प्रेसीडेंट भूटो कह रहे हैं कि बिलोचिस्तान में मिनि बंगलादेश हो रहा है। इसलिए रूसी नेताओं को इस के बारे में सोचना चाहिए। एशिया में चुंकि प्रवाही स्थिति है इसलिए यूरोप के इतिहास को देखकर जिन कल्पनाओं को उन्होंने निर्माण किया है वह एशिया पर बिना यहाँ, की स्थिति पर विचार किए हुए लाने का प्रयास उन लोगों को नहीं करना चाहिए।

इन सवालों के बारे में भारत को पहल करनी चाहिए। एशिया के नक्शे की ओर देखिए—कोरिया बंटा हुआ है, वियतनाम बंटा हुआ है, पश्चिमी एशिया में जाइए, पश्चिमी एशिया की जो मूल समस्या है उस के बारे में तो कोई सोचता ही नहीं। सीरिया और मिश्र का जो इलाका इसरायल ने लिया है यह बुनियादी सवाल नहीं है। बुनियादी सवाल यह है कि वहाँ के जो फिलिस्तीनी लोग हैं उन को अपने अधिकार मिलेंगे या नहीं? भारत ने 1947-48 में जब यह मामला संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सामने आया था तो यूगोस्लाविया से मिल कर फिलिस्तीन की समस्या के हल के लिए एक मिले जुले राज्य की, फेडरल राज्य की कल्पना रखी थी। आज भी मैं चाहूँगा और मैं तो चाहता ही हूँ कि इसरायल ने जो इलाका हड़पा है सीरिया का और मिश्र का उस में से वह निकले लेकिन साथ साथ पहले गाजा स्ट्रिप के ऊपर मिश्र का कब्जा था और पुराने जेरूसलेम के

ऊपर और जार्डन नदी के वेस्ट बैंक के ऊपर जोर्डन का कब्जा हो गया था। क्या वजह है कि इन इलाकों में फिलिस्तीनी लोगों का अपना राज्य न बने? फिलिस्तीनी लोगों का फिलिस्तीन की भूमि के ऊपर स्वतंत्र राज्य बने इसके लिए भारत और अन्य देशों को प्रयत्न करना चाहिए तथा इसरायल और फिलिस्तीन दोनों राज्यों के बीच में एक कान्फेडरेशन बने या फेडरेशन बने। फेडरेशन बनने में तो बहुत समय लगेगा। लेकिन कम से कम फिलिस्तीनी लोगों को अपना प्रभुसत्ता सम्पन्न राज्य बनाने का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए। यह सवाल मिश्र और सीरिया का नहीं है, फिलिस्तीनी लोगों को जोर्डन राजा के कब्जे से और मिश्र के कब्जे से छुड़वाने की निहायत जरूरत है। उन का अपना राज्य बना देंगे तभी जा कर यह बात पश्चिमी एशिया में आगे चल सकती है।

मैं और भी दो तीन बातों का उल्लेख कर के अपने भाषण को खत्म करना चाहता हूँ। आज हम आन्तरिक मामलों में एकाधिकारशाही के खिलाफ होते हैं। लेकिन विश्व में संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के रूप में वीटो और स्थायी सदस्यता के रूप में भी एकाधिकारशाही है। क्या वजह है कि जिन को सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल में परमानेंट सीट और वीटो का अधिकार है उन्हीं लोगों की आण्विक एकाधिकारशाही भी दुनिया में है। इसलिए विदेश मंत्री को यह कह देना चाहिए कि जिस तरह से हम किसी फौजी खेमे के साथ अपने को नहीं जोडना चाहते हैं, और इसलिए भारत में किसी को भी नाविक अड्डा या हवाई अड्डा देने का सवाल बिलकुल नहीं उत्पन्न होना चाहिए चाहे रूस हो या और कोई देश हो।

साथ साथ यह भी स्पष्ट करना चाहिए कि यह जो आण्विक-एकाधिकारशाही है उस का भारत डट कर विरोध करता है। इस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि आप आज ही आण्विक हथियार बनाने लगे। आज जो आर्थिक स्थिति

## [श्री मधु लिमये]

है, उस में हम जैसे लोग यह सलाह नहीं दे सकते, लेकिन भारत को अपनी रक्षा के लिये आणविक हथियार बनाने का अधिकार सुरक्षित रखना चाहिये। हां, दुनिया के सभी लोग आणविक निरस्त्रीकरण के लिये, पूरे निरस्त्रीकरण के लिये तैयार हो जायेंगे तो मैं कहूंगा कि आप भी उस के लिये तैयार हो जाइये। लेकिन जब तक दुनिया तैयार नहीं है, तब तक मैं यह मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। अमरीका और रूस के हाथ में आणविक हथियार शान्ति के लिये खतरा पैदा नहीं करते हैं, लेकिन भारत के हाथ में आयेंगे तो खतरा उत्पन्न हो जायेगा, इस दलील को, इस तर्क को, मैं मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ।

