

Mr. Speaker: When he says that it would not happen again, is that not regret?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I express regret on behalf of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for Legislative Assemblies and Councils of Ministers for certain Union territories and for certain other matters be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members, 30 from this House, namely:—

Shri R. Achuthan; Shri Ramchandra Vithal Bade; Shri Laxmi Narayan Bhanja Deo; Shri Brijji Basi Lal; Sardar Buta Singh; Dr. Antonio Colaco; Sardar Daljit Singh; Shri Dasaratha Deb; Dr. P. D. Gaitonde; Shri R. M. Hajarnavis; Shri Gauri Shanker Kakkar; Shri R. Keishing; Shrimati T. Lakshmi Kanthamma; Shri Lalit Sen; Shri R. N. Yadav, Lonikar; Dr. Mahadeva Prasad; Shri Dhuleshwar Meena; Shri Mohammad Yusuf; Shri H. N. Mukerjee; Shri Partap Singh; Shri Man Singh P. Patel; Shri Surendranath Dwivedy; Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao; Shri R. V. Reddiar; Shri Sanji Rupji; Shri Era Sezhiyan; Shri S. T. Singh; Shri Hari Charan Soy; Shri N. M. Wadiwa; and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

and 15 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 15th day of April, 1963;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 15 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

12.14 hrs.

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 17 to 23 and 118 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which 8 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating which of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND NO. 17—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Speaker: Motion Moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,55,04,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Tribal Areas.'" (17).

DEMAND NO. 18—NAGA HILLS—TUENSANG AREA

Mr. Speaker: Motion Moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,54,89,000 be granted to the

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area'." (18).

DEMAND No. 19—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion Moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,47,15,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'External Affairs'." (19).

DEMAND No. 20—STATE OF PONDICHERRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion Moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,45,28,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'." (20).

DEMAND No. 21—DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI AREA

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,90,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Dadra and Nagar Haveli Area'." (21).

DEMAND No. 22—GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,48,46,000 be granted to the

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Goa, Daman and Diu'." (22).

DEMAND No. 23—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,42,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'." (23).

DEMAND No. 118—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,12,75,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'." (118).

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Prime Minister want to initiate the discussion?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I think that it will be better that I speak at the end.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): This House has always voted with alacrity the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, and I have no doubt that this being a year of stress and strain, we should do so

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

again, but we shall do so with the confident conviction that basically the correct policies are being pursued by Government in the sphere of external affairs.

I am happy that it seems that the rather unreal debate 'Defence versus development' is now over and there is a general realisation in the country that defence and development are vital just as both wheels are vital if a vehicle is to run.

The country's defences have to be built on foundations of strong economy and supported by enduring international goodwill. This is why the task, particularly, in the Ministry of External Affairs is complex as well as immense in the context of today. But it is a happy sign that there is a general realisation that the most powerful instruments that we have for safeguarding our freedom are the development plans and the policy of non-alignment.

There has been much unthinking criticism of our foreign policy, some people alleging that it has failed and that it has failed all because China committed aggression on our borders and every country in the world has not vociferously come down on our side at once and in the way that we liked. In regard to this, it is good to find that informed opinion in this country is very clear that the foreign policy of our country has been conducted properly and effectively.

12.18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

To be angry because every country in the world has not come down on our side vociferously is an attitude which I am glad to notice a journal like the Economic Weekly of Bombay, which has by no means any communist or near-communist affiliations, characterises as follows. A journal like the Economic Weekly of Bombay says:

"This is an attitude which, to say the least, is childish."

And it adds:

"A moment's reflection will show that our salvation lies not in dividing the world into two camps, one with us and another with China, but in isolating China in the political sense. We have as a civilised nation to strengthen the forces in the world that aim at reducing the dangers of a global conflict, and such a catastrophe can be avoided only by not being a party to polarisation of contending forces economic as well as political."

This House has already accepted the Colombo proposals along with the clarifications which were given to them by the sponsors of those proposals. In not accepting these Colombo proposals, China is making a mistake that is as bad as that she made when she crossed the McMahon line. In any case, we have done the right thing.

China had mounted against us a diplomatic offensive, but now we hold the initiative, and the world knows well enough where we stand. I know, of course, that there are difficulties, and the path towards negotiations will be tortuous, and I know also that psychologically India-China relations have received a wound that would not be easy to heal; it will take a long time to heal. But we pursue, let us hope, a principled policy which is consistent alike with the interests of our country and the requirements of peace.

I was quite interested the other day to notice an observation made by a great friend of India who is also a very eminent economist, Mrs. Joan Robinson, in regard to certain aspects of the situation in our country after the border affair. She said, when she was recently in this country—I am quoting her words—

"The British economy went a long way towards socialism under the impact of war. Paradoxically, the emergency here, it seems to me, has not strengthened those who are in favour of equality, development and social justice. On the contrary, it is the right-wing elements with intimate links with the private sector who seem to be profiting from the emergency".

This is a feature which has struck a very eminent and very sympathetic liberal observer of the Indian scene and this is a matter of which I hope Government takes due note.

This is a matter to which I make special reference because I discover that it is not only the distinguished leader of the Swatantra Party—I do not mean my hon. friend, Prof. Ranga, but his mentor, Shri Rajagopalachari—who is wanting a change of leadership in this country. He is not alone in wanting it. He has also indicated lately the road that we should pursue. In a journal called the *Swarajya of Madras* dated the 23rd February, Shri Rajagopalachari wrote, among other things:

"The honour and security of our country do not wait for us in Tanganyika or Ceylon"....

this is the way he puts it—the honour and security of our country do not wait for us in Tanganyika or Ceylon.

"The path to these goals lies elsewhere and it is high time we turned in that direction and ceased playing with our future. The myth of Afro-Asian solidarity has ended in smoke. Our road is plainly indicated".

I am sure he means which road—the road to Washington D.C.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): No, Washington to Delhi.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: He is not alone in wanting a change of leadership. Prof. Ranga, who I find has got

the honorific of 'Acharya', repeats it from time to time.

Shri Ranga: Yes, I agree.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is not only Prof. Ranga who wants it. The head of the State of a neighbouring country, President Ayub, made a statement lately condemning what he called Jawaharlal Nehru's 'pride' standing in the way of an Indo-Pak. settlement. He said further that 'things might have been different—I am quoting his words—'if men like Rajagopalachari or Jaya Prakash Narain were at the helm of affairs in India'. Unfortunately for Shri Rajagopalachari and Shri Jaya Prakash Narain, it is not Ayub or his patrons who nominate India's leadership. Unfortunately for us also, international norms have come down so—and the conduct of some of our people have helped that process—that the head of a neighbouring State can make such statements.

We saw the Sino-Pak. agreement which runs counter to every canon of decent diplomacy—an agreement over Kashmir—and we have said it over and over again in this House that the two countries, China and Pakistan, had no business to enter into that agreement. Its object is crystal clear. They want to create fresh tension between India and Pakistan. It is the latest move in the diplomatic war of nerves against India. We find, for instance, that in London the *Times* wrote an editorial the other day, on the 8th March, where referring to our protest to Peking, called in teth 'somewhat overstated protest of India to the Chinese Government' and then went on very patronisingly to say virtually to us to come to an agreement with Pakistan—I am quoting the words of the London *Times*—

"No matter what the urgings of pride".

No matter what the urgings of pride, we are supposed to enter into some sort of understanding with that coun-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

try on terms which we are not supposed to examine in the light of our own interests. Remembering the sanctimony which has been the hallmark of the *London Times*, one can understand, and even laugh at this. But the matter went very much further. We shall not forget very easily how Mr. Duncan Sandys pulled no punches sometime back when he referred to what we were doing over these matters.

There has been obvious nibbling of our sovereignty by distinguished visitors, and it needs firmer handling. Some such feeling is growing about defence matters, with various foreign military experts creating the impression that they are superintending our armed forces. Even the Ambassador of the United States visited the front to hold conferences with army commanders.

The Indo-Pakistan meetings have been going on, and I wish to say in this House, unlike many who have taken on a different kind of coat, that we have always wanted friendship and understanding with Pakistan and in spite of pin-pricks and worse, we wish success to the elongated efforts which are now going on. But as the discussion between India and Pakistan go on, what do we find? I am reminded of a nursery rhyme which would be familiar to a number of Members in this House, which said:

"Mary had a little lamb
Its fleece was white as snow
Everywhere that Mary went
The lamb was sure to go".

Wherever India and Pakistan are to meet in order to discuss the terms of an agreement, the US Ambassador and the UK High Commissioner are also to go. I am reminded of an advertisement which you find in hoardings all over the country about a particular brand of cigarettes, which I shall not name, which says: "Wherever you go, you get... (this particular brand of

cigarettes)". Wherever you go in order to solve the Indo-Pakistan tangle, the little lambs of Mary are accompanying us. There must be some meaning to it; there must be some point in it.

The US Ambassador is an expert in the use of words. As an individual, he is a highly estimable personality, because of his learning and because of the way he can put across his ideas and that sort of thing. Recently, he went to Calcutta and made certain statements to the press. I notice that the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta, a daily of long standing, which is a consistent supporter—sometimes over-enthusiastic—of whatever the Congress Government is trying to do, has thought it fit to write a leading editorial article on the US Ambassador's statement in Calcutta. In this leading article in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, there is a quotation from the speech by the US Ambassador, that he was holding 'a watching brief' as far as the Indo-Pakistan talks were concerned. He is holding a 'watching brief'. On behalf of whom? And for what reason? What is his *locus standi* for holding a watching brief? I suppose it will be claimed that he is a very good friend of ours, representing a country which is our only hope in this desolate world and so on and so forth. He added again—I am quoting his words—"that the United States' efforts for the success of the current talks between India and Pakistan were not mere recreational exercises, not merely the lamb following Mary, but it is something else. But when he was asked as to what was his impression over the signing of the Sino-Pak agreement—I am quoting from the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* editorial of yesterday:

"Professor Galbriath is reported to have said that the impression that the USA was unhappy over the signing of the Sino-Pak agreement was not right, and added, America was not concerned with

the morality and wisdom of Pakistan's action in this regard".

So we understand. Of course, it was clear to everybody with a head over his shoulders, that it was not for nothing that the U.S. Ambassador and the U.K. High Commissioner were following us wherever we went in order to have a settlement between these two countries. It is as clear as daylight that without the sanction of the United States in particular, the Pakistan Government would not be able to lift a little finger, and whatever they are trying to do in this regard surely has got the sanction, the *imprimatur*, of these people who are now trying to poke their finger in every Indian pie. They sup in our cup, they dip in our dish, in a manner which is reminiscent of those early days when they did try to make an effort to make our freedom not as real as we have made it.

There is not much of a mystery about what is happening behind scenes, what is being sought to be done by the US and UK combine. Some people will fish in troubled waters. It is a pity that we cannot stop this angling, but I do hope that the Government of India does apply its mind to it so that this kind of angling is no longer practised by certain people whose character is, in any case, dubious. I say so because they are going round the country making speeches to all kinds of audiences including audiences composed of MPs and members of legislatures of the different States and saying things which hurt, which should not be said by representatives of foreign Powers. For instance, here is the copy, the authorised text, I presume, of an address by the United States Ambassador to India delivered on the 20th February, 1963 to a meeting held at the Indian School of International Studies, Sapru House. I presume a copy has been sent to every Member of Parliament, or otherwise I would not have had the good fortune of securing this beautifully produced text of a

very beautifully delivered speech. At page 10 of this little pamphlet, the United States Ambassador has chosen to deliver himself of this sentence:

"The best advice may not come from those whose ultimate preference is to do nothing."

The reference is very clear to the Afro-Asian nations, the Colombo Powers and the insinuation here—thanks to our friend Shri Hem Brera—is that the Afro-Asian powers are no good at all; they cannot do a thing and they also have no business to advise you either. This is a hit at our Afro-Asian friends which surely this country will not stomach. I know it is a fashion for certain hon. Members to ridicule these people but it is important that we realise today what role we are likely to play in the future world and what role the Afro-Asians are likely to play along with us. The United States Ambassador in that very same speech has said that the United States is no longer in the market for military bases; it has no interest in military alliances. If there are friends of mine like Acharya Ranga who counted on that kind of thing happening: United States offering us advantages of a military alliance, on the basis of the speech made by the accredited Ambassador and Plenipotentiary and God knows what else, we have got a statement: "We have no interest in military alliances."

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Sir, I do not wish to interrupt him but I have to inform him that I had never made any statement that I am asking for alliances. I said only that India should welcome their comradeship in our common struggle against Communist China.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am happy that in the struggle against us Shri Ranga . . . (Interruptions.)

