

[Shri G. Viswanatham]

release immediately Mr. Viswanatham and the others and give an assurance that they will not unnecessarily impose section 144 Cr.P.C. which suppresses the democratic rights of the opposition.

13.33 hrs.

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS, 1973-74—
contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No. 28 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which 6 hours have been allotted. Members present in the House and desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions which they would like to move.

DEMAND No. 28—MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 68,57,77,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 1,50,00,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1974, in respect of 'Ministry of External Affairs'."

SHRI SAROJ MUKHERJEE (Katra): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose on behalf of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry. The Report submitted by the Ministry is full of a complacent attitude and it has in my opinion undermined the danger to our independent foreign policy from the United States imperialism. The year before last the prestige of India went up

when the freedom struggle was going on in Bangladesh. After certain vacillations and drift, the Government of India took the correct decision to fight out the Pakistani horses, though after lakhs of people were already butchered. After that the entire nation stood behind the Government, India's prestige went up and India was at the height of its glory. After that what happened? Every time we are surrendering to United States imperialism. Love-calls had been going out from our Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, were rejected by the rulers of the United States, which is a shame to us. It is their consistent policy to perpetuate tensions and conflicts in our sub-continent. We are over-looking that danger.

After the glorious war we did another good thing, namely, the conclusion of the Simla Agreement which started on a sound principle, the principle of bilateralism. At that time, barring certain reactionaries inside our country and outside in countries of the world like imperialists, all the progressive people of India and outside all over the world hailed that agreement. We said at that time that if the question of the prisoners of war was not solved, the Simla Agreement could not be implemented. A very illuminating article was published by the *Times of India* at that time on this point. There also the External Affairs Ministry vacillated and drifted for a long time and that enabled our enemies, the reactionaries inside India and outside in the world over, to have a campaign against India. The Pakistani rulers decided to send out a batch of women to campaign against India on this issue and a number of trade unions sent their representatives to the international forum. All this happened because of our policy of vacillation and drift in the matter. Only a few days ago a correct decision was taken to have simultaneous

*Moved with the recommendations of the President.

repatriation of Bengalis from Pakistan and Pakistani prisoners of war from India and Bangladesh, excluding 195 prisoners of war against whom the Bangladesh Government want to proceed on war crimes. We think this is a correct decision and if the Pakistan Government reject it, they will be exposed before the bar of international opinion, progressive opinion.

13.38 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This policy of vacillation and drift on the part of the External Affairs Ministry is still going on. In Asia, in Africa, in the Arab world our prestige has gone down during the period under review. In regard to Ceylon, Burma and Cambodia, good relations are yet to be established. A few days ago when our External Affairs Minister went to Burma, there was some talk regarding a peace zone in the Indian Ocean. In Cambodia our Government is not recognising or helping the union of the National Government of Cambodia led by Prince Sihanouk.

In regard to China we are taking the correct stand, though a very bold initiative could have been taken by our Government. We know that there will be no danger from socialist countries to India. Some parties from here and outside club together China and U.S.A. in the same bracket. From some imperialist countries India faces danger but not a single socialist country is dangerous for India's economy or development or its pursuance of an independent foreign policy. This we should remember. A socialist country will never harm our country if we pursue an independent progressive role in our foreign policy.

In the African countries too our prestige is going down. In Uganda and other places they put Indians as being synonymous with Indian exploiting businessmen. Our people love the African people. Exploitation

is really going on by some of our businessmen there.

In the Arab world also we are now isolated. During this period you have seen the Bengazi Resolution. They have taken a resolution for a campaign against India.

With regard to Sikkim, we have commitments regarding defence, external affairs and communications. We should not have sent our Army to defend the reactionary Chogyal Regime. We should have been with the people who are hankering for progressive reforms. We want that the British legacy of the status of an Indian protectorate in Sikkim should be ended. Sikkim should be made an independent, sovereign democratic nation and there should be cordial and brotherly relations with India. This should be done.

From all this one can say that the performance of the Indian Government or the External Affairs Ministry smacks of a tendency of expansionism. This should be stopped. This should be prevented as also vacillation in our dealing with other countries. Coupled with this there is the sale of arms to other countries. We do not want to sell arms to other countries. Arms are sold for what? To repress their own people as well as to fight with other countries. Some time ago Minister Shri V. C. Shukla admitted in Lok Sabha that we sell arms to certain countries and coupled with that there is the export of capital. With all this one can say that there is a tendency growing for expansionism. I will come to the question of the United State later on. Everybody knows the external policy of the country is the reflection of its internal economy, internal policy. Our economy is tied with the chariot wheel of America's crisis ridden economy. In our own report you have admitted—India believes that there need be no conflict of basic interests between her and the USA. What is the basic interest of an imperialist country? But India claims to be socialist and pro-

[Shri Saroj Mukherjee]

gressive and has got independent policy, and hence there should be conflict of basic interests with imperialist countries. Whereas in the case of the Soviet Union you have written India's co-operation and understanding with the Soviet Union will continue to be a basic feature of India's foreign policy. Understanding and co-operation with the Soviet Union—a Socialist country—is a basic feature of socialist policy but with the interests of American imperialism, there is no basic contradiction. It comes out of the statement in the report that you are with the imperialist interests and not with the socialist interests. We say your policy is playing between the two camps—the camp of imperialism and the camp of socialism. We are having trade, co-operation, treaty, etc. with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to bargain for more economic aid and more help from imperialists, preferably the United State of America. You know, what for? This is the bargaining power you have. From 1950 to 1973, a period of very good relations with the USA has been followed by a period of estranged relations. This is going on in a cyclic order, but the basic thing remains that you are attached to the United States, American interests, imperialist interests. This is a dangerous game—'Chanakya Nitti' and playing on the differences but you are vacillating and you are drifting and at the end you will be in a soup. The entire country will be under US domination if you go on like this. You are utilising the differences between the two camps; you are utilising the differences between the Soviet Union and China. All these things are good for temporary purposes. But in the long run, it will tell upon the economic health, the political development of our country. Therefore, you should end such a policy which bring economic ruination.

Two days ago, two top persons from America came here, Mr. Kenneth Rusk and Mr. Joseph Sisco—they are tour-

ing round this region. What did they say? Mr. Joseph Sisco said:

"U.S. would be concerned if any-one major power achieved dominance in the area. We would be concerned about any policy that would be a new threat to the integrity of Pakistan. The U.S. has a constructive role to play in that area. Actually, I do not think that any other major power could take our place there. This is a substantial U.S. position on the sub-continent."

With this purpose they have come here.

Our Foreign Minister, Mr. Swaran Singh, on 30th November, sent a love-call there. They dropped their anti-CIA campaign, as a result of which the U.S.A. also said that blocked aid to India would be released. They announced the release of the communication equipment which India had ordered from U.S.A. But after a few days, what happened? The news came that arms were being supplied to Pakistan.

Again, in the same report, our Foreign Minister said, "It will create difficulties to achieve peace in the sub-continent." It is true. But again, you are surrendering to U.S. imperialism. Our Finance Minister went there. What did he say? He said:

"Have-nots have been ignored. We deplore the attitude of affluent nations which produces highly unfavourable effect on developing economies, on the purchasing power of their resources, on the problem of external debt servicing, etc.

Therefore, we are heading towards economic dependence.

This is what the *Statesman* editorial says:

"There now remains the residual problem of what should be done with the Rs. 2400 crores of outstanding rupee liabilities on PL 480 account.... As Dr. B. R. Shenoy

points out, these funds do not represent real resources and any disbursements of rupees against these securities is purely inflationary. That is a foreign Government is empowered to create money and aggravate domestic inflation, albeit with the Indian Government's permission, is a fantastic anachronism that needs to be removed."

Coming to the economic situation, there has been the currency crisis in America. There has been a 10 per cent devaluation of dollar—it is the second in 14 months. We have seen the emergence of the European Economic Community with Britain entering it. Their economic power has been far more than that of U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and Japan. In respect of "Bloc of 9", its imports in 1971 amounted to 171 billion dollars, and its exports in 1971 amounted to 312 billion dollars. As against that, U.S.A., U.S.R.R. and Japan totalled 78 billion dollars in respect of imports, and in respect of exports also the same feature is revealed. The figures for 1972 will also be like this. Therefore, this currency crisis and economic crisis of U.S.A. is being put on the shoulders of India and the Indian Government is crying for a moratorium on wages, increase in productivity and linking it with wages. All the burden of the world capitalist crisis is being imposed on an Indian worker. This should be stopped.

We are getting milo mixed with datura, rotten milk powder and this economic fiasco. You are heading towards it. It must be ended. You have seen Ambassador Moynihan's statement. What did he say? The main problem is to increase volume of trade with India. That means they will inflict all their burden on India. The Statesman's editorial of the 16th April rightly said "Ambassador Moynihan's statement that any nation which enjoys a surplus in its trade with the U.S.A. must provide equal access to its markets for Ame-

rican products, is to be strongly resisted." They say, we want to increase the volume of trade. That is our problem. Indian and U.S. volume of trade should be increased. That means more burden on us. Therefore, from this economic field our foreign policy is being dictated. We demand that this should be ended.

Last of all, my point is this. If you want to pursue your progressive independent policy, you must immediately give recognition to Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea and recognise the Government of National Union of Cambodia. You must quit the Commonwealth. Now the situation is very favourable for us. There is a detente in Europe, there is detente between two hostile camps and the most outstanding victory of the people of the world is the victory of Vietnamese people. Americans have been forced to retreat. War has been ended but still South Vietnam is getting money—150 million dollars upto June 1973 to carry on their war in Vietnam. It is a victory for the people—on outstanding victory. We must liquidate our vacillation and carry forward with our independent, progressive Policy.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir: In spite of all that has been said by my friend opposite, I think we can look back to the year that we have left behind with a fair amount of satisfaction so far as our foreign policy is concerned. Not only there has been improvement in the field of foreign affairs and fruitful and decisive settlement of matters which are of interest to this country, but also our foreign policy has helped to a great measure in the achievement of the broader goal of creating a healthy and peaceful climate in this sub-continent. The foreign policy that, we have pursued so long has also been vindicated by the events which have followed the year 1971. .

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

Sir, it is not for the first time that our foreign policy has been criticised in this House as being vacillating, as was done by my friend who preceded me. During the life-time of late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and also afterwards criticism was levelled against our foreign policy—that it is a vacillating policy, that it has left us friendless and defenceless and often the foreign policies of other countries were eulogized. But, let us see the effect of the foreign policy of other nations. There was a time when Pakistan's foreign policy was openly acclaimed by my rightist friends. But what their policy has led them to? Not only has it led to the dismemberment of that country, but we have also seen that they have undergone a complete and in glorious defeat in our hands in the 14-days war.

What about America. The emphasis of American foreign policy so long was anti-communism and their self-imposed duty of containment of Communism in Asia. But, what we see of their policy today? They are not only embracing Mao but we see today also that they are following the foot-steps of the Communist regime, thus exhibiting a complete hypocrisy of the Policy.

About China, so much has been said by my friend opposite. They profess to be the greatest lovers of the under-dogs of the world and the bitterest enemies of the colonial powers. But what do we see today? China has not only embraced Kissinger, but in South-East Asia and Bangla Desh, unfortunately and tragically, it has sided with the oppressors and not with the oppressed. And, after the event of Bangla Desh and South-East Asia, for my Marxist friends to say that China being a Communist country will never do any harm to India is to live in a make-believe world.

Compared to all this, our policy of non-alignment has stood the test of time. Not only it has stood the test

of time but it has tremendously proved to be successful. No doubt there have been minor adjustments and readjustments here and there which I do not call vacillations because adjustments and readjustments are necessary on occasions, to meet the changing needs of internal, regional and international environments. But it must be said to the credit of our policy that the broad principles have prevailed with a remarkable clarity even till now.

Coming to the question of our policy in more concrete terms, there has been one very significant development in the international situation since we discussed the international situation on the last occasion in this House towards the end of last year. That is the signing of the Treaty on Vietnam. The Vietnam Treaty and the emergence of Bangla Desh have not only changed the geo-politic map of this sub-continent but it has also changed to a great extent the balance of power here. These facts must be taken into account and lessons must be learnt from the lessons of Vietnam. What are the lessons of Vietnam? The lessons of Vietnam are, in my opinion, the lessons of failure of the two great powers like the USA and China who have exhibited always a marked tendency to direct the political development of the smaller States. The French could not control Vietnam. However hard they tried, the mighty USA could not perpetuate a particular ruling elite there. The lessons of Vietnam have been that however small and poor a State may be, particularly, in Asia, in the ultimate analysis, it is the internal considerations and not external forces, that decide and determine the political character of a State. What is the strength of Vietnam, this under-developed nation, with its short-statured people. With that strength they could fight the American imperialism? The strength of Vietnam lies in the nationalism of its people, in the patriotism of its people and in their practical competence and valour exhibited by its people. Another lesson of the Vietnam war is

that massive external help from even a most powerful nation could not thwart the nationalistic appeal of a country, however small and however undeveloped it may be. These issues have been finally, fully and irrevocably settled and that external encouragement, whatever it may be, cannot subjugate the political aspirations of a State. We must learn lessons from it. On the basis of these backgrounds, we must improve our relations today in South-East Asia which I consider is the most important territory from our foreign affairs point of view. I do not consider even China or USA of that great importance as I consider our relations with the South-East Asia. After all, we should take note of the fact that after Vietnam there may be a reluctance on the new part of the USA to intervene in the South-East Asia in the same scale and magnitude with which they intervened in Vietnam. But if we think or if somebody thinks that their intervention in South-East Asia has come to a stop, we will be living in a utopian world. Only the form and characteristic of intervention of America in South-East Asia has changed and in fact, America is trying to make inroads even into our own country in a different context to-day. We must guard ourselves against this dangerous policy of USA.

One fortunate thing that has happened is that our image has grown in the eyes of the third world to-day after the 1971 victory. We must at the same time remember that we must act with great caution while dealing with the nations of the South-East Asia because the nations in South-East Asia to-day are in a great doldrums because of the self-contradictory and erratic policies pursued by China, the fast-sinking image and influence of the USA and the uncharted destiny of Japan and, let us admit it, to a certain extent the hesitation on their part to us because of our enormity in size. These facts must be taken into account and the primary task before our Ministry will be to create intra-regional relation-

ship in the South-East Asia in a more healthy basis so that an atmosphere of friendship and co-operation in this region may be created between our country and other countries.

14 hrs.

I hope our policy makers will remember that after the experience with USA, it is only those nations which are helpful and cooperative which will have an abiding influence in this region. The tendency towards expansionism or political dominance will have a disastrous effect. We must take note of this fact. China and USA are creating a war psychosis in this region. For this atmosphere creating a friendly atmosphere devoid of expansionism or any sort of dominance is not of course an easy task. Our Marxist friends made certain remarks to the effect that India was showing a tendency of expansionism. I can understand this because they are doing it deliberately in order to promote the interests of China and to create a bad image of our country in south-east Asia. In doing so they are doing the greatest disservice to this country. Any patriotic Indian wanting peace in this subcontinent should not make such allegations. We should go all out to foster cooperation in this region and to develop mutual friendly relations in this region. There should be a healthy rational aid policy in this region. This should be based on technical and personnel support. As the Prime Minister has rightly stated at the Asian Trade Union Seminar the opportunity for fruitful exchange of information among south-east Asian countries must be explored. We should help particularly the smaller and weaker nations. We should make an attempt to arrive at an agreement or convention to guarantee the sovereignty and independence and territorial integrity of nations of South-east Asia.

China and USA should be made to realise this that in spite of diver-

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami] ties among nations, on one thing all are united, namely, their revulsion to foreign dominance and interference. It is very heartening to note that our relations with S.E. Asia are becoming much better every day. We are having a very healthy relationship with Bangla Desh. The Indo Bangla Desh agreement, by delinking the humanitarian problems from other problems affords an opportunity for creation of a peaceful atmosphere in this region. I hail the agreement. The ball is now in the court of Mr. Bhutto, and he has to respond to it. In the past our experience with President Bhutto has been one of disappointment. Even to this agreement he has shown a dichard attitude when he says, because crimes were committed in Pakistan and the persons involved were citizens of Pakistan, so, the trial can be only in Pakistan and not in Bangla Desh. There cannot be a more absurd logic than this. It is the Bangla Desh people who suffered due to Pakistani crimes. Who else but they can go into these war crimes? History has precedents about these things. Czechoslovakia and Austria were at the time of the II World War, part of Germany, but the II World War Trial was held at Nurem-burg. Pakistani politicians have not been able to get rid of external influence from America and also their internal military regime, and, being influenced by these factors, have shown attitudes which are immature, insincere and unfortunately hypocritic. It is very heartening that the world opinion, including the opinion recently expressed here by a French intellectual have hailed this joint Indo-Bangla Desh declaration and on my part will keep my fingers across and hope for the best response from Pakistan.

The relationship with U.S.A. has been a matter of great disappointment. We wanted to have the best of relationship with America not, because this country cannot live and prosper without America's aid but the

basic philosophy of our country is to have friendly relationship with all countries. It is a matter of deep indignation for us today that America has helped Pakistan in the race of armaments. Only on my part I will say that America by their action is not only betraying the peace in this world; not only betraying people of Asia but they are betraying to a great extent their own people and their own youths.

It is a very healthy and happy sign that our relationship with Soviet Russia is growing everyday. But it appears it has unnerved the forces who are hostile to world peace and forces who are hostile to us. A cloud has been sought to be created on this relationship by some interested powers outside and some of their stooges here. Let us remind these people—people who are hostile to us—that Indo-Soviet relationship is built on such a strong edifice that nobody can move it an inch. Our treaty relationship with Soviet Union is bilateral and solely intended to preserve peace in this sub-continent by preventing foreign influence but it imposes no obligation on us to be sub-servant to the interests of the Soviet Union whether it be in Asia or elsewhere. As I have no time at my disposal, I shall now touch only some points. I feel if we want successfully implement and continue our foreign policy it is necessary to evolve immediate measures by which our economy can arrive at a stage of take-off. The second point which I want to touch is that the Foreign Ministry with the consultation of the Petroleum Ministry must evolve an oil policy because unless there be a progressive oil policy in this country the entire external relationship of this country may be in jeopardy.

Before I conclude I want to say a word about this Report. This Report seems to be written in a casual

manner. I will give three illustrations. If you look to the paragraph in South East Asia you will find that you have barely given a catalogue of visits and counter-visits. Then look to the most important sentence at page 10:

"India's consistent approach on relations with Pakistan, despite the outbreak of war in December, 1971 resulting from Pakistan's aggression, was that if Pakistan showed willingness to live in peace with India, India would respond in full measure to establish mutually beneficial and friendly relations."

This gives an impression that we are asking Pakistan to take the initiative and we are only to respond but the fact is otherwise. It is we who have taken the initiative.

I conclude by saying that we are passing through a critical time and we should not take anything for granted because the foreign policy of a country cannot be based on black and white of exclusive colours but should be sophisticated enough to take in a whole gamut of shades.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is a good job that this debate follows upon our joint declaration with Bangla Desh and a pledge that we have given that India and Bangla Desh will work together to establishment of durable peace in the sub-continent. Every valid consideration, politic as well as humanitarian was incorporated in our joint declaration. The repatriation of civilian internees who are Bangla Desh nationals in Pakistan, and Pakistan's nationals in Bangla Desh simultaneously with Pakistani prisoners of war, barring those wanted for trial in Bangla Desh as war criminals are required under the declaration to be freed. Not only Pakistan but also its friends in many countries including India have on purpose blacked out the fact that while

Pakistani prisoners of war have been kept under humane conditions and at very great cost to ourselves, following in every particular the Geneva Convention, Bangla Desh civilian internees have been made to suffer inhuman living conditions which have been vouched for by independent foreign observers. What the unpredictable President of Pakistan has really in mind remains, however, still to be found out, more accurately, it is what the people behind him, those by no means unknown backers of Pakistan want, whose intentions require to be found out.