अभी श्री कृष्ण मेनन साहब ने एक बहुत अच्छी बात कही। उन्होंने कहा कि बारबार आप यह बयान क्यों देते हैं कि चीन के साथ हम लोग समझौता करने के लिये तैयार हैं। अब तक दर्जनों बयान आ चुके हैं, लेकिन चीन की ओर से कोई प्रतिसाद नहीं हुआ। आप बयान देते जा रहे हैं। मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ, जैसे रूस और चीन का संघर्ष शुरू हो गया, हम लोग चीन के हमदर्द बन गये। मैं यह ताकत के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ—जिस तरह से रूस और चीन के बीच में विवाद के विषय हैं, उस से भी अधिक विवाद के विषय भारत और चीन के बीच में है। रूस और भारत के बीच में सीमा का विवाद नहीं है। बारबार चीन को जो न्यौता दिया जा रहा है, इस का क्या मतलब है? अन्ततोगत्वा चीन के साथ मित्रता का रिश्ता होना चाहिये, यह मेरी भी राय है, लेकिन इस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि दुर्बलता के आधार पर मैं चीन के सामने घुटने टेक कर समझौता करूँ। उन्होंने आप की सीमा का एक बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा हड़पा है, अपने हाथ में रखा है। अभी भी तिब्बत की राष्ट्रीयता का मामला है। आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ—यहाँ कुछ लोग हम को प्रतिक्रियावादी कहते थे—जब हम तिब्बत की बात कहते थे। लेकिन आज सोवियत

रूस के अखबार, ताशकन्द रेडियो चीन पर अभियोग लगा रहे हैं—इस से आप लोग सबक सीखिये। हमारे नेता दूर की बात देखते थे, जो बात लोहिया जी 1947 में करते थे, आज अगर रूस के नेता करने लगे हैं तो यह जीत रूस के नेताओं की नहीं है, लोहिया जी की जीत है। इस लिये किसी को प्रतिक्रियावादी कहना सस्ता है, लेकिन मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ—चीन और भारत के बीच में समझौता तभी होगा, जब भारत शक्तिशाली बन जायेगा, जब भारत आर्थिक स्थिति में आत्म-निर्भर हो जायेगा, जब भारत में सामाजिक विषमता खत्म हो जायेगी, जब हमारी आर्थिक तरक्की होगी, जब आर्थिक गैर-बराबरी खत्म हो जायेगी। मैं फिर ताकत के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ—फौजी शक्ति या केवल आर्थिक और औद्योगिक शक्ति ही शक्ति नहीं होती है, नये आदर्श, नये विचार—ये भी वैदेशिक नीति के कारगर हथियार बन सकते हैं। महात्मा गांधी का हिन्दुस्तान इस तरह की सृजनशील नीति चला सकता था, लेकिन इस देश का दुर्भाग्य ऐसा है कि महात्मा गांधी के चेलां ने मध्यस्थता और आनेस्ट-ब्रोकरी का रोल पसन्द किया, सृजनशीलता के रास्ते पर वे नहीं चले।

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Buldana): The Indo-Soviet Treaty of peace, Friendship and Co-operation was a landmark in the history of India's foreign policy. Though friendly relations between India and the Soviet Union were of a traditional character and though the Soviet Union had given considerable help to India in carrying out certain major projects in different plans, the Treaty of August 1971 laid a very firm foundation for the friendship and provided the basis for long-term co-operation in various fields.

The 15-year agreement on economic and trade co-operation signed on 29th November was a major step in consolidating peace and co-operation between these two countries.

The 15-year agreement between the two countries has shown their determination to develop and strengthen economic and technical co-operation as

well as trade between them on the basis of panchsheel, that is, respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit.

Of the many agreements, which have been reached between the Soviet Union and India, there are three very important features to which I would like to refer. First, to develop their economies, the two countries shall aim at the sharing and utilisation of upto-date technical and technological achievements on mutually favourable terms. Secondly, for existing projects previously undertaken with the assistance of the USSR and for undertaking new ones such as the oil refinery at Mathura and others, the Government of USSR will extend to the Government of India credits, the amounts, terms and conditions of which will be settled by separate agreements. The agreement further contains the important provision that the methods of reciprocal settlement, the amounts and terms of credit relations would be streamlined and improved. This might mean that the credits would be re-scheduled and perhaps the terms of repayment will be relaxed.

Another agreement provides for the setting up of a study group whose main function will be to exchange experience and knowledge in the fields of economic forecasting, methodology of planning, formulation of projects and programmes, planning of supplies of materials, exchange of published reports on materials.

