

[The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock].

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

### ARREST OF MEMBERS

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter dated the 22nd August, 1968 from the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, New Delhi:—

"I have the honour to inform you that I have found it my duty, in the exercise of my powers under section 64 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to direct that Sarvashri Madhu Limaye, George Fernandes, Arjun Singh Bhadoria, Shiva Chandra Jha, K. Lakkappa, Ram Sewak Yadav and Maharaj Singh Bharti, Members, Lok Sabha, be arrested u/s. 188 I.P.C. for defiance of the prohibitory order under section 144 Cr. P. C. in force, for demonstrating and raising slogans in front of Russian Embassy, Chankya Puri, within the jurisdiction of police station Chankya Puri, New Delhi, against the entry of Russian troops into Czechoslovakia.

Sarvashri Madhu Limaye, George Fernandes, Arjun Singh Bhadoria, Shiva Chandra Jha, K. Lakkappa, Ram Sewak Yadav and Maharaj Singh Bharti, Members, Lok Sabha, were accordingly arrested at 11 A.M. on this day, the 22nd August, 1968, and are being produced before the judicial Magistrate, New Delhi at Central Jail, Tihar, Delhi."

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : सदन के उठने से पहले यह सूचना आ जानी चाहिये थी और गृह मंत्री जी को इसके बारे में बयान देना चाहिये था। आप गृह मंत्री को कहे कि वह इसके बारे में बयान दें।

MR. SPEAKER: We will see.

14.02 Hrs.

### MOTION RE: PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON SITUATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move:

"That this House do consider the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia."

Sir, this motion speaks of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister yesterday.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kundrapara): Where is the Prime Minister?

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: If we are to go through the statement made by the Prime Minister. . .

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, न प्रधान मंत्री हैं, न विदेश मंत्री हैं। इनकी महत्वपूर्ण बहस चल रही है लेकिन इन में से कोई भी नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : आप प्रधान मंत्री को आने के लिए कहें। सदन के साथ इस तरह का व्यवहार नहीं होना चाहिए।

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): It is this callousness which harms us. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Anyway, we will proceed. I hope they will send a word to her.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि जब तक प्रधान मंत्री न आएँ, सदन की बैठक स्थगित रखी जाए।

श्री रवि राय : मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप इसके ऊपर सदन का मत ले लीजिये।

MR. SPEAKER: There are two Cabinet Ministers here. Let Mr. Bhandare continue. The Prime Minister will come.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: Let the House be adjourned till then. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us proceed.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: Sir, I was trying to place before the House that the statement made by the Prime Minister contains two propositions. One is in the second paragraph of her statement which affirms India's faith in the fundamental principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations.

The second proposition is that it contains certain declarations. The statement contains, in all, six declarations. The first declaration deals with the fact of entry of armed forces of the Soviet Union and four Warsaw Pact powers into Czechoslovakia border. Then second, it also declares and affirms India's friendship towards the people of Czechoslovakia and conveys to the people of Czechoslovakia India's profound concern at the turn of events soon after the settlement or resolution of problems and differences between Czechoslovakia and her allies. The third declaration which it contains is the declaration of our anguish at the events in Czechoslovakia. The fourth declaration is that it declares the hope and desire that the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact powers will be withdrawn at the earliest possible moment. The fifth declaration which it contains is that the Czech people will be able to determine their future according to their own wishes and interest. The sixth is that whatever mutual problems there may be between Czechoslovakia and her allies will be settled peacefully.

Along with these six principles, there is a declaration in the statement of further affirmation of India's faith in the fundamental principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations.

In view of these declarations and affirmations of faith in the fundamental principles of international law, India's stand is made clear and, therefore, I hope the House will accept the statement of the hon. Prime Minister indicating the stand taken by India.

Now, coming to the events, I just raise a question as to what is the justification for the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact powers for the armed intervention. What is the justification? The justification is given in the *Tass* statement on Czechoslovakia developments. This statement says, among other things, that it was authorised to state that the party and government leaders of Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have asked the Soviet Union and other allies to render the fraternal Czechoslovak people urgent assistance, including assistance with armed forces. This is the justification given from Moscow in the *Tass* statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: No justification for aggression.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: Why don't you have some patience and listen to me so that you can realise and appreciate what is stated here?

This is the justification given by Moscow. But it has been refuted by the Head of the Government of Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The report says, 'urgent personal appeal to the people'. It says:

"The President in an urgent personal appeal to the people asked them this afternoon to maintain reason and complete calm..."

I am not going to read the whole of the statement. I shall read out the two propositions which are contained in the statement. It says:

"This happened without the knowledge of the President of the Republic, the Chairman of the National Assembly and the Premier or the First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee."

[Shri R. D. Bhandare]

This is the first proposition, that the Prague radio speaks of regarding the statement made by the President. The second proposition which it contains is this:

"The Party Presidium regard this act as contrary not only to the fundamental principles of relations between socialist States but also as contrary to the principles of international law."

If we are to read these statements, we cannot but come to the conclusion that there is no justification whatsoever for the armed intervention by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact powers. Of course, these statements are quite contradictory to the Moscow announcement. But I would submit that we must place more reliance on the statement made by the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Coming to the point that the Moscow Radio and the *Tass* agency have stated that there was a threat to socialist forces in Czechoslovakia. What are the facts? Do the facts justify the stand taken by the Soviet Union or do the facts belie *in toto* the stand taken by the Soviet Union?

I need not go into the history of it, because the history is quite fresh and known to everybody. We are also quite aware of the facts. The Czech Communist Party wanted to bring in or usher in a change. They wanted to have some sort of liberalisation and a policy of democratisation in the life of the Czech people. Much has already been said regarding this liberalisation and democratisation. Explained in simple language it means this that it speaks of giving liberty to the Czech people so that the people can speak out their minds and develop their life in the manner they like and have the same amenities as are available to the others. This in a nutshell is the liberalisation movement that has been sought to be ushered in Czechoslovakia by the Communist Party. If that is the fact, then why should the socialist countries take an antagonistic attitude towards this liberalisation or democra-

tisation? But they immediately took an affront and started criticising the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. In fact, they went to the extent of threatening the Czech Communist Party. But even then, even under the threat of pain and penalty, the Czech Communist Party tried to be calm and showed its anxiety to come to some sort of settlement and resolve the differences between the Czech people and the other Socialist Warsaw Pact countries.

When they showed the anxiety, they did in fact assemble in a Conference and try to settle the differences that were existing in between the Czech people, the Government and the Communist party and the Socialist Party which were the members of the Warsaw Pact. A resolution was passed and a settlement was declared. The very next moment, there was the march of the Armed Forces into Czechoslovakia. Such an abnormal thing had never taken place in the history of any country. On the one hand, there was a talk of settlement, and the stretching of the hand of friendship but on the other there was also a stabbing in the back. This is how I would like to characterise the action.

For what purpose is this armed intervention made? According to my judgment, the armed intervention of the Soviet Communist forces and the Warsaw Pact Powers is to curb or crush the policy of liberalisation started and accepted by the Czech Communist Party. That is one of the reasons. The second reason, according to my judgment, is that they wanted to suppress the human freedom and liberty that was sought to be given to the Czech people by the Czech Communist Party. In the light of these two points, the conclusion is that this armed intervention by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact powers is a crime against humanity and a crime against human values cherished by mankind.

Then, this armed intervention militates against certain principles. It militates against the principles of international law itself.

Just as we have accepted the theory of fundamental rights for individuals, likewise there is also the theory of fundamental rights of the nations, and these fundamental rights of the nations are accepted by all civilised countries, or if I may put it on a broader basis, by civilised or uncivilised countries. These fundamental rights speak of several rights. The first is the right to exist. I need not trouble you by reading a long chapter, but I shall deal only with four or five very fundamental rights recognised and accepted and appreciated by all civilised countries. These fundamental rights of the nations are in existence right from 1916. They are:

1. Every nation has the right to exist and to protect and to conserve its existence.
2. Every nation has the right to independence in the sense that it has the right to pursuit of happiness and is free to develop itself without interference or control from other States.
3. Every nation is in law and before the law the equal of every other nation belonging to the society of nations."

So, this speaks of equality of sovereign States. The fourth one is:

4. Every nation has the right to territory within defined boundaries and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over its territory."

If all these fundamental rights are taken into consideration, I may conclude that the armed intervention by the Soviet Union militates against and destroys these fundamental rights recognised by the civilised countries. It also militates against the right to exist. What is meant by this right to exist? I shall just read out only one line in this regard.

"The science of international law has recognised the right of national existence."

This is a primary law of human action. If the armed forces are to march over,

and in fact, they have already marched over and taken possession by this time of Czechoslovakia, then it militates against and destroys the very principle of the right of national existence. It also militates against and deprives the nation of the right to independence. In regard to the right to independence again, I would just like to read out one small line. I am reading from page 297 of *International Law* by Charles G. Fenwick. It contains three propositions again. The term of freedom or independence of State means,

'freedom of the State from control of any other State.'

It means that no other State has any right to have any sort of control or any kind of control on any other nation.

It is the first proposition. In simple language, this speaks of the right of 'national self-government'. That is exactly the point against which the armed intervention militates.

The second proposition connotes the supreme power of a state to determine the relation it desires to maintain with other states without interference on the part of any other third state.

The third proposition, which deals with the right of independence connotes sovereignty. Sovereignty may be defined in this connection as an independent personality of the state in its relations with other members of the international community. In other words, it again speaks of the right of equality of sovereign states, or sovereignty of States.

This armed intervention also militates against the right of self-determination. The concept of the right of self-determination need not be explained. In simple language, it speaks of the right of a people to follow their own way and method of life. The liberalisation movement started in Czechoslovakia is sought to be destroyed by armed intervention.

Then I come to my last two points --- and I have done. This armed inter-

[Shri R. D. Bhandare]

vention militates against the charter of the UN, article 2(1), (2) (3) and (4). I quote article 2:

"The Organisation and its Members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in Article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The Organisation is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members".

Now here, on the one hand, is Czechoslovakia, and on the other hand, the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact countries. The latter are denying the right of equality of sovereign States and equality to Czechoslovakia.

- "2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter".

So the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact States are not prepared to recognise and fulfil the obligations in sub-article 2.

- "3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered".

Here was an attempt by the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the rulers of that country to have some sort of understanding. They tried to meet in conference; they tried to persuade the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries to settle all disputes peacefully. In fact a resolution was passed. But as soon as the conference was over, the armed forces of the other countries marched into Czechoslovakia. Therefore, my submission is that it militates against even sub-article 3 of Art. 2 of the UN Charter.

- "4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force

against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations".

Here the territory of Czechoslovakia is violated and the whole of the country is taken possession of. I, therefore, conclude that such an act is deplorable and reprehensible.

AN HON. MEMBER: And condemnable.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: He may be very strong in the use of words; I may not be. But the fact remains as I have stated. Looking at the statement of affirmation of principles, of fundamentals of international law, in the statement made by the Prime Minister and the other declarations which I have quoted a little while ago, I hope that this House will accept the Motion moved by me. . . .

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): We shall with the necessary amendments.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: . . . so that the intention of India and the position taken by us will be made quite clear to the whole world. With these words, I have done.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That this House do consider the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia."

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: What about our motions?

MR. SPEAKER: There are a number of amendments. I shall call the names of hon. Members. Their amendments will be treated as moved. Shri Tenneti Viswanatham, Shri Hem Barua, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, Dr. Karni Singh, Shri M. R. Masani, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, Shri Bal Raj Madhok and others, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Rabi Roy, Shri Sequiera,

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, Shri Yashwant Singh Kushwah, Shri S. M. Joshi, Shri Abdul Ghani Dar. The amendments standing in the names of these hon. Members are treated as moved — all of them. We have to regulate the time. A large number of hon. Members, almost half of them want to speak on this. We have got 3½ hours. As is the practice, we have given time to each party. Within the time available, we are dividing it between the Opposition and the Congress Benches. If each party nominates one representative, it will be good. The Independents will get two because they are the biggest party here. I appeal to the other hon. friends not to mistake me if I cannot give a chance to all of them.

**SHRI RANGA:** You should try to extend it by one hour.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is invariably done. Even assuming that I extend the time by one hour, I do not think I shall be able to accommodate all the friends from the Congress Benches. I have no objection. That is always understood, even without your asking. I am getting a number of chits from the parties and also independents. There is no use dividing among members of the same party the time available for that party. For instance, the PSP gets seven minutes. If it is divided among two Members, it does not help. Then some Members from the parties are sending me names separately, apart from the speakers indicated to me here officially — not the PSP. I do not want to mention the names. If I am not able to accommodate all of them, I request them to excuse me.

**SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam):** I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry

of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, condemns the naked aggression on Czechoslovakia, committed by the Soviet Union and four other countries on 21-8-1968.” (1)

**SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai):**  
I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, condemns in the most vigorous terms the armed attack on the peace-loving people of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union in collusion with some of the Warsaw-pact allies of the Soviet Union and since this brutal onslaught on the brave people of Czechoslovakia constitutes a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity of a nation and the rights of the people to liberty and freedom, a fact that poses a grave challenge to the values cherished by humanity and since this naked aggression constitutes a flagrant violation of the U.N. Charter calls upon the Government to bring the fact of this brutal aggression to the platform of the UNO forthwith.” (2)

**श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :**  
मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर यह रखा जाये, अर्थात्—

“यह सभा रूस तथा वारसा संधि के कुछ अन्य राष्ट्रों की सशस्त्र सेनाओं के चेकोस्लोवाकिया में प्रवेश के बारे में 21 अगस्त, 1968 को सभा में प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा दिये गये वक्तव्य पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, चेकोस्लोवाकिया पर रूस एवं वारसा संधि के सदस्य राष्ट्रों द्वारा किये गये वीभत्स और अमानवीय आक्रमण की घोर निन्दा करती है।” (3)

DR. KARNI SINGH (Bikaner): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, condemns this aggression as uncivilised behaviour in international relations and further urges upon the aggressor countries to vacate such aggression immediately in the interest of international peace." (4)

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, condemns the naked aggression by the Soviet union and its accomplices and denounces it as a violation of human freedom and a threat to world peace." (5)

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, deeply deplores the aggression against Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and some other Warsaw Pact countries." (6)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, strongly condemns the armed entry of the troops of the Soviet Russia and its Warsaw Pact Allies into Czechoslovakia as a wanton act of aggression against a peaceful neighbour and calls upon all peace-loving Nations of the world to lend full support to the Czechoslovakian People and their leader Dubcek in their movement to assert their National Independence and right to determine their way of life freely." (7)

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, condemns the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia, and calls upon the Government to use its good offices to secure the withdrawal of the invading forces." (8)

SHRI RABI RAY: I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, condemns the naked aggression on peace-loving, independent socialist Czechoslovakia by the USSR and her Warsaw Pact allies; and further demands that the Russian and her allied armies withdraw immediately from Czechoslovakia territory; and further

urges the Government of India to initiate steps in every national and international forums to defend the sovereignty and integrity of Czechoslovakia, a country whose friendship with India is based on ties much stronger than those that bind most other nations; and further expresses the solidarity of the people of India with the people of Czechoslovakia." (9)

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA (Marmagao): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, do insist that the Government condemn the entry of foreign armed forces into the soil of the sovereign State of Czechoslovakia and calls especially upon our friendly relations with the USSR to secure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of these forces from Czechoslovakian soil." (10)

SHRI K. D. TRIPATHI (Unnao): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, is of the opinion that whereas the Soviet Union and her Warsaw-Pact allies have committed an international outrage by forcibly occupying Czechoslovakia and have thereby gravely endangered world peace;

And whereas India has always raised her voice of disapproval of any action that undermines the principles of non-interference by one country in the affairs of another country, respect for sovereignty and

independence of nations, and peaceful co-existence, expresses its fullest sympathy with the valiant people of Czechoslovakia under the leadership of their legally constituted Government and calls upon the Government of India to take effective steps in unison with the non-aligned nations for restoration of the *status quo ante* in Czechoslovakia as it existed on August 20, 1968." (11)

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, is of the opinion that there has been a clear violation of the U.N. Charter by the U.S.S.R. and some of the Warsaw Pact Powers." (12)

श्री यशवन्त सिंह कुशावाह (भिड़) :  
 मैं प्रस्ताव करना हूँ कि मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर यह रखा जाये, अर्थात्—

"यह सभा रुम तथा वारसा संधि के कुछ अन्य राष्ट्रों की सशस्त्र सेनाओं के चेकोस्लोवाकिया में प्रवेश के बारे में 21 अगस्त, 1968 को सभा में प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा दिये गये वक्तव्य पर विचार करने के पश्चात् गहरी चिन्ता प्रकट करने हुए रुम तथा वारसा संधि के राष्ट्रों से अपील करती है कि वे अबिलम्ब अपनी सेनायें चेकोस्लावाकिया से वापस ले जायें, क्योंकि हर राष्ट्र को अपनी स्वाधीनता और सार्वभौमिकता की रक्षा का अधिकार है और विश्व के समस्त राष्ट्रों को हर राष्ट्र के इस मूलभूत अधिकार का सम्मान करना चाहिए।" (13)

SHRI S. M. JOSHI (Poona): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime

[Shri S. M. Joshi]

Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, condemns the military intervention in Czechoslovakia, a Sovereign State and a member of the United Nations." (14)

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR (Gurgaon): I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, calls upon the Government to raise voice in U.N.O. that U.S.S.R. withdraw their forces immediately from Czechoslovakia." (15)

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot): I rise to speak in support of the substitute motion tabled by my party which seeks to "condemn the naked aggression of the Soviet Union and its accomplices" and to denounce it as "a violation of human freedom and a threat to world peace."

In the last twenty-four hours one had the feeling of having to live through a bad dream all over again. It seemed to have happened somewhere, sometime. Indeed, it did happen: it happened, almost with a family likeness, in November 1956 in the neighbouring country of Hungary, in the capital of that country, Budapest, when in very similar circumstances Soviet tanks invaded Budapest, destroyed the legitimate Government of that country, imposed a miserable, puppet regime under Kadar and snuffed out the voice of Hungary even under a communist Government.

Once again, it is all happening, twelve years later. One wonders: is there to be no end to this kind of naked Imperialism at this stage late in the 20th century? What was the crime of the Czech communists? It could be summarised in one sentence.

They wanted to give a human, decent face to what they called "socialism". Their objectives are such that every Member of this House — with perhaps rare exceptions — would accept in our country — the restoration of the rights of the Press, writers and artists, liberalisation of the economy, perhaps in the direction of Yugoslav improvisations; and finally, democracy within the communist party; even in the one-party State. That democracy, we were told, was to take such innocent, positive forms as the freedom to criticise the leaders of the party at party meetings; the freedom to join the party and to **resign at will**, which seems to have been denied to Mr. Kosygin, judging by reports from Moscow and elsewhere yesterday; and the right to elect party office-bearers by secret ballot! This was the crime for which the bandits in the Kremlin thought it necessary to send in their tanks.

Why should they do it? The answer is obvious. Because they are frightened about the wrath and the rising of their own people, who are beginning to show the same signs of the urge for limited freedom as elsewhere. And they know something which we ought to remember: that freedom is indivisible. They do not want freedom to raise its head anywhere on the other side of the Iron Curtain in case it spreads into their own homeland.

I am sure that this House would like to extend its sympathies and to raise the voice of solidarity with, the Government and the people of Czechoslovakia.

It is for the third time in a lifetime that these unfortunate people have had to endure an invasion and an occupation of their country. The first one was by Hitler in 1938. At that time, Winston Churchill had said: "Such an episode is not simply an attack upon Czechoslovakia; it is an outrage against the civilisation and freedom of the whole world." The second attack came in February, 1948, when these same men from the Kremlin overthrew the legitimate government of Benes and Masaryk, imprisoned President

Benes and sent the younger Masaryk either to his death by suicide or murder. And now, for the third time, the brave people of Czechoslovakia are seeking to resist the destruction of their freedom. Young men are fighting with Molotov cocktails against Soviet tanks, but it is interesting to see that the mass of the people are resorting to civil disobedience, to non-violent resistance. They are lying down in front of the tanks and asking the tanks to run over them. They are showing a solidarity and a morale which should evoke the admiration of the world. Twenty-four hours have passed and they have not found a Quisling or a Kadar to come forward and form a puppet government yet. It is no mean achievement in a country where the communist party was in government, so that stooges would be readily available. We honour them for their brave resistance, for the recognition of realities, consisting in the fact that young Czechoslovakians in the streets are shouting "Gestapo", "Fascists" at those who are manning the tanks, recognising the basic similarity between the Fascists of the right and the Fascists of the left, that between them there is nothing to choose. They have learnt their lesson. Have we?

What are the lessons that we have to learn from this? The first is that, the entire understanding of the Soviet system as it has been preached to us from certain sections of our national leadership has proved to be entirely unfounded. I have been hearing for the last few years about the need to change in respect of the Soviet Union, about the need to shake hands with the men of the Kremlin, about the need to visit the Soviet Union and learn from their great advances, because I was told that now the Soviet system had "liberalised": that communism had "a new face". That is the face we are seeing today, the same hard face behind the mask, the same iron fist beneath the glove. It is exactly the same thing that was seen in the days of Stalin: there is no change; not a change in fundamentals. In fact, there is increasing decay and degeneration in the Soviet imperialist dictatorship.

In 1948, Stalin was there, that blood-thirsty monster whom Khrushchev denounced in appropriate terms after his death but whom we denounced while he was still alive. He was there. And yet what happened? When Tito rebelled -- what Tito did in 1948, the Czechoslovak leaders are doing today -- that horrible man, Stalin, did not move; he did not send his tanks into Yugoslavia, with the result that Yugoslavia is free and Marshal Tito is a colleague, in the non-aligned conferences, of our own Prime Minister.

I am glad to say that as a result of that abstention on the part of Stalin which Kosygin and Brezhnev could not show, today four Ministers of the Czechoslovak Government have reached Yugoslov territory and are functioning in the name of that country. It may be correct to say that, after the Bratislava Conference, where the moderates were in a majority, where Kosygin had his way and the Politburo majority decided to sign a pact with Czechoslovakia, when they got back to Moscow, the Stalinists took over and Brezhnev and the majority that developed overthrew Kosygin, who is today a prisoner in his Premiership. In the light of what I have just said about 1948 and Tito, is it not being unfair to the memory of Stalin to describe the present events as the action of the Stalinists? Because Marshal Stalin did not do what they have done. He held his hand; he allowed Yugoslavia to get freedom. Perhaps they should be called Maoists.