An Hon. Member: The cat is out of the bag.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Does he identify himself with China? He is saying so. Is he happy to identify himself with China? (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If at this hour of the day I have to answer accusations in regard to our identification with a country about which I have already made a reference, I imagine the intelligence co-efficient of the Members of this House has come down very low. But it is very clear from what is said in this House as well as outside that there is a concerted effort to bring about a state of things where all that India stands for, all that socialism stands for, all that the Afro-Asian solidarity principles stand for and all that the anti-colonialism and the non-alignment principles stand for is going to be subverted and in that I am sure Prof. Ranga is going to be in the best possible company. It is very necessary to remember, in spite of what they may say about the Afro-Asian countries that we are always with the disinherited of the world; we are a people who are under-developed and who are handicapped by imperialist exploitation and we have been kept too long in a state of planned backwardness and we have been the agrarian hinterland of the metropolitan economy of the imperial powers. We should know where our deepest friendship lies. That is why India at one time was a hero to Africa and to the countries of Asia which were fighting for freedom. That is why India was the sponsor of the Asian Conference in 1947, even before our country was free. That is why India played such a large role in the achievement of independence of Indonesia. We have to remember this today when we are told how between India and Indonesia a wedge is being driven so that the friendship of our two countries is subverted. Even today in the Delhi Statesman there is a special article which tries to point out how on account of the ineptitude of our governmental representatives the

friendship which was developing so naturally is being sought to be diverted and distorted. In regard to Africa so many things have been happening lately. The Indian image which at one time was an image to be proud of in the eyes of Africa and of Asia is now something very different. Something has gone wrong, and the job of the Prime Minister and his Government is to see that it is rectified without delay.

Here it is necessary to refer to a matter which was partly mentioned during Question Hour and that was the Moshi Conference. I am not going into the detail over what happened in that Conference. But I am sure if the Prime Minister asks those members of his own party who had been there as delegates to the Moshi Conference, he could realise how in the eyes of the African people who matter, who are the representatives of African resurgence India's character appears in a very different light from what it used to be. There is a thick wall of misinformation and misunderstanding and suspicion about India. Lately, the External Affairs Ministry is reported to be taking some steps in order to improve our propaganda apparatus. But actually it is not all due to propaganda which China is conducting in Africa, though it is terribly active in trying to put across a picture of India which is very different from what India is really; we are being painted by Chinese propaganda as aggressors on our own border; we are being painted as having forsaken non-alignment and completely dependent on the United States aid and so on and so forth. But this kind of propaganda would not have, under normal conditions, cut any ice with the African people. It is only because our conduct in regard to many things had been such that now, no longer does Africa look up to us in a way it used to. Only the day before yesterday I found in the Parliament Library a book which has not yet been numbered—a book called *Africa in world politics*, by an American writer Vernon

McKay. There at page 179, it is stated quoting an African writer: "India is the hero of subject countries." In the same book, a few pages later, at page 189 it is pointed out that there is a change now as far as the reaction of Africans to the position of India was concerned. I am quoting from this book:

"The leading role of Indians in the Afro-Asian movement, which Nehru held at the Bandung conference of 1955, had already declined by 1957 when Nasser welcomed the first Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Conference in Cairo. The many all-African conferences since 1958 bypassed India altogether. Within the United Nations, Africans not only took over the leadership of the anticolonial struggle but even came into conflict with India over certain African issues. The moderate position of India on such items as the French Cameroons elections in 1960 and the attempt to impose strong U.N. sanctions on South Africa irritated African leaders. Furthermore, India has been placed in the unwelcome position of having to choose between different factions in the Congo and to support one side or the other in the Morocco-Mauritania dispute."

It is not only this. Since the Belgrade Conference we are discovering that as far as the Afro-Asian aspirations are concerned there is a growing feeling that India is no longer taking that live, dynamic, vitalised and inspiring role in the fight against colonialism that she had been before. This is what was reported to those who went to Moshi. They have said these things and I am sure they have reported also to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has taken 25 minutes. He can take any time allotted to his party.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I shall try to finish as quickly as I can. The African leaders, for instance, tell us of

such little things which might appear to be little things, as the delay of India in recognising Algeria before her Independence was fully won, when the provisional Government was functioning; that is the kind of thing which hurts. They have told our delegates that after all, in such places as Cairo, or Tanganyika or Dar-es-Salaam, there are agencies, there are offices and there are organisations, where those people of Africa who have still to win their way to freedom have got their organisations, and they have been told that they have been trying to get some set up in Delhi, some kind of organisation; but the response from Delhi has not been very positive at all. These little things matter.

In Jakarta, for instance, the Asian Games took place. Possibly it was a very silly matter, silly, over which the animosities which were hidden beneath the surface suddenly found rather peculiar expression. But it is even more silly to ignore the fact of the existence of certain difficulties in the Indonesian minds in regard to India's role. We do not go forward.

In regard to Malayasia, the Prime Minister said the other day that he had agreed on principle to that matter at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference because it meant an expansion of the area of freedom, but actually, when the question of Malayasia is going to be concretised in tangible terms, then certain difficulties arise about which India has got to express her opinion, but somehow or other, India does not express that opinion; which is why we discover that in Indonesia the anti-Indian attitude is being sought to be sustained. This is a matter of which we have to take very, very serious notice.

Shri Hanumanthaya (Bangalore City): I want to know from the hon. speaker if the anti-Indian feeling generated in Indonesia is not engineered by the communists who are pro-Chinese there.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I have nothing to say; this kind of interjection will only waste my time. I resist the idea that it is on account of communism that anti-Indian feelings are growing. I am giving you references and authorities and arguments which show that it is only on account of the ineptitude of our Governmental representatives that this is happening. I say nothing against the Ambassador who has himself got a good bill from the *Statesman's* correspondent who writes today in that paper. But there must be other people who are behaving very badly.

I am quoting again from the *Economic Weekly*—its Fourteenth Annual Number, which came out last month—February, 1963. This is a very responsible journal which is making statements which have to be answered by Government. It says:

“Unfortunately, the Prime Minister proposes, but it is the group of civil servants who constitute the top echelon of the Ministry of External Affairs who disposes. Given their background, it was in all seasons a difficult assignment for them to apply effectively the policy of non-alignment;”

The Prime Minister has sought to answer the question during the Question Hour; we could not press him for lack of time. It is very necessary that we go into this matter very deeply. Then the paper says in a special article written by its correspondent:

“...this can be said of most Indian ambassadors sent out to small countries in Asia and Africa, their behaviour has often been overbearing, arrogant and supercilious. It was difficult for them to realise that the withdrawal of the British has not made them the bearers of the imperial mantle, that they were ambassadors of a country which preaches socialism and brotherhood, to equally independent countries and not royal

emissaries going out to provincial satrapies.”

This is very strong language. But I do not say this applies to everybody. I know there are people who are friends of mine working as Ambassadors and in other capacities in some of these countries, who are doing as far as we know, very, very good work. There are exceptions, but there is a general impression in the minds of our Afro-Asian friends that so many of these Indian representatives have the haw-haw manner, the old school tie idea and a superiority complex in regard to the coloured people; that is a thing which should be shed as quickly as we can. Otherwise, unless we learn the lesson of humility, and if the idea is to depend only upon whatever assistance is going to come to us from our white-patrons from Washington and—God knows, from wherever else—we shall be in the soup, and we shall also be in difficulty because we do not know who our friends are, who our brothers are with whom our interests lie, and that is why we should take it upon ourselves today, particularly in view of the situation which has now arisen, when the Colombo proposals have been accepted by our country and China has not accepted. We should take up the position where we can rehabilitate ourselves; not only just rehabilitate ourselves but to resume again the leadership of anti-colonial fight which it was the traditional right of India to assume; that, we had done. But we have almost lost that right because of certain defaults.

I shall give you also another thing from the *Economic Weekly's* article which is rather interesting and might be liked by the House: it is a reference to Shri Krishna Menon who, I think, is here. I am quoting from the *Economic Weekly*, Annual Number, February, 1963, pages 115-116:

“Few people within India realise how much of a hero Krishna Menon is to the small countries of

Asia and Africa who have only recently got rid of colonial shackles and still retain a deep suspicion of Western intentions."

I say this though I have said repeatedly in this House that personally I am not a particularly fervent admirer of Shri Krishna Menon:

"It has happened on many occasions that as one waded across the delegates' lounge in the United Nations, one could hear delegates from even some Latin American nations, who simmer at what they consider to be the over bearing attitude of the US but cannot openly voice their discontent, praise Menon for dishing it back to the US. And to an African delegate from Mali or Sudan, Menon, dazzlingly dark, bronze hair all aglow, impeccable in logic, devastating in repartee, was a symbol of the underprivileged's final awakening; he was almost the instrument of retribution, scornfully laying bare the hypocrisy and insincerity and knavery of the Western countries."

This is a quotation; not what I say. This is what they say about the kind of impression we are producing in certain countries. I know our External Affairs publicity needs to be brushed up, not merely brushed up but revolutionised, changed in a different manner, and that is why the points raised by Shri Kamath and other people become very important: why the service personnel who are well-versed in protocol and table manners, who can speak certain languages with a certain kind of gusto, or whatever it is, should be given so much preference, as it happens. Many of them are our own people, very, very good people. I have nothing to say against them, but it is very important that politically speaking, political personalities should be in charge of the conduct of diplomatic negotiations, particularly in a time when crisis take place. So many occasions have come to the notice

of Parliament and the country, when a *coup d'etat* occurs in a particular country and our representatives knew nothing at all about it. We never had the slightest inkling of what is going to happen, say, in Turkey, Iraq, Syria.—whatever other country that might be; so many *coup d'etats* happen today that it is rather difficult to keep track. I know it is very important, and therefore, the bureaucratized diplomatic representation abroad must be rectified. I do hope Government does not misunderstand this sort of reference and does not interpret what I am saying as an overall, omnibus accusation against all our diplomatic representatives. It is nothing of the sort. It is very important that we must rectify it, because all people talk about it, not merely in Parliament but outside; there are people like those who conduct a paper like the *Economic Weekly*, for instance. When they talk about it, it is very important that Government takes some steps in this regard.

I know that the Prime Minister himself is sensitive to the subtleties of the situation now unfolding and aware of the essential validity of the policies we have followed since Independence, but the nagging question remains: How long, how long would we depend upon one man and his capacity to continue to contribute to the political or economic health of this country? Is it not the task of patriotism, particularly the task of the Congress party which luckily has got the Prime Minister to lead it, is it not the task of the Congress party and the Government of the day to find out ways and means by which the policies formulated by the Prime Minister, in conformity with the traditions of our country, with the best interests of our country, with the spirit of our Independence, can be sustained objectively speaking? That is the job which is not being done, and the Prime Minister himself has his own special responsibilities. Just as he should not by action, he should not even by implication, countenance close associa-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

tion with bloated money-bags who have been condemned by the Vivian Bose Commission, he should not allow the sort of rope which he permits to a certain variety of foreign journalists. Only the other day, there was a report in the *Times of India* which was quoting perhaps from the *Washington Post* whose correspondent had said something about the Sino-Soviet rift having been helped at India's cost and put those words in the mouth of the Prime Minister; later the Prime Minister said that it was a wrong and mischievous report. The Prime Minister also is supposed to have disapproved strongly of the activities of a foreign woman journalist who has produced a book about India, full of half-truths and all sorts of insinuations. They have the run of the land. They go about wherever they like, and having a pigmentation of the skin that they have got, they have easy access to the Prime Minister, and the result is that these things take place. The Rev. Michael Scott, for instance, is a very estimable and reverend gentleman, highly entitled to our respect and possibly a very well-intentioned man, the "do-gooder" type which we see in different countries from time to time. He comes to India and he says, "I am going to meet Kaito. I have a letter from Phizo." He tells the Press that he has passed on a letter from Phizo to the Prime Minister. Then we get reports that Phizo has written to Shilu Ao in order that some kind of thing might take place. There is the report which appears in the *Amrit Bazar Patrika* yesterday. All these happen because these foreigners come, see the Prime Minister and have lunch with him and God knows what other meals. We do not waste the Prime Minister's time, when he has a hell of a lot of work to do. But these chaps come and see him, God knows at short notice or long notice; they do waste his time. The Prime Minister is reported to have made statements which later he repudiates, with the result that our foreign

policy is unnecessarily distorted by all kinds of irrelevant and frivolous asides, which happens only because of a certain weakness the Prime Minister has for being rather polite towards people of foreign nationality and with a particular pigmentation of the skin. May be because, they are very polite, they are very efficient and they speak the language so well; it sounds so nice to have a change from the kind of talk which we indulge in here. Possibly there are reasons for it, but the result is that he is also not looking after certain things which have got to be done. He should not allow this sort of rope which he allows to a certain variety of people, journalists as well as others.