I think these agreements are very important. They are mutually beneficial to both countries and are not of a one-sided character.

Now to take some allegations made against the agreements. It has been alleged that as a result of these, India has joined the Russian camp or that that there has been a sell-out, accusations to which the Prime Minister has given convincing replies. Further, India and the Soviet Union have similar views on many vital problems of international politics, one of which is the West Asian crisis. Both countries are of the view that the West Asian crisis can be solved and enduring peace established if the Security Council Resolution No. 242 of Nov. 22, 1967 is properly implemented. In the

Arab-Israeli War, India has consistently supported the just cause of the Arabs. But there is one aspect of the problem to which I would like to refer in this context. It has given rise to a very serious problems for the whole world, I mean the problem of oil. It is quite justifiable to use oil as a weapon in war time, but even after the war was over, they continued to cut supplies of oil or to sell it by auction, as a result of which the economies of all countries of the world are getting into serious trouble. It will harm not only the countries against which it is aimed but also neutral countries, and friendly countries like India. I am afraid this may precipitate a serious economic crisis and envelope all the countries of the world.

In this connection, I would like to say that the attitude taken by the Shah of Iran is noteworthy and deserves to be considered seriously by these Arab countries.

Coming nearer home, to China we have made our attitude clear. This has been done often enough. But I am afraid the Chinese commitment to Pakistan and her hostility to the Soviet Union would make it difficult for her to respond to our friendly approaches.

As regards Pakistan, our Government deserves to be congratulated on its infinite patience and understanding towards the Government of Mr. Bhutto. But in spite of all the goodwill towards Pakistan and our desire for stability there, Mr. Bhutto's response is disappointing and it is creating difficulties. He is a very difficult person to deal with. We know what he has been saying and doing in regard to Kashmir. But still I believe our Government should pursue a policy of friendship and co-operation and bit by bit see that there is peace and goodwill, because only by this way can we utilise the resources fully and abolish poverty from this sub-continent.

The PL 480 debt agreement between the USA and India is a very encouraging sign. The USA has shown considerable accommodation and even generosity towards this country, and I believe if we pursue this line, we can establish more friendly relations with America.

[Shri Y. S. Mahajan]

Sir, our policy is based on Panchsheel which is derived from our historical tradition. India has never committed aggression against any country in the world during thousands of years of its history, but in the last 25 years aggression has been committed against us four times. But we should still pursue our policy of Panchasheel, and support the United Nations and ultimately see that the United Nations or some such organisation is given teeth, and has power to carry out its decisions or has sanctions behind it. In this way, when our policy succeeds and when we have a federal sort of government comprising the whole world, then only it will be possible to establish peace on an enduring basis.

**SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH** (Pupri): Sir, the Government deserves congratulations for ably conducting the foreign policy in a fast-changing world community. (*Interruption*).

In this context, I want to say this. I was listening with very due attention to my friend Shri Madhu Limaye. Whatever weaknesses might have been there in our foreign policy, the foreign policy of India has never lacked idealism. As we have known from the history of the world, after the second world war, it did provide a new trend in international affairs which has been appreciated by everybody and every commentator in world affairs. I do not say Shri Madhu Limaye lacks intelligence and understanding of the conduct of our foreign policy. He is an intelligent man and he is a very able parliamentarian, but his effort is deliberate and quite malicious and mischievous. I hope that he will find many other weaknesses in the conduct of our foreign policy, but he will not denigrate the conduct of our foreign policy on this issue, that is lacks idealism.

I was listening to Shri Shyamnandan Mishra with great respect and attention. I fail to appreciate his criticism of appointing retired public servants as our ambassadors. I quite appreciate that public men should also adorn those offices. (*Interruptions*). If retired public servants are fit to represent the people in this House, on the Congress (O) or the Swantantra party tickets, they are equally fit to represent our country ab-

broad. (*Interruptions*). If they are useful in this House I do say that they have made very good contribution they are equally useful for conducting our foreign policy as abroad. We must appreciate in this context the role which Mr. Haksar is playing in the conduct of our foreign policy.

The Government deserves further approbation of this House not only for extending friendly relations to other countries but also consolidating our friendly relations with our friends and extending the scope and diameter of our friendship with other countries in the European Community and also the countries in the socialist bloc.

In this context, I would like to mention one factor which is very much in the minds of the people, and that is, the Asian security concept. Although this concept is not properly spelt out by its author, nevertheless, doubts have been created about the concept of collective Asian security and suspicions have been aroused. At the moment, I do not want to say anything more, because it is still a concept. But our Asian historical experiences are entirely different from those of Europe.

All European countries irrespective of their ideology and political system are interested in having collective security pact or an understanding. But the experience of Asian countries, historically and in the context of the present political situation, is entirely different. Whenever there is talk of a military pact or understanding or a conference for this purpose, there is suspicion. I congratulate the Government for their proper reaction during the visit of Mr. Brezhnev which accorded with the basic tenets of our foreign policy.