Meanwhile, Mr. Bhutto has responded rather equivocally and with a certain amount of malevolence. To him, Bangla Desh as a sovereign State recognised today by more than a hundred other States is not a reality. His pledge which he has repeatedly given at Simla and elsewhere that he would recognise Bangla Desh remains unfulfilled. With arrogant gumption, the new Pakistan Constitution envisages Bangla Desh as a part of its territory and wishes away a glorious and successful liberation struggle which is a shining part of contemporary history.

Even so, the terms of the joint declaration are so reasonable and so fundamentally generous that Mr. Bhutto cannot reject it out of hand altogether and that is a good thing. He is asking, and it is a good thing in his case, for further discussion. For a serpentine and slippery operator of his type, it is something of a positive, if minimally positive response.

What we have to do, I submit is that making sure of Dacca's complete concurrence, we should take up the thread of talks for implementation of the Simla agreement. Bhutto with the crude variety of craft in which he is proficient goes on repeating that he wishes to observe the Simla agreement in letter and in spirit, and the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

joint declaration has now put him on his trial. India and Bangladesh together have taken a principled stand which no amount of motivated attack can tarnish in the eyes of honest people anywhere. It is good that, as my hon. friend Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami also has said, the conscience of Europe, in so far as it exists, has spoken through the voice of Monsieur Andre Malraux, and our foreign office should follow up the situation with the dignity and the determination not to be put off by the blackmailing manoeuvres of Mr. Bhutto and his patrons.

This country must also face up to the continuous and recently accentuated crisis created by the U.S. resumption of arms aid to Pakistan, accompanied as it has been, by Peking's policy of arms supply to the same country.

There are also such phenomena as the patent likelihood of further lethal assistance through the instrumentality of countries like Iran. There can be no manner of doubt that these goings-on are meant to bolster up the hawks in Pakistan who thrive themselves and please their masters by keeping up a warlike atmosphere in our sub-continent. Our one and only Field Marshal who in his Burra Saheb talk in Britain was utterly unbecoming of an Indian national, reminded me of a British general who is described as "invincible in defeat but insufferable invictory." At least, he is insufferable when he speaks in *mufti*. He has reminded us, at any rate, of the fact that Pakistan continues to be battle-ready as she always has been. It is a pity that this country still has to live with this menace planted by the British in 1971 as a time bomb intended against India, its rulers even today unreconciled to a peaceful sub-continental understanding. India's obligation, however, remains, the obligation for working for peace, concord and understanding, the obligation of building solidarity with Bangladesh as

well as with Pakistan, and also to promote, to the extent that we can, Pakistan's relations with Bangladesh on the basis of amity and understanding.

I find it very significant that both Bhutto and Nixon spoke on the same day, 15 March, about India emerging as a dominant power. This they did in an effort to provide an alibi for fresh supplies of US arms to Pakistan. Bhutto talked about India's pretensions to being a dominant power while Nixon spoke even more explicitly. I quote:

"After the war which broke Pakistan in half, India's superiority is so enormous that the possibility of Pakistan being a threat to India is absurd".

Variations of the same theme have come from the team of Rush and Sisco and all that tribe, and variations of the same theme have also been heard in vicious tones from China.

This simplistic and mischievous logic flies in the face of history and fact. It was Pakistan, not India, which in the last 25 years has repeatedly committed aggression on us. It says US imperialism, with its teeth broken and its prestige humbled in Vietnam, to keep up armed tension between our two countries so that we can fall a prey to its political and economic policies of domination.

In tune with Washington—for that is the irony of world history today—People's China talks of India's dominance over Bangladesh and Pakistan being menaced by India's strength. Happily, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and his Bangladesh which went on a general election lately have firmly repudiated this calumny, but the calumny goes on being repeated in the hope that mud, if thrown often enough, will stick to a certain extent.

All talk about India's superiority and new accretion to her strength, whoever makes it, should be viewed with the utmost misgiving. It may sound flattering to some people in India, and Big-Money press may gloat over it, but saner elements must regard such references not as a compliment but as part of a dangerous game to feed a complex in our neighbours that India has a so-called hegemonistic role.

Twentyfour years ago, in 1949, Jawaharlal Nehru had warned:

"Some people talk rather loosely, if I may say so, rather foolishly, of India becoming the leader of this or the leader of that or the leader of Asia. Now, I do not like that at all. It is a bad approach, this business of leadership".

At the same time, Jawaharlal Nehru added that India might be saddled with a certain responsibility which is special. I quote his words:

"India realises it and other countries realise it also. The responsibility is not necessarily for leadership but taking the initiative sometimes and helping others to co-operate".

These words have a profound validity today. This country is not to play the role of a big brother scaring away smaller brothers, but we are a big country on which some historic responsibilities and duties have devolved and, therefore, we have to take certain initiatives. For example, in regard to peace in Asia and peace in as much of the world as we can help to bring peace to India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have almost completed fifteen minutes. (Interruptions) You started at 2.04; now, it is 2.20.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: India should do nothing that lends itself to

the impression that we are throwing our weight about.

In this context, it is important that the Prime Minister is going to Ceylon. It is good that the Minister of External Affairs went to Burma and to the Gulf States and certain other countries.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am sorry; you have started at 2.09. It was my mistake.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: We must be ready even to bend a little backwards in relation to our neighbouring countries to ensure good will and friendliness.

In Sikkim, something has happened to which the country surely must give its attention. It is a difficult and delicate area where India has to be friends with the popular and democratic forces and, at the same time, beware of our enemies' intrigues. So far, the response of both the Chogyal and the people to the steps taken by Government is an adequate vindication of India's role and intentions. China, of course, has butted in with certain mischievous insinuations, and the Americans have been busy because fishing in troubled waters is an American speciality.

I find, for example, that the Political Officer in the United States Consulate General in Calcutta, Mr. Peter Burleigh, went to Gangtok on the 17th and 18th February. He also recently visited Assam and Orissa and Hazaribagh at strategic points of time perhaps with a certain very special intention. I find also that in the Calcutta Consulate-General of the United States, there is a Vice-Consul called Mr. Charles Coudert who is mentioned in a book by Dr. Julius Marter called *Who is in the CIA*, wherein a lot of particulars are given about this very unsavoury customer.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Jawaharlal Nehru had laid the foundations of that great and unique friendship with the Soviet Union which is at the basis of the Indo-Soviet treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation. This is a model on the basis of which we have to proceed further and we have already got a similar treaty with Bangladesh. We are trying to secure a peace zone in the Indian Ocean area, and in regard to the question of Asian peace, we ought to go ahead and take certain initiatives. We should go and in a friendly fashion remind Peking that China had in 1955 herself proposed a collective peace pact in Asia and the Pacific.

It may be too much to expect China to change her tone of hostility to the Soviet Union and to India at the present moment but an Asian and peace and security understanding necessarily requires the consent of China which has been emphasised by the Soviet Union, and China can be reminded of what she herself wanted in 1955. We can go ahead in order to really and truly secure a peace zone in the Indian ocean region and the whole continent of Asia.

Meanwhile, there is neither reason nor sense in the trepidation we seem to exhibit before the United States in particular and we say nothing, for example, about its continuing black-guardry in Indo-China where it is trying desperately to undo the results of the glorious victory of heroic Vietnam, where it is propping up reaction that is doomed in Cambodia and Laos where it is keeping its vile armament strength intact on sea and land in Southeast Asia. Not a word has been heard from India about the full implementation of the Vietnam peace agreement. Government shies away also from recognition which we demand of the provisional revolutionary government of South Vietnam already recognised by more than 30 countries; displaying a pusillanimity

in regard to this question, we only made a verbal protest to the United States when our embassy in Hanoi was damaged, but the United States Government made no response to it, as was stated in answer to a question in this House.

The Prime Minister makes a very good point against the United States' infamy in Vietnam at the One Asia conference held in Delhi. But sorrowfully in contrast with the conduct of the Swedish Prime Minister who got himself in trouble with the United States, she took back her words, and she told, of all people, the editor of the magazine called the Forbes Magazine, which is a special magazine of American big business, in its 4th March issue, that "there was no conflict of interest" between India and the United States.

Such gestures are coming with a peculiar frequency. I notice for example that after the assassination of American and Belgian diplomats in Khartoum by people obviously misguided but turned desperate by the cruel tragedy of the Palestinian problem, our Prime Minister expressed her shock to President Nixon but nothing as far as is known was conveyed to Belgium Government's sorrow even is so nicely selective.

Only the other day the Rush-Sisco team came here to meet not only their counterparts who are there in plenty in our South Block but also the Prime Minister whose doors are wide open for such gentry from a particular country.

It can only be fear of American reaction which stops us giving diplomatic recognition to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a country which is a shining exemplar of self-reliance and national self-respect. Countries like Mauritius and Malagasy recognise North Korea but somehow we hold our hand. Perhaps we are in fear for many reasons, among them

being the PL 480 fund accumulation—the total amount payable from us being Rs. 2468 crores. Something has got to be done about it. It is to be completely frozen or a moratorium should be put on it till India reaches a stage of stable growth and surplus budgets. Even Mr. L. K. Jha towards whom in a drunken moment Mr. Kissinger titled the other day in Washington had said that the most useful role for these PL 480 funds was to have no role at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your time is up.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I will need a few more minutes; otherwise there is no point in political parties taking part on the foreign affairs debate.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I wish the House were more realistic in allotting time.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I shall finish in two or three minutes; I shall finish as quickly as I can.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can take three more minutes.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Influences such as these make a shambles of our foreign economic policies. I am glad Mr. Goswami also referred to it. Mr. Moynihan, the American Ambassador made a speech in Bomoay before our business people which is a very bad pointer for the future of Indo-American trade. We find that unlike Chile which has taken over copper, we go slow, we hesitate to take over foreign oil interests. That is why we find open allegations in our Press that a Planning Commission Member formerly employed by the scandal-generating Bechtel firm has accomplices in high places to connive and put fertiliser operation largely in hands when we can take them over easily.

Foreign policy needs to be conducted with more courage and a sense of perspective, a feeling about the rapidly changing world and our role in it, that is to say, with a spirit and a certain ideological orientation so that the world knows our stand, that we are on the side of peace and socialism, so that the world does not doubt our bona fides.

This is not done because of a wooden administration. Our embassies are sad, often ineffective establishments. In London our High Commission is more a mausoleum than a live organisation. Information Officers are badly recruited and few find congenial conditions for effective work. Last year I was in Sofia. Our Ambassador with his vivid cultural and human interests made himself immensely respected. His poem on Dimitrov won the heart of the Bulgarian people. But for some reason which I cannot fathom I find him transferred to Guyana. I am not sure if we have Embassies which are adequate in countries specially important to us, like Chile or Tanzania, not to mention others nearer home.

Big money propaganda in Press, Parliament and outside goes on; the new orchestration is: love United States, love Pakistan, love China—all in the name of 'maturer relations', of objective analysis, and most laughably, in the name of compassion, of peace, of geo-political wisdom. So prepared publicity is given to all kinds of things like what I, have already referred to, Kissinger tilt towards L. K. Jha.

Let us remember that on the contrary if arms supplies make a decisive change in relation between countries the Pentagon would rule the world. But, to-day, the United States is driven to licking its Viet Nam wounds and manoeuvring in order to carry on in a different fashion. If Government, therefore, pursues radical policies at all, mobilises the enthusiasm of our

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

people as Government did at a point of time when the Seventh Fleet of the United States was prowling in Indian waters, when Government had given a new assurance to our people about a new texture of foreign policy as well as the economic organisation, we can bring together our people in a position of strength which alone would lend our foreign policy a character and the potentiality which it deserves.

With these words, I would point out that there are many lacunae, many weaknesses and many deficiencies still in our foreign policy and pusillanimity in the face of the U.S. imperialists which stand as a disgrace which, another we shake the better it will be for our country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I wish the House had allotted a more realistic amount of time so that this tussle between the Chair and the speakers can be avoided to a great extent.

Now, I have some bad news for the speakers from the Congress benches. There is a request from the Whip that they should confine themselves to ten minutes.

Dr. Austin.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the recent international developments have, in a way, given rise to the hopes of men of goodwill, the world over, that a new period of relaxation in the international field is emerging. No country would be more happy in this new turn of developments in the international fields than India, committed as it has been to the pursuit of peace, amity and concord among nations. Various bilateral understandings amongst even hitherto warring powers and their political leaders are proofs to the fact that they have taken a more flexible attitudes in their international relations. They seem prepared to react

with flexible responses. The affairs of the nations show a tendency to be guided keeping in view the best interests of humanity as a whole.

The recent Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation has been a model in this line. The understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States as a result of summit talks and with U.S. and China with China and Japan and the Berlin Agreements and the understanding between Moscow and the Federal Republic of Germany have all contributed to relaxation of tensions and comparative normalisation of relations. So, an approach to the problems of world issues in a spirit of tolerance and understanding are clearly discernible. I preface my observations touching on these healthy trends one sees in the international field because observers of the international scene feel that countries tend to stress bilateral relations de-emphasising power bloc considerations. In place of bi-polarised world they see the emergence of a multi-polarised world.

Immediately after independence India's foreign policy leaders visualised such developments. India did not believe in power-blocs. It advocated principles of peaceful co-existence. Later, these cardinal principles of India's foreign policy had been formalised in the fine principles of co-existence, commonly known as "Panch Sheel". At that time - big powers' minds were obsessed with power-bloc objectives global hegemonic outlooks - and so these ideas were rejected as irrelevant and naive. Even against this background we pursued an independent foreign policy, meeting every issue on merits no matter what the approach of this country or that country was to any particular issue.

Since the Chair has given me a warning, I do not want to go into the details of the problem. Shall we come to more concrete aspects of our foreign policy? In our quest to build durable

peace in our sub-continent, one sees an abiding concern and commitment to the concept of peace as a whole. Although Pakistan had repeatedly attacked us, we exercised great restraint in our dealings with Pakistan, extending always the hand of friendship. In the same way, in our relations with our neighbouring countries, although we had reason to be antagonistic or develop a hostile policy, never once we considered a Government or a country as our enemy. This attitude has been based on one of the outstanding principles of our foreign policy. It is no fault of ours that we are a big country. The concept of the colossus of the south perhaps obsessed the people of Nepal, in spite of the historic and various other bonds which bind both Nepal and India. In spite of the fact that Nepal had tried to balance between China and India and tried to build up some relations with China, India has been consistently following the policy of cultivating Nepal. Today after the recent visit of our Prime Minister, the bonds of friendship between these two countries have become all the more strengthened. In the same way, later this month our Prime Minister proposes to visit Sri Lanka, which again has gone to China fearing the colossus of the north. We are trying to allay the fears and create an impression that as far as India's pursuit of foreign policy is concerned, we are not dominated by geo-political considerations or considerations of hegemony. I am sure the ensuing visit of our Prime Minister will pave the way for better understanding between Sri Lanka and our country.

The situation in regard to Bangladesh has been referred to by many friends who have spoken before me. I do not want to go into details of that issue. We have passed through difficult times and we have supported the cause of that country at grave risk. At a time when India was trying hard to create an infrastructure for economic self-reliance, forgetting

our domestic commitments, we had gone in a big way, which no other country in the world has so far done, to help liberate the people of Bangladesh for Pakistani military despotism. We know the political implications of our commitment. With a hostile China and a hostile America, we went to help them, because the history of India and of the Indian National Congress, which fought for the freedom of our country, has always been to go to the rescue of the people in distress, the people in agony whose liberty is trampled upon.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra):
Why don't you go to Tibet?

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: I will come to that a little later.

I prefaced my observations with reference to this general relaxation of tension in the international field. But I do not think the developments taking place beyond the western borders of India and in western Asia are in tune with the general tenor of relaxation and detente. In today's *Times of India* there is a reproduction of an interview which the *New York Times* correspondent, Mr Sulzberger had with the Shah of Iran. It says that the Shah of Iran is unduly concerned over the prospect of the dismemberment of Pakistan and he takes unto himself the duty of preserving

Pakistan. Then he goes beyond this and says that he will have to enter into the field if such things take place. This observation of the Shah of Iran has to be related to the supply by the U.S.A. of over two billion dollars worth of military hardware to that country. As everyone knows, Iran has no enemies around except a little bit of conflict that had arisen between Iran and Iraq recently, which was patched up. The resumption of military aid to Pakistan by the U.S.A. is again a pointer which makes one think

[Dr. Henry Austin]

whether these steps are in tune with the detente in the international scene. So, we have got to be a little alert. Our foreign policy has got to be articulate, taking into account these developments, because these developments do not augur well for the security of this country.

Coming to the Simla Agreement, everyone hoped that the President of Pakistan would come forward in a big way towards implementing the Simla Agreement. Then again the reluctance of Pakistan to accept the peace offer,—the joint declaration of India and Bangladesh expressing their readiness to solve the humanitarian problems concerning the Prisoners of War Issue has also to be related to the emerging situation. But I may say that our foreign policy seems pretty conscious of these developments in Western Asia and Pakistan. The recent visit of our Foreign Minister to the Gulf countries and the increasing effort made to cultivate the countries of Western Asia will have a healthy impact in evolving a correct policy in that region.

The meeting of the Military leaders of the Arab countries now being held in Cairo has got to be watched in the context of the continued provocation created in a big way by Israel. A new situation has emerged in West Asia because of the Israeli planes attack on Lebanon killing several persons. This has alerted Arab Countries and today military leaders of about 18 Arab countries are meeting in Cairo. The Arab world will not remain a silent spectator when continuous provocations take place at the instance of certain imperial powers. There again we have got to watch the situation carefully.

In an examination of our foreign policy we find that its pursuit has been based on certain limited objectives

as well as long-range considerations. The limited objective is to ensure durable peace in South Asia. Towards that end we are cultivating friendship with Nepal, Ceylon and Bangladesh. Our approach to the remaining country in the region namely, Pakistan would have been also more fruitful if that country succeeded in extricating itself from international conspiracies of imperial powers.

In pursuit of our long-range objectives, we consistently stand in the vanguard for peace and friendship among nations. Another point at issue is our relationship with China. My hon. friend, Shri Piloo Mody, referred to the situation in Tibet. In spite of provocations, our policy has been to have a re-approachment with China on terms beneficial to both countries. We are not going to be involved in any conspiracy. We do not want India and China to remain hostile countries. There again we have expressed our willingness to be friendly with China and I am sure China will also see its way to build up healthy relations with us.

To be brief, the pursuit of our foreign policy has been on right lines. It is sufficiently flexible and responsive to specific situations and, at the same time, consistently steadfast to the basic postulates of our foreign policy, laid down by the architect of our foreign policy, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I am sure that if we continuously pursue this foreign policy, it will create conditions where, just as we have entered into a treaty of peace and friendship with the Soviet Union, extending the area of peace, we will be able to enter into similar arrangements with other countries as well, thereby contributing to further strengthening and consolidating peace, co-operation and friendship among nations, and thus ensuring a secure, just and affluent world.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, before going into the details of our foreign policy, let me quote two or three sentences from the Report of the External Affairs Ministry:

"The year under review witnessed a wider acceptance of the principle of non-alignment as endorsed at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-aligned countries held at Guyana. . . . It was gratifying to note that in the communiques issued following President Nixon's visit to China as well as his visit to the Soviet Union, the five principles of Panch Sheel found reference in one form or another."

Again it says:

"India's own contribution towards peace has been widely welcomed and acknowledged."

If you are going to believe this statement, you should come to the irresistible conclusion that India's diplomacy is successful and it is the best in the whole world. But what is the reality? What is our influence and our status in international affairs?

It was Shri Nehru who was said to be the architect of our foreign policy. He said, "We may have acted well or badly on the international stage, but, we are not frankly speaking influential enough to affect international President Nixon's visit to China as events very much". That was said by Shri Nehru in 1948.