Sir, I do not want to take any more time, though I have a great deal more to say. We have received in recent months a jolt to our mind and heart. Just because we have received this jolt, it is very necessary that we do not lose our balance. It is because we have got this jolt we realise now what it is to really and truly fight for the promotion of the interests of our country in a very troubled and difficult world, which we are hardly able to understand because of the peculiar complications which have entered into its very composition. That is why it is very necessary for us to uphold the principled foreign policy, a principled foreign policy which the nation has evolved through its own experience and out of its deepest feelings. Let that principled foreign policy shine, as the sun shineth in its strength. We have this strength and if we cling to our principles, then nothing can defeat us, whether the challenge comes from one country or from another.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Sir, during last year, on several occasions this House has debated certain trends regarding foreign affairs and approved in broad outline the policy that was pursued. This is an occasion when

not simply the policy, but its implementation also is taken into consideration, when we are debating the demands of the External Affairs Ministry, we will have to consider if what we have approved again and again has been properly implemented and whether the instrument of implementation is properly handled or not. This aspect on this occasion is very relevant and I would put equal emphasis on this aspect as well as the foreign policy in general.

Since the Chinese aggression, doubts are being raised from all quarters whether there was something inherently wrong with the basis of our foreign policy, the premises on which it was based, etc. In certain quarters in this country, sometimes openly and sometimes in a subtle manner, an attempt is being made to undermine the very foundations of a policy which we have assiduously pursued during the last 14 years and to my mind, pursued against heavy odds, because we are living in a world, which is in a flux. There is a certain historical dynamism and unless the foreign policy of India is such as to catch up with that spirit and live up with it, I do not think it can make any worthwhile contribution in serving the national interests as well as the international obligations in the broadest sense of the term.

After our freedom, the whole world, particularly the African nations, the South-east Asian countries and in West Asian region new nations have come up and after independence a revolution is taking place throughout this world. We cannot ignore this aspect of it. They have still to find out and discover their own moorings. But one basic factor which is easily discernable in this world is that they are intensely anti-colonial in their approach. Let us understand it very clearly. When we lay down a certain emphasis on some aspects of our policy and try to judge it in a short-term way—its failure

or success—we are ignoring the sweep of history, the different levels of development in different regions of the world, and just laying down certain things for our immediate benefit. Because of our past dependence, there is a certain historical relic in the minds and philosophy of some people and some parties like the party represented by Shri Ranga and others, to seek some help, run for help, instead of standing on our own feet. That basic weakness is historically coming down; it is a psychological relic in their make-up and it comes up when foreign policy issues are debated. They advocate, "Oh! You have failed; take shelter under some umbrella."

We must look to the generation that will take up the reins of power in this country, after the present rulers. Are we going to give them a legacy of dependence psychological dependence, military and economic dependence on some big power somewhere else or are we leaving them a shining example that against all odds, India stood firm with the spirit of this new world. That new resurgence was also referred to by my hon. friend who preceded me. Or, are we taking a position ignoring all these facts of life? To my mind, whatever the Chinese have done, one thing has come out really in shining colours, according to my understanding of the situation, China wanted India should come out openly and should be just pushed into some camp and then China can accuse us and tell all the Afro-Asian nations that India has thrown overboard all the fundamentals of her policy and aligned herself with some bloc. It is not looked with great favour in these nations.

Dr. M. S. Aney: What is the authority for your saying this?

Shri Khadilkar: If you carefully read the Indian press, instead of playing their role in a constructive manner and replying to the Chinese allegations and charges, they are more

[Shri Khadilkar]

interested in creating a psychological atmosphere in which they make it appear that we are not capable of standing against China and we might take shelter and embrace somebody. That psychology is created. Excuse me if I say this; I have got enough proof of it. I read the daily press in this country. Let me quote from this book. This is a banned book, though I do not subscribe to this ban: *Sino-Indian Boundary Question*. In this, there is last article viz. "More about Nehru's Philosophy." In that article, from the very beginning to the end, in a very learned manner, they have built up a case in which they have said, quoting from *Discovery of India*, written by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru long long ago, that Nehru is an expansionist from the very beginning, before India achieved Independence. Have the editors in this country, the so-called learned editors who are getting fat salaries nowadays, applied their mind collectively and effectively replied to this article? No effort has been made so far.

13 hrs.

An Hon. Member: Has the External Affairs Ministry dealt with it?

Shri Khadilkar: I will come to that later on. I will touch that aspect later, as to whether the External Affairs Ministry has dealt with the matter or not.

Sir, I was on this point, that we will have to assess whether the policy we pursued was correct in the context of the world situation at the present juncture and whether our instrument of implementation of that policy has handled the situation in such a manner and as far as possible implemented it in the spirit in which this House has approved it.

Sir, as I was saying in the beginning, we have made up our mind once for all that we do not want to cut ourselves off from this stream of his-

tory, from the Asiatic world, from the African world and join hands with the people who are shouting that their method of life, their socio-economic system, their system of protection and military alliances, is the only system, after the break-down of the imperial world system, where we should fit in. I feel that the Prime Minister, and this House also, deserves full credit for having said: nothing doing, we will not break this friendship, this solidarity with these new nations and their aspirations, and that we will try to understand them and build up greater friendship.

To those who shout from here at Moshi Conference and say that our delegation did not do much, I have only to say one thing. Well, perhaps, the Chinese were superior, I admit; but, at the same time, it must be clearly understood that our delegation went there, tried to explain our case and point out to the representatives of the Afro-Asian nations that we also, whatever our differences, would like to stand together with them against the past colonialism against which they were fighting and try to reach a new level of stability according to their ideals in their own countries. That great thing has been achieved.

Now, one aspect is there in the light of the acceptance of the Colombo proposals. What next, people ask. China is not prepared to accept *in toto* the Colombo proposals. In this connection, I would like to repeat almost a nursery rhyme that is there in China today in order to understand what is fighting a war. Well, a saying of Mao has become almost a nursery rhyme. What is it? It is: "Know thyself, know thy enemy; hundred battles and hundred victories". India also should try to understand the enemy, try to understand herself and lay down a policy for the future.

To my mind, on the border you must prepare for a long long stale-

mate. There is not going to be a war. That is my assessment of the situation. We have got to prepare for it. But certainly there is going to be a long stalemate, and in these diplomatic manoeuvres that China is playing, we must stand equal to them. That is the most important thing. To my mind, we should not give any ground for China to point accusing fingers towards us and say to the Afro-Asian world: "Look here, what India is saying is one thing and what she is doing is something else."

In this connection, I would like to point out to the recent utterances by the former dignitary of Tibet, the Dalai Lama. We have given him asylum here. It is very good. As a democratic country we should do it. But we are, fortunately, or unfortunately, not in a position like Britain or America where when in similar situation an asylum is given, the person concerned can be allowed to function irrespective of their relationship with their neighbours. What has happened recently? He has issued a statement and the Peking Radio is making use of this. Let us understand it very clearly. In it indirectly, he has instigated the Tibetans to rise in revolt and adhere to a constitution which he has proclaimed. On the floor of this House, I know, again and again, the Prime Minister has clarified our position *vis-a-vis* Dalai Lama who is here. He has stated that he is not supposed to function as a State. When we have said that we do not intend, that it is not our objective, to liberate Tibet—I can understand if it were our objective and certain things are said—I do feel that at the present juncture a statement of this nature—I have no time to reproduce or read out the whole statement here—will be doing greater harm and certain self-restraint should be practised by the honoured guest of this land which has given asylum to him and his own people. I do not know whether the statement was issued with the full approval of the Foreign Affairs Ministry.

Shri Ranga: Why should there be any approval at all? Why should he seek their approval? He is a free man as you said.

Shri Khadilkar: He is a free man, but not a free man as a representative of a State. He is as free as Shri Ranga is and not beyond that. That is why I have pointed out this aspect of the matter.

But there are other aspects regarding the implementation of the policy on which I want to dwell at some length. As my hon. friend said, our conduct of foreign affairs has utterly failed to some extent to deal with the foreign propaganda. I will give you some instances. I entirely agree that some persons from public life should be taken in, because today foreign affairs do not mean gathering of some crumbs of news in an evening party at the table of some high dignitary from Britain or America. It does not mean gathering news at a cocktail party. Usually some of the missions of small, newly independent countries function in this way. They gather crumbs of news from high dignitaries of big nations or big powers like America or Britain and pass them on to their home governments as if they have got some original news. Those days are gone.

Therefore, the foreign service people, whether they be service personnel or from public life, should understand the dynamics of diplomacy of China and the new socialist world. If they are ignorant about it, then they are bound to fail. You call it a jargon, but they have a specific meaning for it. Therefore, you must try to understand that jargon, their philosophy of life their philosophy of social organisation and their philosophy while conducting the foreign affairs. Unfortunately, what I find is, our foreign service is not up to the mark in this respect. But more than this, foreign languages are more important. I read in the papers during this

[Shri Khadilkar]

critical period when we were attacked by China, our Press Attache or Information Officer in Germany was not acquainted with the German language. Therefore, at least, as other diplomats are trained, we must have fully equipped personnel who understand the languages of different countries. For instance, I learn from good authority that in Latin American countries Peking radio is every day beaming whereas our radio service does not reach there and therefore we have to depend on hand-outs.

I want to make a submission in relation to the Press Attaches or Information Officers. Some men from public life should be encouraged and a certain contact should be established so that in academic circles, in cultural circles and others they should go on their own or at the Government's instance and build up a certain friendly atmosphere that is called for. I know that when my hon. friend, Dr. Gaitonde, went to Brazil he did good work to dispel certain doubts and propaganda that was carried on by interested parties. I do not know why such an attempt is not being made by us. China is sending people to the Afro-Asian world to have contacts at different levels. As I have stated on a former occasion, whenever people go from here to China, Soviet Union or other countries, they see competent people who can handle and guide any delegate and interpret him because they are so well-equipped. I do not understand why we should not train our people, at least in the foreign service, to do a similar job for propaganda purposes because the hand-outs issued by the foreign missions are not generally taken very seriously.

Then, my humble submission is that there are three questions which should be settled during the lifetime of our Prime Minister, and they are (1) our border conflict with China,

(2) the problem of the frontier tribal people and (3) our conflict with Pakistan.

In this context, the question of dealing with the frontier tribals is very important, because it is both internal as well as slightly external. We are integrating our society. Now the time has come when we must give serious thought as to how to integrate the so-called hill people, because their way of life their approach to life is different. Some people have asked: why not integrate NEFA with Assam? If you were to send an officer from Assam to NEFA, it is very much resented because the hill people feel that their neighbours are their exploiters.

Shri Basumatari (Goalpara): ...not in NEFA.

Shri Khadilkar: I am sorry, this is my information. We must try to integrate all the hill tribes outside the border as well as within the border into a common society in India, which is a big task. The integration of States on the basis of language has taken place. So, why not make efforts to integrate tribals also? Of course, it is not an easy task. Neither can it be solved by military might. Greater understanding and educative approach is called for to solve this problem.

So far as the conflict with Pakistan is concerned, I must congratulate Shri Swaran Singh for carrying on the negotiations. Four rounds of talks are over and the fifth round is yet to take place. I admire his patience in this matter. A new atmosphere is likely to be created at the next meeting because, along with the Kashmir problem—Kashmir has become an obsession with Pakistan—the other outstanding issues are likely to be taken up. It is a good augury. It is not a question, as Shri Mukerjee has stated, of somebody holding a brief for somebody. We should not deviate from the

path set before us and the policy we have laid down. It must be our earnest desire to come to some durable understanding with Pakistan. By itself it is to our advantage; not because some British diplomat feels that way or some Americans feel that way.

As I said earlier, it is not a question of aligning ourselves with the west; it is a question of aligning ourselves with the forces of history. Afro-Asian countries are in revolt. Internal revolutions are taking place. The old imperialist system is broken. They want to find new stability. They want a stable system in place of the vanishing colonial system. We have proved by our progress for the last fifteen years and by the policies that we have followed, both internal and external that our democracy can certainly give dependable guidance. We do not want to isolate ourselves from these broad dynamic currents of history.