What has happened has very grave implications for the security of our country and its frontiers. For some years now our Government thought that they were being clever, clever in trying to play off Moscow against Peking! Let them beware. That schism is coming near its end and a rapprochement between Peking and the Stalinists or neo-Maoists in Moscow is in the making. When that takes place, the entire foreign policy of this Government is going to crumble and this country will have to evolve a new foreign policy. These events, coming within weeks of the decision of the

[Shri M. R. Masani]  
same government in the Kremlin to arm Pakistan a few days ago, are a grave warning.

Now, let us look at the world reaction and let us look at our own reaction. Leading statesmen of almost all the free countries of the world have spoken by now. Yesterday our Prime Minister made a statement. She said "India has always raised her voice whenever certain principles have been violated". If that is so, why not now? I was very glad to hear from the hon. Member from the Congress Benches a fair, honest and forthright exposition of the facts and the law on the the subject. But, then, why not accept our amendments which in terms mention what he says in his speech? What is inaccurate about saying that the Soviet action is a violation of the United Nations Charter, a violation of international law and an act of naked aggression? Why should not the House go on record to endorse Shri Bhandare's propositions?

Why was it that yesterday we had a miserable performance from our Prime Minister? She kept on repeating her "concern" at what had happened in Czechoslovakia. But she did not have the guts to condemn, or even deplore the outright act of aggression and breach of international law. Why did she keep on referring — I am quoting from that statement — twice to "events in Czechoslovakia" and "the turn of events"? Why not describe the events? Why not say what these events were? Why not call a spade a spade, or at least a shovel. Why turn to the Oxford dictionary and describe it as "a tool for digging and cutting ground, turf, etc., with a sharp edged blade and wooden handle, used with both hands"?

Yesterday the Prime Minister tried to take shelter in an alibi when she said that with the sole exception of the Prime Minister of Australia, no world statesman or government had been so brash as to say anything as we had suggested to her in the House. Let me now quote what the Prime Minister of Australia has said, which

is a notable statement which we could well emulate. In the course of a statement Mr. Gorton, who entertained Mrs. Gandhi only a few weeks ago in Australia, says:

"At this point I do state most firmly that in the view of the Australian Government such interference in the affairs of an independent country is to be condemned.

Furthermore, armed threats and armed intervention, particularly since they appear to be motivated merely by a desire for oppression of freedom of thought in that independent country, are a most serious breach of the United Nations Charter, of international law and practice, and are deplored completely and utterly by the Australian Government.

It must be a matter which has saddened all those who had hoped that there might be in the Communist world some relaxation of this central dogma, of this central tyranny, which has for so long been imposed, and that we might be reaching a stage where freedom would be allowed in those countries which now appear clearly to be colonies in fact of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

But Mr. Gorton is no longer alone. In the twenty-four hours that have passed many people have spoken.

There is the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Michel Stewart, who announced yesterday that Britain was taking this matter to the U.N. Security Council. The German Government leaders have described Soviet action as "a clear violation of Czech sovereignty and interference in the internal affairs of that country." President de Gaulle, the great neutralist and friend of the Soviet Union, has described the Soviet action as "a blow to the rights and destiny of a friendly nation." U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations has denounced the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia as "a blow to the world order and East-West relations." And then, finally, our Prime

Minister's non-aligned colleague, Mr. Tito, has condemned the Soviet invasion as "a violation of the sovereignty of a socialist country." He said: "The sovereignty of a socialist country has been violated and a severe blow struck at socialist and progressive forces in the world." Now that other world leaders have spoken, may we now appeal to our Prime Minister at least to bring up the rear? Or, will she allow the hereditary colour blindness, an ailment which she has inherited, to help her to maintain the guilty silence which she maintained yesterday?

Now, Sir, the duty of India is quite clear and on behalf of my party I make three demands of the Government, if they want to hold up to the honour of India. Do we not remember the years after the events in Hungary when we had to hang our heads in shame because we discovered what had happened only after the whole chapter was closed? Now, Sir, the Government of Czechoslovakia is still functioning and today there is still hope that the tanks may go back, as Mr. Khrushchev turned back when he tried to send naval forces to Cuba, when President Kennedy threatened. And so, our first demand is this: We demand the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet forces and the restoration of the normal functioning of the legitimate Government of Czechoslovakia.

Our second demand is this: in case a Quisling is found, a Kadar is found, a puppet is found, to go on the Soviet Radio to declare himself to be the Government of Czechoslovakia, that we do not recognise that puppet Government. We should withdraw our Ambassador and suspend our diplomatic relations till such time as Czechoslovakia has at least a communist Government of its own choice.

And thirdly, Sir, I think, the time has come for the country to demand that our Government, or parts of it, give up their policy of acting as satellites of the Soviet Union which has disgraced our country in the last year or two.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in this grave moment of the world events, I rise to support the statement that has been made by the Prime Minister yesterday. Sir, while supporting the statement, I have moved an amendment and I would like to read my amendment which says as follows:

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

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, is of the opinion that there has been a clear violation of the U.N. Charter by the U.S.S.R. and some of the Warsaw Pact powers."

Sir, this outrageous act of the USSR and some of the Warsaw Pact countries has created great resentment and deep shock in world opinion.

As our friends have clearly stated, this is an unprecedented act of naked aggression in the history of the world. Sir, we were shocked to hear that because Czechoslovakia wanted certain liberalism to be introduced in its thinking and they wanted to develop the socialistic pattern of society in the manner in which they wanted it, Soviet Russia could not tolerate this temerity of the peace-loving people of Czechoslovakia.

World opinion—from President Johnson to Marshal Tito, everybody—has expressed its resentment. The four big powers even moved a resolution in the Security Council, which was passed by an overwhelming majority, condemning the action of the Soviet Government.

As every aggressor will do, the *Tass* has come out with a justification of this aggression on Czechoslovakia. But, unfortunately, it has found its echo not in any other world press but in the Indian *Pravda*. If you would see the editorial of the *Patriot*, you would

[Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah] find how truthfully and faithfully it has reflected the feeling of *Tass* in Moscow. The plea that has been made out is that some leaders had invited the military intervention to set right things and put Czechoslovakia on a sound footing. If this analogy is taken to its logical conclusion, a day may not be far off when Shri Dange may also invite the Russian Government to set right things in our country.

The intention of the Soviet Union was clear when they started manoeuvres on the borders of Czechoslovakia and wanted to browbeat and threaten the reformist Prime Minister, as they called Mr. Dubcek, into bowing to that fact. But the great freedom fighter, as Mr. Dubcek is, who was able to represent the insurgence, opinion and emotions of the people, was not prepared to oblige the Soviet Union. He had done so not because he was against the hand of friendship that had been extended by Soviet Russia but because the Warsaw Pact had also enjoined certain obligations on these powers.

For the information of this hon. House I would read the relevant article of the Warsaw Pact. Article 1 of the Warsaw Pact says:—

“The contracting parties pledge themselves in conformity with the Charter of the UN to refrain in their international relations from threat or use of force and to resolve their international disputes by peaceful means in such a way so as to not threaten international peace and security.”

I am not quoting from the UN Charter; I am quoting from the Warsaw Pact that had been entered into by all these powers.

It is not as though it is a move that has been set afoot now by the Soviet Union with its satellite allies, like Hungary, Poland, East Germany and other countries. One could see that in the Soviet Union the struggle has already started and been intensified.

After the eclipse of the Stalin era a sort of reformist movement, as has been evidenced in Czechoslovakia, had started in the Soviet Union too with the advent to power of Khrushchev. We could find the change towards liberalism, the attitude of the Soviet people changing and the concept of socialism and communism having new dimensions. The Stalinist hard core were lying low and were waiting only for a time to dethrone the Kosygin Government and re-establish the dictatorial regime. We do not know what is happening in the Kremlin; may be, a civil war is going on there and we would not be surprised that, as we have seen yesterday, Kosygin and the Defence Minister have resigned. We do not know that by the time we go to our houses we may also hear other things.

This infighting that is going on in Soviet Russia is reflecting its repercussions in Czechoslovakia. On that score I do not minimise the friendship that we have for the people of USSR and other countries of the Warsaw Pact. It is not our intention to cast any aspersions over the aspirations and legitimate rights of the people of these countries. Our anxiety is as one of the participants of the U.N. Charter, as one of the champions of the human rights and as one of those who firmly believe in the integrity and sovereignty of every nation, whatever may be its size and population.

We fought for that. The Father of the Nation has taught this country how to fight the mighty imperialism whatever may be its armed strength. We have inherited the noble principles of the Father of the Nation. We are the first to denounce aggression wherever it is. As our Prime Minister pointed out, very rightly, even when an independent country, when Hitler committed aggression on Czechoslovakia, it was the late Prime Minister Panditji who raised his voice against the naked aggression. When there was the Suez crisis, it was he who raised his voice. The voice is the moral authority of India has had its way.

I am glad our Prime Minister, without waiting for important world leaders to express their opinion, has come forward to denounce aggression.....  
(Interruptions) Yes, yes. It has been in no unmistakable terms. As a non-violent nation, we do not believe in words but in deeds. We have expressed our opinion in unmistakable terms. If we could go through the statement of the Prime Minister, as has been clearly enunciated by my hon. friend, Shri Bhandare, we could see that in no unmistakable terms we have called the spade as spade. There is no mincing of matters.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: What are your instructions to the Indian Delegation to the United Nations?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: In our relationship on international affairs, when we deal with friendly countries, when we deal with independent and sovereign countries, what language does Mr. Sondhi want to use? Does he want to use the language which he uses here?

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): The language of the Oxford dictionary. (Interruption).

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: It is an international etiquette. What more can a friendly country express?

I really appreciate the stand taken by our Prime Minister. It will, certainly, go down in history. I say, at the right time, a call has been given by the leader of a great and big nation in the world. We have done our duty. At the same time, we have also expressed our anxiety, our concern, at the manner in which some of our friendly countries, like, Hungary, Poland, etc., with whom we have got friendly relations, have also succumbed to this sort of thing. There is a clear move, knowingly or unknowingly, consciously or unconsciously, whatever it may be, that the big powers have come to think that by using nuclear weapons, the whole humanity will be destroyed and so they are reverting back to the conventional war-

fare to see that the periphery of their country toes their line and be their satellites and they feel, even with a slight violation of toeing their line, that their independence or their security may be in jeopardy. That has been clearly reflected.

You could see the strategic position of Czechoslovakia and also the countries that are around Russia and you could also see the wave of liberalisation that is flowing right from Yugoslavia and Rumania. You could, perhaps, see that the Soviet Union may be feeling that if these people, the intellectuals, the young generation who have got independence of thought and who want to pursue socialism consistent with their national aspirations, want that they should not, any more, play the role of a satellite but rather of a colleague of the Soviet Union, there will be trouble for them. That must have irritated and created a sort of uneasiness in the minds of some of the junta who are trying to usurp power and re-establish the Stalinist cult of communism, whatever it is.

So, this fact must be borne in mind and I would humbly suggest to the leaders of the Opposition that the Prime Minister's statement is inconsistent with our national dignity, with our national honour, with our firm belief in the policy of peaceful co-existence and also in our dealings with international affairs.

Mr. Masani has brought an amendment on behalf of his Party. I would only request the members of the political parties that at least in this they must be careful. I have been seeing that, whenever it is convenient to denounce this party in power, they are prepared to join hands even with the Communists.....(Interruptions). I have got the greatest respect for Mr. Nath Pai; he has got a broad vision; he believes in nationalism and not in the internationalism preached by our Communist friends, for whom internationalism is superior to nationalism and nationalism does not come anywhere for them. Even for medical treatment they want internationalism. None of

[Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah]

their leaders has even medical check-up in India; they find good doctors and nursing homes in Moscow and other places. I have no quarrel with them on this. My grievance with the political parties is this. The time has come when they should realise that this sort of honeymooning, temporary honeymooning for the sake of some political gains, will not be in the interest of Parliamentary democracy in this country. We are facing a gravest threat in the history of the world. Indian Parliamentary democracy must survive. It should survive so that it may act as a bulwark not only against communism but also against bourgeoisism, imperialism and capitalism. Indian democracy is a beacon light to all these countries. So, I would request the political parties not to go in for short-term gains but to go in for the long-term gain of preserving the Parliamentary democracy in this country.

With these few words, I support the Hon. Prime Minister's statement.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK** (South Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I commend to this Hon. House the amendment that has been moved to the motion of Shri R. D. Bhandare by my Party. I wish we had no need to move this amendment. There would have been no need for it if the Prime Minister had come out with a statement which would have been worthy of her, worthy of this House and worthy of our great country. She, no doubt, expressed her anguish, the anguish of this country, over what has happened in Czechoslovakia, but she failed to condemn what the Russians have done there and what other members of the Warsaw Pact have done there. I wonder why she faltered in her duty. After all, she is the daughter of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Whatever other shortcomings there might have been in the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we all bow to him for his advocacy of freedom; whenever there was aggression anywhere, he always came forward in condemnation of it in the strongest possible

terms. That, we were expecting from the Prime Minister. The world expected India, the biggest and the largest democracy in the world, to come out in the strongest terms in condemnation of what has been done in Czechoslovakia.

What is the crime that the Czechoslovakian people have done? They are a communist country. They claim to be communist; they continue to be socialist. Their only crime was that they wanted to have some liberalisation of its system. Their only crime was that they wanted to have some democracy in their country. At the same time they wanted to maintain their links with the Soviet Union and with the other Warsaw Pact countries. For that crime of having some liberal constitution, of having some freedom, they are being destroyed. They are being destroyed, they are being attacked, in the name of suppressing a counter-revolution. Our communist friends say that there is a counter-revolution, there is a threat to socialism; so Russia has the right to come in. May I ask them: "Where is your slogan of 'Workers of the world, unite'?" Is this the way of uniting the workers of the world? Are the people of Czechoslovakia not human beings? Are they not workers? Have they no right to shape their destiny as they want?

15 HRS.

So what Russia has done now has clearly proved that there is no difference between communism and nazism. Actually both are the same. Both look upon Hegal as their God-father. For both, the state is everything. Both want one state, one party, one leader. Both want to use their power to destroy every vestige of freedom wherever it exists. Therefore, it was the duty of every freedom-loving Indian, every freedom-loving human being, to condemn what has happened there.

Actually, what is the position? The Government of Czechoslovakia have issued a declaration—I think it is worth

reading. They issued the proclamation on'y yesterday. Therein they say:

"We consider it a violation of international law and the provisions of the Warsaw Pact and the principles of equal relations among nations".

The Warsaw Pact, by which the Russians swear, to which the other invaders of Czechoslovakia also adhere, says in clause 8:

"The contracting parties declare that they will act in the spirit of friendship and co-operation with the aim of further developing and strengthening the economic and cultural relations between them, following the principles of mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs".

This is the Warsaw Pact and it is these very countries which are signatories to it which are invading Czechoslovakia now.

It has been said that the Russian armies have marched into Czechoslovakia on the invitation of the Czechoslovak leaders. I want to know who are the people, who are the leaders who have invited the Russian armies, the Polish armies and other armies to enter Czechoslovakia. Who are the quislings? We know the long history of quislings. The Russians have been depending upon them. There may be some quislings here also. Therefore, we should be careful about them. There may be some in the ruling party also. Of course, on this side we have a number of them.

I want to put some specific questions. I want to know who are the quislings, who are the people who have invited the Russians there. Have the Government of India any information? Have they made any enquiry from the Czech Embassy here, and have they sympathised with them? My information is that our Government have even refused to properly deal with the Czech Embassy here.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): You are wrong.

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK: I wish I was wrong. I am prepared to be corrected. But I understand that only a very junior officer of the Government of India went there to talk with them. I think it was the duty of the Government of India to immediately contact the Czech Embassy here and sympathise with them and tell them that the 'Government and people of India sympathise with you in your travail; we are with you and express our solidarity with you'. But nothing of the sort has been done. Not only that; efforts are being made to minimise the whole thing.....

SHRI NATH PAI: As usual.

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK: Of course, I have nothing to say about the communists. But I want to ask: is it a fact that only the day before, the editor of the Indian 'Pravda' has gone to Moscow? Is it a fact that the editor of *Patriot* has gone there to get instructions from the mentors there? Is it a fact that our Government have released the foreign exchange for this trip of his to get instructions?

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK: Shri Narayanan, editor of *Patriot*.

I would specifically like the Government to make its position clear in this matter. So far as the people of India are concerned, we want to make it clear that this is not a thing which concerns them only. It is a question of morality; it is a question of humanity; above all, it is a question of national rights. We who stand for some kind of international morality, we who stand for some kind of principles governing relations between different nations, have a right today to ask the Russians, who even today swear by the Charter of the UN, whether the independence and freedom of

Czechoslovakia can be so trampled under foot by its powerful neighbours. Today it is Czechoslovakia; tomorrow it may be Rumania's turn. It can be our turn also. Let us not forget because such countries are surrounding us also and such dangers are developing around our country also. We have also quislings in our country who are prepared to play the game of the so-called peoples' democracies of Russia and China. Our own interests demand that such things are not perpetrated and therefore, I want to make some specific suggestions which I think this Government will seriously consider and work upon.

Firstly, we should make it clear that we do not want to give recognition to any Czech Government that might be set up by the Russians in Czechoslovakia. The lawful Government of that country is not yet gone. They have issued a proclamation in which they have given instructions to their people and have also made some specific demands. The proclamation says:

"We categorically demand the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the five Warsaw Pact States and full respect for the State sovereignty of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in accordance with the provisions of the Warsaw Pact. We urgently request the military commands of the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Bulgarian People's Republic to issue orders to stop military actions causing bloodshed and damage to the economy of our country. We demand that normal conditions be immediately restored to enable the constitutional organs of the Republic to discharge their constitutional functions. We demand the release of all members of these organs so that they can resume their normal work."

These are the demands put forth by the lawful Government of Czechoslovakia. When that country was in-

vaded, they sent a delegation to the Soviet Embassy in Prague led by the Speaker of their Parliament to argue with them to stop this kind of thing. But that delegation has been detained; it has not come back. The President, the Prime Minister and the other leaders have all been detained. We should join Czechoslovakia in demanding that the delegation should be released; they should release all the leaders of the Government including the President and the Prime Minister so that they could function in freedom. If they do not do so, we should not recognise any Government that might be set up by the Russians in Czechoslovakia. Even if the lawful Government were to function from outside Czechoslovakia—it is quite possible that they might be hounded out of that country—we should recognise them and not recognise the Government set up by the Russians.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is going to meet very soon and India must take the initiative in raising the question of Czechoslovakia preservation of peace and freedom and democracy there. We should not wait for the others; we should take the initiative. We can join other countries also to deal with this matter in an honourable way.

Thirdly, we have been concerning ourselves with all kinds of affairs, wherever they arise, even where we are not directly involved. But here is a matter in which we are directly involved. We have the closest relations with the East European countries and we have a long history of friendship with Czechoslovakia and those countries have been helping us in so many ways. Peace and war are indivisible. If peace is disturbed and war is forced in Europe, nobody can be sure that it will remain confined to Europe alone and will not engulf the whole world. Therefore, we have a direct interest in seeing that peace is maintained and the world is not engulfed in war by the aggressive actions of Russia and Poland. Therefore, we should take the diplomatic initiative and we should

move the like minded nations and non-aligned countries. Tito is there; he has been taking some initiative in so many matters. Only recently, he visited Prague and some of the Ministers of Prague are in Yugoslavia. We should take the initiative and call all these people to an international conference of all the countries who stand for freedom and democracy. We should mobilise world public opinion so that this aggression can be vacated.

I want to make one point very clear. We do not look upon this as a party question; it is a national question. We are expressing the national will. There may be some quislings here or some Russian and Chinese patriots who may not agree with what I say. But they are Russian and Chinese patriots and we need not bother about them. But so far as Indians are concerned, all the nationalists and all the democrats are of one mind.

If Government, therefore, accept the amendment moved by two senior Members of the Congress Party, namely Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, then I shall be prepared to withdraw my amendment, so that the whole House may express its opinion in a unanimous way and in a dignified way in favour of that amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Hanumanthaiya.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी आपने कहा था कि माननीय सदस्य, श्री मधु लिमये और श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीज़ आदि, को मैजिस्ट्रेट के सामने पेश किया जा रहा है। लेकिन स्थिति यह है कि उन को तिहाड़ जेल में रखा गया है, उन को खाने के लिए कुछ नहीं दिया गया है, पीने के लिए पानी नहीं दिया गया है।

MR. SPEAKER: For the information of the hon. Member I may tell him that I have asked the Home Minister to make a statement. On his behalf and on behalf of the House I have already asked him.

श्री रवि राय : पालियामेंट के सदस्यों के साथ ऐसा व्यवहार किया जा रहा है कि उनको खाने पीने के लिए कुछ नहीं दिया गया है। क्या वे आदमी नहीं हैं? अभी अभी श्री जार्ज फ़रनेन्डीज़ का टेलीफ़ोन आया था। उन्होंने बताया कि उन लोगों को खाने पीने के लिए कुछ नहीं दिया गया है।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): They have not been given even food in the jail. We got a telephonic message just now.

श्री रवि राय : क्या पालियामेंट के सदस्यों के साथ ऐसा व्यवहार किया जाना है। इस तरह का अमानुषिक व्यवहार तो आज तक कभी नहीं हुआ था।

श्री निहाल सिंह (चन्दौली) : गृह मंत्री यहाँ पर आ कर इस बारे में वक्तव्य क्यों नहीं देते हैं? पालियामेंट के सदस्यों को खाना नहीं दिया गया है, पानी नहीं दिया गया है।

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a fish market where one can shout. I would like to remind him that he is an hon. Member of this House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Not even food has been given to them. They have not been produced before a magistrate yet. This is most unfair.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already heard the leader of their party.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: There is no question of party. This is above party. Let the Home Minister go to the Tihar Jail and see the position for himself. There is a lady also there.

श्री रवि राय : सरकार उन लोगों के साथ प्रतिहिंसक व्यवहार कर रही है। उन को पानी भी नहीं दिया जा रहा है।

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has said it once, twice and thrice. He has been seconded by Shri S. M. Banerjee also.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI: *Rose* . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I have already heard the leader of the party. Does the hon. Member also want to disturb the debate in the middle?

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप गृह मंत्री को कहें कि माननीय सदस्य जो शिकायत कर रहे हैं, वह उस की जांच कर के सदन में वक्तव्य दें।

MR. SPEAKER: I have already communicated it to the Home Minister and I think he will intervene on this some time during the debate.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let them be given food at least.

MR. SPEAKER: I know that the hon. Member is very sympathetic to the cause for which Shri Madhu Limaye and others have gone there.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: This kind of reflection is unfortunate. Please do not cast any such reflections. I am as much a patriot as you are.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): We have heard so far four speakers, two from the Opposition and two from the Congress Benches. I am one of those who want to say this; if I see a bottle which is partly filled with water, I would rather say that it is half full rather than half empty. When I see the speeches here, I see a remarkable identity of thought, and I see that the feelings are the same. It may be that some Members have used words which may not have been repeated by other Members. But we have to look to the essence of the matter and the essence of the matter is that this House emphatically and unanimously regrets. . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Deplores.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: All right, deplures. . .