The position remains almost the same. Now recent Report from the United Nations says: "India is finding it difficult to make her presence felt in the U.N. Lobbies". This is our foreign policy. This foreign policy in all these years has been bankrupt, sterile and static. Our foreign policy

lacks dynamism and imagination and our foreign policy makers suffer from inertia. They do no act. They only react.

We assure the world that we are really non-aligned even after the Indo-Soviet Treaty. We forget the changing world. When the United States bombers are dropping tonnes of bombs on Hanoi and other cities President Nixon is given a warm welcome in Kremlin; China is calling President Nixon an imperialist and he is given a warm welcome in Peking; the two Germanys are coming together and the two Koreas are coming closer. I want to ask the Government what is the relevance of non-alignment no-a-days? I would like to quote one of the authorities on non-alignment. Shri K. P. S. Menon said, "Non-alignment as an emollient of the cold war ceased to have any relevance because one did not know with whom to non-align oneself." In this context it would be better to the warning given by the ex-Foreign Minister Shri Chagla. He said, "it is always a mistake for a country to put all its eggs in one basket. We ought to survey the situation and see where our interests lie, where our friendship should be, not permanently but for the time being."

We talk of Panch Sheel day in and day out and try to discover this Panch Sheel in Nixon's communique. This is what the originator of the Panch Sheel said about it.

"Where is Panch Sheel? It cannot be worked in the present international situation. It has become merely a slogan."

This is what Pandit Nehru said once when he was in Nepal. We are harping on this old slogan. Now-a-days our policy should be realistic, flexible and up-to-date. Leave this old slogan.

[Shri G. Viswanathan]

What is our policy in Asia? Our diplomacy has been a failure and it is the most ineffective as far as Asia is concerned. There are many reasons, may be the main reason is our hostility with our neighbours. China and Pakistan. Another reason is that our policy towards South East Asian countries has not paid good dividends. Another important point which I would like to express is about the wrong posting of diplomats particularly in South East Asia. One of our senior journalists has written.

"Indian diplomats posted in Asian countries and in particular in South East Asia are not always men of calibre. The best ones seek and get European postings. While European and American capitals are rated "A" Asian capitals are considered C & D."

This is what Mr. Kuldip Nayar has written.

As far as our nearest neighbours like Nepal and Sri Lanka are concerned, we wish our friendship should be strengthened. I understand that our Prime Minister is going to visit Sri Lanka in a day or two. I hope the main issue will be the implementation of the Shastri-Sirmao Pact of 1964. I would like to bring to the notice of the Government that fears have been expressed by the so-called Stateless persons in Sri Lanka that their future may be bargained away or jettisoned by the Indian Prime Minister in a fit of generosity towards a small neighbour country.

Again, we have been demanding that in countries like Sri Lanka, Malaysia and Singapore, to understand and appreciate the problems of the people of Indian origin, Tamil-knowing diplomats should be posted. The Government should consider it.

Coming to Pakistan, after a long time, after many years, democracy has returned to that country and we wish

them well. The recent gesture or the offer by India and Bangladesh on repatriation should be considered a very fair offer. I think Pakistan should be wise enough to accept this offer. This is a package deal. Once Mr. Bhutto was quoted as saying:

"The prisoners of war issue is the main hurdle and Kashmir is the hurdle of all hurdles."

If he is going to accept this offer, at least the main hurdle will be solved and removed. As far as Kashmir is concerned, we have shown the world that bilaterally this problem can be solved. The delineation of the line of control has proved that problems can be solved between Pakistan and India bilaterally. As a preliminary step, I think both the countries should resume over-flights and also other channels of communication.

Again, I would like to point out that diplomatic relationship should be immediately re-established.

On the Kashmir issue which is supposed to be the hurdle of all hurdles. I want both the countries to take realities into consideration and find a lasting solution. Otherwise, there will be no real solution to the Indo-Pak issue.

Now, let me come to our relationship with China and the Soviet Union. The ideological quarrels between the two leading countries of the socialist camp are going on in the international arena. So long as China and Russia are hostile towards each other, our relationship with one will automatically have repercussions on the other. The Soviet Union has given its fullest support to us when we were in trouble. It is our good friend. But China is perturbed at the implementation of the Indo-Soviet Treaty and, particularly, they smell a rat in clause 9 of the Indo-Soviet Treaty. They fear that the Soviet Union may attack China

from the west and ask India which is a partner in the Treaty to attack the same country from another side on some pretext or other. There is no harm in taking an initiative to disabuse these unfounded fears to the extent possible. Since there is a change in China's attitude which I find from the Report is now for the better, we should go in to seek normalisation of our relations with China.

I think, Mr. Chagla is correct when he says:

"It is a mistake to rely on friendship with one power. Russia has stood by us and we are grateful to Russia for that. But there is no permanent friendship in international affairs. This friendship may last so long as there is confrontation between Russia and China. The confrontation can easily change into ping pong matches and handshakes."

Sir, war is over in Vietnam. The United States has drained about rupees 81 thousand crores. And, finally, after burning its fingers, it has now left Vietnam.

The country which has lost its image badly in Indo-China is not South Vietnam, nor even the United States. But it is India. We have suffered irreparable damage for our omission and commissions because of the Government of India's policies. India had been playing a major role in Indo-China from 1954. India also acted as the Chairman of the International Control Commission. But, what is the position now?

After the Paris Conference India has not been included even as a Member of the International Supervisory Committee because of the policy of the Government of India. While India raised its relations with North Vietnam at Embassy level—which we welcome—, it completely ignored South

Vietnam. As a consequence we had to shift our headquarters from Saigon. Whereas, the other two countries—Poland and Canada—were allowed to function from Saigon. India has given room for a charge of partiality between two Vietnams and that is one of the major reasons why India has been excluded from the new Supervisory Committee.

Sir, let me now come to the question of West Asia. The situation of No War and No Peace continues there. The super powers have not helped to find a solution in that area. Attacks and terrorism are continuing irrespective of the fact whether it is by Arab Guerillas or Israeli Commandos or whether the scene of activity is Munich, Lod Airport, Khartoum or Beirut. Killings are going on, which is not going to solve the fundamental problem. What is our contribution to this immediate problem? We have been repeating that the cause of Arabs is just and that Israel is the aggressor. But, we have not so far taken any concrete steps to break the stalemate. There is a change now in the Israeli attitude. We found recently evidence in the newspapers. Even though Israel is armed to the teeth, it knows its limitations. With all the preparations of war the Arabs are aware of their weaknesses. India should play a constructive major role in bringing these parties to the table. We alone cannot do it. We also should persuade super powers to help us in this. This necessarily means that we must have our diplomatic relations with Arabs as well as the Israelis. At present we do not have diplomatic relations with Israel. We should have diplomatic relations at least at the level of Consul-General at Tel Aviv or Jerusalem so that we can understand the other point also.

Sir, here I would like to say that in spite of all our unstinted support to the Arabs, none of them came to our help when we needed it. It is

[Shri G. Viswanathan]

unfortunate that of the 96 countries that recognised Bangla Desh, only four are from this region. I think Government of India should not allow India to be taken for granted.

Now, I would like to say something in regard to our policy regarding diplomatic relations—which seems to be a policy of untouchability. Whether it is Israel or North Korea, we practice this apartheid policy. I want the Government to take a comprehensive view of this policy.

Sir, the United States must note that all of us in this country and in this House have unanimously condemned its rearming Pakistan. Now, there seems to be a change for the better. Even though White House has damaged friendly relations, the public opinion and the opinion of Parliament in the U.S. are in favour of good relations with our country. United States should desist from rearming Pakistan and we should get an assurance from the United States Government that their arms given to Iran will not be passed on to Pakistan.

We should go in for a pragmatic relationship as far as the USA is concerned.

15 hrs.

Bangla Desh has been blocked from entering into the United Nations by the Chinese veto. It is unfortunate that China which was itself kept out of the United Nations by the American veto should itself use veto against Bangla Desh. Now the time has come for all countries to think of a thorough change in the structure and working of the Security Council of the United Nations because the system of veto where one country can hold the entire world to ransom is creating havoc and I think it should be removed.

Now, as the last point, I would like to mention that the third world countries must come together and we should take the initiative in this. The

Guatemala session of the Latin American Parliament has passed a unanimous resolution asking for a preparatory committee to make a study of the problem of Africa, Asia and Latin America. This is a great initiative and we should take the offer which is given by the South American countries and India should be one of the countries foremost to formulate policies so that all the third world countries can come together and solve the international problems.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur): What strikes me as amazing in these annual debates on External Affairs is that while the world is changing very fast, the approach and the analysis of the Opposition still recedes to 1948. They are still debating non-alignment and all the rest of it. The speeches are full of adjectives and there is hardly any analysis of the events. I would like to put some facts before the House to see what the world is like.

On the 10th of April, President Nixon in a message to the Congress on trade asked for the most favoured nation's treatment to be extended to the Soviet Union. At the same time, he asked for trade barriers being raised against Japan. Japan is to invest huge amounts of money on Siberian oil. China does not want American absence from South East Asia. The United States is going to invest 3.5 billion dollars on Russian gas and the Soviet Union is selling Uranium fuel to West Germany.

This is the world that we find today in the face of which the old concepts, the old ideological considerations and the old approaches are completely meaningless.

I must congratulate the Government for the flexibility it has shown in its approach to the world problems and the boldness and the decisiveness that has marked our actions. We have shown to the world that decisions

concerning the interests of the country will be taken by us in terms of our national interests. Neither the Seventh Fleet nor dollars nor food-aid is going to stand in our way at all.

15.02 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

The initiative taken in Simla by us and the recent proposals to Pakistan have been welcomed the world over. No third power was responsible for this and it is this boldness of approach it is this positiveness and it is this pragmatism that has been marking the policy of my Government.

There is talk about Pakistan. But we should remember that Pakistan to-day is not the Pakistan as we knew it over the years and the greatest disservice that we would be doing to our country and to Pakistan is to keep on equating Pakistan with India. The sooner we disabuse our minds of this, the sooner we make it clear to our people that Pakistan to-day is not going to be equated with India no matter how hard the USA tries the better it will be. One result of this fanciful approach was that Pakistan collapsed and it is not the same Pakistan as it was earlier. When Pakistan becomes a pawn in the hands of the super powers or when Pakistan is playing the game of the United States or the Chinese, certainly, it is a matter of concern for us and it is here that we have to look at the two billion dollar arms sale to Iran. The interest that the United States is taking in the Persian Gulf is going to affect this country far more than the interest that it took in the Indo Chinese war. There is an energy crisis and every kind of diplomacy is going to be employed in the West Asian countries, in order to corner oil resources, and millions and millions of dollars will flow into the hands of autocrats and unstable rulers. What we are going to witness is not something which is very easy to foresee. It is going to be very difficult; there is going to be great

pressure by the United States, by the huge cartels and monopolists. Today the idea of the United States seems to be to use Pakistan as a flank of its own West Asia policy. This will be disastrous to Pakistan. We hope that it will learn from past experience and not allow itself to be treated in this fashion.

Some of our friends here talked about equi-distant. But they seem to forget one thing. We cannot be equi-distance with powers which act adversely to us and powers which act friendly to us. People gave us lectures about non-alignment having been lost because of the Indo-Soviet treaty. Wherefrom has this criticism come? It comes from those people who criticise our country, who criticise my party and this Government for not joining with the United States of America. India has decided to exercise its sovereignty and it has decided to seek a peace which would be in its national interest. There was no uproar when between 1962 and 1965 we received 82 million dollars worth of arms from the U.S. and Americans supervised the deployment. In the late fifties we signed an agreement for 16 million tonnes of food grains from the USA. No voice was raised then of India becoming over-dependant upon the USA.

Historically we have seen this. Whether it is a question of Kashmir, whether it is a question of Goa or Bangladesh, the Soviet Union has consistently stood with us. No tangible reason has been given by these people why we should not be on the friendliest of terms with a country which has consistently stood by us and stood with us; facts prove this. We have received millions of dollars worth of arms from the Soviet Union not to mention all the other help which we have got in the matter of manufacture of heavy electricals and many other industries like steel and basic industries which are very vital for our country. With reference to our naval dockyard, with reference to our heavy

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

industries and also steel, heavy electricals and machine tools, the Soviet Union has helped us tremendously. We seek the friendship of Soviet Union not because it adjoins us, not because our ideologies are common, but because there is a certain mutuality of interest. It is not in the interest of the Soviet Union to make a satellite of India. That would serve no purpose. Soviet Union wants India as much as we want the Soviet Union today. On this mutuality of interest we should come closer and closer with the Soviet Union not only in terms of our foreign policy but I would be bold to say even on economic matters. Those people who criticise us for getting closer to the Soviet Union do so because they do not have the facts clear, because they have been brought up on western books written by western intellectuals and western newspapers. Consequently, those people do not think of national interests, but think in terms of their prejudices. There is yet another set of people who quite often come between the great friendship of the Indian people and the Soviet people. These are the people who forget that it is national interest that joins India and Soviet Union. People who make it party group or coterie interest are not being national and there must be many in the Soviet Union who would be saying: "God save us from such of our friends in India."

Sir, we should not debate these points any longer. In West Asia, South East Asia and at several other places our interests will be found to be common with those of the Soviet Union. The havoc that is going to be played in the Indian ocean is yet another thing because of which we will further need to ally with the progressive and socialist forces in the world. We must ever be keen on our relationship with our neighbours. We must ever be vigilant about people who want to disrupt the economy and we must see to it that we produce a policy which is consistent with the aims of the people of this country;

that is, we march towards the path of socialism and not towards the path of reaction and monopoly.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर):
सभापति जी, गतवर्ष के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय घटना-चक्र और उसके सम्बन्ध में भारत की नीति पर जब हम विचार करते हैं तो हमारे हृदय में संतोष और खेद की मिली जुनी भावनाएं उठती हैं। संतोष इसलिए कि हमने बंगलादेश की मुक्ति के महासंग्राम में अपना योगदान देकर भारत की प्रतिष्ठा को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में ऊंचा उठाया। खेद इसलिए उत्पन्न होता है कि हम उम प्रतिष्ठा को कायम नहीं रख पा रहे हैं।

विदेश मंत्रालय की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है, मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ :

"भारत यह अनुभव करता है कि अगर भारतीय उपमहाद्वीप में स्थाई शांति लानी है तो पाकिस्तान को नयी स्थिति की यथार्थता को स्वीकार करके स्वतन्त्र और प्रभुसत्ता सम्पन्न बंगलादेश को मान्यता प्रदान करनी चाहिए। ऐसा करने से उन युद्धबंदियों की वापसी के प्रश्न को हल करने में सहायता मिलेगी जिन्होंने भारत और बंगलादेश की संयुक्त कमान के समक्ष समर्पण किया था।"

स्पष्ट है कि जब यह रिपोर्ट लिखी गई तो भारत सरकार यह चाहती थी कि पहले पाकिस्तान बंगला देश को मान्यता दे और फिर युद्धबंदियों की रिहाई के बारे में चर्चा हो। लेकिन हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने एक न्यू इनीशिएटिव लिया है,—वह मुझे क्षमा करेंगे यह न्यू इनीशिएटिव नहीं है—यह न्यू इन्टेन्डर है, यह नया समर्पण है। आज पेंकेज डील की बात कही जा रही है। भारत और पाकिस्तान के युद्ध के दिनों में श्री पेंकेज डील की बात कही गई थी। शिमला के शिखर सम्मेलन के पूर्व

इस बात पर बल दिया गया था कि सारे प्रश्न एकमुश्त हल होंगे और टुकड़ों में सबालों को हल करने की पाकिस्तान की चाल में भारत नहीं फंसेगा। लेकिन शिखर पर बैठकर हमने ऐसा समझौता किया, जिसे पैकेज डील नहीं कहा जा सकता, जो पीसमील समझौता था, हमने अनेक सबालों को अनिर्णीत छोड़ दिया और आज युद्धबंदियों के सबाल पर पैकेज डील की बात कही जा रही है।

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि बंगलादेश की मान्यता का क्या होगा? यह ठीक है कि प्रश्न मानवीय है लेकिन प्रश्न क्या केवल हमारे लिए मानवीय है, पाकिस्तान के लिए मानवीय नहीं है? शिमला में पाकिस्तान अपनी भूमि ले गया, हम पाकिस्तान से कश्मीर की भूमि वापिस नहीं ले सके। यहां तक कि हमने छम्ब के क्षेत्र को भी मुक्त करने की मांग नहीं रखी। हम चाहते तो कह सकते थे कि छम्ब का क्षेत्र हम तब खाली करेंगे, छम्ब का क्षेत्र हम तब आपके पास रहने देंगे जब आप भारत के पास चिकेननेक का एरिया छोड़ने के लिए तैयार हो जाएं। लेकिन शांति की मृगमरीचिका में फंसकर हमने पाकिस्तान के पक्ष का समझौता कर लिया। और अब पाकिस्तान युद्धबंदियों को लेने जा रहा है। मुझे डर है कि पाकिस्तान यह भी पैकेज डील नहीं मानेगा। वह स्पष्टीकरण मांग रहा है, भुट्टो साहब का भाषण सन्देह पैदा करने वाला है। हमें इस सबाल पर पाकिस्तान से द्विपक्षीय बार्ता करने से इन्कार कर देना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान की चाल है कि बंगलादेश को अलग रखकर हमसे बात करे। यह हमारे और बंगलादेश की मित्रता के सम्बन्धों को मजबूत करने में सहायक नहीं होगा। जो भी स्पष्टीकरण मांगने है वह पत्र-व्यवहार द्वारा मांगे जा सकते हैं लेकिन नये पैकेज डील पर कोई चर्चा नहीं होनी चाहिए। और अगर पाकिस्तान चर्चा करना चाहता है तो बंगलादेश को मान्यता देकर बंगलादेश

के प्रतिनिधि के साथ भी चर्चा करने के लिए तैयार हो।

स्थायी शांति की कामना से हमने शिमला समझौता किया था, अब सरकारी प्रवक्ता चेतावनी दे रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान से खतरा टला नहीं है, पाकिस्तान शस्त्र संग्रह कर रहा है, सुरक्षा पर अपना व्यय बढ़ा रहा है, पाकिस्तान के इरादे अच्छे नहीं हैं। भुट्टो साहब का मूल्यांकन हमारे मित्र श्री मोदी क्या करते हैं, उसके आधार पर नहीं होना चाहिए, भुट्टो साहब मोदी साहब के मित्र हो सकते हैं लेकिन भुट्टो साहब पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति भी हैं। व्यक्तिगत मित्रता और राष्ट्रीय हित, इन दोनों को हमें मिलाने की भूल नहीं करनी चाहिए। जबतक भुट्टो साहब चीन और अमरीका के चुंगल से पाकिस्तान को निकालने का निश्चय नहीं करते और इस भूखण्ड में विश्व की शक्तियों के हस्तक्षेप को रोकने के लिए कटिबद्ध नहीं होते तबतक स्थायी शांति की हमारी कामना कभी पूर्ण नहीं होगी इसके लिए पाकिस्तान के दृष्टिकोण में बुनियादी परिवर्तन आवश्यक है। उस बुनियादी परिवर्तन के कोई संकेत नहीं मिल रहे हैं। दूसरी ओर संकेत ऐसे मिल रहे हैं कि अब ईरान को इस भूखण्ड में एक सामरिक शक्ति के रूप में खड़ा किया जा रहा है जिससे वह इन देशों से सम्बन्धित समुद्र पर अपना प्रभाव जमा सके और वह अमरीका का खेल इस क्षेत्र में खेल सके। अमरीका से जो यह आश्वासन मांगा जा रहा है कि तुम्हारे हथियार ईरान के रास्ते पाकिस्तान नहीं जायेंगे कोई अर्थ नहीं रहेगा, अमरीका ने हमें आश्वासन दिया था कि उसके शस्त्र हमारे विरुद्ध प्रयुक्त नहीं होंगे उस आश्वासन का कोई मूल्य नहीं रहा। ईरान क्या करेगा उसके बारे में अमरीका के आश्वासन की कोई कीमत नहीं है। हथियार जो देता है उसकी मंशा क्या है उसका इतना महत्व नहीं है, जो हथियार लेता है उसकी नीयत क्या है इसका हमें ध्यान