Therefore, I would submit in the end to the House that while we endorse this policy, we will continue to pursue this policy. Whether we are attacked by China, or the stalemate continues, we will not swerve from our path, either this side or that side. We would like to assure the Afro-Asian nations that we stand with them, irrespective of what China may say in its propaganda, and that we do not want to isolate ourselves and take shelter somewhere else. We want to reassure that in spite of the psychological dependence that has been built in the minds of people by parties and leaders like Shri Ranga we will not be a prey to them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: According to intimation since received from Members, the following cut motions are desired to be moved to Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs: Cut Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. Hon. Members may move them.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Sir, I beg to move:

(i) "That the Demand under the head Tribal Areas be reduced to Re. 1." [Failure to bring tribal areas at par with other parts of the country (2)]

(ii) "That the demand under the head Naga Hills Tuensang Area be reduced to Re. 1. [Failure in integrating Nagaland with the rest of the country. (2)]

Shri Yashpal Singh: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Naga Hills—Tuensang Area be reduced by Rs. 100." [Failure to promote goodwill with Naga people. (3)]

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1." [Failure of the foreign policy (4)]

Shri Yashpal Singh: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100." [(i) Negligence of duty by our embassies abroad especially in vindicating India's stand during the Chinese aggression in 1962; (ii) [Failure to establish satisfactory relations with the neighbouring countries like Burma, Nepal, Ceylon and Pakistan (iii) Need to restrict the number of foreign visitors invited by the Government at the time of Emergency. (5)]

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Sir, I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head State of Pondicherry be reduced to Re. 1." [Failure to bring Pondicherry under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs. (7)]

(ii) "That the demand under the head Dadra and Nagar Haveli

[Shri Ram Sewak Yadav]

Area be reduced to Re. 1." [Failure in bringing Dadra and Nagar Haveli area under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs. (8)]

(iii) "That the demand under the head Goa, Daman and Diu be reduced to Re. 1." [Failure in bringing Goa, Daman and Diu under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs. (9)].

(iv) "That the demand under the head other revenue expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100." [Failure to reduce the heavy expenditure. (10)]

Shri M. Muhammad Ismail: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head other revenue expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100". [(i) New conditions imposed on Haj pilgrimage to Saudi Arabia, (ii) Need to persuade Saudi Arabian Government to appoint more Muslims (Guides) for pilgrims from Kerala, (iii) Need for giving representation on the Central and Port Haj Committees to such States as Kerala wherefrom a large number of pilgrims are going, (iv) Need for having a special rehabilitation department for the refugees forced out of Ceylon, Burma, Mozambique, etc. (v) Need to persuade Burma Government to allow more reasonable remittances by Indians in Burma to their dependents in India, (vi) Need for persuading Ceylon Government to allow reasonable facilities to Employees in Indian mercantile firms in Ceylon, (vii) Need for more and better publicity in foreign countries especially in the Middle Eastern and African countries. (11)]

Shrimati Gayatri Devi (Jaipur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, before I

start I would just like to reply to something that Professor Mukerjee stated in his speech. He spoke about Shri Rajagopalachari, who is not here and said that we were fortunate that Shri Rajagopalachari was not able to choose our leader in this country. But, I think, I must say quite confidently that if it came to such a pass of either Professor Mukerjee having to choose our leader or Shri Rajagopalachari, this country would stand by Shri Rajagopalachari's choice. Now I would like to deal with the other points.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Sir, with your permission, I would like to say that Shri Mukerjee did not say that he wanted it; he quoted Ayub Khan.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: The Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs for the current year is before the House. It will be seen that this year's budget of the External Affairs Ministry has been increased by Rs. 2.19 crores. Let us hope that the hard earned money of our tax-payers will not be wasted.

We must consider if our Missions abroad have succeeded in feeling the pulse of the countries to which they are accredited.

13 16 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

We have two recent examples of their having failed in this respect. The first was in Indonesia when our representative was taken by surprise at the anti-Indian demonstrations. The second was in Ceylon. Although they convened the Colombo Conference to solve the Sino-Indian dispute, they refused to remit to India the money collected by Indian nationals for our National Defence Fund. And yet our Government was not aware of this fact until it appeared in the press. In Burma we are no better off. We hear from the people returning from Nepal that the people there are not too fond of us. Recently, the hon.

Home Minister had to go there to soothen their feelings. There are persistent rumours too that our territory bordering on Burma, some of the NEFA areas, parts of Assam and North Bengal have been so heavily indoctrinated by Communist propaganda without any check that they might turn hostile to India. We are spending considerable amounts on this area and I hope that the Government is doing all in its power to counteract the Communist propaganda.

Our Missions in foreign countries should be able to advise the External Affairs Ministry as to how we manage to antagonise those countries. Diplomacy is a delicate affair. In the Middle East and the African countries too we have spent so much. Apart from Egypt, to whom we must be grateful, there was no favourable response from the other countries during the Chinese aggression. Why? Why does this happen to us? It needs investigation. In Moshi too look what happened.

Perhaps, our publicity has not been successful. Our own newspapers have commented on this, and it must be true because the Indian Government have been obliged to import a highly paid journalist to advise us on certain matters.

We are spending so much on sending our representatives abroad and on our propaganda. Would it not be a good idea if we acquired some long range transmitters also that we could do some of our propaganda through the radio? At present we seem to be wasting money on waging a campaign of propaganda on our own people. If, for example, the seventy lakhs of rupees that is being diverted to be spent on television in Bombay could be diverted for buying long distance transmitters, we could broadcast our point of view to other countries and counteract the propaganda of Radio Peking.

While on the subject of publicity, I should like to refer to the warnings

we get periodically in the press—not to start rumours. But when the Ministry of External Affairs shrouds itself in a cloak of mystery, it is hard not to prevent rumours. For instance, a room has been allotted in the Ministry of External Affairs for a State Chief Minister. Naturally, people wonder why. His mere presence in Delhi has started rumours and the mystery has deepened because he has gone abroad on a mission of which we in India are ignorant. One would like to know the reactions of the Central Ministers in this respect—what, in fact, can this Chief Minister do that the Union Ministers cannot achieve? Is he both indispensable to his State and to the Central Cabinet? Whose precise role is to acquire arms from the United States—Shri Chavan's Shri Krishnamachari's or his?

Sir, when people are not taken into confidence, naturally they start speculating and a rumour is born. In times like this, rumours can be very dangerous. So, I would implore the Government not to be unnecessarily cagey if they are sincere in their plea to kill rumours. The fault lies with the Government, not with the people.

I have deviated from a point I wished to emphasize and that is the importance of our relations with our neighbouring countries. If we can develop friendly relations with our neighbours, then our frontiers and our defences are, more or less, assured. Since the British period in India, considerable changes have taken place on our borders. For one thing, Burma has become a separate country and with the partition of India, Pakistan has now become our neighbour. Unfortunately, during the partition anarchy prevailed and as a result of communal riots, loss of life and other things, our relationship with Pakistan became very strained which, of course, is very sad. We have so much in common culturally—and also the waters of our rivers—and in West Bengal we produce a lot of crops that they manufacture. I have no doubt that had it not been for the problem

[Shrimati Gayatri Devi]

of Kashmir, these questions would have been solved some time ago. I only hope that Sardar Swaran Singh and Mr. Bhutto would soon come to an understanding on these vital problems.

In the same way, it seems a shame that when Tibet was invaded by China, we did not do as much as protest. At that time, we were on good terms with the Chinese and we were pleading their cause in the United Nations. We could surely have appealed to them on behalf of Tibet. Shri Acharya Kripalani, Shri Ranga and Shri Masani and many others repeatedly pointed out the danger of the occupation of Tibet by China and yet our Government turned a deaf ear to their appeals. All that they had said has been proved true today. The whole world watched Tibet being swallowed up and no one raised a finger. I remember thinking, at that time, that surely tragedy like that could not take place in the twentieth century. On our part, was it not a short-sighted policy? But there must be some sort of method behind this seeming madness—what could it be? Was it our fear of alienating Russia? Russia is a mature country and she would not start a world war on any provocation. Besides, it is no concern of hers if we wish to preserve a neutral and friendly relation between ourselves and China.

We call our foreign policy a policy of non-alignment, a neutral policy and a policy which is not tied to any military bloc. But in the true sense of the term, we have never been neutral. We were prepared to break our friendly relations with Britain over Suez and quite rightly so. We denied recognition to Israel and refused to exchange envoys with her. Although the Prime Minister has stated that whilst for reasons of political expediency, diplomatic relations cannot, as yet, be established with Israel, he sees no reason why other relations, such as, trade, cultural and other activities could not take place between

both the countries. But, in actual fact a further deterioration between our relations and hers has taken place in the last few months. For instance, Indians visiting Israel have to apply for a special passport; Israelis, who wish to visit India, often only in transit find it impossible to get visas and the trade has come to stand-still. Our businessmen are told by the officials of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry that by instructions from the Ministry of External Affairs no import or export licences can be issued for Israel. This seems extraordinary when we need all the trade possible.

Also, Sir, we were silent when Russian tanks were showering bullets on the freedom loving people of Hungary and Poland. We almost always supported the Communist countries, supported the Communist bloc, in the United Nations. How then can we call ourselves strictly neutral? Our neutrality seems pro-communistic.

Before concluding, I should like to touch briefly on our relationship with the Western Democratic countries. They have been giving us aid on a massive scale to prevent India from following the footsteps of so many South-East Asian countries that have gone to the communist bloc. There have been times when our representatives have gone out of their way to embarrass and insult these countries specially in the United Nations and yet, when we were attacked, they were the first to come to our assistance. Of course, our leaders were fully aware that these two countries could not afford to allow India to be swallowed up by a communist country. But whatever our Government might say about America or England wishing us to remain non-aligned, one cannot but help wondering what the man in the street in those two countries thinks about our unfriendly attitude. It may be that the opinion of the man in the street in India does not count with the Government, but in those democratic countries, it certainly does.

There are in this world today two distinct trends—the communist and the democratic. We can no longer oscillate between the two. If we persist in playing with both these sides, I would only ask one question: If it came to a question of an all-out war between China and India, would Russia be in a position to supply arms to both these countries? In the same way, it would seem that India is both having her cake and eating it. But in pursuance of this policy between the two, we have adopted a policy which has lulled us into a sense of false security. Not only that. It has prevented us from building up our arms as rapidly as we should. Therefore, I think, we owe it to our own people, to our friendly democratic countries to let them know on which side we stand.

The American President, Mr. Kennedy, made a declaration that the American people would stand by India in her fight against Chinese aggression if communist China were to indulge on a large scale invasion. It is a pity that so far, the framers of our foreign policy have not shown their appreciation to this unconditional and whole-hearted offer. I sincerely hope and trust that irrespective of our views regarding the so called neutral policy of our Government, our leaders will hasten to develop our defences and our foreign policy in the light of this proffered comradeship from Western Democratic nations.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, the hon. Member who opened the discussion on behalf of the opposition from the Communist party, seemed to suffer from many allergies and many phobias. I think his allergies seem to have been to some foreign journalists, foreign visitors from U.S.A., Great Britain and other places. I do not believe in this kind of approach to our foreign policy. Nor do I believe in the kind of approach to our foreign policy which has now been formulated by the noble Lady Speaker who preceded me. I believe that our foreign policy has to be conditioned by our past traditions, by our cultural heri-

tage, by the conduct of our freedom struggle in India and by the exigencies of the social, political and international situation as we face.

I do not think any country in the world thinks of its foreign policy in terms of black and white. Neither the U.K. nor the U.S.A. nor any other country. No country can be presumed to follow a foreign policy which is a linear policy, which does not admit of any deviation to this side or that side. All countries have certain basic policies and they are guided by them. I believe, our basic policy is the policy of friendliness towards every nation. But, that does not mean that we stretch a hand of friendship to one who tries to chop our head. Even in the case of those persons, our policy is, we try to negotiate for peace and if that is not possible, we fight as grimly, as toughly, as desperately, as determinedly as any other nation does. Therefore, to make our policy a very simple affair of joining one bloc or other is not in the interests of history, nor in the interests of the present conditions of our country. Nor is it good for us that we should develop any kind of allergy to certain powers. I think so many countries of the world have been standing by us, so many peoples of the world have been friendly to us. Our Prime Minister addressed a letter to the Heads of States: I think there were 112 letters. From almost every Head of State was received a very friendly response so far as our policy towards the Chinese aggression was concerned. There were a few countries that did not send any reply to that letter. That was due to the fact that some of them had acquired freedom recently, some of them were too small and some of them had other preoccupations. Almost all the countries gave friendly and almost fraternal response to the letters which our Prime Minister wrote to the Heads of States. In view of that, to say that our relations with this country or that country are not friendly and that we are being isolated and that we are not functioning, so far as the field of foreign

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

policy is concerned, properly, is, I believe, a travesty of truth. It is, I believe, a distortion of truth.