SHRI PILOO MODY: And then condemns.

SHRI NATH PAI: Deeply deplures.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: All right. This House deeply deplures the aggression that has been committed by Russia. Russia need not be confronted with the UN Charter and other international agreements.

As has been pointed out by my friends already, the Warsaw Pact itself stipulates in article 8 non-interfere in domestic affairs. But today's Russian communique makes out that the people requested interference and the leaders invited them. But if we strictly and sincerely construe the Warsaw Pact, it would prove that Russia cannot find any justification in international law or in the agreement signed by its own hand with its own satellites.

This is not an opportunity for the Opposition Parties to blame the Prime Minister. Let them bring no-confidence-motion and discuss. . .

SHRI NATH PAI: What for? She has not committed aggression.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: To say on every subject that Government have not done well and have failed would mean repeating the same old argument to which at any rate the Treasury Benches and all of us have become immune. They have to use some fresh medicine because we have become acclimatised to old arguments. No doubt, we deplore and even condemn. But is our work over by saying these words? Does our work conclude? Is our work over with that? I submit that this is only the beginning. Therefore, let us not run away with the impression that since we have given vent to our feelings our work is finished. Really our work begins only now. India is such a country that it has to play a very important role in the future events to come, maybe, in the Security Council, maybe in the General Assembly of the UNO, or maybe, as my hon. friend has suggested, in an international non-aligned conference or something of that kind.

I do not know what steps the Government of India have taken. It is just

two days. It seems to me that they have not been able to play their due role in the world organisation. We are content to keep ourselves in office here, and in the international sphere we are content to watch in the sidelines. That is not an honourable part to play for a great country like India.

Our State symbol contains three lions. They are royal animals. We have not adopted as our State symbol buffalos, which keep themselves indifferent to the passing traffic on the road. Our leadership must assert itself and show the right path. There was an occasion when we had played a great part in order to liberate Indonesia. We had called a conference of all the Asian nations and created an atmosphere for colonial countries to get freedom. Here is another great opportunity for India to come on the world scene, take initiative, convene a conference and even move in the Security Council so that this aggression may be vacated. Let the hon. Members please remember that it is not the emphasis on words that matter; it is the word itself that matters. The Prime Minister has categorically said in the statement that the Russian and other satellite forces must be withdrawn from Czechoslovakia. What steps should be taken by the Government of India in order to play the role allotted to it by destiny, I leave it to them. I am sure they will do it. But I give a warning. They have not produced for some years the impression that they are an effective force in the international world. I must make it clear, and I hope and I request that they must wake up. It is not sufficient that they keep themselves in office as Ministers. Nobody will remember after sometime who were the Ministers. The achievement to the credit of the country will endure to their credit and to the good of India.

Russia, for one reason or other, did this: I am not prepared to condemn Russia. Please listen to me. (*Interruption*). Merely because we belong to different parties, and one day we exchange hot words — that does not end our friendship. Russia has been a

friend of India in times of difficulty, and it is not as though Russia will become our enemy hereafter. Maybe for their own reason, maybe for not sufficient reason, maybe also for wrong reason, they have taken a wrong step. If there is anybody in the world who can persuade Russia, it is only India and no other country. And I want India to exercise that good influence with them, not by condemnatory attitude, but by persuasion. (*Interruption*) You are never capable of placating and that is why you remain all the time in the Opposition. Placating is also a form of winning friends, and therefore, do not decry that word.

Now, Sir, Russia has to be persuaded. I want to tell Russia that it is a great country. It need not depend upon a small country like Czechoslovakia, or any capitalist countries for its protection. It is so strong that it can stand by itself and defy the world. Why should such a mighty country trample over a small country? (*Interruption*) It is not heroism. If Russia, on the ground of non-compatibility of views on socialism, had any grouse and if it had the courage, it should have done to China what it has done to Czechoslovakia. The contrast of this attitude towards China and Czechoslovakia shows that its courage is not in keeping with its might. Even to restore its own image of correctness and courage, it has to retrace the steps it has taken.

I read some years ago that in the pre-French revolution days several theories were advanced by Rousseau, Voltaire and other great thinkers for the establishment of democracy in the world. One of the reasons for which they wanted democracy to come into existence was to avoid wars and internecine disputes in Europe. They argued that if Kings are there, they will wage war for their own personal glorification or to conquer the territories of some other countries with a selfish motive. They said democracy would banish wars. But when democracy came into existence wars took a more serious turn and they grew into world wars. Similarly, the theory of Marx

that after the establishment of Communism world will have peace and progress in abundance is belied. Today we know what is happening to the Marx thesis. Peace is being shattered by communism in its own domain. China and Russia, the principal proponents of Communism are at loggerheads. Maybe, it is the nuclear weapon that is in the way; otherwise, they could have come to fight. Today if Czechoslovakia takes to arms, it has a mighty army, I do not know what would happen to the world. For some reason or other, Czechoslovakia is passive. It has adopted a policy of passive resistance. But its army today is more than 2½ lakhs and its air force is mighty. It is an industrialised nation. If South Vietnam, a backward country, could put up a great fight against the mighty Americans, surely Czechoslovakia can put up an equally good fight, if not a better fight, against Soviet Russia.

I make this suggestion to some of my hon. friends. The first and concrete step we have to take is to recognise the emigre government of Czechoslovakia. Unless we adopt some such concrete step, we will not be in a position to tell the world that we mean what we say.

So far as our Prime Minister is concerned, instead of condemning her statement, finding fault with her statement, you have to try to understand correctly the words she has used. In the first paragraph she has stated "the ideals by which we stand". In the second and third paragraphs she has clearly suggested the ways that have to be adopted. Instead of blaming the present Prime Minister, please see the difference between the previous Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister in this very matter. When Hungary was invaded, the previous Prime Minister was not able to say as much as this. At least this Prime Minister has the courage to come and say what has been said. While criticising, a discriminating mind will have to see what one has done and what one has not done. It is not as if great men will act always rightly or ordinary men will

always act wrongly. That is a childish attitude to take. If someone has done something good, you have to recognise it, you have to encourage it and you have to give your full support to it.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am speaking on behalf of the Independent Parliamentary Group.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, as an Independent Member of Parliament.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: My substitute motion seeks to condemn the Soviet led invasion of Czechoslovakia and calls upon the government to use its good offices to secure the withdrawal of the invading forces. What is more, I am inclined to agree up to a point with my hon. friend, Shri Masani, when he said that the Prime Minister's statement might have been more categorical, she might have called a spade a spade or even a ruddy spade. But, quite frankly, I am not unhappy with the Prime Minister's statement, and I say that advisedly, because it represents a departure, and in my view a heartening departure, from the shameful attitude that was taken up by Shri Krishna Menon, speaking on behalf of this country, at the General Assembly. Some of us recall vividly what happened at that time. To the shame of India, not on one resolution but paragraph by paragraph, Shri Krishna Menon not only voted against, he abstained from voting when all those paragraphs were directed to secure the withdrawal of Russian invading armies from Hungary. The Prime Minister has rightly referred to the anguish of our people at this invasion. And, indeed, I believe, and I shall say, that every right thinking Indian will be outraged at what has happened and I believe it will outrage the conscience of the people around the world, who subscribe to human freedoms and human rights. And, Sir, in passing, may I mention that it is — to say the least — cynically ironical that Russia should have undertaken this invasion in the so-called Human Rights Year? After the Soviet leaders had recognised the leadership

in Czechoslovakia, after the Czech leaders had talked to them, this invasion which has taken place, to say the least, carries the stigma and a deliberate planning. After talking with them, this action must necessarily assume the characteristics of a deliberate ruse in order to mislead the Czechs and perhaps world leaders and world opinion. These developments have come not only as a shock, but they are saddening. They are sad for me.

Only recently I wrote an article where I underlined the value of Indo-Soviet friendship. I mentioned among other things that while Russian arms aid to Pakistan should make us more cautious, it should not lead to an anti-Russian tirade, it should not undermine Indo-Soviet friendship. I wrote that article very recently. But inevitably what has happened is bound to produce unhappy world consequences. As Mr. Masani has just mentioned, the Secretary-General of the United Nations has denounced the Soviet-led invasion and he has said that it is a blow to world order and East-West relations.

Sir, I was one of those who thought that the present Soviet leadership represented a break from the brutalities in techniques of murder, inhuman oppression and indeed, the political thuggery that represented the Stalinist era and to some extent also the Khrushchev regime. I was one of those who had begun to distinguish between what I thought was a rising liberal trend in the new Russian leadership and the continuing basic — I won't say thuggery — but barbarism, basic barbarism, of the leaders in Peking. There was a welcome thaw and I was among those who believed that under the new Russian leadership the Communist world might become more aware of the values of human and of national freedom. But what has happened, Sir? At one blow all that has been destroyed. What has this Russian invasion underlined, in the final analysis? Sir, it has underlined that in the Communist pattern there is no place for human freedoms, in the communist

pattern there is no place for human decencies, in the basic communist pattern there is no place for the values of the human spirit.

SHRI NAMBIAR: There is nothing to wonder. If the communist regime is so bad which has no value for human beings, what is the harm in removing that system by a military intervention? (*Interruption*)

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna): No harm to you. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli): There is no logic in what the hon. Member says. . . .

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I do not know why my hon. friend Mr. Nambiar should react so violently. I am not pointing a finger at him. The trouble is, they keep fitting the caps to their own heads.

As I was saying, for India there is this ominous development that this invasion of Czechoslovakia represents a reversion of Communist policies to the basic barbarisms of the Stalinist era. That is the ominous part of this invasion.

May I say with all due respect to my hon. friend, Shri Nambiar, that the Russians today have given notice that in the Russian Communist empire there cannot be even a movement towards human freedoms, to some semblance of liberalism in human affairs? I said it before with regard to the Chinese and today it would be applicable to the Russians that insistence on helotry of the individual, helotry for nations at any rate in the Communist orbit, represent the basic and indeed the supreme attributes of Communist dictatorship today.

I have no doubt that what has happened is going to face the world with a major crisis, not only political but in a sense moral. I do not know, there is almost bound to be not only a revival but an intensification of the cold war; but I can see it extending. It will

not be a cold war merely between two super-powers seeking spheres of influence, increasing areas of international hegemony; it will now become a cold war between ideologies that are essentially incompatible — the ideology which we subscribe to in India, the ideology which respects human rights, the ideology which respects values of the human spirit and the ideology which treats with utter cynical disregard human or national rights. That is the cold war as I see it developing.

Finally, I am not a little anxious. My hon. friends have talked about recognising an emigre government. But I wonder whether there will be any emigres. Already tendentious reports are being circulated that the Russian army or the Soviet-led armies went in at the invitation of certain so-called Czech leaders in order to meet counter-revolutionaries and reactionaries. This, we know, is an old, time-worn Communist technique in order to justify interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries. They adopted the same techniques in Hungary.

Mr. Masani referred to Kadar as quisling, but at least at that time the conditions were more opportune to enable the Russians to rationalise their invasion. In the first place, you did have — I do not know how to pronounce his name — Imre Nagy and you had Kadar. The latter is supposed to have invited the Russians in. But nobody has recalled what has happened to poor old Nagy. He and his fellow ministers were abducted by the Russians and murdered in cold blood. There was also the smokescreen provided by the Anglo-French. . . . (*Interruption*)

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA (Gauhati): Sir, on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Under what rule?

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA: Rule 356. It says:—

“The Speaker, after having called the attention of the House to the

conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or in tedious repetition. . . . (*Interruption*).

He is repeating what Shri Masani and other Members have said. You have a right to ask him to discontinue his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure, he would have finished the speech by now.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I would have finished, Sir.

I was saying, Sir, that the Russians had during their invasion of Hungary certain conditions by which they could camouflage their invasion. I was at the point when I was referring to the Anglo-French aggression in the Suez. That was immediately before the invasion of Hungary. So, the Russians said, “Well, what was good enough for the British and the French brazen aggressors is good enough for us Russians in Hungary.” There were those conditions. But today it is going to be very difficult for our Soviet friends to manufacture alibis. They will probably get hold of a stooge. Mr. Masani said that they have not been able to get hold of a suitable stooge yet. But they might get hold of a stooge and put him up with Russian support. We have, after all, got the example of Mr. Ulbricht in East Germany resting on Russian bayonets. But my real fear is this. I hope, this House will express the hope that Mr. Dubcek and his colleagues will not share the fate of Nagy and his colleagues. What I have asked for in my substitute motion is that, apart from taking steps, concerted measures, to help save Czechoslovakia in her struggle for freedom, India will use its good offices *vis-a-vis* the Soviet authorities in an effort to induce them to withdraw their forces.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday the Prime Minister, in her statement, started saying that it was with a heavy heart and deep and profound sense of concern that she was making the statement. I would like only to substitute the word

'concern' with 'shock'. We are profoundly shocked because we have a feeling that we are slipping from civilisation to savagery. We are profoundly shocked because the much cherished socialism which we would like to see succeed in this country is being tarnished by imperialistic doles that are being attached to it.

What is the position? As the Prime Minister has admitted very clearly and unequivocally, the troops have occupied Czechoslovakian territory. Now, the Russians claim that it is at the invitation of the Czech leaders that they have occupied the territory. Here, I would like to point out that this claim is being made after they have occupied it, not before they have occupied it. Till today, till this very minute, there is not a single Czechoslovakian leader who wants, in league with the Russians, to say in so many words that they would have liked to have Russian tanks and troops in Czechoslovakia.

What is it due to? The hon. mover of the motion, Shri Bhandare, said that soon after the Bratislava Convention, they were occupying it. But there was a time lapse. Mr. Masani was telling us that it is due to their process of democratisation and liberalisation that is taking place there that these things have happened. I take a different view of this. This democratisation process had started even before the Bratislava Convention. By that Communique, we got a feeling that the Russians and the Warsaw Pact countries had concurred in the steps taken by Dubcek and others. At that time, he was not termed as a sort of reactionary, as an enemy of communism, as an enemy of socialistic solidarity and all that as it is being applied to him today. What I find from the reports that we get is that in between the issue of the Communique and the movement of troops into the country, there was only one thing that could have attracted the entry of the troops and that is the attempt by the Czechoslovakian National Party to have a dialogue with other nations of the world. They did attempt that. We did

read in the press that they wanted to get some kind of aid from other nations. They wanted to open trade relations and all that.

15.43 HRS.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sir, as a peace-loving nation, if at all we are interested in what we say, namely, to promote the cause of international peace in the world, I am sure, everybody to whichever bloc he may belong has got to welcome this attitude. Even the so-called Socialists who say they are leading the hegemony, being at the top of socialistic solidarity group, did make many an attempt to open their windows in their country in the name of international peace. If that is the reason, it is all the more necessary for us to be very emphatic, in order to preserve international peace, in deploring what has happened there and in saying, as the Prime Minister has rightly said, that the troops should be withdrawn at the earliest opportunity.

15.45 HRS.

Now what is happening? I do not know the thinking of our Government. There are a few amendments, I do not know whether Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani is going to move her amendment and stick to it. . . . (Interruptions) I do not know whether she would stick to it or whether she would withdraw. From what Mr. Venkatasubbaiah said, it seems that they are going to behave as loyal Congressmen. I would only appeal to them to be principled Congressmen while professing loyalty to their party. I, on behalf of my Party, am prepared to accept the amendment standing in the name of Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and Shri Venkatasubbaiah.

Here I would like to have one important clarification from the Prime Minister while she replies. Today we have read the news that the representative of USSR at the U.N. Headquarters, Mr. Jacob Malik, has stated that they are not going to allow this matter

to be discussed at the Security Council, and he is reported to have said that this is an internal matter of Czechoslovakia. This is very strange! After all, he is the plenipotentiary of USSR at the U.N. Headquarters; he is there as the representative of the Russians and not of Czechoslovakians. It is very ironical for him to say that it is their internal matter and that the U.N. cannot intervene in that. It seems, this matter is going to come up. What the Resolution of Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani seeks to reaffirm is the stand that we have to take at the U.N. I am very keen about it. After all, you may evade it now, but tomorrow or the day after it will crop up and Government has to decide this way or that way. I would like to know from the Government whether they are prepared to tell — they should, in all fairness, — the House that they are going to sponsor it or at least support it when it is sponsored by other nations to discuss the matter in the Security Council.

About our foreign policy, the Prime Minister has used, as Mr. Hanumanthaiya has pointed out, some brave words, no doubt. But what is the follow-up action that we are going to take in this matter? Are we going to express our active sympathy with the sufferings of the Czechoslovakians? In what way are we going to do that? Here it is very pertinent to ask this. I think, our policy of non-alignment, as the Prime Minister herself has stated yesterday, does not preclude us from actively sympathising with people who are distressed just as our secularism does not preclude people from worshipping the deity of their own choice. If that is the position — I take it that it is so based on our previous experience: we have sympathised with many nations and communities who were distressed and who were oppressed —, if that is the position still as the Prime Minister's statement indicates, I would like to know from the Government whether it is prepared to accept that amendment. I am sure, almost all the Opposition, excepting one or two, is prepared to vote with the Government for that, and it would be a fine thing to demonstrate and to tell

the distressed people that we are morally with them and we are prepared to support their cause.

I would conclude by saying this. If there is anything that could be called as the soul of a nation, it is this active sympathy that a nation shows to the distressed people that could really be called as the soul of a nation. If we fail the distressed people at this juncture, I am afraid we would only be called bread-winners and not a nation with a purpose. I would appeal to the Government to rise to the occasion and actively support the cause of Czechoslovakians.

#### 15.50 HRS.

**SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA** (Secunderabad): Is it very difficult to speak when the House is emotionally excited. I would like to remind members, specially those of the Opposition, of the old adage that anger is a bad adviser. Here and elsewhere there is a tremendous search for adjectives and nouns impregnated with abuse. If by condemnation or by strong words we could achieve anything purposeful, I would say, let us all combine and shout and abuse.

We are in a very serious situation in world affairs and we have to function in such a way that we can at least contribute something to bring about a peaceful order. Therefore, this excitement, this reaction, that we find in this country has been alarming. It occurred to me as if this is the first time that we have noticed one country attacking another or one country sending her forces into another's. We acted as if it were an abnormal shock. Is that so? After all, forget for a moment that Russia is a communist country. Let us also not make this situation an occasion for preaching anti-communism or discoursing on the merits and demerits of democracy.

Look at the world as it is. When Israel attacked Egypt, was it not aggression? She still occupies large portions of Egyptian territory. Why were we not exercised? Is it because they are not socialist countries? Take, for example, Rhodesia.

SHRI NAMBIAR: Take Vietnam.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA: I am not going to oblige my hon. friend.

SHRI KAMALNAYAN BAJAJ (Wardha): That does not give an excuse for Russia to march into Czechoslovakia.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA: Take South Africa. For a number of years, it has been in possession of S.W. Africa. Every resolution of the UN has been spurned.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: We have condemned all this. The Government has done it. Why is it not doing it now?

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA: He did not condemn Israel. Did he? Did he condemn the USA?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: He is speaking for the Government. I had no occasion to speak.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA: I am on a very important matter.

The position today is that there are two big blocs and they have their spheres of influence. If that influence is touched, they are going to take up arms. Is there not a Monroe Doctrine in the USA? What was their reaction to Cuba? Suppose tomorrow there is a communist revolution in Brazil or Mexico. What will be the attitude of the American Government? They will march their forces into that country.

So you have to take the facts into consideration. These are facts of life. There are two blocs and they have their own Monroe Doctrine, one in America and one in Europe.

Shri Masani said the other day that the frontier of the US is the Mekong River. Have we forgotten that? In the world affairs. . . . (Interruptions.)

15.55 HRS.

श्री रवि राय: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं दूसरी बार यह चीज उठा रहा हूँ कि जबकि चेकोस्लोवाकिया जैसे महत्वपूर्ण

प्रश्न पर सदन में विचार चल रहा है तब न तो प्रधान मंत्री उपस्थित हैं, न राज्य मंत्री उपस्थित हैं और न ही विदेश मंत्रालय के उपमंत्री ही मौजूद हैं। आखिर इस का क्या मतलब है? हम को बार बार यह सवाल उठना पड़ता है। यहां पर प्रधान मंत्री, सम्बन्धित राज्य मंत्री और न ही उपमंत्री मौजूद हैं और मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कौन इस समय इस डिबेट को सुन रहा है और नोट्स ले रहा है? Interruption.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is the Deputy Prime Minister.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Is this how India speaks? There is a graveyard behind there; there is nobody there.

श्री रवि राय: विदेश मंत्रालय से सम्बन्धित कोई मंत्री रहना चाहिए। लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री महोदय चली गई हैं, राज्य मंत्री भी चले गये हैं और कोई भी विदेश मंत्रालय से सम्बन्धित मंत्री या उपमंत्री इस समय सदन में मौजूद नहीं हैं और हम यहां पर किस के लिए बोल रहे हैं?

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): I am present here all the while.

श्री रवि राय: आप विदेश मंत्री तो नहीं हैं। यह हाउस की परम्परा रही है कि जिम्मेदार मंत्री को रहना चाहिए और उस के मौजूद न रहने से हाउस की अवहेलना और उपेक्षा होती है और मैं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय चाहता हूँ कि आप प्रधान मंत्री महोदय को हाउस में बुलवाइये। आप आज्ञा दीजिये कि वह यहां पर आयें।

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO (Kakinada): The Deputy Prime Minister is next to the Prime Minister and is also a member of the Foreign Affairs sub-committee of the Cabinet. . . . (Interruptions.)

SHRI NAMBIAR: On a point of order. Amidst interruptions, Mr.

Sondhi was heard to say that it was a graveyard. Living members are there; it is not a graveyard. He must withdraw it.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: No... (Interruptions.)

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: May I submit to the House very humbly that this is a very grave and serious question that we are discussing. It will be best if we allow the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker to conduct the proceedings in peace. It is a very serious occasion. It is strangulation of a nation, not of an individual. So, we must be careful not to disturb the House and allow the Deputy Speaker to conduct the proceedings in peace.

16.00 HRS.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA: I would like the House to forget for the moment the two communist countries. What was the reaction of this free world when Pakistan attacked India twice, not only attacked but attacked with the help of foreign arms? Was there any condemnation the world over? Today, it is not only a question of one country attacking another or entering that country with the force of arms, but because it is a communist country, communism has to be condemned. We have to be completely honest and recognise if that is not one of the factors that is working in our reaction today.