[श्री प्रटल बिहारी बाजपेयी]

रखना होगा। मुझे भय है पाकिस्तान अधिक से अधिक अपने को पश्चिम एशिया की शक्तियों के साथ जोड़ेगा और ईरान के साथ उसके घनिष्ठ सम्बन्ध बनेंगे और फिर वह सारे भूखण्ड को प्रभावित करने का प्रयत्न करेगा। ऐसी स्थिति में भारत के साथ तनाव बनाए रखने की उसकी नीति उसे लाभदायक सिद्ध हो सकती है।

कुछ हमारे मित्र कहते हैं पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र आ गया है, हमें पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र को बढ़ाने में महायत्न करनी चाहिए। कुछ पाकिस्तानी पत्रकार भी आये थे, उनसे मिलने का मुझे मौका मिला, वह भी इसी आशय की बात कर रहे थे। मैंने उनमें भी पूछा और अपने उन मित्रों से भी पूछना चाहता हूँ जो लोकतंत्र का दुहाई देते हैं, क्या हमें पाकिस्तान के घरेलू मामलों में दखल देना चाहिए? पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र है या नहीं, यह पाकिस्तान का घरेलू मामला है। और केवल वहाँ लोकतंत्र है इसलिये पाकिस्तान भारत विरोधी रबैया नहीं अपनायेगा, इस भ्रम में किसी को रहना नहीं चाहिये। अगर पाकिस्तान के अपने हितों की व्याख्या यह है कि भारत के साथ तनाव बनाये रखने में उसका लाभ है तो वहाँ सत्ता का स्वरूप कुछ भी है, हमारे साथ उसका संघर्ष चलेगा। लोकतंत्र के नाम पर/हम कुछ नई मुविधायें देने, कुछ नये समर्पण पाकिस्तान के करने के लिए तैयार हों यह हमारे भी हित में नहीं होगा।

सभापति जी, इस रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि अमरीका के साथ हमारा कोई बुनियादी संघर्ष नहीं है। जो भी संघर्ष पैदा होता है वह किसी तीसरे देश के बारे में अमरीका और भारत द्वारा अपनायी गई नीति को ले कर होता है। इस विश्लेषण से मैं एक सीमा तक सहमत हूँ। लेकिन इसका एक पहलू और भी है। क्या दुनिया की महा शक्तियाँ सचमुच यह चाहती हैं कि भारत एक बड़ी शक्ति के

रूप में उभरे? हमारा भूखण्ड, हमारा जनबल, हमारे प्राकृतिक साधन, इस विश्व के भाग में हमारी सामरिक स्थिति, हमें इस बात का भ्रवसर और चुनौती देती है कि हम एक स्वतंत्र शक्ति केन्द्र के रूप में प्रकट हों। आज विश्व केवल दो गुटों में बँटा नहीं है। सोवियत रूस, अमरीका, चीन, पश्चिमी यूरोप और जापान, पांच शक्ति केन्द्र उभर रहे हैं। इन शक्ति केन्द्रों में भारत की भी गणना होनी चाहिये। हमारी शक्ति पड़ोसियों को भयभीत करने के लिये नहीं होगी, हमारी शक्ति, पड़ोसियों को सहायता देने के लिये होगी। प्राचीन काल से आतताइयों का दमन और साधुओं का संरक्षण यह हमारा मिशन रहा है। भविष्य में भी भारत इसी मिशन का निर्वाह करना चाहता है। हम एक शक्ति केन्द्र के रूप में उभरें यह हमारी विदेश नीति का राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य होना चाहिये। अमरीका इस बात को पसन्द नहीं करता। सोवियत रूस भी पूरी तरह से पसन्द करता है, इसके बारे में मुझे मन्देह है।

सभापति जी, सोवियत रूस के साथ हमारे मित्रता के सम्बन्ध हैं। कठिनाई में सोवियत रूस ने हमारा साथ दिया है। हम एक संधि के बन्धन में बंधे हैं। उस संधि में यह भी कहा गया था कि सोवियत रूस हमारे आंतरिक मामलों में दखल नहीं देगा। लेकिन सोवियत रूस का भारत के आंतरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप चल रहा है। ताजा उदाहरण है 19 से 22 दिसम्बर तक मास्को में सोवियत रूस की स्थापना की 50वीं वर्षगांठ हुई, वह एक राजकीय समारोह था, भारत उसमें निमंत्रित किया गया था। भारत का प्रतिनिधित्व हमारे महामहिम उप-राष्ट्रपति और माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी ने किया। उस भ्रवसर पर भारत और रूस की मित्रता की जो घोषणायें की गयीं उन से किसी का विरोध नहीं हो सकता। लेकिन उस भ्रवसर पर भारतीय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के चेयरमैन, श्री डांगे को भारत के उप-राष्ट्रपति के समक्ष बिठाना और उनका भाषण कराना, यह तो

परोक्ष रूप से यह मान लेना है कि सोवियत रूस की दृष्टि में भारत सरकार और भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी एक ही दर्जे में हैं ।

उस समय डाँगे साहब ने जो भाषण दिया वह और भी आपत्तिजनक था । डाँगे साहब ने केरल की संयुक्त सरकार का हवाला दिया और सोवियत रूस से कहा कि आप भारत की ऐसी मदद करिये जिससे हिन्दुस्तान में ट्राइनिटी-मसजिद-की, केरल के ढाँचे पर चलने वाली सरकार नई दिल्ली में कायम हो सके । क्या यह सोवियत रूस को भारत के आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करने का खुला निमन्त्रण नहीं है ? क्या सोवियत रूस ने भारत के उप-राष्ट्रपति और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के चेयरमैन को एक ही दर्जे पर रख कर भारत सरकार की अवहेलना नहीं की ? सारे भारत का अपमान नहीं किया ? वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध रखें और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के हमारे मित्र मास्को के निर्देश पर चलें, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर अमरीका में ऐसी स्थिति होती कि भारत के उप-राष्ट्रपति और हिन्दुस्तान की किसी एक पार्टी के नेता को एक ही मंच पर बैठा कर उस नेता से यह कहलवाया जाता है कि अमरीका हमें ऐसी मदद दे जिस से कि भारत में लोकतांत्रिक शक्तियों का एक संयुक्त शासन स्थापित हो सके, तो भारत की स्वाभिमानी जनता की प्रतिक्रिया क्या होगी ? हम अमरीका के इस तरह के हस्तक्षेप को कभी बर्दाश्त नहीं करते, और सोवियत रूस का यह हस्तक्षेप भी बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जाना चाहिये । लेकिन विदेश मंत्री कहते हैं कि हमें आपत्ति नहीं है । यह तो हमारी लोकतंत्रप्रियता का प्रदर्शन है । यह लोकतंत्र-प्रियता का प्रदर्शन नहीं है, यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमारी दुर्बलता का और दयनीय स्थिति का विज्ञापन है ।

सभापति जी, आज गुट निरपेक्षता की बातें करने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है । जो देश अमरीका से अनाज पर निर्भर रहने की स्थिति में आ गया है

और उस अनाज के साथ घूँसा आ रहा है, और जो देश अपनी रक्षा की आवश्यकता सोवियत रूस से पूरी करता है, वह सच्चे अर्थों में स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति का अवलम्बन नहीं कर सकता । हमें अपनी सीमाओं स्वीकार करना चाहिये और उन सीमाओं के अन्तर्गत विदेश नीति का निर्धारण कर भारत की औद्योगिक और सैनिक शक्ति को बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये । औद्योगिक दृष्टि से समुन्नत और सैनिक दृष्टि से आत्म-निर्भर भारत ही सच्चे अर्थों में एक स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति का अवलम्बन कर सकता है ।

सभापति जी, भारत अभी तक ब्रिटिश राष्ट्र मंडल का सदस्य है । राष्ट्रमंडल की पहले भी अधिक उपयोगिता नहीं थी, जो कुछ थी वह यूरोपीय साम्राज्य बाजार के निर्माण के समय समाप्त हो गयी । अब ब्रिटिश राष्ट्रमंडल में हम रहें इस बात की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है । हमें ब्रिटिश राष्ट्रमंडल की सदस्यता को छोड़ देना चाहिए ।

अरब देशों के प्रति भी हमें अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करना चाहिए । अरब भारत की मित्रता को एक तरफा मान कर नहीं चल सकते हैं । हम यह आवाज उठाते रहे हैं कि इजराइल द्वारा अधिकृत अरब भूभाग मुक्त होना चाहिए । लेकिन किसी अरब देश ने नहीं कहा कि पाकिस्तान द्वारा अधिकृत कश्मीर का भूभाग या चीन द्वारा अधिकृत अक्सई चीन का हिस्सा भी मुक्त होना चाहिए । हमारी नीति सम-सहयोग के आधार पर निर्धारित हो । अगर अरब देश हमारे और पाकिस्तान के, हमारे और चीन के साथ मित्र हो सकते हैं तो हम अरबों और इजराइल के एक साथ मित्र क्यों नहीं हो सकते हैं ? इजराइल को हम ने मान्यता दी है लेकिन हमने कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित नहीं किये । क्यों नहीं किये यह मैं समझने में असमर्थ हूँ ।

[श्री प्रटल बिहारी बाजपेयी]

कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने में हमें किसी देश के साथ भेदभाव नहीं करना चाहिए। दोनों कोरियाओं के साथ हम कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें, उत्तर वियतनाम के साथ हम ने किये, दक्षिण वियतनाम के साथ भी करें, इजराइल के साथ भी करें। जो देश विश्व के मान-चित्त पर वर्तमान हैं और जहां उन को निवृत्त करने वाली प्रभावी सरकार चल रही है, कूटनीतिक मान्यता प्रदान करने में कोई कठिनाई पैदा नहीं होनी चाहिए।

सभापति जी इस विवाद में सिक्किम की भी चर्चा की गई है। हमारे मार्क्सिस्ट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के मित्र यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं वह चीन के प्रति तो बड़े नरम हैं लेकिन सिक्किम के बारे में कहते हैं कि भारत ने सेना भेज कर बड़ी गलती की। सिक्किम के और हमारे जो सम्बन्ध हैं उनके अन्तर्गत हम सिक्किम के आग्रह पर सेना भेजने के लिये बंधे हुए थे। सेना भेज कर हम ने अपने दायित्व का पालन किया है। सिक्किम में हमारी विस्तारवादी आकांक्षायें हों, इसका प्रश्न ही पैदा नहीं होता है लेकिन अगर हमारे मार्क्सिस्ट मित्र कहते हैं कि सिक्किम को आजादी देनी चाहिये तो इसमें से यह ध्वनि निकलती है मानो हम ने सिक्किम को गुलाम बना कर रखा है। उनका भाषण हमारे विरुद्ध हमारे पड़ोसी चीन द्वारा प्रयुक्त किया जा सकता है। भारत के साथ सिक्किम के क्या सम्बन्ध हों यह सिक्किम तय करे। हमें सिक्किम पर कोई चीज थोपनी नहीं है। लेकिन एक बात स्पष्ट है कि जब लोकतंत्र की लहरें उठ रही हैं, तो सिक्किम उनसे अछूता नहीं रह सकता है। सिक्किम एक सांविधानिक राजतंत्र के रूप में चले, अगर ऐसी परिस्थिति वहां पैदा हो सके, तो हमें उस पर प्रसन्नता होगी।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने वन एशिया सम्मेलन में जो भाषण दिया, उस का यहां उल्लेख किया गया है। जो भाषण उन्होंने दिया था, वह ठीक था। मैं जानता हूँ कि उनके मन में

रंगभेद की भावना नहीं थी। लेकिन क्या कोई इस बात से इन्कार कर सकता है कि अमरीका ने एटम बम जापान पर ही गिराया? अमरीका यूरोप के किसी भी गोरे देश पर एटम बम गिराने का साहस नहीं कर सकता था। केवल एशिया को ही इस प्रकार के विनाशक शस्त्रों के उपयोग की एक प्रयोगशाला समझा जाता है। या तो प्रधान मंत्री वन एशिया सम्मेलन में कुछ कहती नहीं, और अगर कह दिया था, तो हिम्मत के साथ उस पर खड़े रहना चाहिए था।

लेकिन फिर मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम अमरीका के दबाव में हैं, हम रूस के दबाव में हैं और फिर भी हम गुट-निर्पेक्ष नीति पर चलने का दावा करते हैं। हमें अपनी विदेश नीति अधिक तेजस्वी, अधिक लचीली, अधिक व्यवहारवादी और राष्ट्रीय हितों का संरक्षण और संबर्द्धन करने वाली बनानी होगी। आज हमारी विदेश नीति में कभी तेजस्विता का अभाव हो जाता है, कभी लचीलेपन का अभाव हो जाता है और इसी कारण गत वर्ष संसार में हम ने जो कीर्ति कमाई थी, हम उसे कायम नहीं रख सके। यदि विदेश नीति के निर्धारण में, और उसके संचालन में, आवश्यक परिवर्तन कर के हम राष्ट्रीय हितों का संरक्षण कर सके और विश्व-शान्ति के निर्माण में योगदान दे सके, तभी हमारी विदेश नीति सफल मानी जायेगी। आज की स्थिति में उसे सफल नहीं कहा जा सकता।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): I rise to support the demands for grants of this Ministry and in supporting, to compliment the Ministry of External Affairs for the way in which the affairs of this country in the external field were being conducted in the course of the last year. In retrospect I honestly feel that enough has happened in the last year which should give us, as a self-respecting country, satisfaction. The policies we have been adumbrating have been accepted on a global basis and stand vindicated.

My friend Mr. Viswanathan said that the prestige of the country had gone down and that in the United Nations we were not able to pull sufficient weight and also that our foreign policy lacked the backbone. Whether we are able to pull sufficient weight in the portals of the United Nations, is one thing. But I would ask one question: what is the yard stick by which you judge whether the foreign policy is correct or not? That we pull some weight in the United Nations—is that to be the sole yardstick? Should we go about as a big power with all the world following us, is that the yardstick? Or is it to be the yardstick that the stand you are taking in the international affairs matter by matter and country by country stands vindicated? My submission is that when we approach the question of evaluation of foreign policy, the yardstick we have to adopt is not the measure of the so called influence that you are wielding but the measure of acceptance of the policy which we have been following up in the international affairs, that is, in essence, what we mean by the principle of non-alignment. Non-alignment does not mean non-cooperation with any other country. It does not mean that you are not going to pull your weight with some other country. Non-alignment simply means that you reserve your right of sovereignty in your own affairs and in taking your own stand with reference to different matters that are coming up on the international front and the thrust that you are taking up. The correct test is whether that stand has been accepted or not by the international community when time goes by.

Judging the whole scene from these standards, I feel that India has got sufficient scope and sufficient justification to feel satisfied because, whatever stand India has been taking in the international problems now stand vindicated one by one—whether it be on Vietnam or whether it be on Korea or whether it be on German Federation or whether it be in the matter of lessening of tension or ad-

mission of China in the United Nations or whether it be the principle of co-existence or whether it be aggressive aspects of the bloc politics. In all these matters, when we look back, we find that last year is a year in which many of these stands have been vindicated. It is in that respect that I say that although at a time when we were ploughing that lonely furrow, with respect to certain areas, we find that in the international policies the other countries are compelled to take up the stand that we have been taking. That bloc politics is now going out; that confrontation is now lessening and it is certainly a matter of satisfaction for us that Shri Nixon had to go to Peking, he had to go to Moscow and agreements had to be worked out and the two Germanies had to come together. And a four-power agreement had to be evolved and the Viet Nam confrontation had to be called off.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Is that all because of India?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I am not saying that this is because of India but I am saying that the stand we took with respect of all these issues to-day stands vindicated. It is one thing to say that it is because of India and it is yet another thing to say that the stand we took in the international politics has been proved to be correct. It may or may not be because of India. But, certainly it is a matter of satisfaction that the position we took stands vindicated to-day whether it be because of us or whether it be in spite of us. But, I do submit that we also contributed in a big measure. We had been asking for the admission of China year after year to the United Nations. We contributed to the building up of the international opinion. We were campaigning against the Viet Nam war. I do submit that our country continued for the cessation of confrontation in Viet Nam. We did contribute to the building up of the international opinion on Korea. After all whatever

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

contribution you can make in the international arena it is only upto the extent upto which you can evolve the international opinion. You cannot do that either by your atom bombs or by your arms. It is by the building up of the international opinion that you can spare the international policy and the fate of the international current. Therefore, I say that in the course of these years, we have been making our contribution by building up international opinion. It is this that ultimately necessitated or compelled the powers to come to the line which we have been advocating. It is there I submit that we have proved to the world that our foreign policy is proved to be a complete success. There we have got a sufficient satisfaction. It was said here that in the portals of the United Nations we do not count for anything. But I humbly beg to differ from that evaluation. Times have changed. There was a time when India was free and African countries were in bondage. Then India by her very presence could exhume dynamism in the international fields, in the portals of the United Nations. Since then the African countries have emerged as free and sovereign. They are independent, sovereign countries. A large number of such independent sovereign countries, there are in the United Nations. Therefore, the same demonstrative sort of influence which you might perhaps have been able to exert some-time back, you may not be able to do now. But the question is whether in the portals of the UN you are able to get the stand you are taking accepted by the international community. I want to ask, when the Bangladesh confrontation began, where were we? What was our position in the UN? We were struggling to get our position accepted. We had to go from country to country to get acceptance of our position. Today may be Bangladesh has not got admission into the UN. But the Security Council has accepted the position, and excepting for a veto, Bangladesh

would have been admitted. When the real tussle began in the General Assembly, what happened? Is it not a real diplomatic victory that we could get the General Assembly accept the resolution not by a division but unanimously recommending to the Security Council that Bangladesh be admitted? Have we not covered a long distance in the last 18 months? From a point where Bangladesh was a moot proposition and could not be accepted as a sovereign country, we have travelled so far that the General Assembly recommended the admission of Bangladesh to the Security Council. Is it not a real victory? In my view, the way we have managed things in the UN is really admirable.

In the election to the International Court, we put up our candidate. There was a real tussle and our candidate won with the largest number of votes, excepting one. Could you say we are not wielding any influence, that we are without friends in the UN and we have estranged and been put in isolation in the international forum? Let us not be unrealistic when we make an evaluation. Let us be charitable to ourselves. Charitable you be to others, but let us be charitable to ourselves also. If you do so, you will have to acknowledge that the foreign policy of this country has proved itself to be a correct foreign policy, which is being evolved by an independent country. Mr. Vajpayee said, we are not able to evolve an independent foreign policy. May I ask him in all humility, can you give an instance where you can say that this is not an independent decision and an alternative decision could have been taken? To evaluate as to whether the policy we are pursuing is independent or not, the method is to point out one action and say, this is not in the interests of our country and this is not the stand we would have taken if we are a real sovereign country. I would challenge the opposition to point out a single step where we have been following the dictates of some other country. It does not benefit even the leader of an

opposition party to portray a picture in which you announce to the world that we are not a sovereign country but an appendage of some other country. If there is some justification for it, all right. If not, it will be the most ruinous sort of stand to take in its relationship to the welfare of our country. So, taken altogether, we have sufficient ground for satisfaction about the foreign policy we have been pursuing.