The next problem is in regard to the Indian Ocean. The seas of the world belong to the entire human race. There is no quarrel over that. But when warlike movements or warlike uses are made tensions arise and the Americans must share the largest part of the blame, because it is due to their activities in setting up naval bases and communication centres from Australia to South Africa that the Soviet Union has been activated to take retaliatory measures and the Indian Ocean has become an area of tension.

The Sino-Indian relations are bound to come up at every international conference and in every important forum in this country just as the Indo-Pakistan relationship used to come up before the establishment of Bangladesh. We endorse the sentiments of Mr. Samar Mukherjee in this regard, but I should like to know from him whether he wants that the Indian Foreign Minister should go on his knees before the Chinese Foreign Minister and beg for normalisation of relationship with them. It is the Chinese who have wronged us. So long as the fact of aggression remains no normal relationship with the Chinese is possible. In the recent past on the question of Bangladesh not only the Americans but the Chinese also opposed the creation of Bangladesh. Mr. Mukherjee should not forget that it was the Chinese who exercised the veto in the United Nations to prevent the entry of Bangladesh and that fact remains even today.

When we talk about the problem of relationship with our neighbouring countries, we should also bear in mind the countries in South East Asia. At the moment we are preparing our Fifth Plan. I would request the Government that the foreign policy planners should take into consideration the economic necessities of the South Asian countries in preparing our economic plans so that our economic activities may be relevant to the economic development and necessity of the South Asian countries.

With these words, I support the foreign policy of the Government of India.

**SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT** (Kozhikode): Mr. Chairman, Sir. I am highly grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to take part in this debate, on the External Affairs. Whatever may be our differences with the Government with regard to economic policy internal affairs or otherwise, I have no hesitation in saying that we have great appreciation for the policy followed by the Government of the country with regard to foreign affairs. We also appreciate the attitude adopted by the Government with regard to various problems that have arisen in various parts of the world recently from time to time. We have admiration for the stand taken by our Prime Minister and External Affairs Minister and also our representative in the Security Council with re-

gard to the recent Israeli aggression against the Arab Powers and the recent West Asian war between Israel and Arab powers whatever may be the results of this war. One thing has clearly come out: that Arabs can unite and fight heroically. The myth of invincibility of Israel has been broken for all time to come together with this, we have also developed deep bonds of friendship between us and the Arab world which I am sure will go a long way in establishing friendly relations and also leading to the economic co-operation between of the countries concerned. Nobody will dispute it, if I say that Israel is a cancer planted in the Arab world by the imperialist and expansionist colonial forces in this part of the world for their own selfish ends and to achieve their own expansionist policy. This cancer has to be wiped out then alone peace can be established. Therefore, while supporting the Arab cause and condemning the Zionist aggression our country has not only supported the liberation struggle of the Palestinians and the demand for vacation of the aggression against the Arab countries. But has also taken a just and firm stand in international politics. This has been not only appreciated by us, but it has given a place of prestige for our country in the international field, because Israel stood completely isolated throughout the world this time. Now we are going to have a Geneva conference. I am happy that not only Israel but the Arab countries also like Egypt, Jordan and probably Syria will sit round the table and discuss solution of the problems for the establishment of peace and vacation of aggression in West-Asia. But I feel the matter should not be left entirely in the hands of the super powers like USA or USSR, who may have their own interest to expand the areas of influence. Our country also should take a leading part in such a Conference as we have taken in bringing about cease-fire solution in the Security Council. I am sure earnest endeavour will lead not only to the vacation of aggression by Israel from Arab soil and the rehabilitation of lakhs and lakhs of Palestinians in their homeland but also to the return of the old city of Jerusalem back to Muslim hands, with which Muslims have got a great spiritual and emotional attachment. This attachment with the old city of Jerusalem is also emotional because it was facing towards

[Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait]

that great mosque Baitul Mukaddas the Muslims used to pray before facing at holy Kaaba. I would, therefore, very much appreciate if the Government of India, take an active part in the Geneva Conference to support the Arab cause and their genuine aspirations. Coming to Indo-Pakistan relations, we really appreciate the stand taken by the Government of India and welcome the repatriation of the prisoners of war. We all hope that Mr. Bhutto will realise the wisdom of recognising Bangladesh. By doing so not only good relations will be established between Bangladesh and India, but between all the three countries of the sub-continent, namely, Pakistan, India and Bangladesh, which will lead to the prosperity and progress of the people of this area.