Now, the Soviet Union says that Czechoslovakia has threatened her security. I do not know. But the reply is, there will be a puppet government, Quisling and all that. The communist countries believe in communism and they want to spread communism everywhere and defend the communist governments everywhere. But, on the other hand, people who fight for democracy establish dictatorship and call it democracy. Look at the map of the world. Where is democracy and who is there to say that it is rape of democracy? Where is democracy today in the

whole of Latin America, the whole of Asia except in poor India and in one or two other countries? So, this talk of democracy and all that would really amount to a sort of speech made during the elections.

The Soviet Union says that her security was threatened because Czechoslovakia's occupation by some other forces or by a government hostile to Soviet Union would not be in the interests of her security. Sir, are there not forces working which have used the people of other countries to bring about an anti-communist movement? What about Indonesia? What about Ghana? There are no foreign forces there. What about the partition of India? Were people not used as instruments for the partition of our country? Similarly all these people may also be just instruments. So, how do you know what information the Soviet Union has got today to take such a step against such a small country? What information has that big country got to take such a step against the small country? It is very difficult to understand that such a step should be taken. So, there must be something more than what appears in the press.

Sir, the strategic position of Czechoslovakia is important. When Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia, that led to the second world war. When Russia took Czechoslovakia, NATO was formed. Today, if Czechoslovakia goes into hands which are hostile to the Soviet Union, the question of East Germany will crop up, and East Germany will break up. West Germany will again become a power in Central Europe which the Soviet Union dreads, and that is why she is very keen that such a situation should not arise.

Imagine a similar position, if such a position is faced by the United States of America. It will also act in the same way, whatever the reason they may tell us. Lastly, what should we do? There is, several times, the demand that we must not be friends of this country of foes of

that country and all that. We must always look at our national interests. What is our national interest today? Suppose, I give them a blank cheque and they say, "Condemn Soviet Union, and recognise others."

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you condemning?

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA: I am not condemning. I do not condemn. I want this country to play an effective role in world affairs. That can be done only when she has one policy towards both the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Just abusing to satisfy somebody leads us nowhere. We are depending on foreign aid from both the Soviet Union and the United States of America. In this surcharged atmosphere if some countries keep their heads, they can play a mediatory role, an effective role in world affairs to bring the two countries together, either through the United Nations or some other means.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Yogendra Sharma.

DR. MAITREYEE BASU (Darjeeling): Sir, I do not want to speak. But I want to hear either Shri Dange or Shri Hiren Mukerjee. We do not want to hear any obscure Communist members.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is for the party to choose its spokesmen. It is not fair for others to comment on it.

16.06 HRS.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*.]

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, we want to hear the Communist leaders.

MR. SPEAKER: Whom the party chooses, it is the concern of the party. We cannot dictate to them whom they should choose.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): I am requesting you to make such a request to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Sharma is naturally speaking on behalf of that party.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai): If she does not want to hear the speech she can get out of the House.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti): Sir, her demand is very genuine.

MR. SPEAKER: No, it is for the party to decide.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA (Begusarai): Sir, I would like to place before the hon. House the view of my party over the developments in Czechoslovakia. This development not only affects Czechoslovak people, the community of the Socialist countries but also the wider international relations. One can understand the anguish and concern shown by different people over these developments. But it will be a mistake to think that all these people are viewing this development from the same angle or under the same impulses. We are all agreed that the sovereignty and independence of every nation has to be preserved. But, at the same time, we are also concerned about the defence and the future of the socialist system (*interruptions*) and the achievements of the emancipated working people, throughout the world. It is here our disagreements with the Swatantra Party, Jan Sangh and others. In so far as they are concerned, they are not interested in what happens to socialism. When Shri Masani, for example, becomes the champion of Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, which he and his Party has always condemned, one cannot but miss the obvious motives. It will be remembered that Shri Masani, who is crying hoarse about freedom and independence once called upon President Johnson not only to continue bombing of North Vietnam but also to march the American troops into its territory.

We have never heard Mr. Masani and others uttering a word against

U.S. aggression in Vietnam, the mass murder, pillage and rape that goes on there.

However it is necessary for us to correctly assess and understand the developments in Czechoslovakia if we as a nation want to express ourselves in favour of independence and socialism.

We have been watching with deep concern and anxiety the developments in Czechoslovakia over the past few months and we are now gravely concerned that the armed forces of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw powers have entered Czechoslovakia.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Long live the C.P.I. !

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : We wish the problems within the Czechoslovak Republic and as between Czechoslovakia and her Warsaw Pact allies could be resolved without recourse to intervention by the armed units of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries.

Our Party's position in regard to developments in Czechoslovakia are quite well known. When the reforms were undertaken by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia under the leadership of Dubcek, our Party came out in full-throated and open support to the measures for strengthening and developing socialist democracy. We acclaimed it as a positive development.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is the position now ?

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : We stand by the position we took earlier and we do feel that such reforms are necessary to strengthen and develop socialist democracy in the world. (*Interruptions*)

At the same time we pointed out that this process of reform was being exploited by friends like Shri Masani and the anti-socialist and imperialist forces in order to bring about a change of the social system in Czechoslovakia, restore capitalism in that country and

take it to the Western camp. There is plenty of evidence about this both in Czechoslovakia and in the neighbouring countries notably in Western Germany. In the name of reform what these anti-socialist forces, both external and internal, aimed at is the overthrow of the socialist system in Czechoslovakia. They published their so called appeal called *Two Thousand Words* in which they have an open call of revolt against the socialist system. They ran a campaign against the Communists and went even to the length of demanding the dissolution of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. And some of them like Mr. Masani said that the Communist Party of India should be banned. Some others also voiced the same feeling. These facts cannot be denied and in fact they have been stressed by Premier Dubcek himself.

16.15 HRS.

It may also be noted that the Bratislava Agreement to which Dubcek is a signatory took note of these developments. Of course, this dark side of the picture in which anti-socialist forces and imperialists were trying to mobilise themselves openly and covertly was completely missed by hon. Members, like Shri Masani, who suddenly became the champion of the Action Programme of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. Shri Madhok's interest in Czechoslovakia falls in the same category as the interest shown by anti-socialist and imperialist forces.

While supporting the measures for strengthening socialist democracy we also emphasise the need for defence of socialism and defeat of the plans of anti-socialist and imperialist forces. This was also the commitment undertaken in the Bratislava Agreement of six Warsaw Pact powers including Czechoslovakia. We expected that the solution to the problems would be found through mutual efforts between the Czechoslovak leadership, on the one hand, and the leaders of the other signatories to the Bratislava Agreement, on the other. Unfortunately, this has not happened.

The Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact powers whose troops have entered Czechoslovakia had made certain statements to the effect that they have no intention of staying in Czechoslovakia. I do concede that the developments in Czechoslovakia, especially the entry of the Soviet and other troops of other Warsaw Pact powers, are an extraordinary development. While cherishing the sovereign rights of Czechoslovak people, which must be respected, we cannot at the same time discount the serious threat to its socialist system, when all anti-socialist and imperialist forces are waiting for a chance to snatch away Czechoslovakia from socialism.

We hope that the troops of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw powers will withdraw from Czechoslovakia as soon as possible.

SHRI NATH PAI : Immediately.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : The normal conditions will be restored and socialism in Czechoslovakia made safe.

Before I conclude I would like to have a word about the proposal for the adoption of a resolution by the House on this subject. Never in the past on such occasions did this House adopt any resolution.... (*Interruption*). The general practice has been to endorse the statement made by the Prime Minister. So far that has been the practice of this House. The House did not, for instance, pass any resolution when Guatemala was attacked or during the Hungarian developments in 1956 or on the Bay of Pigs US invasion in Cuba or on the US-backed invasion of the UAR by Israel. Never, of course, did the House pass a resolution condemning the US aggression in Vietnam. We do not see why the hon. Members should ask for a departure in the present case to adopt a resolution.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI (Bilhaur): All I wanted to say was that this was not a very spontaneous outpouring and I wanted the hon.

Member to be spared the torture of reading out something.

SHRI M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL (Manjeri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is indeed highly deplorable that 25 years after the cessation of the catastrophe of the World War II, military force has come to be applied for enforcing ideological submission of one country to another. Sufficient points of law and of international law have come out of the discussion that has taken place so far. Nobody denies that there has been an application, a use, of military power today. The question is whether it is aggression and whether that aggression is justifiable. That is being discussed. Here, I would like to point out even the Russian point of view. The U.S.S.R. says that as soon as they find that the presence of their forces and of their allies is not needed in that country, they will be withdrawn. That means, in a way, the U.S.S.R. and their allies admit that that is an undesirable course that they have adopted in the present circumstances. That is the position so far as military action is concerned.

Now, I do not want to repeat and evaluate all that has been said here on the matter. So far, nobody has said that what has taken place is the right thing to do. I think, everybody has taken exception to what has happened. Yesterday, the Prime Minister also, in her statement, did not say anything which would amount to any condonement of the thing that has happened. That is the position. We do not like military force or violence or aggression to take place in the world because it will not only affect the people who are directly involved in the aggression but will also affect everybody else in the world. We also stand to be affected by such an aggression. Therefore, it is in the interest of all the nations of the world, including ourselves, to see that such an aggression does not take place or, if it takes place, it is vacated as soon as it is possible.

Now, the things have happened as they have happened. What are we

[Shri M. M. Ahammed Ismail]

to do under these circumstances? Are we to condemn the people who have resorted to aggression, break their friendship away and be done with it or do we really want to help the nation which has been the victim of aggression and also try to improve friendship amongst all the nations as before? If we want only to condemn aggression and be done with it, and thereby break our non-alignment policy and our friendship with every nation of the world, we may still do it. But, I think, nobody would agree that that is our object. Our object is to see that what has happened is rectified in the proper manner and in proper time and that aggression is vacated and, at the same time, Russia is also agreeable to vacate that aggression.

Under these circumstances, I think, what the Government of India has said about the matter is sufficient to show that the Government of India does not support what has happened and does not support the action that U.S.S.R. and her allies have taken. The Prime Minister has expressed anguish and concern over the matter. What do we do after this? We must not take it easy. We must even at this very minute begin to act. How to act? We have to persuade Russia to withdraw her forces from that country and, perhaps, we may succeed as somebody said that of all the nations of the world, we are in an advantageous position to take up such a mission as that. We may be, perhaps, in a more advantageous position than many other nations of the world. Therefore, what I would suggest is that the Government of India, at once, should get in touch with the U.S.S.R. with the object of having the forces withdrawn, at once, and persuading them, once again, to settle the dispute between them in a peaceful manner.

If we do that, it will be one of the most remarkable achievements of our country and thereby, we shall be benefiting not only the world but also ourselves. This is what the Government must do, according to me.

**श्री चंद्रजीत यादव (आजमगढ़) :**  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में उत्पन्न एक गम्भीर स्थिति पर विचार कर रहे हैं। आज इस सदन में जो भावनाएँ प्रकट की जा रही हैं, यह सही और स्वाभाविक है कि ऐसे अवसर पर इस प्रकार की भावनाएँ उठती हैं और उठनी भी चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि सोवियत रूस ने चेकोस्लोवाकिया में अपनी सेनाएँ भेज कर, वहाँ के प्रमुख स्थानों पर कब्जा कर के, यहाँ तक कि उस देश के संसद् भवन पर कब्जा कर के एक ऐसा कार्य किया है, जो इतिहास की एक अत्यन्त दुःखपूर्ण घटना है। इस स्थिति में संसार के ऐसे सब लोगों का इस घटना पर अपना शोक और खेद प्रकट करना स्वाभाविक है, जो इन मान्यताप्राप्त सिद्धान्तों पर यकीन रखते हैं कि दुनिया में अमन रहे, जो नये और छोटे देश आजाद हुए हैं, उन की आजादी दिन-ब-दिन मजबूत होती जाये, पड़ोसी देशों में मित्रतापूर्ण सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए और दुनिया के किसी भी देश को, चाहे वह कितना भी बड़ा और शक्तिशाली देश हो, किसी अन्य देश के आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करने का कोई हक नहीं है।

हमें इस बात का गर्व है कि दुनिया में जब से इन सिद्धान्तों की स्थापना की गई है, हम ने हमेशा बड़ी मजबूती के साथ इन सिद्धान्तों को प्रतिपादित किया है और हमारी सरकार ने हमेशा इस सम्बन्ध में अगुवाई और पहल की है। इस लिए जब रूस ने अपनी सेनाएँ चेकोस्लोवाकिया में भेजीं, तो कल प्रधान मंत्री ने इस देश की जनता की भावनाओं का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हुए अपनी गहरी चिन्ता प्रकट की। यह स्वाभाविक है कि हम इस बात में यकीन रखते हैं कि दुनिया के किसी भी देश को किसी अन्य देश पर हमला करने का हक नहीं है। हम इस बात में यकीन रखने हैं कि दुनिया के सब देशों के आपसी सम्बन्ध शान्तिपूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व के सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित होने चाहिए।

रूस एक ऐसा देश है, जिस के प्रधान मंत्री ने हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के

संघर्ष के समय इस बात की चेष्टा की थी कि विश्वशान्ति के हित में और इन पड़ोसी देशों के हित में यह आवश्यक है कि इन के पारस्परिक विवादों का एक शान्तिपूर्ण हल निकाला जाये। इसलिए जब उस देश की सेनायें एक पड़ोसी देश में और उसी परिवार के एक देश उस जाती हैं, मैं के क्षेत्र पर कब्जा करती हैं और उस के आन्तरिक मामलों में दखल देती हैं, तो सारे देश में और दुनिया में इस बात की चिन्ता होना स्वाभाविक है। मैं समझता हूँ कि चेकोस्लोवाकिया में सेनायें भेजने के रूस के इस कदम को हमें बहुत ही स्ट्रॉंगली डिस-एप्रूव करना चाहिए। हम उस कदम का कभी भी समर्थन नहीं कर सकते हैं।

मैं समझता हूँ कि रूस के इस कदम से दुनिया की उन शक्तियों को बड़ा धक्का लगा है, जो चाहती हैं कि दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रहे और दुनिया का हर देश, चाहे वह कितना भी छोटा हो, शान्ति और स्वतंत्रता के साथ रह सके। रूस, दुनिया के बहुत से समाजवादी देशों और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टियों ने 1960 में एक-साथ बैठ कर सारी दुनिया के सामने यह घोषण की थी कि वे शान्तिपूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व में विश्वास रखते हैं, वे विश्व-शान्ति के लिए काम करते हैं। इसलिए आज हमें और दुख होता है। हम इस बात को मानते हैं कि दुनिया के अन्दर समाजवादी देशों की एक बहुत बड़ी देन है। दुनिया के वह छोटे देश जो अपनी आजादी का संघर्ष लड़ते थे, उन्होंने रूस से और समाजवादी देशों से प्रेरणा प्राप्त की है। दुनिया के बहुत से छोटे देश जो आज अपने विकास और उत्थान के संघर्ष में जूझ रहे हैं, हमें आज इस बात का फरख होता है कि जब समाजवादी देश उन की मदद करने के लिए, उन की सहायता करने के लिए, उन का सहयोग करने के लिए अपना कदम आगे बढ़ाने हैं। हमें इस बात की खुशी होती है कि जब दुनिया के यह समाजवादी देश इन तमाम चीजों के ऊपर रहनुमाई करते हैं। लेकिन हमें इस बात के लिए आज दुख होता है कि ऐसे लोग जिन्होंने सिद्धान्तों की प्रतिष्ठापना दुनिया के

अन्दर की है, ऐसे लोग जो उन सिद्धान्तों के अन्दर यकीन रखते हैं, ऐसे लोग जब इस प्रकार का कदम उठाते हैं फौजी संघर्ष के जरिए तो हमें धक्का लगता है, हमें तकलीफ होती है। इसीलिए श्रीमन्, मैं समझता हूँ कि आज सारी दुनिया का जनमत दुनिया का प्रगतिशील जनमत, दुनिया के वह लोग समाजवादी सिद्धान्तों में जिन की आस्था है, आज उन को भी सब से अधिक धक्का लगा है। रूस के इस कदम से दुनिया की जो प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतें हैं, जो साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियां हैं, आज उन को इस बात का मौका मिला है कि वह समाजवादी खेमे के ऊपर कीचड़ उछालते हैं और समाजवादी व्यवस्था के ऊपर उंगली उठाते हैं, यह सब से बड़ी दुखदु घटना जो घटी है दुख हमें इस बात का है।

आलोचना की गई इस सरकार की और यह कहा गया कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इस बात की निन्दा नहीं की, प्रधान मंत्री ने साहस के साथ काम नहीं किया। श्रीमन्, प्रधान मंत्री जी के बक्तव्य को हम गौर से देखें तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सब से पहली बात कही, उन्होंने इस देश की जनता की, भारत सरकार की, इस बात के ऊपर चिन्ता व्यक्त की कि रूस ने जिस काम को किया है, चेकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता को आज जिस संकट का मुकाबिला करना पड़ रहा है इस से भारत सरकार को अत्यन्त गहरी चिन्ता है और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को इस बात का बड़ा गहरा दुख है। उन्होंने इस बात को बड़ी मजबूती से कहा और दूसरी बात जो मसानी साहब ने आज कही है, उन्होंने इस बात की मांग की है कि चेकोस्लोवाकिया की भूमि से रूस की फौज वापस बुलायी जानी चाहिए, कल प्रधान मंत्री ने जब पहला मौका मिला, जब कि दुनिया के बहुत से देश अपनी राय पर गौर कर रहे थे, उन्होंने अपनी घोषणा भी नहीं की थी, इस सदन की भावना को ध्यान में रखते हुए, इस देश की एक जो हमारी परम्परा है, अपनी भावनाओं को स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक व्यक्त करने की हमारी परम्परा जो है, दुनिया

[श्री चन्द्रजीय यादव]

के हर ऐसे बड़े मसलों पर शीघ्रातिशीघ्र अपनी प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त करने की हमारी जो परम्परा है, उस के अनुसार उन्होंने तुरंत यह कहा कि हम रूस से इस बात की आशा रखते हैं कि रूस अपनी फौज चेकोस्लोवाकिया से फौरन वापस बुलाएगा। उन्होंने इस बात के ऊपर अपना विश्वास प्रकट किया। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बात सही है और मेरी निश्चित धारणा है कि रूस के नेतृत्व ने बहुत बड़ी भूल की है, यह एक ऐतिहासिक गलती की है जिस का अन्दाज़, जिस का एहसास बाद में होगा। उन्हें अपनी फौज शीघ्रातिशीघ्र चेकोस्लोवाकिया से वापस बुला लेनी चाहिए, मैं इस बात की मांग करता हूँ और मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इस बात की मांग कर के हमारी भावनाओं को सही रूप में व्यक्त किया है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दूसरी बात जो कही वह यह कही कि हिन्दुस्तान इस बात में यकीन करता है और आज से नहीं, शुरू से हमें इस बात का गर्व है, जब हम अपनी आजादी का संघर्ष लड़ रहे थे, अपनी गुलामी की जंजीर तोड़ने के लिए लड़ रहे थे, उस जमाने से दुनिया में जहाँ भी अत्याचार होता था, फासिस्ट ताकतों द्वारा या किसी के द्वारा भी कहीं भी अत्याचार होता था, तो हमारी हमदर्दी हमेशा उन के साथ होती थी जो अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे, हमेशा हम उन के साथ थे जो अपनी गुलामी का जुआ अपने कंधे से हटाने के लिए व्याकुल हो रहे थे। हम ने संयुक्त राष्ट्रसंघ के अन्दर, बड़े बड़े दुनियाँ के सम्मेलनों के अन्दर और हर ऐसे मौके पर तीन चार बातों को बड़ी मजबूती से कहा है। यह हमारे राष्ट्रीय हित में भी है और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय हित में भी है कि दुनिया के अन्दर शांति कायम रहे और उस के लिए हम हमेशा प्रयास करते रहे हैं। हम ने बड़ी मजबूती से इस बात को कहा है कि हम दो पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों के बीच में मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध कायम रखना चाहते हैं। हम उस के हामी हैं और इसीलिए पाकिस्तान ने हमारे ऊपर जब हमला किया था

तो हम ने उस हमले का मुकाबिला भी पूरी शक्ति से किया लेकिन हमारे तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने कहा था कि जब हमारे देश पर हमला हुआ, हमारे देश की प्रभुसत्ता पर हमला हुआ तो जिस एकता के साथ, जिस शक्ति के साथ हमने दुश्मन का मुकाबला किया था, उसी एकता और उसी शक्ति के साथ पड़ोसी देशों के साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने के लिए भी हमको काम करना होगा। हम उन बातों में यकीन रखते हैं, उनके ऊपर हम स्टैंड करते हैं। इसीलिए हम इसके लिए आवाज हमेशा उठाते रहे हैं। हमने हमेशा इस बात को कहा है कि दुनिया के किसी भी देश को इस बात का हक नहीं है कि वह दूसरे देश के अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल दे और इसीलिए हमने दुनिया के किसी भी देश को इस बात के लिए स्वीकार नहीं किया कि वह हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल दे। जब दुनिया के किसी देश ने हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल देने की कोशिश की है, उसके ऊपर अपनी राय जाहिर की है तो हमने उसका विरोध किया है और इसीलिए हमें इस बात के लिए हमेशा सतर्क रहना चाहिए कि जहाँ हम चाहते हैं कि दुनिया का कोई देश हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल न दे तो हमें खुद भी किसी देश के अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल नहीं देना चाहिए। मैं एक मित्र के नाते, रूस के एक मित्र के नाते, कहना चाहता हूँ, हिन्दुस्तान और सोवियत रूस की मैत्री दुनिया की प्रगतिशील ताकतों के लिए, दुनिया के समाजवादी खेमे के लिए, दुनिया में शांति के लिए बहुत जरूरी है, इस मैत्री को हमें हर कीमत पर कायम रखना चाहिए। लेकिन इसके माने यह नहीं होते कि अगर सोवियत यूनियन कोई गलती करता है तो हम एक मित्र के नाते यह भी न कहें कि यहाँ सोवियत यूनियन भूल कर रहा है, इससे उन ताकतों को धक्का लगता है जो हम मजबूत करना चाहते हैं। और इसीलिए प्रधान मन्त्री नेकल एक संयत भाषा में कहा, ठीक है आपकी भावनाओं की हम कद्र करते हैं, विरोधी दलों से जो भावनाएँ उठाई गई हैं उन

भावनाओं की हम कद्र करते हैं। ऐसे मौके पर भावनायें उठती हैं लेकिन जिनके कंधों पर शासन चलाने की जिम्मेदारी है वे केवल भावनाओं से काम नहीं लेते। भावनाओं के साथ विचार भी जरूरी है। विचार के साथ बुद्धि भी जरूरी है। बुद्धि के साथ साथ संयम भी जरूरी है और संयम के साथ साथ जिम्मेदारी भी जरूरी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कल जब वक्तव्य दिया तो उसमें हमारी भावनायें भी शामिल थीं, हमारा संयम भी उसके अन्दर शामिल था, उसके अन्दर हमारी जिम्मेदारी भी शामिल थी और उसके अन्दर हमारी वह नीतियाँ भी थी जिनमें हमारी निष्ठा है और जिनको लेकर हम देश में अपना काम करना चाहते हैं, जिस के अन्दर हम अपने समाज की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं।...