Mr. Vajpayee said that the new initiative we have taken in the sub-continent is against the interests of the country. When the Simla Agreement was signed, he said it. Now he says it again. I can only sympathise with the deliberate attempt on his part not to understand the implications of the initiative we have taken. The cease-fire took place and the prisoners-of-war are with us. The Geneva Convention says, prisoners-of-war have got to be returned. But our reply is that the Prisoners-of-war surrendered to the united command and, therefore, except after discussion with Bangladesh and India, the prisoners-of-war could not be returned. We are taking this stand. Now he says that the prisoners-of-war should not be returned before recognition. I am looking at it from another perspective. The General Assembly of the United Nations have taken a decision that Bangladesh must be admitted to the United Nations. A recommendation to the Security Council to that effect has already been made. Along with that there is another resolution that the prisoners-of-war must be returned. If Bangladesh insists that nothing should be done except after discussion, of course we have no alternative. But if Bangladesh is prepared to de-link with the issue why should we be stubborn about it? The admission of Bangladesh is now in the hands of the United Nations itself. Therefore, we are attempting to de-link it from the prisoners-of-war issue.

The humanitarian problem is not only one. There is the humanitarian

problem with regard to the prisoners-of-war. There is another humanitarian problem with regard to the Bengalis in Pakistan. There is a third humanitarian problem with regard to the Pakistanis in Bangladesh. Are we to allow these humanitarian problems to remain there and are we to use these human beings as hostages for the purpose of recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan? Now that a majority of members of the United Nations have accepted and recognised Bangladesh, recognition by Pakistan is only a matter of time. It is in their interest to de-link it, as has been done by Bangladesh.

If anything, we have to congratulate the External Affairs Minister for this initiative he has taken whereby he has put Pakistan in the dock. We have found how Pakistan has been put in the dock. Pakistan has now come out with another argument that the moment the hostilities are over the prisoners-of-war must be returned. What do they mean by hostility? Are the hostilities over? I am afraid, the hostilities are not over. The cease-fire has taken place but the hostilities are not over because the basic causes of the war are still there. One basic cause was the demand of Bangladesh for their own national identity and, therefore, their sovereignty and existence. That has got to be satisfied. Until that is satisfied the seeds of hostility will certainly remain. Therefore, the argument of Mr. Bhutto that because the hostilities are over, the prisoners-of-war must be returned under the Geneva Convention unilaterally and without any discussion is a position which cannot pass muster. Now the Geneva Convention will be observed, the prisoners-of-war will be returned to Pakistan and the Pakistani prisoners in Bangladesh will be returned to Pakistan when the Bengalis are returned to Bangladesh. Unless Mr. Bhutto agrees to this, he will find it difficult at the bar of international opinion to justify his stand. For this supreme strategic and diplomatic move I must congratulate the External Affairs Minister. As

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

far as recognition is concerned, that is a different matter. All the powers of the sub-continent have recognised Bangladesh; so also the largest number of members of the United Nations. How long can Pakistan remain with eyes completely shut to the hard reality of the existence of Bangladesh? Time will compel Mr. Bhutto to recognise Bangladesh. If Mr. Bhutto will not recognise Bangladesh, Bangladesh will not recognise Mr. Bhutto. That is a problem between them and we will leave it at that. Therefore, this is a major stroke that we have achieved.

There is one point which I would like to emphasize and that is our relationship with the countries of Africa and South America. Our relationship with Africa has been consistently good. Even when Africa was under imperialist rule we had intimate relations with the African countries. No country had identified itself with the hopes and aspirations for independence, sovereignty and liberation from racial discrimination of the African countries than India. In fact, Mahatma Gandhi started his political struggle from Africa. Even today Africa is under the heels of neo-colonialism. Racial suppression is continuing there. When I went to the United Nations it was a matter of pride for me to find that India is still completely leading that section of the United Nations which is fighting against *apartheid* in Africa.

I was really proud to note the contribution that was made by a member of our Embassy Mr. Barkat Ahmed as the Rapporteur of a Committee which was dealing with *Apartheid*. Nevertheless, I have my doubts whether we are sufficiently getting emotionally integrated and moulded into the problems of African nations. There is neo-colonialism going on. We have got to get completely emotionally integrated with them and we will have to give them a feeling that we are completely with them. It is not money that they need. It is emo-

tional sympathy and support that the African countries need. Let us remember it is not only Soviet Union, it is not only America, it is not only China, that counts in the world. It is the re-emerging continent into the consciousness of their rights, it is the re-emerging continent into a struggle to re-establish themselves, that is going to count. We have got to evolve a policy whereby we will be part and parcel of the great continent and will be completely emotionally with them.

In conclusion, I do congratulate the External Affairs Ministry for the way they have been piloting the affairs of this country, for the magnificent stroke of diplomacy that has put Pakistan on the wrong side and for the way we have been able to take a stand that has been vindicated by the international community from time to time.

With these words, I support the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Members may now move their cut motions.

SHRI SAROJ MUKHERJEE: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to project India's image abroad properly in all the matters in international politics (2)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to evolve a bold, healthy and popular policy which reflects internationally India's honour and dignity (3)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for further initiative and earnestness on the part of the

Ministry to develop good neighbourly relations with Pakistan. (9)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for quick and impressive steps to break the existing thaw and bring about friendly relations With People's Republic of China (10)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure of Indian Embassies and Consulates' activities in other countries in respect of publicity and other programmes (11)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to immediately recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and cut all relation with Saigon Regime. (12)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to recognise the Government of National Union led by Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia. (13)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to guide properly and in time the offices, charge-d'affairs and ambassadors of our country in foreign lands by keeping very regular contact with them from India. (14)]

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Continuing defaults in the working of our Embassies and High Commissions abroad. (15)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Desirability of closer links with countries like Chile and Cuba. (16)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Role of foreign policy as an instrument for countering deprecations on Indian economy by foreign oil companies. (17)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Ways and means of consolidating India's friendship and fraternity with Bangladesh. (18)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Desirability of having full diplomatic relations with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. (19)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Problems arising out of recent Anglo-U.S. build-up in the Indian Ocean thus preventing its emergence as a zone of peace. (20)]

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Problems arising out of the situation in Indo-China and continuing neo-imperialist designs in the region. (21)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[India's role in the task of accomplishing security and peace in Asia. (22)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Ways and means of overcoming the intransigence of Pakistan in regard to implementation of the Simla Agreement. (23)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Role of the United States, China and certain other Powers in aggravating sub-continental problems to the detriment particularly of India. (24)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[India's relationship with the United States and dangers latent in present policies. (25)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Situation lately arisen in Sikkim and Government's action in relation thereto. (26)]

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to constantly evaluate and implement an imaginative,

realistic and fruitful foreign policy of India. (27)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to keep India genuinely non-aligned as between the two super power blocks of East and West. (28)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to follow an independent foreign policy in tune with the national interest and security. (29)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to play a more effective role in the United Nations and its specialised agencies for the promotion of peace and development and all round progress in the present day world. (30)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to provide leadership and fresh initiatives to the Commonwealth of Nations. (31)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to promote and cement better relations with the developing and newly independent countries particularly in the continents of Africa and Latin America. (32)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to produce a meaningful friendship and partnership with a number of neighbouring

and countries in Asia more especially in South East Asia, on the basis of equality and mutual interest, benefit and respect. (33)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to drastically reduce the number of both Indians and non-Indians in employment in various embassies, high commissions and consulates of India located all over the world. (34)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to build-up good, well-knit, bold and efficient external publicity units in India's embassies and missions with a view to creating a correct and proper image of India abroad. (35)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for taking a firm, positive and definite stand in regard to the implementation of the Simla Agreement. (36)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide immediate relief and help to Indians who have been thrown out of Uganda. (37)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take concrete measures to start a diplomatic dialogue with the People's Republic of China. (38)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for resumption of a vigorous, free and mutually respectful diplomatic relationship between India and the U.S.A. (39)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for establishing a full Indian diplomatic mission in Israel and a similar Israeli one in New Delhi. (40)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for looking after the Indians who are being forced out of Fiji and other areas and regions of the World. (41)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for severely cutting the reckless expenses and luxurious ways of living in our diplomatic embassies abroad. (42)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for cementing further friendship with the Government and people of the Republic of Bangladesh, so that the ideals of democracy, socialism, secularism and freedom can be strengthened on the sub-continent of India. (43)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for taking all necessary steps to keep the Indian Ocean as a zone of undisturbed and positive peace. (44)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to support all peoples and places fighting against colonialism, neo-colonialism, fascism, totalitarianism and apartheid pursued by various governments or establishments. (45)]

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to sympathise with appreciate and support the natural and democratic urges and agitations of freedom-loving and peace-loving people of Sikkim. (46).]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The cut motions are also before the House.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY (Raiganj):

Mr. Chairman, Sir, in consonance with the basic tenets of peaceful co-existence which forms the matrix of our Foreign Policy, India has throughout accepted and followed the principles of Panch Sheel.

Jawaharlal Nehru was passionately devoted to internationalism and we remember him being associated with International Assemblies fighting against all forms of colonialism, racialism and imperialism.

For him, as, for us all India was not to be relegated to the position of being a mere hanger-on to any one country or group of nations but imbibing the ideals of Gandhiji we were to be a nation destined to bring moral and ethical values to bear in our relations with the international world.

Our policy of non-alignment has been of extreme importance to us and beneficial, for we had seen the settlement of differences amongst nations and the alleviation and easing of politically dangerous situations

In Panditji's own words:

"The policy India has sought to pursue is not a negative or neutral policy. It is a positive and vital policy that flows from our struggle for freedom. When man's liberty or peace is in danger, we cannot or shall not be neutral. Neutrality then would be a betrayal of what we have fought for and stand for".

Further, in 1947, he said:

"We have sought to avoid foreign entanglement by not joining one block for the other. We propose to keep friendship with other countries unless they themselves create difficulties...."

Non-alignment as a philosophy allows judgment of individual events, each on their merits while leaving complete freedom of action to each country keeping in view its own national self-interest.

But in the seventies, Sir, we face new challenges and new obligations. We find that political independence is incomplete without economic emancipation. Further, militant economic alliances dominate global trade.

The determination of the quality and quantity of foreign aid from developed countries to the less developed nations has to be evaluated, for the majority of the weaker underdeveloped countries are at the mercy of forces often beyond their control or liking. Therefore, countries which have the same common problems of abysmal poverty and economic disparities must endeavour to cooperate with each other as far as possible for their development and must reduce their dependence on developed countries.

In the words of Pdsident Nyerere of Tanzania:—

"We shall never be really free while our economic weakness and our economic aspirations force us to our knees as supplicants or scavengers of the world's wealth. Separately, that is, and will remain, our position. We shall beg or wheedle our way towards a little development here and a little investment there all on terms determined by others. But together or even in groups we are much less weak."

These are the new challenges that we are facing in the Seventies—for no longer can one quarter of humanity live in the flamboyance of opulence, while millions starve for a grain of food and a drop of water.

With our conduct being consistent with our professions, we are still today trying to continue retaining friendly relations with powerful nations. In spite of the arms aid to Pakistan, we are endeavouring to sustain our efforts in continuing our good relations with the USA.

Curiously enough, the founding fathers of the American Constitution had in fact demonstrated their belief in the concept that we to-day hold dear, for, when they were confronted with the spectacle of warring nations in Europe trying to import their own feuds and rivalries into the United States of America in the late 18th century and early 19th century, Thomas Jefferson in 1793 announced at the height of the Anglo-French conflict:

“We were in a state of peace with all belligerent powers in Europe.”

Coming to the Far East, in accordance with our principles, once again, India had all along tenaciously, persistently and consistently fought for the admission of China to the United Nations. Even now we have demonstrated our desire, readiness and willingness to normalise our relations with China.

It is no use other nation casting aspersions on India's philosophy of a peace-loving way of life by trying to coerce us and subjugate us into accepting the dictates of major global powers. It is soul-destroying to see efforts to achieve precisely this by dubious means—sometimes vicious—at other times insidious—but at all times obvious.

We see around us policies of unscrupulous stalling to achieve gran-

diose aims of territorial claims by mighty nations, and shameful manoeuvrings in the forum of the United Nations against newly independent countries by the so-called revolutionary powers of this era.

Must foreign policy rest entirely on expediency? There is of course one school of thought which believes in precisely that. Quick results might be achieved at the expense of sweeping away all ethical and moral considerations at great human cost and misery.

Coming to our own sub-continent, our contribution to peace has been consistent with our own sense of values. It was India who took the initiative in her attempt to brush away all veils of suspicion and apprehension between Pakistan and our country, after the cessation of the last war—with the definite aim of bringing to an end the politics of confrontation.

Ours was a sincere effort to begin afresh in creating an atmosphere of peace and mutual co-operation. It is only through sympathy, mutuality and tranquility that we in this sub-continent can deal with the common problems of devastating poverty, and gross under-development and massive over-population. Without the solution of these common problems, no country in this sub-continent will reach the point of take-off to assume its rightful place in the international world on terms of sovereign equality and dignity—and the world will be poorer for that. It is India's sincere belief that left to ourselves, it is possible for all the three countries in this sub-continent to live in peace and harmony with each other and strive towards our goal of prosperity and development in the shortest possible time.

Again India has taken the initiative to resolve the humanitarian problems of the Pakistani prisoners-of-war and for the simultaneous solution of the allied problems such as the repatriation of the Bengalis still in Pakistan and the Pakistanis in Bangla Desh.

[Shrimati Maya Ray]

16 hrs.

Our actions are overt evidence of the fact that there is no desire to be rigid or inflexible. Pakistan today is no longer obliged to recognise Bangla Desh as a precondition to securing the release of the Prisoners of War.

At the same time, Sir, it has to be noted that Bangla Desh has not moved away from its previous stand that it would negotiate only if Pakistan accorded recognition, and, if I may say so, for the ultimate solution of all problems, this is something which is inevitable.

After the ravages of a brutal war, both India and Bangla Desh have by this Joint Declaration shown their complete sincerity and earnestness to evolve a solution to the outstanding human problems that come inevitably in the wake of such events.

The deep desire and the unalloyed anxiety for such solution has been consistent with our past conduct, namely, to offer every opportunity to the Government of Pakistan to meet us half-way in this process.

Also, this Joint Declaration has demonstrated that the two Governments have shown dignity, maturity and utmost sagacity in their extreme concern to iron out the humanitarian problems involving the Health and happiness of millions of people of this sub-continent.

What, after all, is the position now? There are, on the one hand, a large number of non-Bengalis in Bangla Desh who have declared their allegiance to Pakistan. Bangla Desh is ready to repatriate them to Pakistan. Is Pakistan unwilling to take them back?

On the other hand there are an equally large number of Bengalis in detention in Pakistan. Surely, their return is equally imperative. Is there

not a far stronger case for the immediate return of all civilians confined in alien countries, as a result of war, than for that of soldiers, who, after all, have to anticipate the possibility of such detention, because it is their profession?

What possible human consideration can there be to prevent a peaceful exchange of such groups of unfortunate people? Both morally and legally, not to allow such exchange, is reprehensible.

I venture to say that only an utterly immature Government would reject this Indo-Bangla Desh Proposal for the solution of this great problem, arising out of the 1971 conflict.

These proposals are eminently reasonable, palpably just and remarkably generous as well as being genuinely constructive in their approach.

India has to consider the views of Bangla Desh in this whole issue, not only because the prisoners surrendered to the Joint Command of India and Bangla Desh, but, mainly because there are amongst the prisoners, officers and men who had committed heinous crimes against the people of Bangla Desh.

Bangla Desh is entitled to require such persons to be tried publicly, and, if found guilty, to be punished.

These trials are justifiably to be held to expose the brutality let loose against Bangla Desh.

Do not those of us who have lived through and survived the last great war in Europe, have memories of similar atrocities perpetrated against the Jewish race in the West? Do we not remember the Nuremberg trials held in the West after the last war?

Therefore, what is there for anyone to object to, in respect of a similar pattern of behaviour here in the East?

It is in the light of this background that there has been an attempt by India and Bangla Desh to separate the purely humanitarian aspects of the problem from the political and other aspects. There is before us an uncomplicated offer of a bilateral deal.

Pakistan has been harping on the humanitarian aspect of the Prisoners of War problem. The Joint Declaration is positive, undiluted, evidence of our earnestness in throwing open the portals for normal relations. The settlement of any problem can only be reached by negotiation on an equal footing and Pakistan's response to this gesture will be an acid test of the sincerity of their frequent professions. With these words I support the demands and grants of the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the present position of India to my mind on the international map is a tragedy of 550 million people of India. Political will and drive are lacking in the conduct of international affairs and everything seems to be going on with bureaucratic steam. It lacks vision, it lacks elements of growth and adaptability and while every important country seems to be in the midst of fundamental transitions—Mr. Nixon can bring America up-to-date; Mr. Brezhnev can bring Russia up-to-date,—Mrs. Gandhi's India presents a static and petrified picture. That is as a result of the conduct of the international affairs in this country, the way in which it is being done.

Therefore, I am tempted to say that Mrs. Gandhi seems to be looking into the last year's time-table in order to catch the train to destination. Therefore, India has become almost a non-country in international affairs. Where would we be reckoned with in the world—I ask my hon. friends on the other side—if we do not matter at all in South East Asia. After nearly 17 years of peace-keeping role in Indo-China, today we are wanted neither

by South Vietnam which we scorned, nor by North Vietnam which we embraced. We were left out of the Paris Conference on Vietnam. Certainly, India had much greater interests and responsibilities than Britain, Poland and Hungary in the region. Yet India did not find a place in the Paris Conference. Not only that, India was also excluded from the new International Commission for Control and Supervision.

Where do we find ourselves in the power balance of the world today? What is India's position on the global power map and is that position in keeping with the size and population of the country. It is clear that we are not among the power centres that have emerged or are emerging. The new balance is constituted by five power centres—United States, USSR, Western Europe, China and Japan. In other words, the emerging pattern is a five-power balance.

I agree with the view that India cannot settle down to being a second-rate country in international affairs. India's role is not that of a middle or middling power. Either India becomes a major power in the next 10—15 years or she will face a menacing situation of tremendous external pressures and internal turmoil and disarray. That is the position which we must realise. But at the moment India does not seem to be even on the periphery of this power balance that has emerged or is steadily emerging in the world.

In the world today a country has to be a nuclear power or an economic giant in order to be a major power or an independent decision-making centre. But the sad position is that we have neither great economic strength nor we are a nuclear power. Our economic position even amongst the developing countries is indeed very pathetic. We have got a population, amongst developing countries, of the order of one-third of the total population of these countries, but our output is only one-seventh of the development countries. So, we can play

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

neither the game of power-politics, nor the game of power-economic. We cannot play any one of these games.

Among the four Powers, three Powers belong to Asia, and the fourth Power is also directly involved in the affairs of Asia. It is also to be noted—and it is indeed a matter of greater significance, which ought to be noted with the greatest concern in this country—that the Soviet Union is being pushed into a situation of relative isolation in the power balance that is emerging in the world. Similarly, except for the Soviet Union, we have the power-centres, all of them, against us. Thus, both the Soviet Union and India are facing a situation of relative isolation in the present power configuration of the world.

The ties between the Soviet Union and India have to be viewed in this international setting. While India has to steer clear of over-dependence upon the Soviet Union, the realities or the compulsions created by the present international situation cannot be ignored. Nevertheless, it must be said that dependence on the Soviet Union may now be crossing the permissible limit, and the test of our diplomacy lies in surmounting the constraints on our present situation which limit our manoeuvrability and make our non-alignment less credible. It is also remarkable that the present power balance is more favourable to China and Pakistan than to us. If Pakistan and China can turn the present power balance to their advantage, why can India also not do so? This is the most important question to which the Ministry of External Affairs and the Members of Parliament must address themselves.