I welcome very much the recent visit of Mr. Brezhnev the leader of the great Socialist Republic of Russia to this country because this will lead to the economic prosperity of our country. As far as economic development is concerned, we welcome his co-operation. There has been mention of the Asian Collective Security by names of the Members but all the details of this idea have not been spelt out. So far, Even Mr. Brezhnev has given a vague idea while speaking to the members of Parliament, I feel some form has to develop after further discussion. While we are thankful to Russia for her economic aid and support, we must not make ourselves dependent on Russia. We must follow an independent policy of non-alignment and also see that we do not become aligned to this country or that country just for the pleasure or desire of a super-power like Russia. I want to be sure on this point.

As far as PL 480 agreement is concerned, I welcome it. The United States has shown great consideration in arriving at this agreement with India, which is in the interests of our country. We must shape our policy in a manner as to have friendly relations with United States also.

In the end, I want to say that we greatly appreciate the foreign policy of our country because it has supported the right and just cause of the Arabs in the Middle East. It has also tried to create a better atmosphere in the sub-continent by coming to a settlement with

Pakistan. It has also come to an agreement with Russia for economic aid. Here my only word of caution is that we must not become subservient to any of the super-powers and become dependent on them. We must be very careful in dealing with the super-powers. I hope that the cool-minded diplomacy of our Foreign Minister will be in the interests of our country and its people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Aga.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (मुरना) : इसको कल तक रखिये । छः बज गए है । अब बन्द कीजिये ।

सभापति महोदय : जितने बोलने वाले है उनको बुला लेने दीजिये ।

मिनिस्टर कल जवाब दे दंगे ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : हाउस में गण पूर्ति भी नहीं है ।

सभापति महोदय : वे बोल लें, उसके बाद खत्म कर दंगे ।

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA (Bara-mulla) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it has been said here that we are aligned to the Soviet Union and we are a Soviet satellite. I do not want to indulge in allowing imagination to go to this ilimit of absurdity. I want to stress here that we are closer to the Soviet Union because our views on many issues are identical. We want development and, therefore, we want peace. They want peace because they also want development. This identical approach to the problems is bringing us together. It is not right to be allergic to one side or the other side.

At the same time, what I want to say is that we are today discussing the international situation and, there fore, we have to discuss what is our role in that and, before we discuss our role, we must see what is the situation obtaining today. There is a detente in Europe between the two powers. I also do not like the word "Super Powers" being used. Therefore, I say, it is a detente between the Soviet Union and America. If that detente is there, it is because they do not want mass annihilation which will include Americans and Sovie's also. That is

why there is a detente. But outside detente, what remains is not a happy position.

We do not have happy position obtaining in the world. There is trouble in Indo-China; there is trouble in Viet Nam. PRG is deservedly seeking recognition. 80 per cent of Cambodian area has been liberated. But the imperialists are there. In South Korea, imperialism does not allow unification to take place. The imperialist forces are there and also in West Asia. They created Israel in order to perpetuate conflict for all times to come in Arab Land. We have, in Africa, colonies; we have racial discrimination and all those troubles. We see that US imperialism enters the Indian Ocean with the Task Force. Why? They want oil from Iran to go to Israel. That may be one of the reasons. That is a matter of concern for us also. We must see that the Indian Ocean is kept as an area of peace.

We must also uphold and stress that there should be Asian collective security. I do not contribute to the view that it is an idea that has just come from Mr. Brezhnev. This is an idea which came from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself in 1947. In the Asian Relations Conference, he talked of that. We are very much interested in the collective security. It is not anything which has come from the Soviet Union. If they also want peace in the Indian Ocean, if they also want peace in Asia, it is because their two-thirds area is in Asia. We are also vitally interested in it. We would like to hear from our External Affairs Minister who is conducting our policies so very well and which have stood the test of time as to what are the formulations being made that will ensure the collective security.

I want to conclude by making one or two points more. We must see there is peace in West Asia. We must see that we do not just avoid to talk about Asian collective security. I do not understand why we are avoiding to talk directly about it. What we want is that there should be durable peace in West Asia. We must see that the Palestinians get home. We must see that Israelis vacate the areas taken by them. We must see that in Viet Nam, the Paris Agreement is not delayed any more. We must play a dominant role in all these matters. India is not a

small country. It is a continent. It matters internationally.

Lastly, I want to say that only recently we have seen that France is giving arms to Pakistan Imperialist Forces are again giving a false sense of strength to Pakistan. I am not afraid of Pakistan. They are giving a false sense of strength to Pakistan as they gave to Iran. Iran was sometime back talking of its being a mini-super power. Similarly, arming Pakistan is creating trouble here. We must see to all these things and our policy should be such that the United States is restrained to give arms to Pakistan and create a false sense of strength in this area.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for calling me. I am happy to be able to participate in this important debate on international affairs, even though I am sorry to find that the time allotted for this important debate has been cut and that it has been brought almost at the fag end of this current Winter Session.