श्री आटल बिहारी बाजरेयो : थोड़ी सी कमजोरी भी शामिल थी।

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : जी नहीं, कमजोरी नहीं है लेकिन आप चश्मे से देखते हैं, किया क्या जाए ?

श्रीमन्, मैं समझता हूँ कल प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने एक बात और बड़ी मजबूती के साथ यहां पर कहा है कि हमारी पार्टी समाजवादी आस्था के अन्दर विश्वास रखती है। हम समझते हैं कि समाजवाद के अलावा कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है जिसके जरिए हम इस देश की करोड़ों जनता को उद्धार के रास्ते पर ले चलें। हम समझते हैं कि हमारे देश के अन्दर समाजवाद आना चाहिए और इसीलिए जब कोई समाजवादी देश ऐसे कदम उठाया है जिससे सारी समाजवादी शक्तियों पर चोट लगती है, जिससे प्रगतिशील आन्दोलन को ठेस लगती है तो उसकी ठेस हमें भी लगना स्वाभाविक होता है। हम समझते हैं कि हमारे देश के अन्दर जो समाजवाद आयेगा वह हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों किसानों और मजदूरों के संघर्ष के जरिए, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के अनुभवों के बल पर, हिन्दुस्तान की संस्कृति और सभ्यता, हिन्दुस्तान की परम्पराओं की पृष्ठभूमि के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान

की प्रतिभा के सृजन से और हिन्दुस्तान की धरती से पैदा हुआ समाजवाद होगा। उसके अन्दर हमारा विश्वास है हम यह समझते हैं और प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने कल इस बात को कहा कि जेकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता को भी इस बात का हक है। अगर जेकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता अपने अनुभव के बल पर, अपने तजुबों के बल पर अपने प्रशासन में कोई सुधार चाहती है तो इस बात का हक जेकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता को है। इस बात का हक मास्को और पेकिंग को नहीं है कि वहां से बैठे हुए वे इस बात का डिक्लेशन दें कि जेकोस्लोवाकिया में किस प्रकार से सुधार होना चाहिए। जेकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता, जाहिर है कि पचास वर्षों के समाजवादी आन्दोलनों के अनुभव से सीखेगी और दुनिया का हर देश सीखता है, सीखना चाहिए भी। पिछले दस वर्षों के अन्दर रूस के अन्दर भी तब्दीलियाँ आई हैं, रूस के अन्दर भी सुधार हुए हैं, रूस ने अपनी गलतियों को स्वीकार किया है और रूस अपने सुधारों की तरफ बढ़ रहा है। वही हक जेकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता को भी है। मैं समझता था की सेरना में जो सम्मेलन हुआ, ब्राटिसलावा में जो सम्मेलन हुआ, उसके बाद यह जो समस्यायें थी वह सुलझ जायेंगी, आपसी बातचीत के जरिए इसका कोई हल निकलेगा। लेकिन मुझे ठेस लगी ब्राटिसलावा सम्मेलन के बाद जब इस बात की आशा पैदा हुई थी कि यह मसले बैठकर के बातचीत के जरिए से समझ-बूझ करके हल हो सकते हैं, उस वक्त अचानक जब फौजे पहुंची तो हमारी भावनाओं को ठेस लगी। ऐसे लोग जो दुनिया में इस बात में विश्वास रखते हैं—जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी पिछले तीन-चार बार से कह रही हैं और वह सही बात है—कि हर राष्ट्र का अपना व्यक्तित्व होता है, अपने व्यक्तित्व का विकास करने का, अपनी परसनेलिटि को विकसित करने का हर राष्ट्र का अपना हक है और अपने अंगों के बल पर ही वह अपना विकास करता है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि जब इस भावना को यहां पर हम ने प्रकट किया है तो आज

[श्री चन्द्रजीन यादव]

भावनाओं के आवेश में आ कर हम को काम नहीं करना चाहिये। आज जिस बात की चैतावनी में देना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि इस मौके का फायदा उठा कर देश की ऐसी शक्तियों जिनका प्रगति में यकीन नहीं है, जो समाजवाद पर हर मौके पर कीचड़ उछालना चाहती हैं, वे सोवियत भारत की मैत्री को बिगाड़ने की कोशिश करती हैं—हमें इस बात से सचेत रहना चाहिये कि सोवियत-भारत की मैत्री किसी कीमत पर बिगाड़नी नहीं चाहिये। एक मित्र के नाते हमें सोवियत की इस भूल की तरफ़ मजबूती से संकेत करना चाहिये, उन को समझाना चाहिये कि वे अपने इस रास्ते से हटें।

अन्त में, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से अपील कर के कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज इस बात का अवसर आ गया है कि कुछ दिन पहले यूगोस्लाविया के राष्ट्रपति श्री टोडो के जिस बान का आवाहन किया था कि दुनिया के तमाम नये देश, दुनिया के तमाम तटस्थ देश—आज जो समस्याएँ, जो घटनाएँ दुनिया के रंगमंच पर हो रही हैं—चाहे वियतनाम की हो, चाहे इजराइल की हो, चाहे चेकोस्लावाकिया की हो—उन समस्याओं पर दुनिया के तमाम नवोदित राष्ट्रों का—जिन्होंने नई आज़ादी हासिल की है, जो विकास में साहस के साथ आगे बढ़ रहे हैं, जो अपनी इच्छाओं के अनुसार अपने देश का निर्माण करना चाहते हैं—एक विश्व सम्मेलन होना चाहिये। ऐसा सम्मेलन जिसमें दुनिया के ऐसे लोग, जिनका इस सिद्धान्त में यकीन है, बैठें और इस बात पर गौर करें कि दुनिया के बड़े राष्ट्रों उन के मनमानेपन से कहीं यह भावना दुनिया में न फैल जाय कि छोटे राष्ट्रों की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती, उन के अस्तित्व की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती, आज़ादी की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती, उन पर कोई भी शक्ति बाहर से आकर हमला कर सकती है, दबाव डाल सकती है। यह अवसर आ गया है और प्रधान मंत्री जी को इस में पहल लेनी चाहिये।

आखिर में, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक

वाक्य कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं उन से सहमत नहीं हूँ जिन्होंने चार्ज लगाया है कि भारत सरकार की अन्तरराष्ट्रीय नीति हमेशा कमजोरी की रही है, भारत सरकार ने ऐसी मौकों पर कभी पहल नहीं ली—यह बात बिलकुल निराधार है। यदि हम आब्जैक्टिव तरीके से देखें, भावनाओं के वश हो कर न देखें, राजनीति की दलदल में फँस कर न देखें तो आप पायेंगे जिस समय वियतनाम पर अमरीकी बमबारी हो रही थी, हम ने उस का घोर विरोध किया, जब कि नाखों-अरबां डालर हम को अमरीका से आ रहे थे। हम ने कहा था कि वियतनाम पर बमबारी बन्द होनी चाहिये, वियतनाम में अमरीकन फौजें वापस लेनी चाहियें। आज चेकोस्लो-वैकिया में जो हो रहा है—इस बात का ध्यान में रखते हम भी कि सोवियत यूनियन से हमें आर्थिक सहायता मिल रही है—हम ने अपनी नीति के आधार पर कहा है कि रूस की फौजें चेकोस्लावाकिया से वापस होनी चाहियें। जिस समय इजराइल ने आक्रमण किया—दुनिया के किसी भी देश ने अपनी प्रतिक्रिया जाहिर नहीं की थी—हिन्दुस्तान पहला देश था जिसने अपनी प्रतिक्रिया जाहिर की और कहा कि यह हथेला बन्द होना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आशा करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है सदन उस वक्तव्य के प्रति अपना विश्वास प्रकट करेगा और इस बात का अवसर सरकार को देगा कि सरकार इन परिस्थितियों में देश का सही नेतृत्व दुनिया के सामने कर सके।

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (GUNA):  
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can scarcely compete in eloquence with the previous speaker. If I were speaking on behalf of the Congress, I might have been able to compete with him. But as I am not speaking from the ruling party, I think I am unable to compete with him. I do not want to repeat what has already been said. I would only draw the attention of this House to the history of the Czech people. After centuries they got their liberty. How did they utilise it? They established democracy in their country.

Their economic life became so advanced that they could compete with other industrialised nations. They fought Hitler with a bravery that was unsurpassed and yet those who fought with Hitler were made into slaves of Russia. This was the prize that they got. They were not with Hitler, they were fighting against Hitler and yet they came under the heel of Russia. Be it said to the credit of those small countries that they were fighting the battle of freedom and democracy against Hitler. Yet, they all became the slaves of Russia. Take Poland, for instance. It fought against Hitler and yet Poland's liberty was lost. Hungary also lost its liberty. It is a strange world that we are living in. Those who were fighting for the freedom of the world, they have been enslaved and the leaders of those countries had to commit suicide or they were murdered and a Communist regime had been established in those countries.

Now, what has happened in Czechoslovakia? We are told by Russia that they have been invited. I am sure if China or Pakistan invaded India, they could say with greater authority that they were invited by a section of the people here. The second reason given is that they want to save socialism in Czech country. We are also a socialist country.

**SHRI P. GOPALAN (Tellicherry):** What socialism?

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI:** If we establish socialism, tomorrow Russia can say that is a socialist country, this is a country pledged to socialism, it is not fulfilling its pledge and so we invade India to establish socialism, and I am sure the Congress socialists would welcome it, because they are pledged to socialism.

**SHRI NAMBIAR:** Very good logic.

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI:** I do not speak illogically as my friends over there.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Tata-Birla socialism.

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI:** They want to be irrational and illogical. I can speak only with logic. A Congress Member said, so also the Prime Minister, that we are friendly with the East European countries and Russia. What is the duty of a friend? Is it not the duty of a friend, if he is a true friend, to tell his friend that he is wrong when he is wrong? Why mince matters? You have to be very forceful as the ears of the other party are plugged. You have to speak forcefully because the other party is not going to listen to you unless you speak forcefully. It all depends upon his hearing capacity. Do you mean to say that those who are aggressive have sharp ears? They have very dull ears. Therefore, you must impress upon them with loud words that this is what you have done. I do not want that India should not be friendly with Russia. But as friends we must tell them "you have done something wrong, something that may bring about confusion in the world, something that may bring about world war". We must be friendly. At the same time, we must tell them where they have gone wrong. Another Congressman said that this is being done in favour of Stalinism. Then, why are you mincing matters? Did he not say that Stalinism is coming back? If Stalinism is coming back, then why can't the Congress people plainly tell the Russian people that we condemn your aggression on the Czech people? We should be frank. If we are not frank, we are not serving our friends properly.

Another thing that I have got to say is this. One young lady in the Central Hall today said 'I am confused; we are a weak people.'

**SHRI NAMBIAR:** Is it because she is a young lady?

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI:** This man does not know that all ladies are young. I told her, a faint heart never won a fair lady. What are our

[Shri J. B. Kripalani] traditions? Anywhere, wherever there was aggression, before Independence, we condemned it. Jawaharlal said that he felt like taking up a gun and going to fight in Spain. Do people remember that? I remember it very well. If it was not for the fight in India, he would have gone. I quite understand that. When Czechoslovakia was invaded earlier, what did that man with umbrella, Mr. Chamberlain, say? He said that Czechoslovakia is a distant land of which we know little. Today also we are saying that Czechoslovakia is a very distant land, far away, and we know very little of it. We know very much of it. This was a country of brave people. We condemned the Dutch aggression in Indonesia. We helped every freedom movement. I can say with confidence that if we had not waged this war of independence in India, Burma would not have been free, Ceylon would not have been free, many countries which did nothing for their freedom would not have been free. When the British people saw that the Kohinoor of their possessions was gone, they thought it was not worth keeping other countries.

And, Sir, as a country what are our traditions?

Sir, I want to remind this House and this Government about a day when we were assembled in a meeting at Wardha, and there, an old man, not weighing more than a hundred pounds, wanted us to give a challenge to the British Government. At what time? At a time when all the armies of the world, excepting Hitler's armies, were assembled here. The English army, the Indian army, the American army, the South-African army, the Australian army, all armies were collected here. We trembled and we wondered what this old man was talking. Do you know, Sir, what he said? He said: 'You are not respectable organisation. You need not go into such dangerous games.' So, he said, 'I shall go it alone'. When he said, 'I shall go it alone' half the Working Committee was against him.

He said: 'I shall go it alone'. You are a respectable organisation. You have to pass a resolution saying that those who feel with Gandhi may help Gandhi in his movement of 'Quit-India.' And today these people are telling us, speaker after speaker gives us advice to be wise, to be careful, to be cautious. Did we have an army, navy or air-force in those days when we asked the Britisher to quit India?

You have inherited such great traditions. Are you moving away from those traditions that you cannot say at this hour that we condemn what has happened in Czechoslovakia? Have we gone so cowardly? Did Pakistan not invade us and did our jawans, our old ladies and every section of our society, not rise as one man? India may be divided into many parts but when danger comes our people know how to unite and face the danger.

Even if you are fainthearted, as we were of the Working Committee, let this Government be cautious and careful; let the Government not vote but let us all vote that Russia has committed aggression and we condemn it. It has murdered the rights of a nation; it has taken away the liberty of a nation and we condemn it. If we do not condemn it, we stand condemned before the world and before history. Let the Government keep aloof from this resolution and let us pass a resolution that we condemn this aggression because it is a naked aggression. And at what time? When they had decided to come together, when they had accepted the Czechoslovak regime! It is just like the Japanese attacking the Americans at Pearl Harbour. This is nothing less than Pearl Harbour. And our friends say that we will not condemn it! I say, it will be dereliction of duty. We have inherited certain traditions and we must keep them up.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (MADURAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are discussing a very serious situa-

tion. As far as my party is concerned .....(Interruption), our party is known to be one which does not support the Soviet Union in many of its ideological positions; neither do we support the Communist Party of China on many of its positions. Therefore we seek to look upon this problem with a certain amount of objectivity, free from any prejudices or predilections.

Certainly, the events that have happened in Czechoslovakia, with the military intervention of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Powers, have disturbed the entire socialist and democratic world. At the same time, we look at these problems from the point of view of what has been happening in the entire world. The Second World War ended in a way not to the liking of my hon. friend, Shri Masani, and others. The Second World War ended not to the liking of the imperialists. A socialist world came into existence whether Shri Masani liked it or not. A socialist system came into existence and not only it came into existence over the eastern part of Europe but later on that socialist world extended also in Asia. Since then a worldwide fight, a struggle, has been going on all over the world between the forces of socialism and imperialism. This is a fact which cannot be wished away whether we like it or not.

In this House also certain interests and parties are carrying on the same fight. Some hon. Members were expressing surprise that Shri Masani was not so very eloquent and did not feel so emotional, for example, when certain other countries in South America were attacked by the Americans. I am not surprised, because it is a part of a fight; it is a part of a struggle, a worldwide struggle, and certainly Shri Masani would like it, for example, Guatemala was murdered or some other country in South America was murdered. Shri Masani would certainly like it because it is a part of that struggle.

Therefore it is not a question of human rights or something that is motivating them. Let us understand that. As far as some party is concerned, it is taken as a part of that struggle. This is taken as a part of struggle. But this part of struggle has been going on ever since the Second World War. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union which was then the leader of the world communist movement had adopted certain ideological, political and other organisational positions with regard to the communist world whose results the Soviet Union is reaping today. The developments that have taken place in Czechoslovakia, certainly, are the direct result of the very policies that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet leaders have been adopting.

#### 17. Hrs

What is the position today? Today, the position is that as a result of these policies, when they gave ground to those counter-revolutionary forces along with the policies of what we call the big nations' chauvinism adopted by the Soviet Union, naturally, inside Czechoslovakia, other counter-forces began to develop. Naturally, they were also assisted by other forces which were waiting for such development. Under these circumstances, the Soviet Union, having disarmed those militant forces of socialism and communism, ideologically and politically, having emasculated them, has landed itself into this wonderful position where its action is not supported by any communist party in its own ranks. This is a position where even the French Communist Party, even the Italian Communist Party, even the British Communist Party, all people who stand by the Soviet Union with regard to the ideological and political positions, even those Communist Parties, could not support the Soviet Union. On the other hand, they have come out in open condemnation of it.

The position is this. A political problem has arisen. In this world-

[Shri P. Ramamurti]  
wide fight, it is, certainly, true that imperialism has been always seeking to undermine the socialist world. It has always been seeking to undermine the development of socialist movement and communist movement throughout the world. We know, for example, how the Americans sought to arm the West Germans to the hilt so that they can intervene in all these things. We know, for example, how they are intervening in Vietnam. What for? We know that. Precisely, at this moment, instead of strengthening those forces that could stand up to them, having disarmed completely, today, unfortunately, the Soviet Union has found itself in this position of military intervention where, as I said, the communist parties who supported the Soviet Union are not able to support it. Its actions today are such that it is not able to explain in understandable terms to anybody. This is the real position.

What is our position? Our position is that a political problem cannot be solved by military means unless it leads to serious rethinking inside the Soviet Union itself. I know Mr. Masani is extremely unhappy over that. I know Mr. Masani thinks, if the Soviet Union and China come together, what will happen to us. That is what he is afraid of. May I remind Mr. Masani that at the time when the Soviet Union and China were working together, we did not have a quarrel with China and that our quarrel with China developed precisely at the time when the Soviet Union and China quarrelled on ideological questions?

Mr. Masani is worried over that. He is afraid of the fact that if the communist movement in the world gets united, the forces or the interests he represents will be jeopardised—their days are numbered. That is why he is very much afraid of that.

Our position is quite clear. Our position is that a military solution cannot be found for these ideological, political and other organisational

questions essentially unless the Soviet leadership is able to rethink on its basic policies. After all, it should realise that its basic policies have led not only to the division in the communist movement in the whole world but today it has led to the division inside even those communist parties which have been supporting the Soviet Union.

This is the position to which it has led. These problems can only be solved on the basis of rethinking and on the basis of fundamental principles. I know, some of these fundamental principles are anathema to many in this House, but, nonetheless, I hope, it will lead to it so that this kind of thing is not necessary but, on the other hand, the Communist movement in the whole world will stand together and we will go forward whatever might be the forces of imperialism.

MR. SPEAKER : I will allow one or two members on this side. SSP and PSP are the parties which have yet to participate and then the Prime Minister will reply. I would request the hon. members to be brief.

MR. RABI RAY.

श्री रबि राय (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जिस विषय के सम्बन्ध में हम लोग यहां बहस कर रहे हैं वह एक राष्ट्रीय सवाल नहीं है बल्कि वह इस तरह का एक मानवीय सवाल है कि जिसके बारे में हम सब लोग चिंतित हैं। मेरी पार्टी की ओर से जो विकल्प पेश किया गया है मैं उसे आप की सेवा में पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia condemns the naked aggression on peace-loving, independent socialist Czechoslovakia by the USSR and her Warsaw Pact allies; and further demands that the Russian and her

allied armies withdraw immediately from Czechoslovakia territory; and further urges the Government of India to initiate steps in every national and international forum to defend the sovereignty and integrity of Czechoslovakia, a country whose friendship with India is based on ties much stronger than those that bind most other nations; and further expresses the solidarity of the people of India with the people of Czechoslovakia."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, रूस सरकार की ओर से जो वक्तव्य जारी किया गया है कि कैसे और क्यों यह उन की मशमूर मेनाओं को चैकोस्लोवाकिया के अन्दर घुमना पड़ा है तो उसे आप सुन कर ताज्जुब में आ जायेंगे। तास का जो उस बारे में कथन है वह भी आप को पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"It is authorised to state that the party and the government leaders of Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have asked the Soviet Union and other allied States to render the fraternal Czechoslovak people urgent assistance, including assistance with armed forces."

इस तरह का झूठा और गलत वक्तव्य एक बड़े राष्ट्र के फौरन मिनिस्टर का निकलता है। एक बड़े राष्ट्र की तरफ से ऐसा झूठा और गलत वक्तव्य दिया जाता है। लेकिन यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि दूसरी तरफ ।

कल प्राँग में जो चैकोस्लोवाकिया की राष्ट्रीय पार्लियामेंट है उस की ओर से यह प्रस्ताव पास किया गया है कि रूस के इस हस्तक्षेप की वह निन्दा करती है। एक तरफ रूस कहता है कि हम लोगों को वहाँ आने का निमंत्रण दिया गया, न्योता दिया गया, चैकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता की तरफ से हमें वहाँ आने का निमंत्रण दिया गया दुसरी तरफ हम लोगों के सामने यह तथ्य आ चुका है कि चैकोस्लोवाकिया की जो नेशनल असैम्बली है उस ने सर्वसम्मति से यह प्रस्ताव पास किया है कि हम लोग यह जो नैकैड एग्शन

हुआ है, हमारे ऊपर नंगा आक्रमण हुआ है उस की हम घोर निन्दा करते हैं। इस पृष्ठभूमि में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक दुखी देश जैसा कि चैकोस्लोवाकिया है उस के ऊपर यह नंगा हमला हो रहा है। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जब बयान देती हैं तो उन के बयान में आप कभी कोई इस तरह की चीज नहीं देखेंगे कि वह इस हमले की निन्दा करती हैं। आज रूस एक राक्षस की तरह है और चैकोस्लोवाकिया एक शिशु की तरह है। मैं तो कहूँगा कि आज शिशु हत्या हुई है लेकिन इस के बारे में प्रधान मंत्री निन्दा की कोई बात नहीं करती हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कारण है कि इस तरह का हमला हो चुकने पर भी प्रधान मंत्री की तरफ से कोई निन्दा की बात नहीं हो रही है? इस का मतलब स्पष्ट है कि पिछले 21 सालों से भारत सरकार की विदेश नीति रूस और अमरीका की पिछलगू बनने की रही है, यानी उन के पीछे चलने वाली। इसीलिये, मैं कहूँगा, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के बयान में कोई भी ऐसी बात नहीं आई है जिस में स्पष्ट रूप से रूस की निन्दा की गई हो।

17-11

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत वर्ष के विदेश मंत्री या प्रधान मंत्री की तरफ से इस लिये कोई साफ बयान नहीं आया निन्दा का की वह रूस से डरती है। इसी डर के मारे भारत सरकार की दोगली नीति रही है कि रूस क्या सोचेगा। आज चैकोस्लोवाकिया की जनता में आजादी की भूख जगी है, स्वाधीनता की पिपासा जगी है, लेकिन उस मनुष्य के अधिकार के बारे में भारत सरकार कुछ नहीं कहती है।

आप जानते हैं कि कम्युनिस्ट रूस के आधिपत्य के खिलाफ पिछले 15 सालों में एक आदमी विरोध का प्रतिक बना है, और वह है मार्शल टिटो। आज सुबह एक दोस्त ने मुझ को एक किताब दी। शायद आप ने उस को पढ़ा होगा। उस किताब का नाम है "टीटो स्पीक्स"।

[श्री रवि राय]

ब्लाडोमीर डेरिजर जो बायोग्रफर हैं उन की लिखी हुई है। उम में टीटो ने खुद जो कहा है वह मैं आप की खिदमत में पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। आज कम्यूनिस्ट लोग जो कुछ भी कहें, और मैं मानता हूँ कि श्री राममूर्ति कम्यूनिस्टों के दोस्त हैं वह मानेंगे कि टीटो अमरीका के पीछे चलने वाले नहीं हैं। मार्शल टीटो समाजवाद के रास्ते पर चलने वाले, यूगोस्लाविया की राष्ट्रीयता को मान कर वहाँ समाजवाद चलाने के प्रतीक बन गये हैं और उन्होंने स्टालिनवाद से हट कर स्वतन्त्र समाजवाद बनाया है। मैं आप के सामने वह चीज पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जो कि बड़ी भयंकर चीज है। रेड आर्मी के बारे में खुद टीटो क्या कहते हैं वह मैं टीटो की भाषा को उद्धृत कर के सुनाता हूँ। जब रेड आर्मी यूगोस्लाविया के अन्दर घुस गई और वहाँ की पददलित जनता पर हमला किया तो उस के बारे में वह कहते हैं कि :

"Wherever the units of the Red Army passed, people complained about their behaviour. Many women were assaulted, many were raped, and there were cases of murder and robbery. At first we tried to explain these things to the people as isolated instances, but the number of crimes steadily grew. This did enormous harm to the prestige of the Red Army and Soviet Union, and hampered us in our political work, because not only during the war, but even before it, we had been telling our people quite different things about the Red Army. The misconduct assumed such proportions that it was becoming a grave political problem. Reports were received by our authorities that Red Army officers and men had committed 1,219 rapes on Yugoslav territory 329 attempted rapes, 111 rapes with murder, 248 rapes and attempts at murder and 1,204 robberies with violence. The Secretary of the Country Youth Committee of Vojvodina was among the girls raped. Even the wife of a mem-

ber of the National Committee was assaulted. In Belgrade itself there were several cases of rape which provoked indignation in our army and among the civilian population."