I believe that so far as our foreign policy is concerned, our non-alignment has been approved even by those persons who thought it to be immoral at one time. So far as our anti-imperialism is concerned, it finds a responsive echo in the hearts of other struggling nations. So far as anti-colonialism is concerned, we have been one of the most doughty champions in the world all these years, not only after attaining freedom, but even before attaining freedom. Our Prime Minister and other leaders visited those countries even before India became free and even when we were fighting for our freedom.

It has been said that we are losing ground so far as Afro-Asian countries are concerned. I do not believe that. It was said just now that we did not do justice to the cause of Algeria. I think nothing can be farther from truth. I am glad that Shri U. N. Dhebar is sitting in the House at this time. I may assure you that, apart from what our Government did, the Indian National Congress had a committee which was helping the cause of Algerian Independence and the cause of Algerian liberation. I remember attending some of the sessions of the Indian National Congress and finding representatives of Algeria there. To say that we did not do our duty by Algeria or by Morocco, I believe, is something which is not corroborated by facts.

Again, it has been said that we did not try to formulate our policy very clearly so far as the Congo is concerned. I think we sent our contingent to Congo openly and with express motives and with a fully formulated policy. We sent the contingent there so that—not to take part in their domestic quarrel—they may try to restore unity in Congo and bring about solidarity in Congo. I think we

acted so far as Congo is concerned, in the most friendly way.

So far as Hungary and Poland are concerned, I was a Member of this House when the revolution took place in Hungary. I remember our Prime Minister saying that that was a popular uprising. When he said that, I think he implied all that would have been said in favour of a struggle of the people. I remember one of our Ambassadors was sent there to report on the happenings in that country. Therefore, I believe that it is not right to think that so far as the Afro-Asian countries are concerned, we are not respected there, we are not honoured there and that we are not believed there. I believe that the Afro-Asian countries believe in our policy of anti-colonialism, and our policy of friendliness which extends especially to those countries which have acquired freedom recently or which have been struggling for freedom all these years. Therefore, it is no use blaming our country and our leaders for things which have never happened and which are never going to happen and which exist only in the imagination of the people.

There are two or three problems which have always been with us. First of all, there is the problem of Portugal. I am glad to see that the representatives of Goa, Daman and Diu are here with us. It fills my heart with joy when I see these persons sitting in this House. I also feel very happy when I think of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. They have also won their freedom after a long struggle for liberation. But, Portuguese colonialism and Portuguese imperialism refuse to die. It wants a long lease of life. In spite of the counsels of its friends, it does not see the writing on the wall. The U.N. General Assembly passed a Resolution in which it was said that early steps should be taken to see that Angola and Mozambique are directed along lines of self-government. A twenty-four nation special committee was appointed and a fact-

finding mission went there. But, the most unfortunate thing is this. The Portuguese Government does not want to co-operate fully with this committee which wants that Angola and Mozambique should become self-governing countries as soon as possible. I am interested in Mozambique for the simple reason that about 2300 Indians have been forcibly repatriated from that country. I am also interested in this because there are three hundred Indian still there. Properties worth Rs. 60 crores are left there by Indians. The kind of treatment that has been meted out to these Indians need not be described here. It has not been a treatment which can be called a decent treatment. Now, I would appeal to the United Nations General Assembly and to the 24-Nations Special Committee on Colonialism that they should try to come to their findings about it and they should end it. If these Special Committees fail in this duty, I am sure, the Security Council will take appropriate action so that Portuguese colonialism which is so outmoded and mediaeval and which does not fit into the modern world becomes a thing of the past. This is what I would say, Sir, and I send my greetings to those Indians who have come to this country. Some of them have lived there for a long time and I can assure them that their mother country, Mother India, will look after them as well as possible.

Now, Sir, I come to another matter, namely, our Indo-Pakistan talks. I must say that Sardar Swaran Singh and Mr. Bhutto have been very good negotiators. I have been told about some tennis players that they keep the tennis ball in the air for a very long time. I believe that these gentlemen have kept the ball of negotiation in the air for such a long time and I hope that the day will come when these negotiations will yield some fruitful results. One thing has been there as a result of these negotiations, and I want that my Government should reassure the people about these things,

for, I do not think that our Government has done anything to create that feelings. But the newspaper reports have created certain kinds of anxiety and certain kinds of misgivings in the minds of some people. For instance, the people of Poonch, the people of Meerpur, the people of Rajouri, the people of all these places in Jammu and Kashmir State have been feeling some kind of apprehension with regard to their fate. I know Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir . . .

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): With regard to what?

Shri D. C. Sharma: With regard to what is going to happen there. I think, Sir, he did not want me to mention the name of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. That is why he has interrupted.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I only wanted to get information. I did not want to interrupt my hon. friend.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir State had been giving people every kind of reassurance but our Government has got to stick to this policy which our Prime Minister enunciated before these negotiations started, that there might be inor adjustments so far as the cease-fire line is concerned and that nothing else is going to happen. Now, unless that is reiterated again and again, I am sure, the people of that State, in some parts at least, are bound to feel uneasy. I am very sorry that when these Indo-Pakistan talks had been going on, Pakistan should have signed an agreement with China and given away about 13,000 square miles of our land to China. Of course, according to them, it is only about 2,500 square miles of land. But, according to our calculations, it is 13,000 square miles of land. It is our land, Sir, and I am sorry that this land has been described as uninhabitable, inaccessible and not of much use to Pakistan. Of course, it may not be of much use to Pakistan, but it is of great use to us. And, if this land is so useless, why have the

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

Chinese entered into an agreement with Pakistan? So, there must be some specific reason, some military reason or some other reason why the Chinese have tried to get hold of this land. I am sorry that this thing has happened. I believe that when we have some kind of negotiations with China about our borders, I am sure, this land which has gone to them as a result of the agreement with Pakistan will also figure in the negotiations.

One point more, Sir, and then I will finish. It is this. Our relations with Peking are what everybody knows. But, I believe that we have got to mount our publicity gun, if I can use a military expression, as effectively as we can. Otherwise, the number of charges that the Peking Radio and the Peking Press and the Peking rulers are making against us will be very hard to counteract after some time. It is not that those things are read by us in the Indian press. All these things go into the press of the whole world and therefore they create a great deal of harm to the Indian cause. They also create a lot of misgivings in the minds of some persons about them. For instance, there are some persons from my constituency who are now prisoners of war and they have been writing letters to their parents and to their guardians about what is happening to them. Now, I read one letter which a prisoner of war had written from China in which he has said that they were getting very very poor rations and that they were given a very very coarse and inferior kind of rice to eat. We know, the Punjabis sometimes cannot live on a diet of rice. They say: "We cannot live on a diet of rice when no chapatis are given. We cannot live only on rice. We must have vegetables also". Do you know what kind of vegetables are given to them? The rice is boiled and on the top of the boiled rice a few cuttings of grass which grows anywhere and everywhere are put and this is what is served. This is the kind of food which they are giving to our prisoners of war. On the other

hand it has been stated on the floor of the House how well we are treating the Chinese who are prisoners in our country. Today I read in a paper that they are talking about the oppression that we are practising, we are giving mouldy rice and we are giving them some kind of vegetables which are not very proper food. Now, to that allegation, the answer has been given by the chief of the International Red Cross that they have been treated very well. But, I wonder if the statement of the International Red Cross, persons will be broadcast all over the world.

Therefore, Sir, their propaganda machinery is very strong, is very very active, and has a very large field of operation, whereas, our propaganda machinery is not yet so effective. I would say, Sir, that we have to win, this war not only on the field of battle, not only on the diplomatic level, but also in the field of propaganda and in the field of publicity.

I would ask the External Affairs Ministry that they should be more vigilant about the kind of propaganda that the Chinese Government is putting up before us and that we should try to counteract it not only in India but in every part of the world.

Mr. Speaker: No Jan Sangh representative I find here ready to speak. Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I reciprocate the sentiments which were expressed by the Prime Minister when he was giving reply to the debate on the President's Address. He had then remarked that we live in an age of science and technology and we should have a scientific outlook. I would like only to remind him that the essence of a scientific outlook is the rejection of a posture of infallibility and omniscience and a spirit of humility and tolerance. One is gradually noticing that there is a spirit of intolerance towards all those who dare to criticise any aspect of their policy. Any criticism is totally twisted as challenge to the basis of the policy, and, if those

unfortunate critics happen to be the members of the congress party, explanations are asked. I know it is entirely their look-out and they have to face up to it. But if those critics happen not to belong to the party there is a smear campaign started. These methods of Inquisition do not go on with the spirit of science; and I hope he, an ardent student of science, will see that we try to practice what we preach to others.

Having made these preliminary remarks about the necessity of being scientific in all things we do, I should like to say that during the year under review, whereas it has been a year for the rest of the world during which tensions between the great powers have tended to ossify, removing for the time being in any case that plunge into the abyss of a conflagration, so far as this country has been concerned, I think, and it pains me to say so, we reached the nadir of our foreign policy during the past year.

We had reverses in our diplomacy, reverses highlighted by the defeat at the hands of the Chinese armed forces, and an equally potent and dangerous reverse signified by the emergency of the Pindi-Peking axis, whose only objective is unremitting hostility to India.

Having said that, before I turn to an analysis of why that policy and where that policy has gone wrong and try, of course, to be ready to be smeared that this is inspired, this is wrong, this is trying to throw out Mr. Nehru and all that mumbo-jumbo and humbug that goes with it, I shall begin by a scrutiny of the report that has been placed on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this document is a gem of literature, and I should strongly recommend to the Sahitya Akadami to award the best award they have to give to those who have composed it. I am sorry that there is no Indian version of the Nobel prize. I want to know whether the senior officials of the Ministry, the Deputy Minister, the Minister of State and the Prime Minis-

ter ever cared to read what is given on their behalf to Parliament. This is a piece of gross discourtesy, that is, this document. I shall take it up and analyse it.

It assumes that the House has no intelligence and it goes on this assumption of insulting the House. I shall now take only a few pages. Let us take page 24. What has it to say? This is how it begins: This is the report on our relations with other countries. The report says:

"Thailand: The Thai Government expressed their full sympathy and support for India with reference to the Chinese aggression."

—a good thing; and then, we find:

"Kumari Kamala and her dance troupe gave performances at Bangkok."

Then, let us take another page. Now, let us come from Asia to Europe. Let us go to Europe and have a look. Let us take page 36. This is what we find:

"Austria: Shri A. K. Sen, Minister of Law, visited Austria."

—a landmark in the history of Austria. What is happening between Austria and India? A Minister visits the country. In Paris, there are monuments to every single victory of Napoleon. I think that the Austrians should erect a monument to his visit. We are having great co-operation with this country, and credits worth about Rs. 20 crores have been advanced. But this is not the only example.

For Shri U. N. Dhebar's sake, let us take now page 37. What happens in regard to Hungary? Again, we find the same brilliant performance, namely:

"Shri A. K. Sen, Minister of Law, visited Hungary."

Is that the only thing that we did during the course of the year with this country that somebody went and visit-

[Shri Nath Pai]

ed it? This is, of course, not to denigrate, this is, of course, not to say anything against a brilliant Law Minister who is among the more brilliant and abler colleagues of the Prime Minister. But I am saying about the kind of report that is submitted to the House. Is there an assumption that the House does not read? May I tell the only representative of the Ministry, Shri Dinesh Singh who is present, that there are at least some who read and read very diligently? Of course, there is the Parliamentary Secretary too who is also present.

What will be the country's thinking on this? Regarding the Cyprus, we find that it has been stated that when the President of Cyprus came here, there were exchanges of views regarding the international situation a fairly good information.

Now, let us turn to Germany. We find:

"At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Dr. Heinrich Luebke, President of the Federal Republic of Germany, accompanied by Dr. Gerhard Schroeder, Foreign Minister, visited India from 26 November to 5 December, 1962."

There, the report ends. When the President of Cyprus was there, there was an exchange of views on questions of mutual interest. What did the Prime Minister talk with Mr. Leubke? Did they talk about roses and cabbage? What are the Germans to think? Are they to think that there was nothing of common interest to talk about? How are these reports prepared?

Now comes another gem regarding Turkey. I would like to draw the attention of the House to this thing now. What did we do with regard to this important country in the West? This is what we find at page 32. The only thing that seems to have happened in the realm of foreign affairs and diplomacy regarding Turkey is:

"A gift of four animals was made by the Government of India

to the Turkish Ambassador for the Izmir Zoo in Turkey."

That is the report about Turkey.