Coming to South-East Asia, the crucial question is: What kind of equilibrium is going to be brought about amongst the four great Powers? It is possible that in South-East Asia,

we may have the same kind of division as exists in Europe. Just as you have got Russian Europe and Western Europe, it may well be that in South-East Asia also we may have what you might call, though you may not call it so at the moment, the Chinese part, the non-Chinese part or you call it in a general way, the communist part and the non-communist part. That might be in the crucible at the present moment. In the communist part, the two communist powers might be competing for supremacy, while in the non-communist part the United States and Japan would try to make a big thrust. And this position might be liked even by China that in the non-communist part, Japan and the United States might retain their hold and predominance.

Japan has already become an economic giant. It is already an economic super-power and it can no longer remain a political pygmy. This is the position which comes out of all our analysis of the present situation in clear profile. Japan's share in South-East Asia's import was of the order of 25 per cent in 1970, and it is expected to go up to 40 per cent in 1980. Recently, I got a figure that the Japanese exports in South-East Asia amounted to about 10,000 million dollars. So, we can imagine the tremendous surplus and consequently the tremendous economic leverage that Japan would have in South-East Asia and the tremendous dependence that this region would have on Japan. Further, the new defence programme of Japan is going to make it the fourth military power in the world, if you exclude the nuclear powers. If you include the nuclear powers, Japan would soon come to acquire the position of the seventh military power in the world. It is this tremendous economic power and potentiality of Japan that have made both China and the USSR woo Japan so eagerly, to get it closer to them. It has also to be realised that Japan's growing interest lies in the Indian Ocean. Much of the raw materials for Japan

pass through the Indian Ocean, and Japan is going to make a big thrust in this area. That was what was hinted at by the former Defence Secretary of the US only recently.

This is the position, namely, that Japan and China are going to play a big role in South East Asia, particularly in Vietnam. In Vietnam, the reconstruction of that country would require much resources which may not be internally available in that area and they may have to come either from the US or the USSR or from Japan. But it does appear to me that there is a great opportunity for the countries which can show some enterprise, which can bring themselves to muster some resources for this purpose. Japan is going to have a tremendous opportunity for the reconstruction of Vietnam and so is the opportunity for India. There is a great economic opportunity for India for the reconstruction of this area. China has indeed a direct stake in this area: she is also going to make a direct impact on the situation with all the resources that she can command. When China could have a trade of 500 million dollars with the East European countries, it is certainly going to have trade of a much bigger amount with South East Asia. That is what its interest in that area demands.

Now it appears to me that if you go into the present economic situation in India, you will come to the conclusion that India is not equipped for the role South East Asia demands at the present moment. With the present dynamic drive to zero rate of growth, this country cannot expect to make any impact on the South East Asian situation.

Coming to Indo-China, it is quite clear that the situation there is very much disturbing; particularly the conditions in Cambodia are of grave concern. It is feared that there might be a relapse into the situation that existed before the settlement in Vietnam. The capital is surrounded; it is

a most a beleaguered city and it is difficult to see how Geg. Lon Nol can withstand the pressure much longer. Reports indicate that the fighting is done by the Cambodian communists and by the supporters of Prince Sihanouk. The US must resist being drawn into the Cambodian quagmire, after all the bitter experience it had in Vietnam. I think, therefore, that a dialogue between the United States and Prince Sihanouk is called for in the present situation. But we have also to consider and generally we did think in those terms in the past when India did matter in international affairs—whether we can along with some other countries take the initiative in holding a South East Asian Security Conference. So, my concrete suggestion would be that we should take the initiative in the matter of convening a south-east Asian security conference.

In west Asia, or the middle east, we should be watchful of the proclivities of Iran more than those of Pakistan. In many ways, Pakistan might act as a proxy for Iran. Iran is being helped substantially both by the United States and the USSR, and it might soon blossom into a substantial middle power. The desire for access to oil-bearing areas as well as the strategic areas in the Arabian Sea and the Mediterranean can result in an orientation of policies towards Iran. Moreover, it is likely that Iran might build its strength in the Indian Ocean too. And with Pakistan's close relations with Iran we have to be indeed very vigilant so far as the moves of Iran are concerned.

Now, since my time is up, I would like to say a few words about the way in which our ambassadors are chosen, because earlier I had made a reference to the bureaucratic method by which these things are done in the South Block. I would like to say that in the balance, the ratio between the officials and the non-officials among the ambassadors in our country is extremely adverse to non-officials. Recently, one

[Shri Shyamuandan Mishra]

instance came to my notice which I would like to place before the House, and that is indeed very disturbing. One person who is going to be appointed as High Commissioner of our country is currently facing an enquiry commission. The charges that have been made by an hon. Member of the legislature belonging to the communist party—I would also like this matter to be checked—were brought to my notice. That person is facing charges and yet he had been appointed to an important post as that of the High Commissioner.

Now, lastly—it may not be the last point as I want to make one further point also—the Prime Minister recently spoke of the political parties having external alliance. I think it is not in keeping with the dignity of the position of the Prime Minister that such remarks are made. May I say, with all responsibility and without any fear of contradiction, that there are only two parties in the country which have got external allies, and one of them is the ruling party. (*Interruptions*) No other party has got any external alliance. May I say also, with all the emphasis at my command, that it is not this policy, approach or the attitude of the Prime Minister which can bring a measure of unity behind the foreign policy. Therefore, the Prime Minister presents an extremely pathetic and miserable figure on the international scene. This is not the kind of statement which can rally the whole country behind her policy.

Lastly, may I say that one department of Ministry of External Affairs which seems to be meagrely financed, one section which seems to be putting up a kind of window-dressing over the whole thing in such a manner so as to make the conduct of foreign affairs look very attractive, is the external publicity section.

Only one minute and I have done. It is trying to put up a very attractive veneer on the whole thing. May I say that thereby also I imply

a commendation of that section in the External Affairs Ministry but it seems that that section is not so fully equipped with adequate resources.

Finally, in the joint declaration by India and Bangladesh seems to be encountering some difficulties. They are bound to encounter some difficulties. But may I say that the Simla spirit has to be infused there. And if we want to make good in international affairs, if we want to present a picture of strength on the international scene, then we have to be more active than Pakistan in bringing about a settlement in the Indian sub-continent. Without a settlement in the Indian sub-continent, the whole *raison d'être* of India as a country of importance and strength would vanish.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
How do you do it?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
How do you do it? That is the question. May I say that this joint declaration is indeed very fair and reasonable. But I am really sorry why so much time should have been taken by the Government of India in taking an initiative in this matter. Pakistan did have some interest in delaying this matter, because the release of POWs might have a disruptive influence over Pakistan. But India should not have taken so much time in coming to a decision of the kind as it has finally done, because there was a measure of support to Pakistan on the basis of the Geneva Convention and there was the humanitarian problem, which was very much before the International community. Even so I should say that India has now shown some kind of a statesmanship, though late, and we hope that that would be reciprocated by Pakistan. But the main problem, which this declaration has to encounter, is how to save the lives of Bengalis in Pakistan if Pakistan takes the retaliatory measures as a result of action taken against those P.O.Ws., who had taken

part in the criminal acts. That is going to be the rock on which it might founder. There is the humanitarian problem with which we must grapple .. (Interruptions) Since this problem has been sliced into small dimensions, I hope, realisation would dawn on all the parties concerned to settle other problems also in future. With these words may I say that the External Affairs Ministry must show a record in the years to come, of which we can feel proud as Indians and hold our heads high, not as a middle on middling power but as a major power emerging in the international scene.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): I rise to support the demands of the Ministry of External Affairs and while doing so, I wish to congratulate the Captain and the Crew for having piloted the External Affairs department through difficult times very successfully during the last year. I congratulate the Minister for the good report that the Ministry has submitted although they have had to cover a vast canvas.

16.30 hrs.

[DR. SARADISH ROY *in the Chair*]

The last Speaker Shri Shyamanda Mishra was unhappy about India's foreign policy. He said that the picture presented by Shrimati Indira Gandhi's India was petrified. Probably he was thinking of his own petrified party, that is, the Cong.(O). He was thinking of his party but he described the country in those terms. He tried to find fault with the recent joint declaration. This joint declaration has taken the winds out the sails of the Pakistan propaganda efforts to malign India on the international forum. Both Bangladesh and India jointly decided to send back all the 93,000 POWs except 195 who were charged with genocide and other heinous crimes and said that they were prepared to deal with the humanitarian problems. They also said: let us agree to have the

Bengalis in Pakistan repatriated and the Pakistani citizens in Bangladesh sent back. Can you really find fault with this package deal. He says that we have delayed this decision. He knows fully well that it is only after the elections in Bangladesh that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Government would take a positive turn on this matter and Mujibur's Government has succeeded in dealing with this problem which was a very ticklish and sensitive one as far as Bangladesh is concerned. Therefore, instead of complimenting both Bangladesh and Government of India on having taken this decision, Shri Mishraji wants to find fault with them. Unfortunately, again, there is another point which he was obsessed with: India was not a sixth power in this world. Five powers are there and he said that India was not emerging as a power in this region. He says that either we can be economically a big power or a nuclear power. He further says that India's power has been weakened altogether. He knows that India's foreign policy right from the beginning has been against any power-mongering in this world. We never wanted to be a power to deal with any of the countries either in this continent or anywhere. We have never talked of wanting to be a nuclear power or a big brother to these smaller neighbours of ours. In fact our role has been a role of friendship, cooperation that we want to generate in this world of peace. And that is what we have been standing by now, Sir, after the emergence of Bangladesh in this sub-continent and our victory as a supporter and champion of peace in this sub-continent. we have our own role in this entire continent of Asia and in fact, I would go to the extent of saying that India has a positive role in Afro-Asia and in regard to economic growth to cover all those countries. We ourselves are struggling as a developing country. Therefore, let us not try to think

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

in terms of this role, or go on talking about depending on the economic power of others. But, we can have mutual assistance among all these countries. In the South-Asian countries we should try to develop together without having to depend on any big power. That itself is a positive role that we may have to play. In this, whatever role the countries like Japan and others can play we would welcome them as our close friends. As far as the attitude towards our policy relating to Pakistan is concerned, as I said, we have taken a stand by this joint declaration. Now the ball is in the other court—in Pakistan's court—if they cannot utilise that, what can India do? I would submit that there is a snag when they asked for a delegation to come from India to clarify the package deal. There is a snag in this because this is the package deal given by both Bangladesh and India and therefore, India alone cannot take any final decision.

As regards this package deal, I submit that India must not lose an opportunity of sending its envoy or its representative. There is nothing to be lost thereby. What is wanted is to clarify the package deal. That is all. Whatever decision has to be taken regarding the exchange of P.O.Ws, ultimately the whole question has got to be solved. The release of P.O.Ws from India' and the Bengalis from Pakistan, will have to be solved by India and Pakistan by Bangladesh joining hands in this whole deal.

Therefore, we are not going to be wanting diplomatically in this matter. As far as my friend Shri Vajpayee is concerned, I was surprised to hear him in the same tune as Shri Mishra. He said....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
I spoke before him,

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I said 'tune'. I think that the tune can be earlier also. I shall quote:

“भारत एक शक्ति के केन्द्र के रूप में उभरे, यह राष्ट्र की विदेश नीति का लक्ष्य होना चाहिए।”

Again he also wants that India should concentrate on emerging as a power centre. I know his attitude; he wants India to go nuclear. The moment we try to do it, our whole objective of economic revival and taking all the countries in Afro-Asia with us will be deflated and we will also become a party to the power game in this world. That mistake India should never make. If you emerge as a power by your own growth, just as the sun is rising, nobody can point a finger at you. That is the attitude we have to take.

He says, India has not got an independent policy:

“गुट निरपेक्ष नीति नहीं है।
क्योंकि अनाज पर निर्भर राष्ट्र है।”

Mr. Vajpayee saying this is really sad for a person who is full of pride for his nation. We have not got it as a gift. We have paid for every iota of grain we have obtained.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
We have paid for dhatura also.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Having paid for it, what is the harm in accepting it? Which country in the world faced with difficulties of drought is not purchasing food? China, Russia and even Japan are purchasing food from other countries. Do you mean to say the moment you purchase grain from somewhere you become subservient? We had the guts to tell the world that we are not going to toe the line of any other country....

SHRI PILOO MODY: Except the Soviet Union.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Not even the Soviet Union. With Soviet Union, our policy is mutual friendship. Throughout this period, it has been proved that this policy has paid us dividends. They have never let us down. I am surprised that Mr. Vajpayee should have tried to deride our country for this policy of friendship towards the Soviet Union.

Coming to America, our policy is friendship towards all but friendship based on mutuality, without any strings attached and without any sense of subservience to any other country. How did we prove this? Recently when the United States gave arms to Iran, we made no secret of our indignation as far as dumping of arms in the sub-continent is concerned. These are obsolete arms in America—12 billion dollars worth of arms. What can Iran do with it? Even Pakistan could not use those Sabre jets and Patton tanks. Therefore, this policy of America of enslaving the smaller countries by dumping their obsolete arms there is most detrimental. It is really a policy of the famous Ugly American. I do not understand why this Dulles' philosophy is still continuing in this region, although they seem to have given up this policy of containing communism by force of arms as far as China is concerned, after they have had a licking in Vietnam. By dumping arms on smaller countries, they are trying to create other areas of conflict. Mr. Vajpayee was right when he said that this whole sub-continent is being made a practising ground as it were for this arms racket. This must be condemned strongly. If America gives up this policy and play a positive role by helping the developing countries to stand on their own feet and develop themselves economically, we have nothing against America.

We are right when we say that there are certain basic common policies, so far as democracy is concerned, even with America. Therefore, as far as the American people are concerned, there is nothing against them. We definitely like to have friendly relations. The same applies to China. It has been categorically and positively stated in this Report that India would always be willing to normalise its relations with China in spite of our different attitudes on disputed issues. Bearing that in mind, we are quite willing to normalise our relations. But we cannot be over-enthusiastic, as some people would like us. I am really surprised that these very people who up till now were saying "let us not have any truck with China" have suddenly started saying "well, why do we not have a second look and why do we not have better relations with China?". This sudden change is because USA and China have become friends. Therefore, I would submit that we are following an independent policy.

Our foreign policy has always been consistent. We want to be friendly with all. The interest of our country and peace in the world are always kept supreme by us. As far as our foreign policy is concerned, the Government under the leadership of the Prime Minister and Sardar Swaran Singh have really succeeded in piloting this foreign policy in a very successful manner, in a very creditable manner of which India can be justly proud.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Chairman, we are still preoccupied with our relations with Pakistan. I was among those who had welcomed the Simla Agreement. Although I had a number of reservations, I expressed the hope that that Agreement would be a hostage to the *bona fides* of Mr. Bhutto despite his long hostile record

[Shri Frank Anthony]

to India. Large sections of our people had hoped, and continued to hope, for some kind of breakthrough in these 27 years of confrontation with Pakistan. But let us face the facts. Since the Simla Agreement Mr. Bhutto's actions and his statements have moved away from at least the spirit of the Simla Agreement. Some people have sought to explain it away on the ground of some kind of inner compulsions or political pressures. Whatever it may be, the stark and unhappy fact today is that the spirit of the Simla Agreement is largely petrified, if not completely extinguished.

May I say with respect to the Prime Minister that it is unfortunate that the practice initiated by Jawaharlal Nehru, strengthened by Shastri, has not been continued of consultation with the Opposition Groups. I suppose each Prime Minister has his or her way of functioning according to his or her particular style.

Immediately after the Simla Agreement I had been asked by the press what my very humble reaction was, and while I welcomed it, I said that if we had been consulted, I very respectfully would have suggested a different order of priorities. In my respectful view, India's supreme decisive advantage was the territory that we had occupied and, in my view, it should have been the last condition of the Simla Agreement. The return of that territory should have been made squarely based on the acceptance by Mr. Bhutto of the realities in Kashmir. Now in regard to the actual line of control it is only a provisional acceptance. Neither side has given up its original position, and the original position of Pakistan continues to be a plebiscite in Kashmir.

So far as our retention of prisoners of war is concerned, it has never been any kind of an asset. On the other hand, it has exposed us legally,

psychologically, because of the Geneva Convention, the obligation to return the prisoners of war on the cessation of hostilities. It has exposed us to not a little criticism that we have been trading in human misery.

Let us realise that Mr. Bhutto is a first-class political acrobat. He has got counter-weights in this matter of prisoners of war. He has got, at a conservative estimate, 200,000 Bengali civilians; he has got, at a conservative estimate, 30,000 former Bengali members of the Pakistani armed forces. He is going to use these counter-weights, whatever we say. Bangladesh has said that they are going to have a trial of prisoners of war, perfectly permissible under international law and according to legal precedents. But you can expect Mr. Bhutto to do this. For one Pakistani who is tried, Mr. Bhutto will try two Bengalis; for one Pakistani who is sentenced to life imprisonment, he will send two Bengalis to life imprisonment for treason. So, we are likely to see a kind of competition in trials and a kind of competition in giving savage sentences.

I am looking at the facts. Now, India has offered Mr. Bhutto this package deal. Western countries, some of whom are not unduly friendly to us, have taken it eminently reasonable offer, indeed a generous offer. Here again, I do not want to misjudge Mr. Bhutto, I think, the chances are that Mr. Bhutto's penchant for political acrobats will get the better of his tendencies to any statesmanship.

Here, I have a very respectful suggestion to make to the Government of India. Don't get us to a position where Mr. Bhutto gets the ball back into our court, whatever acrobatics he is likely to indulge in. My suggestion is that if Mr. Bhutto does not accept this package deal, apart from handing over the prisoners of war who will be

tried for all kinds of heinous offences. Let us hand back to Bangladesh at least half the number of prisoners of war. Let them go to Bangladesh. Some people have treated the joint control as a fiction. Let us make it a fact. Let us hand back half of them to Bangladesh. They had surrendered to the joint command. There are several former Pakistani cantonments, Jessore for instance, and we may help to feed them. If Mr. Bhutto does not accept this package deal, let us hand back half the number of prisoners of war to be kept in custody in Bangladesh. I know, sooner or later, Mr. Bhutto has to come to terms with realities and the prisoners of war will be back. But my fear is—I hope, it does not become a reality—that once the prisoners of war go back, then whole Kashmir issue will be resurrected. We will be back to square one on Kashmir. That is a reality and a fact that we are going to face.

As I said, the supreme advantage that we had was the territory occupied by us. It never makes the same impact psychologically. Israel has held a lot of territory. Nobody has made an undue amount of noise about it. But we have abandoned that. Once the prisoners of war go back, we will be back to square one on Kashmir.

The Prime Minister's thesis appears to be that this doctrine of balance of power is outmoded. With great respect, I must say, the balance of power doctrine is as old as history itself. The major powers today subscribe to it and they will continue to subscribe to it. Whatever thesis we may propound in this country, every move on the international chess-board today is conditioned by real politik—this global power struggle. What did we see in Indo-China? Russia and China looking on silently while the USA was savagely bombing North Vietnam. Cynically they even feted Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger while it was going on. What was the reason? It was a game where this whole doctrine was at

play, Russia wanting to ensure that China does not achieve any hegemony in Indo-China and China wanting equally to ensure that Russia does not achieve hegemony in that area, so both playing into the hands of America and allowing America a massive military presence in that area—Thailand, Cambodia and Laos. And, another probably lesser motive, because it is all the time part of this strategy between these major powers, was that they probably did not want North Vietnam to emerge with a certain amount of hegemony in this area because there is a feeling that North Vietnam might develop into another variant of Titoism.

So, whatever the Prime Minister might think of this doctrine of balance of power, it is going to be applied with a vengeance to this sub-continent and we are going to have to live with it, and I hope our foreign policy is going to be adapted to it.

I know this word of India being a dominant power has some kind of odious connotation, but India has an inherent right to primacy in this area. It inheres in her size, in her potential, in her crucial geo-strategic position the position of primacy, and because of that we are going to be in the vortex of this game of balance of power.

There is no thaw in our relations with China. Personally, I would like to see some kind of thaw. But unlike us, the Chinese are supreme pragmatists. So, before any thaw, the Chinese will want some kind of a move from India on Aksai Chin and the McMahon Line ...