मैं ने आप को ब्लाडिमिर डेरिजर की किताब से यह उद्धरण इस लिये दिया कि आज हम लोगों के सामने सोवियत रूस का नंगा हमला हुआ क्योंकि चेकोस्लोवाकिया की दुखी जनता का दुबचेक के नेतृत्व में जो मधुधरवादी आन्दोलन चल रहा था उस को देख कर रूसी चिढ़ गये। वह लोग यह नहीं सह पाये कि जिस तरह से टीटो के नेतृत्व में यूगोस्लाविया उन के हाथ से चला गया उसी तरह चेकोस्लोवाकिया दुबचेक के नेतृत्व में घला जाये।

अगर हम इस पृष्ठभूमि में देखेंगे तो पायेंगे कि रूसी टैंकों और रूसी सेनाओं के खिलाफ किम हंग से वीरता के माथ और किम साहस के साथ प्राग के युवजन और प्राग के नागरिक कहते हैं कि रूसी तुम घर वापस जाओ। आज वहाँ के लोग गांधीजी का सत्याग्रह और पैसिव रेजिस्टेंस अपना रहे हैं। यह एक बहुत बड़ी चीज है। भले ही कांग्रेस दल के लोग गांधीजी के सत्याग्रह को भूल चुके हों, लेकिन चेक लोग राक्षसी रूस के खिलाफ कोई क्रान्ति नहीं कर रहे हैं। वह चाहते हैं कि जनता की तरफ से कोई आवाज बुलन्द हो और उसी आवाज को चेकोस्लोवाकिया के नागरिक और युवक लोग दुबचेक के नेतृत्व में अपना रहे हैं।

इस पृष्ठभूमि को लेकर दो-तीन घटनायें मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ। जब हम गुलाम थे तब आप को याद होगा कि पंडित नेहरू ने खुद मुसोलिनी जैसे फासिस्ट आदमी से मिलने में इन्कार कर दिया था। इस लिये इन्कार कर दिया था कि उस ने ऐन्वीसीनिया पर हमला किया था। उसी तरह से जब जापान का हमला चीन पर हुआ तब कांग्रेस ने एक मेडिकल मिशन वहाँ भेजा था जिस में डा० कोटनिस जैसे व्यक्ति को मरना पड़ा। लेकिन वह अमर हो गये, शहीद हो गये। आज कांग्रेस को

वह याद नहीं है। उसी तरह से जब 1939 में हिटलर की सेना चेकोस्लोवाकिया पर हमला किया था उस वक्त कांग्रेस ने गांधीजी के नेतृत्व में विरोध किया था। क्या जब अमरीका इस तरह का हमला करेगा तब हम उस की निन्दा करेंगे और जब रूस का हमला होगा तब हम उस का स्वागत करेंगे? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस में कोई तत्व नहीं है। हमला हमला है।

रूस के हमले का स्वागत करना और अमरीका के हमले की निन्दा करना इस तरह का एक चिन्तन कुछ लोगों के दिमाग में, खासकर कुछ कम्युनिस्ट लोगों के दिमाग में, चलता है। लेकिन इस तरह से मनुष्य की आजादी और मानवाधिकार जैसी कोई चीज नहीं रह जाती है। इस लिये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज यह साफ हो गया है कि यह खुला और नंगा हमला है। हम लोग कहना चाहते हैं कि आज सारे राष्ट्र में जनता इस के ऊपर बहुत चिन्तित है और इस की निन्दा करती है। भारत सरकार की ओर से प्रधान मंत्री ने कल इसके बारे में कोई निन्दा का बयान नहीं दिया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि भले ही मलिक साहब संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में रूस की ओर से कितना ही विरोध करें, जब यह मामला संयुक्त संघ के सामने आयेगा तब भारत सरकार क्या नीति अपनायेगी? क्या जो नीति श्री मेनन अपनाते थे कि जब चीन हमारे ऊपर हमला करता था तब वह कहते थे उस को यूनाइटेड नेशन का सदस्य बनाया जाये, वही नीति अपनाई जायेगी? अगर आज वही नीति भारत सरकार अपनाती है तो मैं उस को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दुस्तान की करोड़ों जनता यह चाहती है कि जब इस तरह की चीज संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में आये तब भारत सरकार इनिशिएटिव ले कर, अग्रग्राह्य हो कर, पहल करे और उस का समर्थन करे।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप जानते हैं कि आज हम लोगों के पास सेना की इतनी ताकत नहीं है कि हम दूसरे देश की सहायता कर सकें।

फिर भी मैं एक चीज की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। जैसे स्पेनिश सिविल वार के समय जो प्रजातन्त्र और समाजवाद में विश्वास रखने वाले लोग थे वह सब जाकर स्पेनिश सिविल वार में प्रजातन्त्री शक्तियों की सहायता करते थे, उसी तरह मैं क्या हम लोग कोई इस तरह का ब्रिगेड बनायेंगे जो वहाँ जा कर चेकोस्लोवाकिया के लोगों की सहायता करे, वह जनमत तैयार करे दुनिया में और जो दृबचक की कानूनी सरकार है, जिस के पीछे वहाँ की पूरी जनता है, उसका समर्थन करे? वहाँ पर कोई दकियानूसी या कठपुतली सरकार बन जाय यह नहीं होना चाहिये।

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग इस लोक सभा में रूस का चेकोस्लोवाकिया पर जो नंगा हमला हुआ है उस की घोर निन्दा करते हैं। सरकार की राय भले ही कुछ भी हो लेकिन लोक सभा इस की घोर निन्दा करती है और हमारी पार्टी भी, चेकोस्लोवाकिया पर जो हमला हुआ है इस की घोर निन्दा करती है।

**SHRI B. SHANKARANAND (Chikodi):** Sir, since yesterday we have been discussing a very great situation which has arisen in the international scene. Yesterday, I saw the Opposition parties fighting among themselves. Today also I saw the Speaker himself sometimes called it "This is not a fish market." These things are happening in this Parliament when we are discussing a very serious subject affecting the world and with which India is closely connected. At this time, I heard the speeches from the Opposition side, and I do not know, and I fail to understand as to who spoke in favour of imperialism and who spoke in favour of communism, because the speakers on the other side were not clear in their own thinking about their own ideologies.

**SHRI M. L. SONDI:** Sir, are we having a lecture on the Opposition?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Order, order. Please resume your seat.

**SHRI B. SHANKARANAND:** At this time, I am reminded of a very

interesting story. There was a very serious case being argued before a court. The lawyer on the one side shouted, showed his fists and stamped on the table and spoke nothing. The lawyer on the other side, without talking anything, kept quiet, but do you know what he did? He moved his fists, this way and that way, stamped on the table, kicked the ground and all that. The others asked, "What are you doing?" He replied, "No Sir, I am replying." That was his first reaction. Afterwards, he opened his books and began to argue calmly. I do not want to do the first one which I quoted. I want to speak out my thoughts on this problem. I do not want to shout like the Opposition benches. (*Interruption*) Russia is strong militarily, and showing its might over a very small country has been, in my eyes, an act of cowardice, and it has exhibited its cowardice. And Czechoslovakia, by showing its passive resistance, has displayed its courage. In this light we have to see the world situation.

I am also surprised to find that many eminent parliamentarians today, on many occasions, who have spoken about democracy and communism are absent today, and those who have spoken since yesterday have not spoken anything and they have not shown their reaction.

On this question, as I said, as far as I can see, China is silent; Pakistan is silent; though some old Communist countries have immediately reacted, these three groups—some in our country, and the neighbouring countries—China and Pakistan—have been silent without saying anything. I am rather surprised; they talked about socialism and about imperialism. But I found the forces of socialism and imperialism were fighting in this very House without fighting in the interests of this country. None of them spoke anything in the interests of the country, and if we have real interest in our country, if we want to give a better image of our country to the world at large, I think we should have wholeheartedly supported the Prime Minister.

What is wrong with the Prime Minister's statement? They are finding fault with the Prime Minister's statement. On this occasion, I want to narrate a very small story. There were some blind men and they wanted to know what an elephant was like. Some of them caught hold of the leg and said that it was just like a tree. Some others caught hold of the trunk and said it was just like a snake. Some caught hold of the tusk and said it was just like a spear. Some caught hold of the tail and said it was like a rope. The Members of the Opposition have done the same thing.

Without knowing what the statement of the Prime Minister is they say that this is not a proper statement, this is not an elephant. Let them study the statement as a whole. Let them know that the statement of the Prime Minister fully carries what they want to express. But they are carried away by their feelings.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Okay, we are now convinced.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I hope you know an elephant now..... (*interruptions*) I am not accustomed to being interrupted, because I never interrupt anybody. I just now gave an example.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: We are very much impressed by his speech.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: It is stated in *Pravda*:

"There is and cannot be any peaceful co-existence in the field of ideology as there can be no class peace between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie."

This is the view given expression to by *Pravda*, the mouthpiece of the Communist Party. I think a certain section of this House is very much associated with this as can be seen from the speeches on the other side.

We are committed to socialism, but not socialism minus democracy. Our socialism is democratic socialism. And

if there is anything against democracy, I think we have to react very carefully. The opposition members are very right in their feeling. They want the Prime Minister to express our feelings in very strong terms. They must appreciate that our Prime Minister has expressed our view in quite reasonable terms with restraint, because she has the responsibility to carry out what she says, because she has to run the government. She has to create an image for us in the world relations.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** He is spoiling his case.

**SHRI B. SHANKARANAND:** If Hon. Members go through her statement carefully they will find that she has given expression to their feelings and thoughts.

Acharya Kripalani spoke something about Indian tradition, culture, history and background. No other member spoke about India, some spoke about Tito, what another country has done, how imperialism is in danger, how socialism is in danger and so on. I say that the whole of humanity is in danger today. So, we must support the Prime Minister so that she can carry out our policies.

**SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I heard the announcer of the All India Radio yesterday at 8 o'clock read out the bulletin, informing us that units of the Soviet army along with those of some members of the Warsaw Pact had invaded Czechoslovakia, I was shocked, stunned and staggered. Anguish, agony, pain and sadness seized me, as it must have seized millions of my countrymen. I was reminded, suddenly, of what I have read but I did not believe: once again, we shall have to witness the cruel truth of a poem by Mathew Arnold:

"We are here on a darkling plain,  
Swept by confused alarms of  
struggle and fight,

Where ignorant armies clash by  
the night."

Across my mind flashed the thought given in a similar tragedy Jawaharlal Nehru had written, which has moved and left an indelible impress on the generation to which I belong:

"Once more we hear the world  
that sickened the earth of old,

No law except the sword, un-  
sheath and uncontrolled".

This was then to be the law. All these years we had hoped that the world was slowly moving towards sanity, towards reason, towards mutual respect. But here was the spectacle of one of the two mightiest nations of the world turning all its fury and might against one of the smallest nations in the world.

Sir, in this agony I also realised that it was not only Czechoslovakia which was going through this agonising tragedy. In a real sense we were on trial. It was not only Czechoslovakia's freedom that was going through an ordeal. It was perhaps our honour also which was on trial. How shall we face it? How shall we react to it? How can we rescue Czechoslovakia's freedom and in the process uphold the honour of our country? These thoughts continue to assail me and I look forward that the Prime Minister, without mincing words, seeing what has happened, would rise up to the occasion and would speak not for a negligible minority, which is vastly parading the label of being progressive, but for the vast broad masses of our country. And what has happened when I listened to the speech? May I say, Sir, I know, comparisons can be odious at times, sometimes invidious. But may I, in all humility and respect, tell her once when Czechoslovakia was the victim of another aggression, what did Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru say? He said:

"I listened to the speech of Mr. Neville Chamberlain. It was an appeal to restraint after the Baldwin manner, but lacking the Baldwin touch and personality. It struck me as singularly ineffective. There was no reference to the vital issue at

[Shri Nath Pai]

stake and the naked sword that was being flashed towards the world challenging humanity. There was no reference to the way of violence that was becoming the law of the nations."

And so, he said:

"I felt depressed and my heart was heavy within me. Was virtue always to be treated so unless it was accompanied by the big battalions? Was evil ever to triumph?"

This was the question, I think, that was uppermost in the minds of every Member of Parliament who listened to the Prime Minister's statement yesterday. We know the great responsibility which lies on the shoulders of the Prime Minister of India. We are also conscious that we have certain relationship with the Soviet Union, and nobody wants those bonds to be broken, but are we to shirk our responsibility? Are we to take it lying down? Are we to take it lying down under the garb of statesmanship? Are we to ignore our basic duties when our honour is at stake and the freedom of another country is in danger, that our national interest may be jeopardised? Shall India sink so low? Is that the tradition, as Shri Kripalani asked us? Is that the tradition which we have inherited from Gandhiji that whatever may happen in the world, because some nations give us a few bags of wheat, therefore, we should be tied down and not say anything, or some other country gives us some wretched little arms and so we should condone these things? Shall India sink so low? This is the thought which comes uppermost in our minds today. The situation was partly retrieved today when something unusual, something unprecedented, happened, not in numbers, but in significance, in meaning. Today we saw 120 million Indians marching in silence, in protest, expressing their solidarity with the people of Czechoslovakia. It was not 120 M.Ps. who marched. Behind these 120 M.Ps. who marched there were at least 120 million Indians who wanted us to demonstrate our sym-

pathy with the people of Czechoslovakia. And in this agonising and disturbing situation, as the news came with every bulletin of the All-India Radio. I was wondering what was happening in Prague. This march was startling and exciting because we were led by one of the veterans of the freedom fight of our nation. We were led by the last freely elected President of the Congress party and we had the company of the one true Congressman in the Congress party, Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani.

17-35 Hrs.

Partly, if the Prime Minister would not speak for us courageously, honestly and in a straightforward manner, we spoke: the MPs who marked spoke.

What is the basic, fundamental issue that is at stake? Shall we be playing only with words; shall we be having semantic quarrels only or shall we face the basic issues, straight and simple? I want to say, the issue is very simple, very clear, very plain and very obvious. The issue is that the rape of a small nation has been committed, the soul of a nation is being tried to be strangled, the voice of a small nation is being stifled by the use of a naked sword. Is this the voice of an Indian reactionary, as some of our friends want to say? One after another I will prove, I think, that it is nothing but aggression. But if it is an aggression what should be the response and the reaction of India? These are the two simple issues before the Parliament and the country today.

I shall now quote, not a reactionary but one of the great Communists of all times, Marshal Tito. This is what he told recently, before the tragedy took place, to Al Ahram. When the tragedy was to befall Marshal Tito says this—and this is something that the Government of India and those who are not still able to make up their minds should take into consideration:—

"Secondly, the situation is not such that socialism in Czechoslovakia is in jeopardy."

Marshal Tito says that he is not convinced that socialism in Czechoslovakia is in jeopardy. He says:—

“If there should be any intervention or strong pressure from the West posing a direct threat to the social system, Czechoslovakia has its own army to defend it, it has its own Communist Party, it has its own working class.”

This is what Marshal Tito says.

17.37 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

But I will turn to one Indian Communist who led the Indian Communist Party with distinction and honour. I wish he had continued a little longer! The tragedy of the Indian Communist Party is that it has never dared to produce a Dubcek. How wonderful would it be if the Indian Communist Party one day produced a Dubcek! I hope that the restrained speech made by Shri Yogendra Sharma today is perhaps the beginning that the Communist Party of India is not immunised against the forces of freedom that are overtaking the Communist Parties in every part of the world.

Shri P. C. Joshi, Shri Pooran Chandra Joshi, not a reactionary, not a Jan Sanghi, not a Swantraite, not a PSP reactionary but a man who led the destiny of the Communist Party of India for the longest period has to say this—for the Communist Party of India I would like to read this: a choice thing it is:—

“Is it not time to learn that serenity is not loyalty to the Soviet Union and all it stands for?”

This is what some people here and some people there also should learn, that there is a lot of difference between friendship and friendship. Friendship calls for a special responsibility. No responsibility is greater than, when the friend is erring, to tell him so with firmness because that is preserving the ties of friendship and that will perhaps save the friend also from further

mistake. We call the Soviet Union our friends. I think, we are friends and I would like the Indians to cultivate that friendship. I know the limitation that friendship imposes upon me and the responsibility that friendship casts on me. Shall I disown that in a moment of crisis? That is the thing. But I discover that a campaign is being raised against some of us because we raised our voice against the supply of Soviet arms to Pakistan and it is said that we are reactionaries. We have always been reactionaries. Somebody today called me a pro-Communist but normally we are being called these days reactionaries. Nothing of the kind is true. The only guilt that can be brought against us with some force of conviction and truth is that what matters, what counts, what worries, what guides and what inspires us is the interest of this country. That is the only thing that leads us to any position in this country.

Shri Pooran Chandra Joshi then tells us very clearly:—

“I say more, why unduly exaggerate the danger of counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia as a convenient cover for interference in the internal life of the Czech Party and of the affairs of the Czech state.”

This is what he says.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was distressed to listen to the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Bakar Ali Mirza, a good man, an honest man and a man for whom I have the highest regard. But I do not know how he could have said what he managed to say today. I was really distressed to hear his speech. Obviously, he seems to know more the truth about what is happening in Czechoslovakia than the President of Czechoslovakia; he seems to be having more agony than the chosen President, the Communist Party, the Legislature and the Government.

Last night, the Soviet spokesman told the Security Council that what they are doing is the domestic affair of Czechoslovakia and, therefore, the Security Council should not interfere.

[Shri Nath Pai]

I think, this will go as a master-piece of the understatement of the twentieth century. I quote from the All India Radio:

"The Czechoslovak President Svoboda said in a broadcast last night that the action of the Warsaw Pact countries was illegal. He declared that there is no way back from the liberal programme the country had embarked upon."

Now, the Czechoslovak National Assembly has issued a Proclamation calling on the Soviet troops to withdraw. I want to tell my hon. friend, Shri Bakar Ali Mirza, here is the proclamation of the Czechoslovak National Assembly. This is what they say. It denounces the occupation as a complete violation of Czechoslovak sovereignty.

I was surprised to hear the people insinuating that it may be in the interest of the Czech people. Is aggression in the interest of any people? We are told that the Czech people invited the Soviet Union. They have never bothered to identify the so-called Czech leaders who have invited the Russian army to go there. We would like to know their names, their status and their positions, as to whom they represent. We have never been told who they are. But we are told they have been invited by the Czech people. May I tell you there is a slogan, recently appearing in the streets of Calcutta it is: माओर एव मुक्तीर एव

The path of Mao is the path of liberation. If this insane person or this irresponsible person gets any possibility of calling Mao in this country, will that be an invitation by the Indian leaders to him to come and occupy our country? I would like to know the answer. Prevarication is going on one after another.

Yesterday, an attempt was made; we did not know the full facts. What facts do we need to know that aggression has taken place? It is quite clear and patent to everybody that the nation has been aggressed upon by out-

side armed forces. Should it take time for India to make up its mind? What does Czechoslovakia says? How can people go on making these insinuations that the Russians have gone at the invitation of the Czech leaders? But this is a classical plea of every aggressor. Don't we know that when Hitler, finally, occupied Norway, he had one Norwegian to invite him, called, Mr. Quisling, who was rewarded and was allowed to form Government? How can India forget all this?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, subject India behaved better than how free India is behaving. I would like to point out that when Abyssinia was the victim of aggression, when Spain was struggling for preserving democracy, when China became the victim of Japanese aggression, the voice of subject India was raised by Jawaharlal Nehru—and also by Tagore—in a moving passage on the tragedy of Spain. The spokesman of struggling India, subject India, occupied India, Jawaharlal Nehru, speaks in these words:

"But while we argue and debate, blood flows in Spain and heroic men and women and even children fight our battles and give their lives for human liberty."

Substitute 'Czechoslovakia' where late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has used the word 'Spain', and you get the full picture of the tragedy, you get the full meaning, the significance and the dimension. Then Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"We are ourselves helpless in India and hunger and stark-poverty meet us everywhere; we fight for our freedom and to rid ourselves of the empire that exploits and crushes us. Famine and flood....."

All this is true of India today.

".....Famine and flood and natural calamity have pursued us and added to the burdens of empire. But out of our hunger and poverty we will send what help we can to our comrades in Spain, and though this may not be much, it will carry with it the earnest and anxious good

wishes of the people of India. For those who suffer themselves feel most for their brothers in misfortune elsewhere."