The hon. Minister for External Affairs, while moving the motion, said that he wanted to make his speech at the end, and he also said that he would add a few new points as well. I wish he had referred to those new points at the beginning so that some of us who are able to participate would have been able to reply to the new points which he promised he was going to make.

The international situation is, by the very nature of things, continuously in a situation of fluid. But it is fortunate that Sardar Swaran Singh is firmly in the saddle as the Minister of External Affairs of our country for the last almost one decade. He is one of the few fortunate and able Ministers who has remained at his desk for nearly a decade; I suppose, next year, he will be celebrating completion of one decade as the same Minister at the same desk. We know his negotiating skill, his patience and his quiet and sustained diplomacy. Had I more time at my disposal, I would have been very happy to say a few words appreciating some of the good things that he and Government have done. But I hope he will not mind my referring to some of the other aspects by way of critical approach because I have limited time at my disposal; I hope he will not consider this criticism as out of proportion if, after having ap-

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

preciated his talents and some areas of his policy and work, I devote the rest of my speech for some of the critical aspects of the foreign policy of our country.

Let us take, first, our relations with the two Super powers, the USSR and the USA. We are very happy that the great Soviet leader, Mr. Brezhnev, visited our country last month and he had very intimate, informal and important discussions with our Government leaders on a wide variety of subjects. I wish the visit of Mr. Brezhnev were made a national event of significance rather than a political event with a lot of party political advantage projected into it. But, then, perhaps it was understandable, even if not pardonable, because after all the great visiting guest was also the Secretary-General of the Communist party of his country and, therefore, probably that kind of projection came. But let us not forget that we in this country and the Prime Minister herself made this point repeatedly clear while the visiting guest from Russia was present that we, in India, have a different system of political functioning and a different system of social behaviour. I will have no time to go into those details. I would suggest that it is good that we have had good relations with Soviet Russia and we are grateful for, though not adequate, the good timely help—I want to underline the word 'timely'—which the Soviet Union gave us in regard to food and other matters, also with regard to the Soviet assurance to us regarding newsprint of which we are finding acute shortage. But, Sir, I want to express a word of caution with regard to Mr. Brezhnev's visit, and that is, we must guard against the possible implications of the big brotherly behaviour of Mr. Brezhnev and the Soviet Union that we might have to face and suffer in this country. If Mr. Brezhnev's doctrine of limited sovereignty is going to be accepted by us, then I suggest and I want to ask the Minister to reply to this point, that that dangerous doctrine of limited sovereignty, our own self-respected and our own self-reliance will be drowned and I do not want that to happen. We are after all a free country, an independent republic, or democratic polity, and we go round saying all the time that we are a non-aligned country. Now, if we are

really a non-aligned country, then let us not do anything which might give an impression that willy-nilly, consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or by accident or by design, we are being tilted more and more towards the Soviet Union. Friendship towards the Soviet Union should not mean loss of friendship or little friendship or loss of warmth with other major powers and certainly with another super power, namely, the United States of America. Our friendship should not be based on mutually exclusive relationship, but it should be mutually inclusive, not mutually exclusive. I want to tell my friends of the Communist Party of India as also the Communists and fellow-travellers in the ruling Party that every time there was a question of need for good relationship with America, immediately they get up and say that America is an imperialist country. But they do not mind their own father country Russia having *detente* with America! So, Moscow can have a *detente* with Washington but New Delhi cannot. I cannot understand this logic. Therefore, I want to suggest one thing. Of course, we know one of the implications of Mr. Brezhnev's visit to India. He wanted to tell our Government, he wanted to tell our Prime Minister that although there is *detente* between Washington and Moscow, but Mr. Brezhnev and the Soviet Union do consider and attach a lot of importance to the Third World in general and to India in particular. That was one significance and he made it clear and that significance was brought out. I would suggest that we should not carry on that partnership with Russia in such a way that the Big Brother goes on behaving in such a way that we are drowned. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Member and the House to Rule 356 which says:

"The Speaker, after having called the attention of the House to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or in tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech."

So, repetition should not be there.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: आप क्या बात कर रहे हैं? हर कांग्रेस के मेम्बर ने रिपी-

टीशन किया है। यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों पर बहस हो रही है। इस में यह स्वामाविक है कि कुछ बातें दोहरायी जायें।

सभापति महोदय : अभी जो बोल रहे हैं उन में जो रिपीटीशन हो रहा है उस को तो एवायड करें।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यहां लिख हुए भाषण पढ़े गए, तब चेयर ने कोई आपत्ति नहीं की।

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR : Let me proceed. With all respect to you, Mr. Chairman, I was not repeating myself and if I seem to repeat somebody else's point, I am speaking almost at the end. What can I do? I am repeating with my own independent emphasis which is totally different.