SHRI PILOO MODY: And the Indo-Soviet Treaty.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: To a certain extent, yes. My own feeling is that we are not emotionally conditioned to make any move with regard to Aksai Chin and the McMahon line. Another Chinese motive is that from

[Shri Frank Anthony]

the old Chinese imperialist tradition inherited, they seem to think that this area is a part of their sphere of influence and that is why, as my friend referred to the Indo-Soviet Treaty, they are using it as an additional argument. Because they are not going to allow Russia to increase its sphere of influence in this area, and that is why we are going to see the Chinese give increasing assistance and encouragement to Pakistan. There was some report—I do not know whether the Minister will tell us whether it was right or not—that there was some kind of a secret military pact entered into Pakistan. Then Tikka Khan was there, there was an open declaration of support by the Chinese leaders for Pakistan's stand on Kashmir, that is for a plebiscite. And China misses no opportunity to embarrass India: every day, almost, we read reports of military assistance and hardware to Mizo rebels, Naga rebels, and I am quite certain—we do not know what position they have adopted—that they would fish in sensitive areas—Sikkim, Bhutan and Nepal. And I am very happy that the Prime Minister went to Nepal, because I read reports which were quite disquieting, and I do not know to what extent they were true that certain elements, extremist elements in Nepal were exporting not only subversion but also arms not only to India but to Bangla Desh. I was, therefore, very happy that the Prime Minister went to Nepal.

In this global policy the Americans are not going to be disinterested spectators. Who are the two main contenders in this game of global power struggle? The Russians and the Americans. Both are building bases, carrying out spheres of influence, one against the other, Russia also against the Chinese. I read this. Mr. Nixon not long ago has avoid this doctrine. He has accepted it as part of his foreign policy thesis, the doctrine of balance of power because, according to Mr. Nixon, the alternative to a balance of power is an imbalance of power, and

according to Mr. Nixon, an imbalance of power can easily escalate into war. That seems to be the main thesis of Mr. Nixon. And, America has the resources. We see them. It is extraordinary whom they are helping. Sri Lanka; secretly, Burma; then Malaysia and Singapore; they have got massive bases; Thailand, Australia and the Philippines. It is a little amusing—probably it amuses a cynic more than anybody else—just look at the assistance they are giving to the Russians. The Indian disciples of the Russians abuse Mr. Swaran Singh even if he talks politely to the Americans. But look at the Russians today. They are getting aid. They are getting huge amount of subsidised grain from America. They are having more and more projects in collaboration with American business-men, projects like, oil, fertilizers, automobiles, etc. They are doing all these things and yet there are disciples in this country who immediately begin to abuse the Prime Minister for trying to be friendly with America. And, I was a little interested to see this that Sheikh Mujibur Rehman the other day paid a tribute to the two main benefactors of Bangladesh. He named America first. The assistance of this kind can be given only by a country like America.—massive economic assistance, and therefore, he said, benefactor number one is America. And, benefactor number two is India.

What I am trying to show is this: America is going to have its own policy towards Pakistan whatever we may say because she is also engaged in this game of balance of power with Russia. Here I want to sound a note of respectful warning. We dare not become too dependent on any country, whether it is Russia or America. My own fear is this that more and more, because of the communist comrades controlling—I won't say manipulating—the levers of economic power, they are going to edge us into the Russian Orb. The Prime Minister is not on the scene, she is not in charge of the economic

ministries, because she knows where she is. These communist comrades in the Government will have edged this country into positions where they will have dovetailed not only our economy, they will have dovetailed our defence, not only with Russia, but with the Comecon countries. That is my real fear and I do not know what is the significance of this Joint Commission on Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation. I do not know whether it savours of some kind of a Comecon technology; but we take our cue so easily from the Russians.

I remember reading an account of the Press foundation asking the Government to join the one Asia Assembly. The communists on this side and the communists on that side did not want Government to join. So the Government practically said, it would not join. But, as soon as they heard that the Russians and the East European satellites were going to participate, they joined with alacrity.

I want to end on this note: Let us have no illusions about Russia or America. None of them is going to share the latest secrets with us. As far as I am aware—I don't know whether the Minister is going to admit it or not,—we wanted quite rightly the MiG 23 and they gave us a flat no. They do not trust us one bit with their latest techniques and items of technology.

About Indo-Soviet Treaty I read a very knowledgeable article, a heavily-documented one,—there is no reason not to believe it,—showing how this rupee-trade agreement with Russia is weighted entirely in favour of Russians. 80 per cent of our traditional items, foreign-exchange earners, have now been diverted to the rupee-trade agreements and the trade is being switched by the Russians to earn foreign exchange. As Mr. Mishra said, in the ultimate analysis, it will be our economic strength that will decide

what position we have in the international sphere. Japan has shown that she is being wooed by all the dominant powers. But we have this lesson to learn from Japan: Japan is being restrained by America from going nuclear because they had liaison. My fear is that the more we move into the Russian sphere of influence they will completely inhibit us from exercising our nuclear options at any time. Many years ago, long before Mr. Vajpayee had come in this House, I had made a request to the then Prime Minister that India should exercise her nuclear options. That was the time when we were 10 years ahead of China so far as nuclear know-how and capacity was concerned. We were ten years ahead and now we are ten years behind.

17 hrs.

I want to end on this note that, I am afraid, by putting increasingly all our eggs into the Russian basket when at some time sense dawns on this country we may not be able to abandon this vegetarian ahimsa complex that has made us abandon our most powerful instrument. I want to say finally that had we exercised our nuclear options when we asked Jawahar Lal Nehru, there would have been no war with Pakistan, and we would never have been exposed, as Shri Mishra pointed out, to this humiliating spectacle. Thirteen countries were invited to this peace conference on Vietnam, and among them were eight European countries without a glimmer of any interest but we were not even invited. North Viet Nam does not bother; so-called Russian friends do not bother, because when it comes to brass tacks, each country is pursuing its own interest; each one is going to do what it feels to be in its own interest so far as the doctrine of balance of power is concerned.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS:
(SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH):**
Mr. Chairman, Sir, already a very

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh]

wide spectrum of topics has been covered by the hon. Members and many points have been raised by them both in appreciation of our foreign policy and the working of the Ministry as well as in criticism of our policy and the working of the Ministry. On behalf of the Ministry I wish to thank all those Members who have said kind things about us, kind things about our policy, and also those hon. Members who have made very valuable and constructive suggestions for the better working of the same. We are passing through a period of time when very significant changes are taking place on the international scene. Hon. Members have already referred to those changes. The configuration of world forces is changing; the bipolar world has already changed into a multipolar world; the days of balance of power and political domination, in spite of what Mr. Anthony has said, said, are also coming to an end, and the very basis of relationship between countries is changing from a basis of domination and leadership to a basis of friendship and equality. These trends and developments are not only very welcome, but I would say they are a clear vindication of the policy which India has been pursuing since our Independence. Our policy is based on the fundamental principles of Panch Sheel and it has been clearly vindicated by the present developments. India has never sought leadership or domination of any country. In fact the very word domination is repugnant to us and we expect and hope that no other country in the world behaves in that approach. We want to have friendly relations with all countries in the world based on equality and friendship. Our policy of non-alignment enables us to do this. It enables us to follow a path, which enables us to achieve stability and peace in the world. Stability and peace in the world are something for which non-aligned countries and developing countries of the world are hungry and they want it badly so that they can

be left alone in order to develop their own economic strength and to develop industrially. A great deal of criticism of our policy of non-alignment has of late died down. Many erstwhile critics of this policy have now veered round to the view that despite the changes in the world, despite changes in circumstances, this policy has still some relevance and validity. But there are still some critics in our country. In one group of such critics, we have people like Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Shri G. Viswanathan who maintain that whereas the policy of non-alignment is really valid and is a good policy, however, India is not adhering to it properly. They accept this policy but their main criticism is that we are deviating from it and that we are not adhering to it sincerely. To them, all that I can say is that their entire contention is wrong and I would like to ask them if they can give one example anywhere or on any occasion on which India has taken a policy decision which is against our national interest or we have taken a decision under the influence of a foreign power. We are absolutely independent in taking decisions, in our judgment we are adhering to the principles of non-alignment very strictly.

There is still another group of critics who maintain and ask the question as to why India is still sticking to the policy of non-alignment when the very circumstances under which this policy was enunciated have changed, when the big powers are giving up the policy of confrontation and tension and are trying to come closer to each other and are striving to reach *detente* and understanding amongst themselves. In these circumstances they maintain that this policy of non-alignment has no relevance. To these critics, all that I can say is that they base their arguments on this presumption that non-alignment is something which owes its origin or *raison d'être* to the division of the world into two power blocs of the forties and fifties. They are basing their contention entirely on wrong

promises. It is true that the division of the world into two power blocs was responsible to a certain extent in bringing about this policy of non-alignment, because at that time, developing countries and the economically backward countries were most reluctant to be drawn into the vortex of big power rivalry and they wanted to be left alone and follow a policy of their own. But the real essence of non-alignment lies in the urge and aspirations of the developing countries to follow their own policies, their own political and economic and social policies according to their own genius and according to their own requirements. That is the real essence. It is not a question of the world being divided into so many blocs and that is why we have got to do it. In the present context or nowadays, even the smallest country in the world will not tolerate any kind of domination from a big power. We have the glaring example before us of Viet Nam. Nobody could keep Viet Nam down. Even the biggest power in the world tried its very best to subdue Vietnam, but their will and their aspirations and their strong desire to be independent overcame all these difficulties, and they refused to cow down before this big power.

This feeling of nationalism in its broader sense and not in its connotation of chauvinism is something which is gaining strength. It will be very difficult for any big power to suppress this urge and these aspirations of the smaller powers and the backward powers. No power on earth can suppress this national urge or will of the Third World.

The House is aware and hon. Members know that the classical colonialism and imperialism of the old days is now giving place to a new-colonialism and imperialism of economic domination. It is not very obvious but it is a fact that it is more dangerous than the classical type of colonialism and imperialism. It is also a fact that this

understanding and detente between the big powers can also lead to the carving out of the world into spheres of influence, which would not be in the interests of smaller powers or non-aligned countries. The non-aligned group of countries is aware of these trends and these developments, and they will see to it, I am sure, that they do not succumb to this kind of pressure or this kind of strategy which is now being evolved by the so-called big powers.

We also fully realise that so long as there are conflicting pulls and pressures of bigger countries on smaller countries, the need for non-alignment will remain, and it is in our interest to strengthen this movement so that the bigger powers are not able to weaken it or to erode it by their subtle machinations.

The Third Summit Conference of non-aligned countries which took place at Lusaka in 1970 was an event of far-reaching significance. For the first time in a conference of non-aligned countries, the idea of economic and technical collaboration amongst the developing countries and the non-aligned countries was mooted there. It was done in order to safeguard and to see that the smaller countries did not come under the domination of big powers. It is true that political domination is coming to an end, but economic domination can be equally bad. The whole idea was mooted so that the smaller countries may not come under the influence and domination of bigger powers and they may be encouraged to bring about economic co-operation among themselves and to become self-reliant through mutual co-operation.

We are looking forward to the next meeting of non-aligned countries which will take place in Algiers. I am sure that attention will again be focussed on the theme of economic co-operation among the non-aligned countries and the deliberations of this

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh] conference will throw some light on some concrete and important steps which might be taken by the developing countries in order to achieve this very laudable objective.

SHRI PILOO MODY: What has happened in three years?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH: There is, if I may say so, need for *garibi hatao* at the international level also.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Having failed in India, they were exporting it.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH: If you are to prevent any kind of conflict between the haves and have-nots, if you want to avoid any tension and confrontation between these countries which can be called 'haves' and these countries which may be termed 'have-nots', we have to have this co-operation, and dehelp each other to achieve economic development. That alone will achieve the objective and nothing else.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: The world does not owe it to us: we have to do it ourselves.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH: Since the emphasis these days is on economic co-operation, I should like to say that we have attached great importance to it and have taken certain steps in order to give more economic content to our policy, and we are giving more importance to the economic aspect of our foreign policy. It is our firm belief that international stability and well being of humanity can best be achieved through an effective system of international economic co-operation and by establishing economic and commercial contacts and by promoting collaboration in industrial and technical ventures with our immediate neighbours as well as with all the developing countries in the world. I am happy to say that as a result of the various steps the Ministry has taken in that direction,

a number of initiatives we have taken in that direction, there is now visible a growing awareness among the countries of Asia and Africa about the competence and ability of this country to be a provider of technical knowhow and expertise, training opportunities to people from these countries, and consultancy service, preparation of survey and feasibility reports, etc. We have also taken keen interest in the activities of such multilateral organisations as the Colombo Plan, ECAFE and SCAAP (Special Commonwealth African Assistance Plan). Through our participation in the activities of these organisations and through our bilateral contacts with a large number of countries, we have given a real meaning to our friendship with these countries, specially through economic collaboration with our neighbouring countries like Shri Lanka, Mauritius, Afghanistan and Bhutan, to name just a few of them. Some idea of the magnitude of our assistance to the developing countries, friendly countries, can be had from the fact that under our ITEC programme alone, Rs. 80 lakhs to Rs. 1 crore are being spent by us every year in order to promote various schemes under this programme. This, however, does not include direct economic assistance to a large number of friendly countries which is quite substantial. For instance, under the Colombo Plan alone, upto the end of 1971-72, we have given assistance to the tune of Rs. 85.83 crores; under the SCAAP, this assistance is of the order of Rs. 82 lakhs upto 1971-72. India has also advanced loans to a large number of countries to enable them to purchase Indian goods as well as Indian services. The amount outstanding as loans to various countries at the end of 1971-72 is of the order of Rs. 65.63 crores.

We have also sent a large number of exports to developing countries in order to assist them in their developmental programmes. About 150

people are working abroad and they have done an extremely good job. Wherever they have gone, they have earned a good reputation for themselves and laurels for our country also.

From this, it will be seen that in spite of our difficulties at home, despite our own limitations, we have done everything possible to share our experience, our resources, with a large number of countries, and we have done everything possible to help them in their very difficult task of economic and industrial development. I must say that this approach to our foreign policy has already paid some very handsome dividends inasmuch as it has greatly increased the goodwill, friendship and trade between ourselves and a large number of countries in Africa and Asia.

Our greatest activity in the field of economic co-operation is in the continent of Africa. We are more than willing to share our experience with them, and to render all possible assistance to them in their own efforts to develop their countries as fast as possible. The House knows fully well that we have many common things between ourselves and the countries in Africa. They have passed through an era of colonial domination and exploitation and so have we. So, we know what their difficulties are; and I think they can gain a great deal from our experience which we are very willing to share with them. We have very patiently and assiduously established contacts with a large number of countries in Africa at the industrial and commercial level and we are ever anxious to proceed further to generate greater mutual economic activity with the countries of Africa.

In this connection, I would like to mention that a large number of joint ventures have been settled by Indian entrepreneurs in several countries of Africa in such wide-ranging

industrial fields as textiles, sugar, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and forest-based industries. We have also provided assistance through grant of scholarships to African students by providing training facilities in India to their technical hands and by making available to them our technicians experts, teachers and doctors.

Now, a few words about the struggle of our African brethren against imperialism, racialism and colonialism, to which a reference was made by Mr. Stephen. So far, we have on every conceivable occasion, always spoken in support of their struggle in Africa. We have supported them morally as well as materially and I will go so far as to say that it is really a shame that, in the stage of human understanding and human advancement, when man has achieved the feat of reaching the moon, there should be some countries which are still living as in the 16th and 17th centuries and following the obnoxious and outdated policies of that age also, policies of brutal suppression and racial discrimination and to keep people in perpetual bondage against their wishes. We have always condemned such policies and we will continue to condemn them, we condemn the regimes which follow such policies.

It is our resolve that we should stand fast by our African brethren and give them all possible help, material support, in their own fight against injustice, tyranny and brutal suppression of human rights.

A word about the African Organisation of Unity, the OAU. We are very happy to note that the OAU, despite the challenges it is faced with, has been able to maintain its integrity and unity and it is playing a very useful and effective role of harmonising and reconciling the different viewpoints and aspirations of a large number of people in the continent of Africa.

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh]

In the political field, our relations with the countries of Africa are also very close. There have been a number of exchanges of visits of dignitaries both from India to Africa and from Africa to India. Our President last year paid a visit to Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zambia, and our Foreign Minister went to the west African countries. From the African side, President Mobutu paid a visit to our country as well as the first Vice-President of Tanzania who came here a short while ago. As a result of these exchanges, a number of mutually advantageous agreements and understanding have been reached to give a new dimension to our traditional ties with the countries of Africa.

Now, something happened last year about which we are all very sorry, and that is, the development in Uganda. The House is fully aware of the unhappy and unfortunate development which took place last year in Uganda. We are also sorry about the shocking events. As hon. Members know, thousands of people were made to leave that country under conditions of humiliation, under tension, and for no fault of their own. We took up their cause with the local government, but unfortunately we were unsuccessful in our efforts to make things easy for them, but we made all possible arrangements to evacuate our own nationals from Uganda, to provide them with all the facilities and concessions and to give them all possible assistance in settling down in this country. The question of the assets left behind in that country is still not being resolved. We have informed the House on earlier occasions that we have taken up this matter, on a number of occasions. So far we have not succeeded, and we have always been told that it was not their intention to confiscate property without compensation. They have not yet been able to evolve any formula or to carry out the evaluation of this property. They did not refuse to pay compensation

but at the same time they have not been able to spell out any concrete policy in this regard. As late as a few days back, our High Commissioner met their head of State President Amin, and raised this question with him. President Amin gave a sympathetic hearing and he promised that he would look into this matter and expedite the question of evaluation and payment of compensation.

The General question of the people of Indian origin in Africa had been agitating the minds of the hon. Members in this House for quite some time past. In this connection I should like to say that practically all the independent African countries have now resorted to a policy of africanisation or nationalisation of their Commerce Industry and means of production. This is a policy with which we cannot have any quarrel because we ourselves have gone through that phase and we have tried to take over control of our economy and means of production. When African countries adopt this policy, it is true, that non-nationals in those countries do suffer. But it is inevitable. Our only effort is to see that when they carry out this policy it should be done in a manner which would not hurt the interests of these people unduly and they should be given time to wind up their business properly and leave the country in an orderly phased manner. We have been trying our best to bring about this kind of understanding between the countries concerned and the people of Indian origin there. We are happy to note that a large number of African leaders have made public statements that the policy of Africanisation would be implemented gradually and in an orderly manner. The hon. Members know that recently there were some developments in Zambia which caused a great deal of hardship to that friendly country. Their life line, their main outlet to the outside world passes through Rhodesia, and it was closed by the

Ian Smith regime, as a result of which the people of that country suffered a great deal economically and otherwise. This matter was taken up by the Security Council and a resolution was passed to give all possible help to Zambia to develop one or two alternative routs. We fully supported that resolution. Zambia is now in the front line of the battle, fighting for the cause of human dignity and equality. Not only India but all countries of the world should give their moral and material support to Zambia in this fight.

It will not be out of place here if I say something about the vast expanse of water which lies between the continent of Africa and the continent of Asia, that is the Indian ocean, to which some reference was made by hon. Members. A great deal of anxiety had been shown by a large number of countries particularly littoral countries in this area. Our policy has been enunciated on a number of occasions. We are for keeping this area as an area of peace and free from big power rivalries... (*Interruptions*). There is no justification for the presence of big powers in this area. We feel that left to themselves the countries of the region will be able to find a *modus vivendi* for the problem. This matter was taken up in the Lusaka conference of non-aligned countries and a resolution was passed in 1970 which was followed up by the General Assembly resolutions of 1971 which declare the Indian ocean has an area of peace.

Now, Sir, we agree that each nation has got a right to move in in international water. But there is a distinction between moving in and in their declaring it as a swimming pool. These waters should be free for mercantile navigation. But their permanent presence in it is not called for. We can only appeal to the big powers that they can certainly use these waters for their *bonafide* needs or their legitimate needs.