Why did she not call the Czech Ambassador yesterday as the Prime Minister of India? Why did she not tell him that it has been the tradition of her country, her father, her nation and her people to stand by all those who are resisting aggression? She could have said this, "I am not today speaking as the Prime Minister of a Party but as the spokesman for 51 crores of Indians". She could have enjoyed this glory for one brief minute. She could have told him, "Please convey to your Government that we stand with you; we have perhaps nothing by way of arms to give you; we have no aeroplanes; we have no submarines; we do not have even much food and money to give you, but the hearts of all Indians go in full sympathy towards you". Did we do it? What stopped us from doing that? Do we need anybody's permission for it? And if we are afraid of doing it, are we fully sovereign and free people in the true sense of the word? I am afraid, not only the case of Czechoslovakia but occasions like this frighten me as to what is the significance of our own freedom.

I would like to point out to you the agonising words one after another of the Czechoslovakian leaders. I read the Resolution. I read the statement of the President. I read the Resolution of the Assembly. Now I will turn and say what the Czechoslovakian representative has been saying at the United Nations:

"Now as then, the question of the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia is at stake". Mr. Muzik declared. He compared the situation to that in 1938 when the Munich Agreement was concluded by the then British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain....."

He challenged the statement of the Soviet representative and said that the Soviet forces have entered his country

against the wishes of his Government, his President and his people.

If this is not aggression, what is aggression? Do we need, like the definition of 'spade', the word 'aggression' to be defined? If aggression is established beyond measure, what should be our duty? Should the Government of India not say at least what the leaders of the world Communist parties have been saying, and should we be hesitating to say that? Which are those Communist parties? The Italian Communist Party is the biggest Communist Party outside the Soviet Union in Europe. The French Communist Party is the second biggest party. These are mighty parties enjoying mass support in those countries. And what have they been saying? Promptly have they come in support of the Czech people declaring their solidarity with the Czech leadership, the Czech Communist Party and the legal Government of Mr. Svoboda and Mr. Dubcek. Should India not do what all the Communists in the world are doing? Let us forget the Americans, the British and the French. You and I perhaps have every reason to believe that once again there might have been a shady deal between Kremlin and White House. We knew that there was such a shady deal at Yalta to divide the world. But have we divided the world? Does India have a skeleton in its cupboard like Vietnam to be afraid of the Soviet Union? Why should we be afraid? I may not care whether Mr. Rusk protests or not. I have a clear conscience. India has a clear conscience. So, there is no justification for the Prime Minister of India to tell the people of India, "The other leaders have not spoken and so, we cannot speak". My country has never committed aggression; India is never guilty of aggression. So, India should raise its voice. Then we are asked this extraordinary question: when did we pass such a Resolution in the past? When Czechoslovakia was aggressed upon in 1938 and became a victim of the Nazis in 1939, there was no Parliament, no freedom. The difference is that today we have a Parliament,

[Shri Nath Pai]

we are free, and, therefore, I want it to be passed; therefore, we want it. This is the reply that I give to all those who are again and again asking.....

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member may please conclude.

SHRI NATH PAI: I would like you to be a little liberal to me. I would like to bring the All India Congress Committee.

Then the All India Congress Committee—how different is the All India Congress Committee today?—which was the parliament of the Indian nation, which wanted freedom, that parliament of India, passed a resolution condemning Hitler's aggression against Czechoslovakia. Those who want to ask the question, 'When did we pass a resolution?', this is the reply that the All India Congress Committee then gave. I wish it had continued that adherence to the interests of our people, to the welfare of our people; then perhaps our history would have been different.

Now, here is Nicolae Ceausescu, the Rumanian Communist Party Leader, speaking:

"If one considers that there is a counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia, one may say the same thing tomorrow about Rumania".

The Rumanian Communist Party said in Bucharest after a meeting of the Party that the 'occupation of Czechoslovakia was a grave mistake and is a serious danger to peace in Europe and socialism in the world'.

What was the crime of Dubcek? Here is the programme which was adopted by the plenary session of the freely elected Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, not imposed by imperialists, not imposed by the Germans or the Americans, the British or Indian reactionaries like Shri Minoo Masani. This was adopted at the plenary session of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Is this a crime against what Marx said? Is it a be-

trayal of the tenets of Leninism? The spirits of both Marx and Lenin must have shed a few tears like many Indians when they saw the Red Army crossing the frontiers of Czechoslovakia, and that too in the name of the preservation of socialism and democracy. Here is the declaration of the Czechoslovak Communist Party which has been accused of betraying socialism

"We stand resolutely on the side of progress, democracy and socialism in the struggle of the socialist and democratic forces against the aggressive attempts of world imperialism. It is from this point of view that we determine our attitude to the most acute international problem of the present and our share in the world-wide struggle against the forces of imperialism".

What is the sin they have committed? They are being accused of being hostile to the Soviet Union. Yet this is their declaration, when they were free to say something:

"We shall put special emphasis on friendly ties, mutual consultations and exchanges of experience with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with the Communist and Workers' Parties of the other Socialist community, with all the other fraternal Communist parties....."

Certainly not a betrayal of socialism, certainly not a betrayal of friendship with the Soviet Union, certainly not a departure from what Lenin stood for. This is the only thing they wanted.

What did they want? Here is the real challenge for India. Does not a nation, because it is small, because it does not have the atom bomb, because it does not control battalions, have the right to follow its own genius and to shape its own destiny? Are we to let loose the floodgates of interference? Shall the sword be the arbiter of human destiny. This is what the people of Czechoslovakia are asking you, me and every man and woman in the world who has a conscience. The Americans may not be free to give a reply. The British may be guilty

of something, and they may not open their mouth. But what is India guilty of that she should not give her verdict clearly on the side of the right of a nation to shape its destiny?

What today Czechoslovakia is asking is nothing but to be left alone, to do what? To shape its destiny, to mould its own future. We have seen within our lifetime this small nation become twice the victim of aggression. First it was in 1939. Then a black night descended on her. Now, immediately after a spell of the sunshine of freedom, once again the bleak, dark, and God knows how long, night of black tyranny has descended on these unfortunate people. In their long history of 1,000 years again and again they have been victims of their mighty neighbours—sometimes Germany, sometimes Austria and sometimes Russia. All that they want is to get back their freedom, to carve their own destiny according to their own genius. I have no doubt that whatever the Russians may choose to do, whatever their so-called allies may choose to do the flame of liberty which President Masaryk once lighted, breaking from the thralldom of Austria-Hungary will once again be lighted in the hearts of the Czechoslovak people and once again a new Czechoslovakia will be reborn with all glory, with all strength and with all freedom.

The only question this Parliament has to answer is: what role did we play in resurrecting a free Czechoslovakia? Shall we be guilty of having acquiesced by our silence in this crime? Are we not answerable to our people, to posterity? What shall the reply of India be? This is the only question that I want to ask the Prime Minister. She said something but that was not at all enough. Our response shall be immediate. No friendship is endangered; but our honour is. Perhaps the Russians will learn to respect us if they knew that we care for values more, we care for honour more than we care for goods, than we care for arms. This is the challenge and India has to respond to it.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (Ratnagiri): I heard a very eloquent speech from my distinguished colleague Shri Nath Pai..... (Interruptions). If eloquent words could give us some power in international affairs, certainly the resolutions the Parliament possess or the feelings expressed by the Hon. Members would mean a great deal. The dark clouds of hostile military intervention in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia have shocked us. The shock is caused more by our sanguine belief that peace on earth and goodwill among men has come to be accepted as a precept of international life. We did not recognise facts of reality and we thought that mankind had by now learnt the price of warfare. International politics respects only one principle and that principle is one of self-interest. If this can be gained peacefully, well and good. If not, as night follows the day, the use of force will be there. This is in fact what has happened in Czechoslovakia. Soviet troops are in occupation of Czechoslovakia and four of the Warsaw Pact countries are also there. President Svoboda and Dubcek are under arrest and the youth of Czechoslovakia are risking death and arrest in their attempt to stem the tide of foreign tanks invading their motherland. It is too early now to say what future developments will take place and how far the ideological, economic, political and military unity of socialist countries of Europe will be able to withstand this serious breach in their hitherto maintained solidarity under the Soviet leadership. As far back as 1948, Yugoslavia under President Tito's leadership had dared to have an identity of its own and when he did so, economic squeeze was used by the Soviet Union. Stalin did not use tanks not because of the reasons given by my hon. friend, Shri Masani; it was 18 HRS.

because Yugoslavia's geographical position is different, and Czechoslovakia is on the very border of Russia, and all other smaller countries—all other smaller socialist countries are there. And therefore, I am inclined to believe

[Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee]

that if economic squeeze has been useful, Russia would have adopted it. I do not think, therefore, that there is any difference in the super-power blocs between the policies and methods used, whether it be the USA, or the USSR. Therefore, whether it is a question of Vietnam, of the Korean war or of the Czechoslovakian situation, the same method and the same jungle law exist. As in the jungle, where the lions have their own territory and if there is any encroachment of that territory there is open warfare, so it is with the super-power countries. As in the old days, so too today, the people of the same religion will fight between each other. Now that the glory and illusion of the first stage of socialism has passed, rivalries will start. We shall see how far the solidarity of the socialist countries can withstand the pressures and rivalries and competition between themselves. So let us not sit in judgment here. Whatever ideological reasons may go to justify the military occupation of Czechoslovakia, the recent background of events, as far as I can see, is, as I said, that the ways of the super-powers are the same. We can do little at this stage, and therefore, I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister on the balanced and well-worded statement she has made yesterday.

In 1961, when the 22nd Congress of the Communist countries took place, the Russians recognised the right of each Communist country to have the pattern of Socialism of its own, and yet today, this is the test which the Soviet Union faces. The test is, whether her invasion of Czechoslovakia will jeopardise her international prestige. The test is, whether the moral leadership she has had over the Communist countries will withstand this. Therefore, it is not necessary for us sitting in Parliament here, to pass a hasty judgment. As I said, our policies must be directed by our self-interest in the same way as the policies of the bigger countries are directed and motivated by their own interests.

Last month, only in July, when the five Warsaw power letter was sent to Czechoslovakia, there was already a warning that the hostile forces held a "threat of tearing away Czechoslovakia from the Socialist countries". Why do we say that we are surprised about it? Were we asleep when these developments were taking place? Were we asleep when we saw the military manoeuvres in Czechoslovakia when, for the first time since 1945, Russian troops were on the Czech soil? Secondly, the elections were to take place next month in Czechoslovakia, and in those elections we know that a certain amount of freedom and liberalisation was going to be introduced. We know that economic reforms were contemplated in the small-scale industries where the private sector would be allowed. All this we saw. But why do we then say that we were unaware of this, and that we were taken aback? I want to know what exactly my hon. friends would like India to do. Is it possible to translate our words into action?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Truth.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: Truth has no value in the international world. Truth has to be backed by power. (*Interruption*). I want to know when in the history of the world international obligation has been governed by truth. Acharyaji is respected by all. He has quoted extensively from what he said happened during the independence movement. Today, the government has the responsibility of governing. Today government's statement and action are concerned not merely with agitation and so on which my hon. friends have the privilege of having, because the government must make statements which will in the future have reference to the action which it proposes to take.

MR. SPEAKER: She should conclude now.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: I will conclude because my time is up. Public opinion which is not translatable into action has little value. There are more constructive ways of

expressing our reaction to the Soviet Union's method of settling accounts with her allies. It is not that we do not disapprove of, that we do not renounce the action of the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia, but I do not think that it is by emotional outbursts of feelings that we can serve the ends that we cherish. There are other peaceful ways like the forum of the United Nations and trade and economic relations. These are peaceful constructive ways. We must always condemn those things which will be a threat to world peace like hasty military action. But, as I said before, before taking any steps we must keep our national interest in view. That is the determining factor for deciding our course of action. Therefore, I reiterate what I said earlier that I congratulate the Prime Minister for her very responsible and balanced statement.

श्री गुलाम मुहम्मद वल्लो (धीनगर) :  
जनाब स्पीकर साहब, यहाँ काफी तकरीरें हुईं, हर एक शख्स ने अपने अपने खयालात का इज़हार किया। एक-दो मिनट में मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँतक हमारी पार्लमेंट का ताल्लुक है, आजादी के बाद, हमारे मुल्क की भी यही हालत थी जोकि आज जेकोस्लाविकिया की हो रही है, सन 62 में जबकि चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला किया था या जबकि पाकिस्तान ने हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला किया था और उन दोनों हमलों को, चाहे वे छोटे पैमाने पर या बड़े पैमाने पर थे, इसी पार्लमेंट ने एग्शन करार दिया था और हमने तबको रखी थी दुनिया की तमाम आजाद कौमों से कि वे पाकिस्तान के हमले को एग्शन मानकर उसे कन्डेम करें या चीन के हमले को जोकि उसने सन् 62 में हिन्दुस्तान पर किया था, एग्शन मानकर कन्डेम करें। ये दो बातें आजादी के बाद हमारे सामने आई हैं और इसी पार्लमेंट ने उन दोनों हमलों को, पाकिस्तान के हमले को भी और चीन के हमले को भी, एग्शन कहकर कन्डेम ही नहीं किया है बल्कि खुद उसका मुकाबला किया अपने देश को आजादी इन्टिग्रिटी और सावरेन्टी को बचाने के लिए। आजादी की हिस्ट्री से पहले जबकि हम खुद अपनी आजादी के लिए

लड़ रहे थे उस के मुताल्लिक बहुत कुछ यहाँ पर कहा गया है। उस वक्त हम खुद आजाद नहीं थे, अपनी आजादी के लिए लड़ रहे थे। हम उस वक्त सिर्फ अपनी ही आजादी के लिए ख्वाहिशमंद नहीं थे बल्कि दुनिया भर की कौमों की आजादी के लिए भी हम उतने ही ख्वाहिशमंद थे जितना कि अपने लिए थे। आज वक्त आया है कि हम यह साबित करें कि हम आज भी दुनिया भर की कौमों की आजादी के लिए पहले जितने ख्वाहिशमंद हैं। मैं यह कहूंगा कि आज इस पार्लियामेंट का इम्तिहान है कि वह इस कसौटी पर खरी उतरे। जैसे कि पहले जब किसी पर भी इस तरह का हमला होता था और आप उस को हमला कहते थे और उस को कंडेम करते थे अगर उस तरह से आप आज उसे हमला कह कर कंडेम नहीं करेंगे तो इस से मालूम पड़ जायगा कि अब आप के उस स्टैंड में कोई एक चेंज आ रहा है और वह अलफाज जो आज से क्वल ऐसे मौकों पर आपने कहे हैं उस से आप पीछे हट रहे हैं। हमारे मुताल्लिक उस हालत में कहा जायगा कि जब अपने ऊपर हमला हो रहा था तो उसे आप ने एक स्टैंडर्ड से नापा और उसे एग्शन कहा लेकिन आज जब कहीं उसी तरह का दूसरे पर हमला हो रहा है तो आपने उसके लिए दूसरा स्टैंडर्ड इस्तेमाल किया है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस से हमें नुकसान पहुंचेगा।

मैं यह जानता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की जिम्मेदारियां होती हैं लेकिन हमले को हमला न कहना, एग्शन को एग्शन न कहना मेरी समझ में यह हिन्दुस्तान की शान, हिन्दुस्तान के ट्रेडिंशंस और हिन्दुस्तान की हिस्ट्री के बिलकुल बरअक्स होगा और दुनिया फिर हमें कहेगी कि हमारी उस आजादाना राय और उस आजादाना स्टैंड में एक जुम्बिश आई है, एक फर्क आया है और उस की कोई कद्र और इज्जत नहीं होगी।

मैं ने आनरेबुल प्राइम मिनिस्टर केस्टेटमेंट को बगौर पढ़ा है। उस में जहाँ तक अपने खयालात के इज़हार का ताल्लुक है यह कहा गया है "विद्वान् एल ओफ एग्सेसिव फोसिज" इस के मुताल्लिक उस में कहा गया है लेकिन स्पेड को एक स्पेड की तीर पर स्पेड

[श्री गुलाम मुहम्मद बखशी]

नहीं कहा गया है। इस से मैं समझता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट अपनी शान को बरकरार नहीं रख रही है बल्कि उस से हमें उनटा नुकसान पहुंचा क्योंकि हम यह आज तक बार बार कह चुके हैं कि हम दुनिया भर की कौमों की आजादी के ह्वाहिशमंद हैं और इसलिए हमें इस मौके पर हिम्मत से काम लेना चाहिए और एग्जेशन को एग्जेशन कह कर हमें अपने स्टेटमेंट में उसे कंडेम करना चाहिए।

[श्री غلام محمد بخشى (شری نگر) -

جناب سپیکر صاحب - یہاں کافی تقریریں ہوں گی - ہر ایک شخص نے اپنے اپنے خیالات کا اظہار کیا - ایک دو منٹ سپر میں یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں ، جہاں تک عماری پارلیامینٹ کا تعلق ہے - آزادی کے بعد ہمارے ملک کی بھی یہی حالت تھی جو کہ آج چیکوسلواکیا کی ہو رہی ہے - سنہ ۶۲ میں جب کہ چین نے ہندوستان پر حملہ کیا تھا یا جب کہ پاکستان نے ہندوستان پر حملہ کیا تھا اور ان دونوں حملوں کو چاہے وہ چھوٹے پیمانے پر یا بڑے پیمانے پر نہ اس پارلیامینٹ نے ایگریشن قرار دیا تھا اور ہم نے توقع رکھی تھی دنیا کی تمام آزاد قوموں سے کہ وہ پاکستان کے حملہ کو ایگریشن مان کر اسے کاندیم کریں یا چین کے حملہ کو جو کہ اس نے سنہ ۶۲ میں ہندوستان پر کیا تھا ایگریشن مان کر کاندیم کریں - یہ دو باتیں آزادی کے بعد ہمارے سامنے آئی ہیں اور اس پارلیامینٹ نے ان دونوں حملوں کو پاکستان کے حملے کو بھی اور چین کے حملے کو بھی ایگریشن کو کاندیم ہی

نہیں دیا - اپنے دیس کی آزادی ازتیکرتی اور ساوریلتی کو بچانے کیلئے - آزادی کی ہستری سے پہلے جبکہ ہم خود اپنی آزادی کے لئے لڑ رہے تھے اس کے متعلق بہت کچھ یہاں پر کہا گیا ہے - اس وقت ہم خود آزاد نہیں تھے اپنی آزادی کے لئے لڑ رہے تھے - ہم اس وقت صرف اپنی ہی آزادی کے لئے خواہشمند نہیں تھے بلکہ دنیا بھر کی قوموں کی آزادی کے لئے بھی ہم اتنے ہی خواہشمند تھے جتنا اپنے لئے تھے - آج وقت آیا ہے کہ ہم یہ ثابت کریں گے ہم آج بھی دنیا بھر کی قوموں کی آزادی کے لئے پہلے جتنے خواہشمند ہیں - میں یہ کہونا کہ آج اس پارلیامینٹ کا امتحان ہے کہ وہ اس کسوتی پر کھری اترے - جیسے کہ پہلے جب کسی پر بھی اس طرح کا حملہ ہوتا تھا اور آپ اس کو ہلکا کہتے تھے اور اس کو کاندیم کرتے تھے اگر اس طرح سے آپ آج اسے ہلکا کہہ کر کاندیم نہیں کریں گے تو اس سے معلوم پڑ جائیگا کہ اب آپ کے اس اسٹیٹمنٹ میں کوئی چھینچ آ رہا ہے اور وہ الفاظ جو آج سے قبل ایسے موقوف پر آپ نے کہے ہیں اس سے آپ پیچھے ہٹ رہے ہیں - ہمارے متعلق اس حالت میں کہا جائیگا کہ جسے اپنے اوپر حملہ ہو رہا تھا تو آپ نے ایک اسٹیٹمنٹ سے ناپا اور اسے ایگریشن کہا لیکن آج جب کہیں اس طرح کا دوسرے پر حملہ ہو رہا ہے

تو آپ نے اس کے لئے دوسرا استعمل کیوں  
استعمال کیا ہے اور میں سمجھتا ہوں  
کہ اس سے ہمیں نقصان پہنچے گا۔

میں یہ جانتا ہوں کہ کورنل  
کی ذمہ داریاں ہوتی ہوں لیکن ہلے  
کو حملہ نہ کہنا ایگریشن کو ایگریشن نہ  
کہنا میری سمجھ میں یہ ہندوستان  
کی شان و ہندوستان کے ترقی پسندوں اور  
ہندوستان کی ہستی کے بالکل  
برعکس ہوگا اور دنیا پھر ہمیں کہے گی  
کہ ہماری اس آزادانہ رائے اور اس آزادانہ  
استیلا سے ہمیں ایک جہش آئی ہے و  
ایک فرق آیا ہے اور اسکی کوئی قدر  
اور عزت نہیں ہوگی۔

میں نے آنریبل پرائمرسٹری کے  
استیلا سے کو بغور پڑھا ہے۔ اس میں  
جہاں تک اپنے خیالات کا اظہار کا تعلق  
ہے یہ کہا گیا ہے دو دنوں کے  
ایگریشن فریڈم - اس کے متعلق اس  
میں کہا گیا ہے لیکن اسپیکر کو ایک  
اسپیڈ کی طور پر اسپیکر نہیں کہا گیا  
ہے۔ اس سے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ  
پارلیامنت اپنی شان کو برقرار نہیں  
رکھ رہی ہے بلکہ اس سے ہمیں اتنا  
نقصان پہنچے گا کیونکہ ہم یہ آج تک بار  
بار کہہ چکے ہیں کہ ہم دنیا بھر کی  
قوموں کی آزادی کے خواہشمند ہیں  
اور اسلئے ہمیں اس موقع پر ہمت سے  
کام لینا چاہئے اور ایگریشن کو ایگریشن  
کہ کر ہمیں اپنے استیلا سے ہمیں اسے  
کنڈیم کرنا چاہئے

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Dis-  
tricts): Sir, before the Prime Minister  
speaks, may I put a question so that  
she can answer it during her speech?

I hold that military intervention by  
one country in the affairs of another  
country is justifiable only in the event  
of external aggression against that  
country and on a clear invitation by  
the legitimate government of that  
country.

There has been a demand in this  
House that we should condemn this  
aggression by Soviet Russia on Czecho-  
slovakia in clear, unmistakable terms.  
There has been a suggestion also  
that we should not recognise any  
government in Czechoslovakia that might  
be set up hereafter unless we are sure  
that that is a popularly elected govern-  
ment of that country.