Therefore, I would say that although we value the Russian leader's visit, let us not be enamoured of the Asian Collective Security idea which he tried to talk with us. Let us not forget that the Russians toyed with this idea in the Peace Conference in Moscow in October. Mr. Brezhnev himself talked about this idea of Asian Collective Security when we went to Kazhakastan in August this year and made this point there and he also expressed the same concept here and I am glad that our foreign Minister, our Prime Minister and the Government have not yet fallen into the trap. I do hope and urge, they will keep themselves alert on this point and not get drowned into this idea of Asian Collective Security at this stage.

Two more points and I have finished. I want to suggest that although the United States are painted as the arch villains, and rightly so to a large extent, because of the Nixon Administration—not because of the American people. But, then, the American people and the Nixon Administration have to be kept separate although we do not relish even a single policy step of the Nixon Administration, we do not want to give an impression that the Indian democracy and the Indian people are against the American people. We are in need of American friendship and Dr. Kissinger is coming next month and I hope the Minister will have fruitful talks with him so that the United States like USSR will also bale, India out of its present difficulties.

Two more points. About non-alignment, I want to tell the House that right from the beginning of the non-alignment Conference i.e. from the 1961 Belgrade Conference, and the on to the 1964 Cairo Conference, the 1970 Lusaka Conference and the 1973 Algiers Conference, in all these conferences, you will see that each time the implications of non-alignment have been changing. I want the Minister and the Government of India to be aware of these implications. I want the Government to have a new look at our non-alignment policy and behaviour so that an entirely new situation which has been created by which new realities and fresh implications have been evolved, are properly and continually explored and located by us. Sir, the tragedy with the Algiers Non-aligned Conference was this. It created so much acrimonious debate that ultimately it was not non-aligned conference, but it became a debate of Pro-Arab and Anti-Israel points and arguments that is not what is expected of a non-aligned conference. That is my point. I want non-aligned conference to be non-aligned. Non-alignment should be viewed in such a way that our constructive policy, our constructive approach, as an independence nation, remain firm.

And, lastly, Sir, I am glad that the Minister's attitude with regard to Bangla Desh is good. There is also a good relationship with Bangla Desh and Pakistan in terms of the POWs going back, but I request the Minister, let Government also take definite steps in regard to opening a dialogue with both Pakistan and China, we should do this on terms of equality and self-respect, not in terms of begging. We want dialogue but not at the expense of our national self-honour and self-respect.

With these words, I would say, I am grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for calling me to speak. And I hope the Minister of External Affairs, for whom I have great respect, has many good points to reply to. He has been going to many countries and by the next year, he may well have completed going round all countries of the world! Let us expect from him tomorrow a detailed statement which will give an impression that India is continually going in the direction of nonaligned, independent, self-respecting policies and programmes with a view to wanting to

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

have national self-reliance and self-honour asserted. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

श्री शंकर देव (बीदर) : सम्भाषित महोदय आज हम एशियन सेक्योरिटी की बात कर रहे हैं। उधर अफ्रीकन यूनिटी की बातें चल रही हैं और यूरोपियन यूनिटी तो फार्म हो ही चुकी है। तो अगर इन में डिफरेंसेज हुए तो मैं यह समझूंगा कि इतनी बड़ी बड़ी ताकतें एक तरफ होंगी और इन बड़ी बड़ी फोर्सेज का जब मुकाबिला होगा, जब जंग छिड़ेगी तो सारी दुनिया को अंगार लग जायगा। इस से तो अच्छा यह है कि हम अलग अलग नेशन रहे और कभी भी अगर आपस में झगड़ा हो गया तो अधिक से अधिक दो नेशन हीं खत्म होंगे। लेकिन यहां पर एशियन कलेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी एक तरफ हो और अफ्रीकन या यूरोपियन के साथ अगर मुकाबिला हो जाय तो सारी दुनिया हीं खत्म हो जायगी। इसलिए हम को निर्णय यह करना चाहिए कि एशियन कलेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी या अफ्रीकन कलेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी या यूरोपियन कलेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी इन की बेसिस पर न सोच कर के वर्ल्ड की सेक्योरिटी के ऊपर सोचना चाहिए। वर्ल्ड की सेक्योरिटी जब तक नहीं होगी तब तक शांति स्थापित नहीं हो सकती है। वर्ल्ड की सेक्योरिटी के अंदर ही यह चीज आ सकती है, मैं ऐसा समझता हूं।