I very seriously beg of the Prime Minister that the Ministry which he heads should show a little deference to the House and to the country, and we should get better reports about what is happening. If you want to tell about the cultural exchanges, have a separate column. If you want to tell about exchange of animals, have a separate column. But, basically, we want an evaluation country-wise, of what is happening.

Now, take another thing. The Deputy Minister is there now. It is, I think, a good thing that some new blood is being brought into the Ministry, and it was high time that the whole Ministry got an arm-shot of new ideas and new blood. We are told that he visited Iraq. And what did he do there. I am sorry; this is no personal reference to my hon. friend Shri Dinesh Singh for whom I have great regard. He visited Iraq and attended the celebration of the 14th July Revolution in Iraq. Since then, another revolution has taken place, but the Government of India is still celebrating the old revolution. The reply will be given that the report was prepared before the revolution. That is not true. The latest visit of the Secretary-General to Moscow has been brought in which came at the end of last month. I do not want to go into this further. I leave it here.

What applies to this report applies generally to the way the foreign publicity of this country is handled. Crores of rupees are spent, and then we find that nobody knows what the Sino-Indian conflict is. And then, what happened? Then, the Secretary-General, the Minister of State, and the Law Minister are sent on errand running from one end of the world to another explaining, 'You see, they are aggressors; we are not; point No. 1' and so on. We cannot rectify the world's mistaken view about the issue overnight by sending the best minds. It is a projection of our view, of our

stand over a period of time. And what we missed to do in ten years cannot be rectified or nullified overnight by sending the best minds. The whole publicity, to which everybody has referred, is so shoddy. I am told that there is a new beginning, and I wish there is success. But there is a reason why it happened like that.

The truth of the matter is that our diplomacy is not an adequate vehicle of our foreign policy. It is totally inadequate to implement, to carry, to project what we have been trying to do in the realm of international affairs. The reason is very simple. We have got a class of generalists; these generalists from the Civil Service are good enough for every job under the sun. They can be made the general managers of so complex a modern structure, economic structure or industrial structure like the Rourkela steel plant; they can be sent to a chemical laboratory; they can be made the administrators, and they can be sent to represent India as diplomats: Press the button, change the label and everything becomes all right.

An Hon. Member: *Sab Jaante Haim.*

Shri Nath Pai: Yes, *Sab jannte haim.* *Sarvajnata* is attributed. No wonder that we find ourselves in a pitiable position. Recently, the Sino-Pakistani Pact was being signed. I am told—I may be wrong; I would tender my apology if I am wrong—the Indian Ambassador did not do anything in the USA to point out what a sinister move it is. I would like to know from the Prime Minister what our High Commissioner was doing in London to tell the British who have all the while being asking India to come to a settlement with Pakistan on this issue? What were they doing? The same had happened during the Suez episode, when we remember all the Ambassadors from all the key Embassies were away holidaying. Once again, the same repetition! Say what you will; nothing will be changing there.

14 hrs.

How do other countries take their foreign service? How do they see the necessity of changing it? I know that last year the Prime Minister took credit by referring to the report of the Estimates Committee on the subject. He said that the Committee had been kind enough to give a certificate. Poor Estimates Committee! I will say this: we must do what other countries do. Since the end of the world war, there have been three times reviews of the foreign service, not foreign relations, of the United States. The Senate goes into it, experts go into it; the latest committee appointed was under Mr. Christian Herter, to go into it and make recommendations to Congress—their Parliament—as to whether the service is adequate in this changing, dynamic world. The Prime Minister will never let anybody come near his foreign service. It is *sanctum sanctorum*. Nobody can go and ask what is happening, whether an embassy is performing properly or not. What is the report? I know the answer will be given that we have an inspectorate system. There was a very able man in the person of Shri Tyabji. Unfortunately, he was shifted, shunted, to Aligarh University. I think he was doing too good a job. But that is their look-out. But in anticipation, let me spike that reply in defence, that this inspectorate is good enough. Can the inspectorate say whether in a given country, the embassy is functioning with a view to the projection of our policy? The inspectorate goes and finds out how many spoons are there, how many forks are there, what furniture is there, whether allowances were properly drawn and spent. It does not give an evaluation of the work. But this is what other countries which are very serious about their foreign policy do regarding their vehicle of service, that is the foreign service.

It is not enough to have a good policy—I have something to say on the policy itself, but now I will be speaking about the vehicle because

[Shri Nath Pai]

this is the only time when we can do so. Loy Henderson, speaking about the American foreign service, says:

"No nation can maintain greatness for an extended period of time unless its ever-changing political superstructure is supported by an enduring framework of competent devoted public servants".

Does the Prime Minister realise the necessity of doing that in the realm of the foreign service? Then again, this is Robert D. Calkins also speaking on the same subject:

"No one in these times can go far on the intellectual capital he acquires in youth"—

Men educated 20 years ago are still to run a world which is changing every day, men who were educated in an age whose values are changing out of recognition, are to conduct India's foreign policy in the age of supersonic speed, in the age of sputniks.

"Unless he keeps his knowledge or skill up to date, revises it, adds to it, enriches it with experience, and supplements it with new ideas as they displace the old, he is soon handicapped for the duties of the day".

I would earnestly request the Prime Minister that in his leisure hours, a good student that he used to be—I hope he still is, but I do not know what happens to the student's leisure when one assumes the onerous responsibility of the crown of Prime Ministership, but he used to be a brilliant student—he spares some time to read a book called *The Establishment*. I will read only one sentence from it for his benefit:

"Whenever any effort had to be organised, indeed palpably threatening disaster averted, outsiders had to be recruited to take charge... By the end of the war,

there was no department concerned with the war—

there was no department of the civil service or of the foreign service—

"which was not in fact, if not even formally headed by people recruited from outside"—

people with new ideas and new enthusiasm. We need to do this. This is T Balogh of Oxford writing in *The Establishment*.

Having said about the service, I shall now turn my attention to other matters. But before I come to the serious criticisms, there are some redeeming features. The best of them, of late, that has happened to us is the very successful visit by the Home Minister to Nepal. Ever since his name was announced, we knew that this was the right choice for the right job. It is very seldom that it happens, that the right man is selected by this Government for the right job. But it was one of the few, rare occasions when the right man was sent for the right job. He has done a magnificent job for this country and I think the whole House will join with me in giving our recognition to it. It is a first-class achievement. Shri Shastri, who has succeeded in every other portfolio, has now one more feather to his crown. Even in the field of diplomacy and foreign affairs, his very first effort has been a signal success. I hope the Prime Minister will draw the necessary conclusions. This is the kind of diplomacy we need today with regard to our neighbours—sending our very best men, our very best talent and our best characters. Diplomacy with these countries in the periphery of India was left to people—I do not want to pass any judgement—who, I do not think, were adequate for or equal to the job they were called upon to do, and therefore, we find China succeeding in all these countries. The Prime Minister must have a look at it. Why does it happen? Why does it happen that China is succeeding in all these countries?

I know the slogan of China being isolated. I will deal with that and expose how totally wrong is that claim, how self-deceptive is the claim that China is isolated. It is India which is isolated, as we found when the question of the Chinese aggression came in the United Nations; when the Indian delegate called a conference of all the Afro-Asian countries, the meeting had to be abruptly broken off because India could not get enough support. They say that China is isolated. Is this an example of China being isolated?

Take other examples. of our isolation. The Prime Minister wrote letters to 60 nations asking for their support. How many of them gave their support? Tunku Abdul Rehman, the President of Cyprus, I think the Prime Minister of Nigeria and a couple of others were the only persons who condemned it as aggression. I know the brilliant reply that will be given, the brilliant reply which indulges in casuistry that will be given in the House and in the country, that they are with us, but they do not want to condemn because condemnation does not go far. Is this how the world is to function? What did you do when Abyssinia was raped by the Italians? Did you say: 'If we condemn, peace will not come?' We condemned the fascist attack on Abyssinia. What did the Prime Minister do when Japan committed aggression against China? Did he take into consideration the argument that the Japanese would be offended if he condemned them? The aggressor has always got to be called by the name 'aggressor' and condemned.

The truth of it is that we had failed and we are still totally neglected, totally alone, totally isolated in this field. It is no use going about telling people that it is China which is isolated. That will be to hide the bitter truth from our people and deceiving ourselves.

Having said this much about isolation, what goes wrong is this, that we never take sufficient care to define

the irreducible minimum of our foreign policy. We left it in doubt. We were very happy to be allowed to proclaim high-sounding principles, and the world, particularly China, and some other countries, drew the conclusion that if only the Indians are left free to proclaim high-sounding principles and parrot-mouth-certain slogans, 'we could do what we can with such things as their territory, as their vital interests'. We were satisfied because we were proclaiming high-sounding principles, and very satisfied that we were succeeding. But this was the danger: we did not reduce to the minimum what is the irreducible minimum of our vital interests. I would like to make a reference to that aspect to which I referred at the beginning. I said that there has been, on the whole, an ossification of tensions in the world and therefore, after hovering on the brink of a world conflagration, the world retreated back from the abyss. Why? Because both the Soviet Union and the USA have no illusion, have no misunderstanding, about one another's irreducible minimum, the basic interests which they must not try to hurt or tread upon. The Soviet Union made it abundantly clear that any other such violation of Soviet aerial supremacy might mean war—that was when the U-2 was crossing stealthily on what they call the Soviet hemisphere. And the Americans made it equally clear when the missile bases were built in Cuba. What was the result? They know how far to go and where to stop. But nobody in this world knows how far you can hurt India, because it was never defined it. China was never told 'Thus far and no further'.

The Prime Minister said something about Tibet in the Rajya Sabha. I am very sorry that those remarks have departed from the usually high standards of truth which he maintains. It pained me to read his speech in the Rajya Sabha on the President's Address. Those remarks are not factually true, are not fair. Dealing with Tibet, he said:

[Shri Nath Pai]

"We inherited the Tibetan position from the British Government, and our own examination of it told us that we could not challenge in law, in constitutional law, anything, apart from the practical difficulties in challenging it".

For what he has done in Tibet, conveniently the buck is passed on to the British. Was that the British position, that the Chinese had suzerainty over Tibet? Was that the British position that the border was not defined? No, Sir. Here is what Sir Anthony Eden (now Lord Avon) who was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs during the second world war when England and China were allies, says. The Prime Minister's remarks regarding this are totally misleading and wrong and have departed from facts because that was not the British position at all. If he is to change it, he is a free foreign Minister but to tell a lie is highly objectionable. This is what Anthony Eden wrote:

"(Her Majesty's Government) They would welcome any amicable arrangements which the Chinese Government might be disposed to make with Tibet whereby the latter recognized Chinese suzerainty in return for an agreed frontier and an undertaking to recognize Tibetan autonomy and they would gladly offer any help desired by both parties to this end."

That was Anthony Eden writing to the Chinese Government when Marshal Chiang Kai Shek and the British were allies. They never accepted anything beyond suzerainty. Suzerainty was to be accepted in return for Tibetan autonomy. We have bartered away both and now are conveniently saying that we cannot do anything and the situation was like that. But having done this we could have done at least one thing: asking China, "What about Sikkim; what about Bhutan and what about

Nepal?" I may as well, with a slight variation, quote Winston Churchill while talking about the way, casual manner in which our interests were dealt with; it can be put in these words only: "Never was so much of so much vital interest to so many was so lightly given away by so few". Today, China is threatening to create a Himalayan Federation of Sikkim, Bhutan, Nepal and Nagaland. I hope the brilliant team of his assistants, Parliamentary and others, bring to his notice what happens. This is the latest issue of *China Quarterly*. What is happening in Bhutan.

"Several Bhutanese headmen are reported to have gone to Tibet, and are being used by the Chinese in their future plans for Bhutan. There are three thousand Tibetan refugees moving about the country, infiltrated by Chinese sympathisers. Finally, just across the border there are an estimated 200,000 Chinese troops, with a key headquarters between Lhasa and Bhutan. Every village and monastery has been requisitioned to garrison them, and they are rapidly building a network of roads, airfields, underground installations and anti-aircraft emplacements."

This is what is happening. I do not know if even today we are serious about what is happening. It is said that in Nagaland two visits have been made by the Chinese delegation. It is not without significance that during the past few months in spite of claims to the contrary by the Government of India, Naga hostilities have very much increased and are on the increase. They are receiving sustenance, help and encouragement from the Chinese. We cannot dismiss it lightly. It is a dangerous thing.