SHRI PILOO MODY: But what about Soviet Russia?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH: We have not given them any facility. Whatever facility is available to others, we have given the same to the Soviet Union. There is no other facility given to anyone. I agree that these are considered to be difficult questions. And they cannot be satisfactorily solved unless there is a serious dialogue and discussion among the big powers. Whatever you may like to have, in this connection, unless the big powers are seized of the matter and they discuss it, it is not possible to achieve anything. We are in touch with likeminded countries and we are taking all possible steps to bring about a favourable situation and to mobilize world opinion in this field. The bigger powers would also have to listen to the viewpoints of smaller countries also.

Now, the hon. Member, Shri Mishraji mentioned about the Commonwealth question. This has been raised on a number of occasions before. It is true that ever since U.K. chose to join the E.C.M. our commercial interests have suffered a great deal. Despite all that I may say and this is our considered view that great advantages can even now be achieved by our association with the Commonwealth of Nations. I can assure the hon. Members that if we find that this organisation is useless, then we will have to think of leaving this organisation. Till such time, there is no reason for us to leave this organisation. We feel that at present there is need for a great deal of cooperation between us and the other countries. You know, we exchange our ideas in the matter of education, in technical and so many other fields. And we feel that it is a useful organisation and it is not the time for us to leave this organisation. But, as soon as we feel that it is time for us to leave, we

[Shri Surandra Pal Singh]
shall leave that. So long as it serves our national purpose we should not leave it.

In the end, I would like to say a few words about the people of Indian origin in Fiji. I wish to say something about this because this question was raised in the House on a day on which it could not be taken up and no reply could be given on behalf of Government. So, with your permission, I would say a few words about Fiji also. Some apprehension was shown by a large number of Members of this House and also by the people outside the country that things are not well in Fiji and that something has to be done. They said that something has happened against the interests of those Indians who are living in Fiji. Those apprehensions were based on a remark which was made by the organising secretary of the National Federation Party of Fiji. It is reported that the Indians in Fiji have been receiving veiled threats from the Indigenous Fijians that they would get the same treatment at their hands as the Indians got at the hands of Ugandans. We took up this matter with our High Commission. We asked him to find out if there was any change in the policy of the Fiji Government towards the Indian community. But, we have been informed by our High Commission that there is no basis at all for any such apprehension in this regard. There is no change in the policy of the Government towards the Indians. All Fijian leaders, particularly, the Prime Minister, are dedicated to the task of achieving complete racial harmony and integration. All Fijians, irrespective of race, colour and religion have equal rights under their Constitution. So, it would be quite irrational and illogical to compare the Uganda development with the situation in Fiji. There is an obvious difference. In Uganda, the people of Indian origin or a majority of them were foreign nationals, who had not acquired the Ugandan nationality

whereas the Indian in Fiji have acquired the Fijian nationality and so they have got equal rights. There is no tension there and everything is going on very well.

In this connection I may say that the Fijian Prime Minister and other leaders openly deplored these happenings in Uganda, and offered to take some of the expellees from Uganda, into Fiji. They would never have made such an offer if they harboured any anti-India feelings.

17.29 hrs.

[SHRI S. A. KADER—in the Chair]

Whatever apprehension has been there in this regard it is not based on facts. We have never received any complaints.

With these few words, I would like to end my intervention.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra):
Sir, after having subjected myself to the torture of having to listen to this debate for so long, not only the minister's intervention but also the others who spoke before him, except for a few leading lights from whom a few accidental words did come out, I am really at a loss to participate in this debate at all. There was a time when the debate on the Demands of the External Affairs Ministry used to evoke a certain amount of interest and enthusiasm not only in the House but in the country as a whole. I find that that position no longer exist today. Nobody cares a hoot as to what this ministry is doing. Nobody either abroad or in this country cares as to what our foreign relations are. It has become a completely lack lustre affair. Let us evaluate it by the two acid tests that are well known: Who are your friends today? Nobody knows who

will help you today? Nobody knows. We live from moment to moment, from crisis to crisis, from event to event and in the sum total, we support the Minister for External Affairs, the Minister of State and also a very large department and many legations abroad, all of whom, I am sure, are having a very good time, which I think they deserve by virtue of the fact that they belong to this ministry.

What is the acid test? Can we say that India has a great many friends abroad? Ultimately we will be judged only by our performance at home. And, our performance at home is wretched. We have demonstrated to the whole world our total incapacity to be able to handle our own affairs. This is the exact impression they carry abroad in every single country of the world. I cannot think of a single country including the Soviet Union where they do not have contempt for us and our Government. I wish, Sir, you understood a little bit of Russian. I certainly wish that Comrade Swaran Singh also knows a little bit of Russian. If he did, he would find that when these people talk amongst themselves in what contemptuous terms they talk about us.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: How do you know?

SHRI PILOO MODY: He does not realise that my CIA friends tell me that, not to speak of the KGB friends I have. The fact of the matter is, we have become contemptible because we cannot manage our own affairs. I know Mr. Vajpayee is terribly hurt when I say it because he wants to feel nothing but the best for our country, which I also want, but I want it in substance, not in feeling. This is our only difference of opinion. He thinks by merely asserting that a thing should be so, it happens that way. But it is not so. It is only after we have learnt to behave responsibly that it will be so.

For instance, the Minister of State said that we have made a strong protest to President Amin about valuation and compensation of property to these people. This coming from a Government that does not believe in property, a Government which does not believe in valuation and in paying compensation? If I were President Amin, I would have said, "If you have article 31C in your country, I have many more such articles in my own." This is the reply I would have given to this Government. Yet, the minister says it with a straight face. This is what surprises me. And, he expects that others will also believe it! This is the credibility gap between what they think of themselves and what others think of them. If you travel anywhere abroad or even talk to the foreigners who come to our country, you find the same refrain: "India is a nice place. There is Taj Mahal"....

AN HON. MEMBER: Moti Mahal also.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The entire country is being supported by the Taj Mahal on the one hand and Moti Mahal on the other. This is the sum and substance of what we can provide.

I think it is a terrible thing because we are a very rich country, we are a very great country, we have all the assets and perquisites, all the knowledge, talent, expertise, everything that you want to have in this country except the capacity to put it together, except the capacity to govern ourselves intelligently. This is the only thing that is lacking. Then, what is the point of talking of foreign policy?

We have signed the Indo-Soviet Treaty. Every member of this House has got up to chant like a parrot what a great deal of good this treaty has done to us. I have no doubt that in our relationship with the Soviet Union we have been fortunate enough to be placed in a position by circumstances where we can demand certain

[Shri Pileo Mody]

things from the Soviet Union and get them. This is a matter of circumstance, not a matter of signature. As a matter of fact, after Mr. Kissinger's visit to Peking, I told the Prime Minister in the presence of many of my comrades over here "I hope you realise that as a result of this visit, what options have opened up for this country". I said that we are now in a position to demand anything we want from the Soviet Union. Because, all these years we have suffered from an unequal relationship and this visit of Kissinger to Peking has given us an opportunity to rectify that imbalance. We are now in a position even to turn round to the Soviet Union and tell them "you take care of China when we are involved in Bangladesh". But they did not do that, because there was no appreciation of the fact that Kissinger went to Peking to scare the Russians, not to scare the Indians and it was the Soviet Union that was isolated as a result of Kissinger's visit. Therefore, it was the Soviet Union which started wanting us more than we had wanted them. Instead of this realisation, we panicked and we sent Shri D. P. Dhar to Moscow. He came back with the treaty, not only the treaty but with a Hindi translation of the treaty that was done by the Russians in Moscow and not the Indians in Delhi, and it was hastily signed by a Minister appointed Plenipotentiary who—well, I let that pass. This is the real situation. Now we have parrot after parrot getting up and saying what a great thing.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Member after Member.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am sorry, I appreciate the correction. Now Member after Member get up and say what a great thing we did.

Has anybody in this House analysed what the Soviet Union gained as a result of the Indo-Soviet Treaty. Has anybody analysed it or said a word about it? When they talk about

other countries you find member after member getting up and saying "yes, we may have received this benefit, but such and such country has benefited more than us as a result of this"—except when it comes to the Soviet Union. This is the dark area about which nobody may speak. What is it that the Soviets have got out of this Indo-Soviet Treaty? For one thing it has exclusively stopped all other countries from flirting with us. There was a very pertinent letter that our friend Col. Gaddafi of Libya wrote to the Prime Minister, a very uncouth, a very rude letter but in substance what he had written is your answer to the Indo-Soviet Treaty. I recommend to the hon. Minister that he goes and re-reads it. He will find the restrictive parameters of the Indo-Soviet Treaty. It makes it difficult for other members of the international community to get in contact with us.

Take the Chinese. Everybody wants to be friendly with the Chinese all on a sudden. Why? Because each wants to be a little Kissinger in himself. So here you have little Kissingers, all advocating "let us get together with China". Everyone wants to get together with China, like Kissinger. But they do not realise what China thinks of us. The Chinese will have nothing to do with us what time the Indo-Soviet Treaty is still in existence. At the same time, do you realise what the Indo-Soviet Treaty does to the Soviet Union? It helps the Soviet Union in its doctrine of the containment of China.

Today, it is the avowed policy of Soviet Union to contain China. It is its principle enemy and the Indo-Soviet Treaty helps in furthering that policy. That is why the Chinese will not talk to you till there is the Indo-Soviet Treaty in existence. This is the reality. Who will explain this reality to people believe only in fiction.

Some people say, we are interested in America. Let me explain about America. As far as India is concerned, India's relationship with America is worse than the Soviet Union's relationship with America. Are these gentlemen aware of it? Today, the Soviet Union enjoys a better relationship with United States than India who has spoilt its relationship because of the Soviet Union.

So much has been said about Pakistan. We can only operate in areas in which circumstances present themselves. With the liberation of Bangladesh, for which the Indian Army has to be congratulated for their victories in Bangladesh nobody ever thinks that the Indian Army liberated Bangladesh; they only think that the Indian National Congress did it—a certain situation has emerged in our sub-continent on which we should capitalise. You talk about dividends. But you must know how to capitalise before you expect any dividends. How do we capitalise? The Simla Summit was a step in the right direction. But what happened thereafter? My hon. friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, has his own side of the story. Somebody over here may have a different side of the story. But the fact of the matter is that we are one of the parties involved and one of the parties that could not live up to or fructify an agreement that we have made, an agreement that was patently unrealisable because, on the one hand, we agreed to discuss everything bilaterally, and, on the other hand, we had a trilateral obligation which we had to fulfil. This is a sort of squaring of the hole which only our External Affairs Ministry can do.

I must say, for the first time in my life, I compliment Sardar Swarn Singh for having done a reasonably good job of presenting a package deal which my hon. friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, does not like. The package deal has several advantages. It has been sugar-coated sufficiently

in a manner in which it might be acceptable to Mr. Bhutto. It is something that has been arrived at in consultation with Mr. Mujib. Therefore, I welcome this initiative that has been taken. But, I hope, as soon as the three parties agree to doing this that they will waste no time in mutual recriminations and put it through.

I am glad that considering the resolution that we passed at Madras, the External Affairs Ministry has acted with a great deal of alacrity and supplied the package deal soon thereafter.

We have always maintained that relations of India should not only be comented around the Indian sub-continent, that is, South-East Asia, but should expand to our neighbours. Take, for instance, Nepal. It is a patent example of Indian inaptitude. Here, we have a country with whom we have enjoyed our relationship which is more than brotherly. But by our moral self-righteousness or smug behaviour over a period of time we have so disillusioned the Nepalese against us that there came a point when it was even a matter of breaking relations with them.

I would suggest to the External Affairs Minister to go and visit Nepal. Nepal finally turned and asked the Chinese to help them. The Chinese built roads for Nepal. The Indians built roads for Nepal and sooner or later Indian roads and the Chinese roads have to meet and that will be a meeting of real tragedy, shoddily built roads on this side and beautifully built roads on the other side! It is a permanent reminder to the Nepalese that next time you want anything to be done, ask the Chinese and not the Indians.

They have asked for certain trade concessions. After all Nepal is a land-locked country, a backward country, tucked away in the mountains. We should treat them as such, as friends with generosity. They want

[Shri Piloo Mody]

certain trading concessions. They want to be able to import a few things and then quietly sell them in India. What is wrong with it? When you have acknowledged that something like Rs. 500 crores worth of smuggling is taking place at our international frontiers, what is wrong with a few rupees dribbling in through Nepal? And, in any case they have not succeeded in stopping it. Why is this attitude then? Accept it as part of your trade deal. It will make the Nepalese very happy and you would have stopped this confrontation which has been going on for the last 3 or 4 years. Now, Sardar Swaran Singh thinks that our Prime Minister will go to Nepal and everything will be washed away, but, not in the manner in which he thinks.

Therefore, I talked at some length about Nepal, because it was a very typical case. Whether it is the case of Ceylon or Burma or the countries in West Asia—take Iran for instance. Here is another example. Iran has been Pakistan's closed friend all these years. We had an admirable opportunity of short-circuiting that relationship if only the Government of India had acceded to the Mithapur project. The Shah of Iran was so interested in the Mithapur project because it dove-tailed his Shahpur project into the Mithapur project in a manner where the whole package was such a neat and was beneficial to Iran and also to India that it would have been something that could have permanently cemented relations between Iran and India, by passing Pakistan whose relationship with Iran is of such great consequence and threat to us. But they did nothing. We shied away from the Mithapur project. Then the Shah said, 'You can go to hell. Whether you make it or not, I will continue with my project.'

This is the manner in which our country operates. At that moment, the External Affairs Ministry should have come down like a tonne of bricks on the head of whichever

Ministry it was, including the Prime Minister's, for stopping this project, because it was required in the vital interests of the country. But who is bothered about the vital interests of the country? We are only bothered in India, either about the vital interests of our own pocket or the vital interests of the Soviet Union. I find very little evidence of anybody who is thinking on a national scale, on a scale on matters which will benefit this country. In fact, the whole basis of foreign policy, that is, enlightened national self-interest no longer exists and that is why I started off by saying that this debate is rather irrelevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Bhatia—not here.

Shri B. N. Shastri.

SHRI BISWANARAYAN SHASTRI (Lakhimpur): I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs.

The time at my disposal is very short. Therefore, I shall confine myself only to the neighbouring countries. Our immediate neighbours are Sri Lanka, Burma, Nepal, Pakistan and China. Except Pakistan and China, our relations with the neighbouring countries have been good and cordial.

I have heard the speech of the previous speaker, Mr. Piloo Mody. He has criticised our foreign policy and he has said this debate is irrelevant. But I would like to say that our foreign policy is based on our own national interest, not in the interest of any other country. Along with our national interest, we have to consider about peace in this sub-continent and the freedom of movement of all nations in the Indian Ocean and mutual cooperation on economic matters. Non-alignment is a policy which has a posture in relation to the two big powers. It has nothing to do with neutrality; it is not a synonym of passivity; non-alignment is a policy of self-confidence and independence formulated by

Pandit Nehru and subsequently followed. It is this policy which guided us to conclude the Indo Soviet Treaty. It is not in the interest of the Soviet Union that Indo Soviet Treaty has been concluded. It is in the mutual interest. It is equally beneficial to the Soviet Union and to our country. Therefore the criticism made against Indo Soviet Treaty is wholly irrelevant totally unfounded.

It is known to every intelligent person in this country that Russia had been and is with us through thick and thin. From Goa to Bangla Desh issue, it is the Government of USSR which stood by India and which supported the views of India and therefore it is not for the sake of Soviet Union that our relation with USA is not cordial. In respect of whatever India is going to support, USA stands in the way and that is something which is creating disturbances and difficulties in our relations with our neighbouring countries. For example, when India supported the cause of the suffering humanity in the erstwhile East Pakistan, USSR supported that cause but USA sent their Seventh Fleet to the Indian Ocean. This indicates the attitude of the USSR to India and the USA to India. Therefore it is clear as to who is our friend and who is not. We are friendly and trying to be with all countries; our policy has been emphatically declared and emphasised by the Prime Minister on various occasions. Our Prime Minister has made it clear in the past. She asserted:

"Our doors are open dialogue with any country in the world on the basis of mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each other."

Mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity is the basis of our policy. Our relation with China is not good. Why? Chinese foreign policy is the reflection of its own domestic policy. Similarly, our foreign policy reflects our own domestic po-

licy. China believes in changes, changes by violence and violent methods and she is committed to perpetual revolution and she wants to export those violent methods to the neighbouring countries; those violent methods have been imported into this country which has been creating disturbances here. It is known to all while there was erstwhile East Pakistan that region was made a field of guirella activities by the Chinese.

So far as Pakistan is concerned since its inception there is anti-India feeling and tirade against India. The rulers there want to live upto the imagination of the people on the anti-India campaign. When Pakistan attacked India in 1965 after that attack there was Tashkent Treaty. It was concluded at the initiative of Soviet Russia. It was expected by all that after that Treaty Pakistan would realise the reality and had learnt a lesson that she would learn the folly of armed hostility with India. But that expectation has been belied. Pakistan attacked India in 1971 and after serious of hostility there is Simla pact. Somebody criticised it that Simla pact is a surrender. But I would like to say it is an improvement of the Tashkent pact because Tashkent pact was concluded at the initiative of a third power but this Simla pact was a bilateral agreement. Therefore, it is a definite improvement and it is not a surrender. Again this package deal was considered as a surrender and it was criticised that we surrendered our land. It was in consistency with our policy that India has no territorial ambition of any country far less of Pakistan. Therefore, our Government did not demand any portion or did not want to retain any portion occupied during the period of hostility.

The joint offer made by India with Bangla Desh to Pakistan is also criticised as a surrender. May, I ask had it been a surrender to Pakistan why Pakistan took so much of time to accept it or reject it. Has it been

[Shri Biswanarayan Shastri]

a surrender they would have been pleased or glad to accept it but why they are hesitant? It simply proves it is not a surrender but it is a rather significant offer by the Government of India and the Bangla Desh. Recently there is some happening, some revolt, in our neighbouring country whose external defence is vested with India, that is, the Himalayan State of Sikkim. There the people revolted against the ruler and the ruler and the people alike sought the help of the Government of India for restoration of law and order there. Sir, it has been criticised and it has been also pointed out that India has interfered with the internal policy, internal problem, of that small state. It is not interference. It is in the interests of that country; it is in the interests of the neighbouring countries that India had to take that position and restored law and order there. It is significant that steps taken by India are to the satisfaction, of course, to the ruler and the people alike.

Since my time is up I would like to conclude by saying a few words, that is, regarding performance of our diplomatic missions abroad. I from my own experience and from other reports can say that the performance of some of our diplomatic missions abroad is not as satisfactory as it should be. It is rather regrettable that some of the personnel of diplomatic missions lack knowledge of Indian culture and heritage. They do not know what India is and who they represent. I would like to suggest that instead of behaving like mini-mughals of bygone days they should

represent India as the Indian citizen of modern age, the concept of the Government and hope and aspiration of the people.

18 hrs.

I hope the hon. Minister will take note of this position and instruct the personnel in the diplomatic mission in a befitting manner so that they can project the image of India properly. They should understand what the policy the Government of India are following and what the relation of the Government of India is with the countries abroad.

The hon. Minister Shri Surendra Pal Singh may term it as a subjective analysis, as I heard him saying on a previous occasion, but I would like to assert that there is nothing in the world purely and solely as objective analysis. Every analysis is bound to be subjective to some extent. Therefore, this criticism should not be ignored simply as subjective.

With these words, I support the Demand.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Puri): I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow. Now, we are to take up the half-an-hour discussion. But Shri Laxminarain Pandeya is not here. So, the House will now adjourn and meet again tomorrow at 11 a.m.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, April, 24, 1973/Vaisakha 4, 1895 (Saka).