I would like the Prime Minister to  
clarify certain points before this House  
before I personally can make up my  
mind and before. I think, a large  
number of Members of this House can  
make up their minds with regard to  
these two demands. Now the situa-  
tion is confused. During the days  
when there were talks in Cierna there  
was a report of Mr. Brezhnev falling  
ill and this was followed by the re-  
ported meeting of Mr. Ulbrich with  
Mr. Dubcek following the Bratislava  
Agreement. Yesterday we heard of  
the reported resignations of the Prime  
Minister and the Defence Minister of  
Russia.

All this gives rise to suspicion that  
there appears to be a serious rift, a  
serious schism, within the Soviet lead-  
ership itself. I would like to know  
whether this Government has tried to  
seek information about this, whether  
it has contacted its embassy in Moscow  
and received information about this  
whether there is really a schism or a  
rift in the Soviet leadership.

Then, there is a report that the im-  
mediate cause calling for the interven-  
tion of Soviet Russia and the Warsaw  
Pact countries is the serious clash be-  
tween the workers of Czechoslovakia  
and the intellectuals.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Now, I would like to know whether this Government has tried to ascertain from its Embassy in Prague as to whether there is any truth in this report and whether it is a fact that the workers of Czechoslovakia are, by and large, indifferent to this aggression. It is on these two points that we should be told in order to enable us to take a clear stand.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I rose to make the statement in this House yesterday on the situation in Czechoslovakia, I said that I was doing so with a heavy heart and with a profound sense of concern I chose my words with deliberation and with a great deal of thought.

There are moments in history when grave responsibilities are cast on Government in whatever they say or do. This is one such moment. The dictates of wisdom enjoin upon us to tread carefully and with great circumspection and, when we are in front of an avalanche, not to make too much noise which—my hon. friends who have done any mountaineering will know—increases the force of an avalanche. I say this not to engage in metaphor but to try to convey to the House the real gravity of the situation. It is easy to give vent to one's feelings and it is easy enough to condemn. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am not insensitive to the views expressed by the Hon. Members. As I have said on a previous occasion, I myself have had the closest connections and personal friendship with Czechoslovakia and her people. So, I myself do feel very strongly on these matters, not only as a Government but also, if I may say so, as a person. But after we have given expression to our feelings, the political realities remain and Government has to deal with them.

Yesterday, I voiced our feelings in which, I am sure, the sentiments of

this House were also included, for the Government and the people of Czechoslovakia. I expressed the hope that it would be possible to restore the normal and legally constituted Government of Czechoslovakia. We earnestly hope that even now it would be possible for this to happen. We earnestly hope that it may still be possible to resolve the differences by the conflict of argument, discussion and debate, not by force. Only that way can there be any durable settlement. This again is the view that the Government has held on all similar problems that these political differences, political conflicts, cannot be resolved by means of force.

Here, I would like to express my deep concern for the safety and welfare of the Czech Government and the party leaders and, I am sure, the House will join me in this.

We are specially concerned with what has been happening because over the years we have been working in the lessening of tensions and we have been working for the softening of the cold war atmosphere. This action of the armed forces entering Czechoslovakia has, with one blow, reversed the situation. It has, immediately, taken us back over the years as if all this long work of bringing people together or getting them together or getting them to find peaceful solution has been overnight wiped out.

Naturally it is of concern to us and we feel that it is of concern for peace in the world. Hon. members have urged upon the Government to play a role at the U.N. We ourselves are anxious to do so. Our country has the honour to be a member of the Security Council. Under the U.N. Charter, the Security Council is the sole forum for the consideration of security matters. I wonder if it would be right for a Government which is a member of the Security Council to state its position on the issues which are going to be discussed..... (Interruption). We should not do anything which might prejudice our role

in the Security Council.....(Interruption).

SHRI NATH PAI: U. Thant has spoken very categorically and has given his opinion.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Why don't you say clearly this side or that side? Don't have rope-dancing.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I think Hon. Members are deliberately trying to give slants to my statement. They have sought to prove that I have not spoken out on the side of Czechoslovakia or perhaps that I have not spoken out strongly enough. Does courage lie merely in words? Venerable Acharyaji reminded us of Gandhiji. Gandhiji did not often use strong words, but he did teach us to act fearlessly and firmly, and in our reaction to what has happened in Czechoslovakia, I do not think we have been timid or that we have hesitated. We have very firmly stated.....

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Gandhiji once wrote an article shaking the mane of the British lion. He did not speak in soft words. When he spoke even in soft words, they went round the world. There was determination in whatever he said, and he did not mince matters.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I should like to assure the House that we shall always uphold the United Nations' Charter on which rests the hope of mankind for a peaceful world. This we have always done, this we shall always do, and we shall work to ensure that the Charter rights of Czechoslovakia are safeguarded in every way. This obviously depends on how the matter comes up there. I can assure this House that just as we are interested as a member of the Security Council and as a member of the United Nations Organisation in upholding the sacred principles of the Charter, we are equally wedded to certain basic and fundamental principles to which we have adhered all these years, and I would like, with the permission of the House, to restate them.

30—1 LSD/68.

We ardently and sincerely believe that every State should be left free and unfettered to decide its own future and its own destiny. We believe that there should be no..... (Interruption) external interference in the affairs of any country. Thirdly, force should not be used as the arbiter of decisions, and finally the differences in ideology or social systems can never be an excuse for interfering in one another's internal affairs. These are no new principles. All who have followed the course of India's conduct of international relations in difficult and varied circumstances will admit that these principles have provided the very foundations of our foreign policy. It is in the light of these principles that we have judged, and shall continue to judge, situations as they arise.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: What is her decision?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I would like to compare the present situation to an avalanche because I know that hereafter the world will either get over this crisis honourably and peacefully and go forward with the process of *detente* and relaxation or we shall revert to the terrible confrontation which had rocked, and nearly wrecked, this world after the end of the Second World War.

I spoke earlier of the work we have done in the lessening of tensions. Now, we had a vested interest in this. Our country, as all developing countries, needs peace for its very development, its very existence. It was, therefore, with hope and confidence that we had watched the vast movement in many countries towards a better and more harmonious world order. It is our hope that the present crisis will not reverse the trend. In the present situation, the immediate need, as I had said yesterday, is for the withdrawal of the forces which have entered Czechoslovakia so that the Czechoslovak people may be free to determine their own future for themselves without any intervention and in an atmosphere which is free from tension. Whatever

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

problems there may be between Czechoslovakia and its neighbours should be settled peacefully by means of negotiations and not through the use of force. The processes of peaceful co-existence which we have tried to promote for so many years must be allowed to develop unimpeded.

We were asked here about whether we have conveyed our views to the Czech Ambassador. We have conveyed our views. The Ambassador is, unfortunately, not here; he is in Czechoslovakia. But we have conveyed our views very clearly to the *Charge-d'affaires* who is here, to the *Charge-d'affaires* of the USSR and to the Ambassadors of the other Warsaw Pact countries. We are in touch with the Ambassadors of other nations also.

We are second to none in our sympathy for the brave and valiant Czech people. We are second to none in our admiration for the dignity and calm with which they are facing the tragic situation, and we are specially aware that the method they have chosen is the method of *satyagraha*.

Just before I spoke, an Hon. Member asked about clash of personalities in the USSR, clash of personalities in Czechoslovakia, something about workers *versus* intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia. We are, as I said, earlier, in touch with the various embassies, though we are not directly in touch with our own Embassy in Czechoslovakia. But there is no authoritative news about the various rumours that are afloat, except that sometime ago, not within the last few days, a letter or a communication did appear in the *Pravda* newspaper signed by 90 workers of, I think, the automobile industry—I am not quite sure which industry it was—in which they had said something about needing help to save socialism.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: So-called letter in *Pravda*.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: So-called—all right.

SHRI RABI RAY: False.

SHRI RANGA: Did they circulate that letter to the editor?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Whatever it was. This is the only indication that we have of any such views. It is quite possible, however, and it is probable also, that there is some kind of difference of opinion within two groups; but whatever the difference of opinion, it is their business to solve it themselves. I have said this before, and I reiterate it.

SHRI PILOO MODY: What did her Ambassador inform her?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: There is no contact for the last two days.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Before the last two days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is our ambassador safe?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: To the best of our knowledge, yes.

SHRI NATH PAI: Is he in Karlov Vary or in Prague?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: To the best of our knowledge, he is in Prague.

SHRI NATH PAI: To the best of our knowledge, he is in Karlov Vary.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is not very far from Prague. It is a very small country and it takes no time at all to go from one place to another. However, I have digressed. I only wanted to say that the Hon. Members should give us the benefit of doubt, if I may put it that way..... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Is it aggression or not?

SHRI NATH PAI: We cannot resist that plea.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The situation is extremely grave. We want that we should be in a position where we can really play our role at the United Nations. We have made our views very clear, without changing words. We have talked about Russian armies going there... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: You must allow her to continue her speech.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: When we say that the forces should withdraw, I think that our views are very clear.....(*Interruptions.*)

MR. SPEAKER: If Hon. Members do not like this, I cannot continue the debate.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The whole purpose of the debate was to get the Prime Minister to change a word here and a word there. At the end of a Five hour debate, all she can say is this.

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore, you must allow her to change the word. You cannot force her to use your words.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR\*

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I have not allowed you to speak. Nothing will be taken down. If you cannot observe order, you have to withdraw.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I should like to say only this. Many Hon. Members have said that this is not a party matter; this is a matter with which the whole nation is concerned. With what are we concerned? We are concerned with the safety of the Czech leaders. We are concerned with the sovereignty and independence of Czechoslovakia. We are concerned with the withdrawal of the forces.....(*Interruptions.*) I have already said that we would support the Charter rights of Czechoslovakia in the United Nations. So, I should say: let us combine on this matter and not quarrel over the use of a word here or there. Let me conclude expressing once more our sympathy and admiration for the people of Czechoslovakia.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: In the spirit of the Prime Minister's appeal just now I should like to say that we on this side also would like a

unanimous vote of the House, not on our motion but on a motion of a Member of her own Party. If the Government accepts Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani's amendment from her own party, we shall all vote for it and withdraw our own amendments.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Just one clarification from the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Then the whole House would like to have some clarification or the other. Mr. Bhandare.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: Sir, after the speech of the Prime Minister, I think it is not necessary for me to say—

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Anything.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE:—anything; but, lest a wrong impression in the minds of some of the Hon. Members should remain, I would like to correct that wrong impression and remove that misunderstanding. The Prime Minister was perfectly right when she posed a question: What is it that we are interested in? Are we interested in the security of the Czech people, or are we to be obsessed as to what has been done by Russia? We are interested in the Czech people, in their sovereignty and their way of life.

Let me read out to you—I am not going to take the time of the House—the statement issued by the authority of the Czech people. It says, "We demand the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the five countries of the Warsaw pact." Has that not been said by the Prime Minister? What is there to be misunderstood? What is there it to be misconstrued? Then, it says, "We urgently request the military commands of the Soviet Union to go away out of our country. We demand that normal conditions be immediately restored to enable the constitutional organs of the Republic to discharge their constitutional functions." Therefore, I submit that if at all there has been any

\*Not recorded.

[Shri R. D. Bhandare]

misunderstanding, it ought to be removed.

May I ask the Members of the Opposition and those who said that the Prime Minister has condoned the action of the Soviet Union, where is it said that the Prime Minister has condoned the action of the Russians?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody has said.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: Somebody said that there is a guilty silence. That impression should be removed. I repeat it: somebody said that there is guilty silence. When the statement is so clear, is so self-explanatory, where can it be shown that there is guilty silence? Therefore, it is not right on the part of the Members of the Opposition to say so.

We must tell the great Czech people that we stand by their side in their effort to get rid of those foreign powers, and in their effort to establish democracy and shape their own destiny and in their onward march towards peace, prosperity and socialism. I am certain that this will satisfy them.

Regarding the amendments, I am not prepared to accept any of the amendments moved by other Hon. Members in this House.

Some Hon. Members rose—

MR. SPEAKER: The amendments are there. I do not think we need carry on the discussion any further. (Interruption). It has been said categorically on behalf of the Congress party by the Hon. Member who just now spoke.

SHRI HEM BARUA: One clarification from the Prime Minister is wanted by me. She has indulged only in generalities. I want to know whether she considered it as a flagrant violation of the UN Charter or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall I now put the substitute motion of Shri Tenneti Viswanatham to the vote?

SHRI TENETI VISWANATHAM: Yes.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, a healthy precedent should be set up by accepting the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: It is for the Member to decide. I cannot help it .....(Interruptions). Would the Prime Minister like to say anything?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have made it clear in the speech that since the Security Council is meeting in a few hours' time, I do not think it would be right to state something like this at this hour.

SHRI NATH PAI: Sir, may I point out.....

MR. SPEAKER: No more discussion on this. I am putting the substitute motion of Shri Tenneti Viswanatham to the vote of the House.

*Substitute motion No. 1 was put and negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER: Now I will take the substitute motion by Shri Hem Barua.

AN HON. MEMBER: The motion of Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani may be taken up first.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. I will put it to the vote first.

SHRI NATH PAI: You have to read it out.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am not going to read it. If the House so desires, let the Hon. Member read it.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Sir, I want to withdraw my amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is for the House to decide it.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI: My substitute motion reads:

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st

August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the USSR and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, is of the opinion that there has been a clear violation of the UN Charter by the USSR and some of the Warsaw Pact powers."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is: That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the USSR and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, is of the opinion that there has been a clear violation of the UN Charter by the USSR and some of the Warsaw Pact powers." (12)

*The Lok Sabha divided,*

Division No. 17] [18.47 Hours.

AYES

Amat, Shri D.  
Amin, Shri R. K.  
Banerjee, Shri S. M.  
Barua, Shri Hem.  
Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal  
Birua, Shri Kolai  
Brahmanandji Shri Swami  
Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri  
Chauhan, Shri Bharatsingh  
Dar, Shri Abdul Ghani  
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
Deb, Shri D. N.  
Deo, Shri P. K.  
Deo, Shri R. R. Singh  
Desai, Shri C. C.  
Devgun, Shri Hardayal  
Dhrangadhra, Shri Sriraj Megh-  
raji.  
Digvijai Nath, Shri Mahant.  
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath.  
Gowder, Shri Nanja.  
Goyal, Shri Shri Chand.  
Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal.  
Jena, Shri D. D.  
Joshi, Shri S. M.  
Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand.  
Kameshwar Singh, Shri  
Kandappan, Shri S.  
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali.

Koushik, Shri K. M.  
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta.  
Krishna, Shri S. M.  
Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.  
Kunte, Shri Dattatraya.  
Kushwah, Shri Y. S.  
Lobo Prabhu, Shri.  
Maiti, Shri S. N.  
Majhi, Shri Mahendra.  
Mangalathumadam, Shri.  
Masani, Shri M. R.  
Meena, Shri Methalal.  
Mehta, Shri Asoka.  
Misra, Shri Srinibas.  
Mody, Shri Piloo.  
Mohamed Imam, Shri J.  
Mohan Swarup, Shri.  
Molahu Prasad, Shri.  
Muthusami, Shri C.  
Naik, Shri G. C.  
Naik, Shri R. V.  
Nayar, Shrimati Shakuntala.  
Nihal Singh, Shri.  
Parmar, Shri D. R.  
Patel, Shri J. H.  
Patodia, Shri D. N.  
Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash.  
Ranga, Shri.  
Ranjit Singh, Shri.  
Rao, Shri V. Narasimha.  
Ray, Shri Rabi.  
Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal.

Santosham, Dr. M.  
Sen, Shri Deven.  
Sequeira, Shri Erasmo de.  
Shah, Shri Shantilal.  
Sharda Nand, Shri.  
Sharma, Shri Beni Shanker.  
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir.  
Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh.  
Shastri, Shri Sheopujan.  
Shastri, Shri Shiv Kumar.  
Singh, Shri J. B.

Solanki, Shri P. N.  
Sundar Lal, Shri J.  
Suraj Bhan, Shri.  
Tapuriah, Shri S. K.  
Thakur, Shri Gunanand.  
Tyagi, Shri O. P.  
Vajpayee, Shri Atalbihari.  
\*Verma, Shri Balgovind.  
Vidyarthi, Shri R. S.  
Viswambharan, Shri P.  
Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti.

## NOES

Abraham, Shri K. M.  
Adichan, Shri P. C.  
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram.  
Aga, Shri Ahmad.  
Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
Arumugam, Shri R. S.  
Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri.  
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha.  
Babunath Singh, Shri.  
Badrudduja, Shri.  
Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan.  
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar.  
Barua, Shri Bedabrata.  
Barua, Shri R.  
Basumatari, Shri.  
Baswant, Shri.  
Besra, Shri S. C.  
Bhagaban Das, Shri.  
Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
Bhagavati, Shri.  
Bhakt Darshan, Shri.  
Bhandare, Shri R. D.  
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri.  
Bhargava, Shri B. N.  
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.  
Bohra, Shri Onkarlal.  
Chanda, Shri Anil K.  
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna.  
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri.

Chandrika Prasad, Shri.  
Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh.  
Chavan, Shri D. R.  
Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
Das, Shri N. T.  
Dass, Shri C.  
Deoghare, Shri N. R.  
Desai, Shri Morarji.  
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.  
Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.  
Dhillon, Shri G. S.  
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri.  
Dixit, Shri G. C.  
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar.  
Esthose, Shri P. P.  
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri.  
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira.  
Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
Ganpat Sahai, Shri.  
Gautam, Shri C. D.  
Gavit, Shri Tukaram.  
Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti.  
Ghosh, Shri Ganesh.  
Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
Ghosh, Shri Parimal.  
Girja Kumari, Shrimati.  
Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan.  
Hanumanthaiya, Shri.

---

\*Wrongly voted for 'AYES'.

- |                              |                                |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Hari Krishna, Shri.          | Nambiar, Shri.                 |
| Hazarika, Shri J. N.         | Oraon, Shri Kartik.            |
| Heerji Bhai, Shri.           | Pahadia, Shri Jagannath.       |
| Hem Raj, Shri.               | Pandey, Shri Sarjoo.           |
| Himatsinga, Shri.            | Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath.      |
| Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas.      | Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani.    |
| Jadhav, Shri V. N.           | Pant, Shri K. C.               |
| Jaggaiyah, Shri K.           | Paokai Haokip, Shri.           |
| Jagjiwan Ram, Shri.          | Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai.       |
| Jha, Shri Bhogendra.         | Partap Singh, Shri.            |
| Kalita, Shri Dhireswar.      | Parthasarathy, Shri.           |
| Kamble, Shri.                | Patil, Shri Anantrao.          |
| Katham, Shri B. N.           | Patil, Shri Deorao.            |
| Kedaria, Shri C. M.          | Patil, Shri S. D.              |
| Khadilkar, Shri.             | Poonacha, Shri C. M.           |
| Khan, Shri M. A.             | Pramanik, Shri J. N.           |
| Kotoki, Shri Liladhar.       | Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi.    |
| Kureel, Shri B. N.           | Raghu Ramaiah, Shri.           |
| Laskar, Shri N. R.           | Raj Deo Singh, Shri.           |
| Laxmi Bai, Shrimati.         | Raju, Shri D. B.               |
| Lutfal Haque, Shri.          | Ram Sewak, Shri.               |
| Madhukar, Shri K. M.         | Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.          |
| Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.         | Ramani, Shri K.                |
| Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand.  | Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri. |
| Maharaj Singh, Shri.         | Rana, Shri M. B.               |
| Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh. | Randhir Singh, Shri.           |
| Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini.       | Rao, Shri Jaganath.            |
| Mandal, Dr. P.               | Rao, Dr. K. L.                 |
| Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad.  | Rao, Shri K. Narayana.         |
| Marandi, Shri.               | Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi.        |
| Mehta, Shri P. M.            | Rao, Shri Thirumala.           |
| Menon, Shri Govinda.         | Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.           |
| Menon, Shri Vishwanatha.     | Reddi, Shri G. S.              |
| Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali.       | Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila.     |
| Mishra, Shri Bibhuti.        | Roy, Shri Bishwanath.          |
| Mishra, Shri G. S.           | Saleem, Shri M. Yunus.         |
| Modak, Shri B. K.            | Sambasivam, Shri.              |
| Mohammad Ismail, Shri.       | Sambhali, Shri Ishaq.          |
| Mukerjee, Shri H. N.         | Sankata Prasad, Dr.            |
| Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda.   | Sant Bux Singh, Shri.          |
| Mukne, Shri Yeshwantrao.     | Sapre, Shrimati Tara.          |
| Murti, Shri M. S.            | Satya Narain Singh, Shri.      |
| Naidu, Shri Chengalraya.     | Savitri Shyam, Shrimati.       |

Sen, Shri Dwaipayan.

Sen, Shri P. G.

Sen, Dr. Ranen.

Sethi, Shri P. C.

Shambhu Nath, Shri.

Shankaranand, Shri B.

Sharma, Shri M. R.

Sharma, Shri Yogendra.

Shastri, Shri B. N.

Shastri, Shri Ramavatar.

Shastri, Shri Ramanand.

Sheo Narain, Shri.

Sher Singh, Shri.

Sheth, Shri T. M.

Shinde, Shri Annasahib.

Shinkre, Shri.

Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri.

Shukla, Shri S. N.

Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan.

Siddayya, Shri.

Sinha, Shri R. K.

Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan.

Snatak. Shri Nar Deo.

Solanki, Shri S. M.

Sonar, Dr. A. G.

Supakar, Shri Sradhakar.

Surendra Pal Singh, Shri.

Sursingh, Shri.

Suryanarayana, Shri K.

Swaran Singh, Shri.

Swell, Shri.

Tarodekar, Shri V. B.

Tiwary, Shri D. N.

Tula Ram, Shri.

Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra.

Umanath, Shri.

Verma, Shri Prem Chand.

Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra.

Yadab, Shri N. P.

Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet.

Yadav, Shri Jageshwar.

MR. SPEAKER: The result\* of the Division is: Ayes ... 82; Noes ... 185. The 'Noes' have it; the 'Noes' have it.

*The Motion was Negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put all the other substitute motions to the vote of the House together.

*Substitute Motions 1 to 11 and 13 to 15 were put and negatived.*

18.47 HRS.

#### CONVICTION OF MEMBERS

MR. SPEAKER: I have to in-

form the House that I have received the following letter dated the 22nd August, 1968 from the Magistrate, First Class, New Delhi:—

"I have the honour to inform you that Sarvashri Madhu Limaye, George Fernandes, Arjun Singh Bhadoria, Shiva Chandra Jha, K. Lakkappa, Ram Sewak Yadav and Maharaj Singh Bharti, Members, Lok Sabha, were tried in my court at Central Jail, Tihar Delhi on a charge under section 188 I.P.C. for defiance of

\*The following Members also recorded their votes :—

AYES : Sarvashri Gulam Mohammad Bakshi and J. B. Kripalani.

NOES : Sarvashri Balgovind Verma, P. Ramamurthi and Vasudevan Nair.