Why do I say so? It is a dangerous thing to dismiss the intentions of totalitarian dictators. England made the mistake and France made the mistake and declared: phu-phu, useless, insignificant, the intentions of

Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf Mao Tse Tung has made known his intentions and you have been ignoring them. I hope Mao Tse Tung has served a notice on the Russians also. There is the treaty of Aigun of 1958 which recognised the river Amur as the frontier between China and the Soviet Union but now the Chinese have said that they may have to think about it. I hope, sober realist that Mr. Khrushchev is, he will take note of this warning and will not repeat the expensive folly which India committed. We relied upon bonds of panch sheel and Mr. Khrushchev may be tempted to depend upon the bonds of proletarian internationalism. It will not save him when it suits Mao's convenience and the military might of the Chinese republic. As soon as Mao came to power he said that China retains the freedom to revise all the treaties and change all the borders. We made this mistake with regard to China when we did not take into consideration her serious intention and one has to pay very dearly for it. May I tell it again? Perhaps the Prime Minister remembers, it is available in any book. If totalitarian dictators are not warned in advance of miscalculating our attitude, if there is a misjudgment of their intentions, it will land the world into trouble. When Adolf Hitler began to make preparations for the final onslaught on Danzig, the German High Command told him: Sir, it is dangerous because Germany will be required to fight on two fronts as England and France may come in if you fight here with Poland. There are minutes in archives to show what Adolf Hitler said: "I know what stuff the Anglo French democrats are made of; they will come and lick my foot if I kick them."

This is the basic mentality of every totalitarian dictator. They need to be dealt with firmly. We are completely ignoring the lessons of history.

Shri Khadilkar: What happened to him?

Shri Nath Pai: Very good question, Mr. Khadilkar. You know what happened before he was removed. 80 million sons of the soil from every country in the world had to be destroyed. Do you want that to happen to India and China? 80 million people were slaughtered in the last world war. Were he stopped when crossing the Rhine. This would not have befallen the world. That is my reply to you.

Sir, I will be claiming a few minutes more. I am the only speaker of my Party. I know that I am claiming your indulgence a little. May I say about the signing of the Pindi-Peking axis that it is a marriage of convenience? This unholy alliance was solemnised on the altar of hostility to India. That it is a piece of sheer chauvinistic opportunism is exemplified by the fact that Pakistan is a member of two military alliances whose proclaimed aim is to contain communism. The second pact, particularly the SEATO, is created to contain China and the Chinese belonging to the socialist bloc whose aim is to defeat all such SEATOs, CENTOs and NAEOS. But they completely forgot their long term mutual hostility to spite India, shook hands and signed a pact.

What is even worse is this? Every Indian is angry. Every Indian is concerned and is worried about this development of this new axis against India. I want to know from the Prime Minister whether my information is correct—that when this nefarious pact was signed a banquet was held in honour of signing of this pact and the Indian Charge-de-affaires in Peking attended the banquet. If this information is true it is highly disgraceful and it is not in keeping with our self-respect and self-interest if the others think that these Indians are hypocrites, we shall have to pardon them.

Shri Tyagi: What is the source of your information?

Shri Nath Pai: Let them contradict it. You know what has happened in

[Shri Nath Pai]

England. If I am wrong, I will withdraw and tender apologies to you and to the Charge-de-affairs.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right. But whenever the hon. Member makes such a statement, he should also have some information. I do not want him to disclose the source of that information.

Shri Nath Pai: You being a Judge, Sir and I being a student of law, you will allow me to say this. In the first place, I am speaking on the most unimpeachable evidence. The proof of it is in that it is not being contradicted; it cannot be contradicted and the dinner was attended. Mr. Speaker, I must also tell you that recently in England there was a case and we know that it is but proper that for some things sources are not easily disclosed. Otherwise, Parliament will not be able to function.

Mr. Speaker: I have not asked him to disclose his source. I am only telling him that he must see that he has that information on which he can rely. Every hon. Member before making any such statement must satisfy himself that the information that he has is creditable. At least he must be satisfied himself.

Shri Nath Pai: May I assure you, Sir, that I am grateful for your guidance. I have fully satisfied myself before making this very serious suggestion, that it was correct. (Interruptions.) It is a very serious thing. Are we to be humiliated? Are we to invite the charge of hypocrisy? It means that the Chinese can draw the inference: any kick is good enough for the Indians; we can kick them and they will take it lying down. Why must we fall so low and try to curry favour, to please and appease the Chinese? What has happened to promethean courage of the Prime Minister, that unbending will, that undaunted courage which once dared to defy the might of empires, which mocked at the dictators and laughed in the face of death itself? Why this

kind of a show? Give us any straw and we will clutch it and come to compromise with you. It is this that we are resenting. It is no use saying that protocol demanded this.

A few minutes more, Sir, and I shall conclude. May I ask him this? There is an impression growing inside the country that we are tending to forget those who fought for us. Nothing has been done about those brave sons of India who were the victims of Chinese perfidy. More than 3,000 of them are prisoners there. It is no use telling us that the International Red Cross is not allowed to do anything. Those brave sons fought for India, and it is our responsibility and duty to release them. An increasing impression is going round the country that the authorities have forgotten them already. I would have thought that the Prime Minister would have made this the first condition when he talked with the delegates from Colombo powers: that the release of all these men is the first thing; no talks with the aggressor till all our brave sons are brought back. They will ever be remembered. We have been demanding it.

I will plead with the Prime Minister. The Government of India generally claims that our policy *vis a vis* China—I have nothing to say about it in general—is a success. We might have lost some territory; we might have lost some face; we might have lost some prestige; we might have been humiliated. We might have been defeated. But the policy is a success. I am reminded here of the parrot story of the princess whose dear parrot had died and she could not be informed of it. But she was gently told: the parrot does not move, it does not kick its legs; it does not eat food; it does not drink water. What did it mean? The only thing left to be uttered was that the parrot was dead! So, the China policy is a great success! Only, we are surrounded by China's machinations. We are losing territory and China is getting away

with it and, no Asian power will come forth to stand by India and condemn it. Still, we tomtom that our policy has been a success. Indeed, strange is the meaning of the word 'success', Mr. Speaker.

In the past, we made one mistake, and that is, of placing too much faith on the Chinese good intentions. I think the Prime Minister again is likely to make a mistake. Pardon my immodesty in daring to suggest that even he could make a mistake. I plead guilty for my immodesty. It is this: in the past, we did that folly. Now, what is likely to happen is this. We are beginning to place too much faith on the possible development of a rift between Soviet Union and China. If it is not in keeping with the self-respect, as the Prime Minister said, to depend on others for defending our country, as he rightly said it, is it the path of wisdom and statesmanship and self-respect to depend for our foreign policy on a possible rift that may develop between China and Soviet Union?

And Mr. Khrushchev—we must take it very seriously—always warned those who want to try to benefit, be it Mr. Harriman or be it the Prime Minister of India—he has already warned us—that it is a quarrel between brothers, a fraternal quarrel, it is a family affair, and any attack on China will be regarded as attack on the Soviet Union. Let us not try to base our policy on that thing. Therefore, what I plead with him is this: We need a policy of firmness, a policy of cultivating our neighbour, cultivating in the way—Shri Shastri has shown the way,—and build our strength. We must discard all our illusions.

I would conclude now since I do not want to try your patience, Mr. Speaker, any more. Shri H. N. Mukerjee symbolising the new tactics of his party, said "Nehru is in danger; save him." This is how they are warding off the attack on themselves. But I say that in sheer tactics and strategy,

since the late Moldke and Schliaffen this is the best tactics that a party cornered has used. There is no question of "Jawaharlal Nehru in danger." They are the champions. Today, he did the same thing very successfully again. He quoted Shri Ayub Khan and tried to suggest the Shri Jawaharlal Nehru is an obstacle to Indo-Pak amity. Wrong and objectionable—we would tell them. May I tell him something from 'home? I think he knows the organ of international communism which is called "The World Marxist Review," published from Prague. In its latest issue, it is said that this is a reactionary Government and this is a reactionary Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*). I think this is a gross insult to this country and a crude type of interference in our national affairs. I hope the Prime Minister will have to take note of this because a sinister move is afoot in this country to call the Prime Minister a progressive and then to attack everybody else behind the shield of calling him like that, and they are getting away with this kind of game. This must be stopped.

I am reminded of a sloka in Bhagwat Gita, and with that, I close. This is what Arjun said after hard probings from Lord Krishna.

नष्टो मोहः स्मृतिलेखा त्वत्प्रसादान्मयाच्युत ।
स्थितो स्मिगतसन्देहः करिष्ये वचनं तव ॥

The Prime Minister should tell the people of this country: "I am your old Jawaharlal; I am the old fighter. I am the one who hoisted the flag on the banks of the Ravi and proclaimed India's integrity and sovereignty. I have listened to your criticisms and to your prodings. My illusions are gone. My doubts are over. And my countrymen, now I shall do as you command." This should be the basis of his foreign policy.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Voltaire said that England ruled the waters; France ruled the land, and:

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Germany ruled the skies. That was before the 20th century. In our foreign policy, we have been following the highest ideals, and now has come the time when defence, which was lying behind the foreign policy, will not only have to run alongside it but perhaps the time will come when defence will have to be a paramount factor in this country.

Our country today is in serious peril. China may attack us this spring or summer, as some have reported. Our borders are violated, and we will have to do some drastic re-thinking about our methods and policies, in order to meet this peril. It is no use blaming the hon. Prime Minister for his policy, if Tibet has been given up, and if we have, some of us have, recognised the past mistakes. But historical mistakes cannot be corrected so quickly. It is in proper perspective that we must band ourselves together and make our country strong. We must fill up the gaps in the passes of our frontiers, namely, Himachal Pradesh and other places. The passes, to use a phrase in my own language—I do not know whether it is correct have been *gal passes*, in the sense that they have strangled our safety. These passes have been there for ages and safety must be accorded to the inhabitants of those territories when those passes approach into Tibet and other neighbouring Chinese territory.

I have a few suggestions to make. We must have intensive and extensive cultivation of friendly ties with all countries of Asia and Africa; we should have a very great drive of friendship in all the ten countries of South-East Asia, whether they are in NATO or the communist bloc. We must have a drastic overhaul of our foreign missions in their methods of work and personnel. We should create a strong China desk in our foreign office, strong and impregnable and effective. Our publicity should be yet modernised and completely overhaul-

ed. The delegation to the United Nations Assembly should be a strong delegation, unmindful of the expenditure so that we may make our influence felt on the forum of the United Nations General Assembly, despite the personalities that may lead or inspire it. France's De Gaulle is thinking ultimately of establishing peace with the Soviet Union and thus solve the Berlin problem, because he thinks that Britain is entirely dependent for its nuclear power on America and he does not want America to boss or dominate Europe. The ultimate aim of De Gaulle is to have a good workable understanding with the Soviet Union and thereby we may draw a moral. Further, Russia is the second largest oil-producing country in the world, and it is supplying petrol to China, and in that context, we must be careful in our dealings, in our adoption of methods, with the Soviet Union. It has after all, done a big job in supporting us on the issue of Kashmir and Goa. We must see that we do not yield on the Kashmir front, and Kashmir has now become our lifeline of security.

These are the general points that I raise today. I wish to explain them at a little length if you allow me time. It is true we have 50 foreign missions and 10 High Commissions and a number of consular offices in our country. Thank God, the Chinese Consulate has gone! Indian Missions abroad are sixty-six and Indian Commissions are fourteen. We have revised our requirements on the budget and have brought it to the figure of Rs. 577.13 lakhs.

It is time that we took an overall view of all these matters that neither our establishment, nor our administration, nor our foreign missions, nor our personnel depend upon the powerful umbrella of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru for protection but every one of them shall account for the work that he or she does on behalf of his country abroad, that the foreign policy of the Prime Minister shall be implemented

very effectively by every one who is paid on behalf of this country to fulfil an assignment abroad.

Today we must take care of the fact that China is springing over our heads on the frontiers and territories of Africa. There is a scramble for Africa. Unless we take note of the events in Africa we have grave danger not only on this side of South-East Asia on our heads but also on the continent of Africa. The Moshi conference was a pointer. Here you may permit me, Sir, to quote from a hundred-year old Catholic paper of Bombay, the *Examiner*, which has an article written by a foreign missionary. This is what he has said about the Moshi conference:

"The Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference here was not as pro-communist a meeting as had been predicted and there was relatively little antagonism shown towards the Church.

It would be a mistake, however, to consider all participants in the meeting as communists. It is probable that a great number of the Africans who joined the Afro-Asian Solidary Organization and attended the meeting did so because they considered it a means of obtaining their rights, especially independence for their countries. Nationalism, not communism, drew them to Moshi.