दूसरी चीज मैं आप के सामने यह कहना चाहता हूं कि एशियन सेक्योरिटी की बात हम कर रहे हैं। पहले हमारे पास जो फोर्सेज होती थीं उन को हम मिलिटरी फोर्सिज कहते थे। उन का मतलब होता था दूसरों पर हमला कर के अपना विस्तार करना, अपने राज्य का एक्सपेंशन करना। फिर जब सभ्यता बढ़ी तो डिफेंस फोर्सिज कहने लगे, प्रतिरक्षा फोर्सिज यानी दूसरा अगर आक्रमण करे तो उस का हम मुकाबिला करेंगे। आज हम सेक्योरिटी की बातें सोच रहे हैं कि नहीं, अब वह लोग आक्रमण करेंगे तब हम लोग डिफेंस करेंगे, यह बात नहीं, बल्कि हम आत्म-रक्षा चाहते

हैं। लेकिन आत्म-रक्षा जो है, जिस को सेक्योरिटी बोलते हैं, इस के अंदर भी भय की बू है, वार की, युद्ध की बू है। इसलिए पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने जो कहा था हम को वही सोचना चाहिए कि कलेक्टिव को-एग्जिस्टेंस हो। कलेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी की बात भी नहीं, क्यों कि उस के अंदर भी भय है, आक्रमण का डर है, इसलिए हम को कलेक्टिव को-एग्जिस्टेंस सोचना चाहिए। और कलेक्टिव को-एग्जिस्टेंस ही नहीं, बल्कि इस से भी आगे बढ़ कर सोचना चाहिए क्योंकि को-एग्जिस्टेंस सिर्फ एग्जिस्टेंस है, उस के अंदर कोई ऐक्टिव चीज, कोई पाजिटिव चीज नहीं है। इसलिए कलेक्टिव कोआपरेशन के तहत जा कर के अंत में हमें कलेक्टिव फ्रेंडशिप के अंदर पहुंचना होगा जो पाजिटिव चीज रहेगी और उसी के अंदर शांति रहेगी, उसी के ऊपर पूरी चीज यह टिक सकती है। इसलिए मेरा यह कहना है, एक ही बात में कह देना चाहता हूं कि हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय को चाहिए कि जवाहर लाल नेहरू जिस के लिए पैदा हुए, जिस के लिए जीये और जिस के लिए मरे वह है पंचशील और उस पंचशील के प्रोपेगेशन के लिए तमाम एम्बेसीज को ऐक्टिव कर देना चाहिए या ऐसा कोई डायरेक्टोरेट बन सके तो बना कर हमें पंचशील का प्रोपेगेशन करना चाहिए।

27-28 साल पहले जो यू० एन० ओ का चार्टर बना था जब कि तमाम विश्व के राष्ट्र नाबालिग थे आज तो वह बालिग हो गए हैं, तो आज तो उस चार्टर के अंदर कुछ न कुछ रिफार्म लाना चाहिए। वन नेशन वन वोट यह क्या है? यह तो बहुत पुरानी बात हो गई, चाहे छोटे राष्ट्र हो, चाहे बड़े राष्ट्र हों, एक राष्ट्र के लिए एक वोट का सिस्टम यह कुछ ठीक नहीं लगता। सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल के अंदर कुछ न कुछ प्रिंसिपल होना चाहिए जिस के ऊपर वीटो पावर उन को देनी चाहिए। ये तमाम चीजें हैं जिन के रिफार्म के लिए विदेश मंत्रालय को ऐक्टिव होना चाहिए और ऐक्टिव हो कर के दुनिया के अंदर यह इन को मूब करना चाहिए

कि भारत विश्व-शांति के लिए ठहरा हुआ है और विश्व-शांति के लिए हर तरह की कोशिश करने के लिए तैयार है। हर देश के अन्दर हमारे प्रतिनिधि पंचशील का प्रौपेगण्डा करें। हम पं० नेहरू को याद करते हैं, उन का जन्म दिवस मनाते हैं, उन के प्रति सब से बड़ी श्रद्धांजली यही हो सकती है कि हम पंचशील का प्रौपेगण्डा करें, पंचशील के प्रौपेगण्डा के लिए हर एम्बेसेडर को चेतावनी दें, यू०एन०ओ० को विश्व-सरकार के रूप में परिवर्तन करने के लिए यू०एन० चार्टर के अन्दर रिफार्म लाने की कोशिश करें।

मैं समझता हूँ—इन सुझावों पर विदेश मंत्रालय विचार करेगा। भारत हमेशा आदर्शवादी राष्ट्र रहा है—इस लिये केवल एक राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा की बात न कह कर विश्व सुरक्षा

की बात कहें, क्योंकि हमारे ऋषि-मुनियों ने हमेशा “वन्दुधैव कुटुम्बकम्” की बात कही है।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I know that it is very late, and, perhaps, you have given me this time so that no other speaker may have a chance to speak tomorrow. With your permission, I shall continue my speech tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please start your speech at least.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard this debate with a great deal of interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will please continue tomorrow.

18.32 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December 21, 1973/Agrahayana 30, 1895 (Saka).*