The question is still being asked: Who is going to control Africa? Those who are asking it do not expect the answer to be 'the Africans'. The events in the Congo have demonstrated that it is possible for a colonial power to leave by the front door, and the same or different external forces to come in by the back."

Here is an appraisal about the Moshi conference by a foreign missionary, a Catholic, in a religious paper. And it is a good thing, when people criticise the Indian participants of the Moshi conference, to note the forces that have been at work at Moshi.

3036 (A1) LSD—5.

The U.A.R. Syria and Iraq will soon constitute a federation sooner than we expect. Their population is less than the Muslim population of India; our Muslim population is fifty million. It is not merely enough to accredit Muslim ambassadors to those countries: it is good and proper and correct to tell them that fifty million Muslims are in this land, perhaps larger than the population of any Muslim country except Indonesia, and more than all the Arab countries put together, that the Muslims here enjoy the highest offices in this country, that they have got their mosques and their cultural life remains unperturbed, and that there are still large cities of India with large pockets of Indian Muslim citizens who are left undisturbed. These are the facts which we must drive home in the Arab countries and not allow any passions to be raised, as Pakistan does against us in those lands.

I am sorry the graceful and charming Maharani Gayatri Devi is not here. She raised some important points from our point of view. She said we are supporting the communist bloc in the UN Assembly. She did not say why we support them or why we are friendly with everybody, whether they are to the right or to the left. But she forgot the basic fact that but for the strong British intervention in Indian affairs there would have been no Pakistan. After Pakistan was created, the Americans jumped into the vacuum and India has been faced with the problems, the after-effects of partition, which first came as a result of British intervention, and today we are facing all the trouble on account of Pakistan having been armed by America. The hon. and gallant Maharani forgot to mention these basic facts that in the United Nations Russia backed us on Goa and Kashmir, a fact which we cannot forget, and that in the American press there was a cartoon wherein Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has been shown as stabbing Mahatma Gandhi, to show that his non-violent policy has been put an end to.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

In the United Nations we have always fought against aggression. We have always gone on supporting the cause of countries crushed by colonialism. And about Hungary, when my hon. friend referred to it, let him not forget the fact that when Britain and France and Israel attacked Egypt, the Soviets were alarmed and got panicky. Their forces instantly went down on Hungary. The Russians who had once withdrawn from Hungary returned with ruthlessness and no doubt hammered at the Hungarians and there was a lot of bitterness, killings and executions. But, had not the unexpected and sudden invasion of Egypt by Britain, France and Israel taken place, the Russians would not have gone back with that ferocity and hammered at the Hungarians. This is a historic fact which has to be remembered. We should go back to the underlying forces behind this great conflict and not merely find fault with the Prime Minister that he did not fight Hungary. We must place ourselves in that position and see what is the cause that impelled him to do this or that.

In South-East Asia we have got nearly ten countries. Their population is less than two hundred million. Some of them perhaps secretly sympathise with us but are afraid to say so. It must be said to the eternal credit of Mr. Tenku Abdul Rahman of Malaya that he raised his voice in our favour against Chinese aggression. Whether they are communists or non-communist countries we shall have to make friends with all these countries—Burma, Malaya, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, the two Viet-nams, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines and Australia, countries right from Burma to the other end. We should not neglect our friendly ties with Afghanistan, Nepal, Iran and Ceylon. Every country is valuable to us. We have seen how the Chinese have curried their favour, how the Chinese fete the foreigners, especially Africans, in their own country. You must have read in the papers today as to how

some young South Rhodesian leaders have been feted and applauded in Peking. I remember in 1959 how the Algerian leaders were feted and applauded in Peking with the result that Algeria is one of the few countries which have not said a word about the Chinese aggression on India.

There should be a drastic overhaul in the personnel and methods of work of our foreign missions. I should suggest that some members of the foreign service who cannot be useful should even be transferred to other Ministries. If a man in Defence or any other Ministry can be transferred, we shall not stand on any technical distinctions; if they are perhaps transferred to other Ministries fresh blood can be poured into our foreign missions—all for the better indeed.

Our missions abroad must be able to move with the times and deliver the goods on behalf of our country. Unless they do that a hundred per cent, the emergency has no meaning. The emergency is an emergency for us and also for our accredited representatives abroad.

In regard to our publicity, when the hon. the Prime Minister answered the question put by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur and said the non-service personnel or non-career diplomats are not perhaps so useful, I thought he perhaps may have forgotten or overlooked the distinguished President in Moscow as our Ambassador, the work done by his own sister in Moscow, in Washington and in London, the work done by Shri Chagla and Shri G. L. Mehta, and our dear friend Shri Dhirailal Bulabhai Desai, and also Dr. Syud Hussain who was our first and best Ambassador in Egypt and who had touched the hearts of the people and . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would request him not to go to details and praise those people; otherwise they will be subject to criticism also.

Shri Joachim Alva: On the other hand, take Mr. Fyzee, our past Ambassador, who wrote a long letter to *The Observer*. If he was not found suitable to be an Ambassador in Egypt I want to know why he was allowed to go into the Union Public Service Commission, then in Kashmir as the Vice-Chancellor there and why he was allowed to go round and write a long article in *The Observer* attacking our basic policy on Kashmir.

In regard to our publicity I find that it is still lagging behind. The best men are not wanted and are asked to go away, and we are still searching for the best men. I would only quote the names of two people, Dr. Girja Mukerjee in Rome who has a number of German books to his credit and his wife who writes splendid articles on Africa. Mr. Jenson, a writer in *The Statesmen*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He should not suggest names for particular posts and be an exponent for anybody.

Shri Joachim Alva: But if the names come in the public papers. . . .

Mr. Speaker: They might come. But a Member of Parliament cannot take up the cause of any particular individuals.

Shri Joachim Alva: All right, Sir. These publicity officers have done very valuable work, and if they wanted a little extra emoluments they should not be sent away; they should be absorbed and made to do the work.

In regard to the UN Assembly I might mention that the time has come for sending effective and vigorous delegations. I have nothing but admiration for Shri Krishna Menon who led the delegation and who has been very popular in Asia and African circles. But one man cannot discharge our work. If there are people who cannot be effective with their next-door neighbours on the benches in Parliament, they can certainly not be depended on to decide the fate of the nations. The United Nations Assembly

is becoming very important in view of the Chinese issue. And China, though she is absent, is exerting more direct influence on the forum of the Assembly through her friends in Africa and others. We ourselves are left perhaps in a little weaker position. It is time that when the next session of the UN Assembly meets, we send out a delegation which can deliver the goods in a more effective manner, converse and mix with the African and Asian delegates in a manner and on a footing of equality and friendship and not superiority and win their hearts by hooks of steel.

We should not yield on the point of Kashmir except where we can go to the farthest limits of adjustment. Kashmir today has become our life-line. We have lost many life-lines. We cannot give away our position on the life-lines that are still existing and are strong for us. Our young men and officers in the army and our non-commissioned officers have remained at their posts in Kashmir for the last 16 years. Some of them have had five changes in two years, thrusting their families this side and that side. We owe a duty to them, who have guarded our frontier. We shall not give it away to anyone at anybody's behest.

We must sympathise with the Soviet Union in their stand against the Chinese. In fact, perhaps they hate each other and they will never be reconciled in the inner-most recesses of their heart, whatever communist philosophy they might participate in, just as India and China may never become the same old friends. But Russia, being the second largest producer of oil, is supplying a large amount of petrol to China and it will be a nice thing to see that Russia's ties with China are not strengthened. As I said, De Gaulle's ultimate objective is to be reconciled to Russia, so as to settle the fate of Europe, which will include the solution of the Berlin problem. From that point of view also, India must draw a moral out of the historic developments on these two

[Shri Joachim Alva]

fronts and it is necessary that we do the right thing at the right time.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Sir, China and Pakistan are uppermost in our minds now. We have accepted the Colombo proposals and China has practically rejected them. With Pakistan we are having some delicate negotiations. At such a time, I feel that the Government of India has to take some very vital decisions and it is our duty not only on this side of the House, but on the other side as well to create such a strength behind the Prime Minister that whatever decision he takes—it may be wrong in some detail in some people's minds—but he must go to the world with the strength of 450 million people. If we do that, I submit whatever decision he may take, we will ultimately reach the goal. This is not the time to make use of rhetoric and have a dig at a little matter here or a little matter there. This is a time of crisis and we, the citizens of this country have a right to expect from every party that strength which will lead us to victory.

There have been lots of criticisms. Some say that we should honour our pledges; we should go straight ahead and try to liberate the occupied territories. Others say that our whole policy is wrong and at this juncture, because we are weak, we must make an alliance with the United States. Whatever policy we may pursue, it is clear that we should not serve the Chinese war aims. What are the Chinese aims? Surely, nobody believes that China was after collecting what somebody described as verticle desert. Even if Aksai Chin was a very important matter for China, there were other ways. They could have come to some understanding on the principle of Burma Road or they could have offered to exchange some territory, so that it can be settled in a friendly way. Surely that is not China's aim. It shows that China has had other objectives than acquiring just a piece of land. What are their objectives?

Political observers say that probably it is to divert attention from internal troubles, because of the failure of the communes and the failure of the food policy. That is a thing which has been tried in Russia. Mao Tse-tung knows the history of the Russian revolution, how the blockade had helped in establishing the revolution of the country. Other say that China is not only after that, but China is also trying to pierce through the ideological barrier which India, with her policy of plans, creates before her, so that ultimately Marxism might succeed and we are standing on the way. There is another group which says that China wants to force India into the arms of the United States and create a world war, so that there are definite alignments, because Mao Tse-tung has written that political power comes from the barrel of the gun. He is the only leader who believes in war as an instrument of policy. He said, in the first World War, 200 million became communists. In the second World War, 900 million became communists and in the third World War, according to simple arithmetic, he thinks 1800 million will become communists. Of course, he does not realise that the times and conditions have changed. The world of 1960s is not the world of 1920s. So, if this analysis is correct, naturally our greatest emphasis should be on our planned development. We should not only carry on development according to the figures given by the Planning Commission or the schemes drawn, but we should have the same intense faith in the democratic process, as the Chinese have in their methods. We have to create that faith.

Secondly, I would take courage and say that we must try as far as possible to avoid total war, because war is the thing that China wants. If you plunge into a war, that might look very courageous and brave and it might satisfy those people who are after glory, but it will be a wrong thing to do.

Coming to alliance with the United States, once you make an alliance with the United States, you cannot escape being involved in the cold war. There are also the factors of geography before you. India is so placed that if you combine with the Soviet Union, your defenceless coast line will be at the mercy of the biggest naval powers in the world. But if you, on the other hand, make alliance with the United States, the biggest land powers will be facing your land frontiers. So, alliance is not a step towards security; it is a step towards insecurity. Some friends say that SEATO and CENTO have given security to those countries. It is one thing to have a few small countries bundled together and it is another thing for a big country like India to form alliances with one bloc or another. It will tilt the balance of power dangerously, whether it is the United States or Soviet Union. That is one reason why we should not align with either bloc.

When you talk of alignment, you forget that the world is changing. The Soviet and Chinese affair is every day in the newspapers. It is not just propaganda or wishful thinking, as Mr. Nath Pai thinks. It is a real fact. He mentioned about the dictators like Hitler and what Mao Tse-Tung has written and he said, we do not take heed. About the Soviet Union, Mao Tse-tung has written quite a lot that he would revise and renegotiate all the treaties that were made by the previous Government. Does not Mr. Khrushchev know what it is?

Does Mr. Khrushchev also not know what Shri Nath Pai knows? The policies of countries are not decided by this. He referred to the Treaty of Anjun. China wants the Treaty of Peking of 1880 to be revised and Vladivostok an all-weather port belonging to Soviet Union is claimed by the Chinese. The boundary between Sinkiang and Soviet Russia near Afghanistan is not delimited. There is also the dispute about borders of Siberia. Apart from this, there is an attempt on the part of the two big

powers of Soviet Russia and United States to come together. The Soviet retired from Cuba. They also accepted some of the disarmament proposals. But the Pentagon is so obsessed by these anti-Communist ideas that they will not come forward and take risks. Naturally, they had to revert to their old alliances, because they could not remain isolated.

It is not only the Communists who are coming together, but the anti-Communist forces are also forcing the Communists to come together. That also we must keep in mind. The European community is becoming a union of political and economic strength. England is trying to develop internal and external pressures to gate-crash into the European community, of course, by invitation. Once this is formed, it is quite possible that they might decide to break away from the United States, and they might become a separate focus for another line.

This is the world situation. Why is it so? What gain will be there if you have alliances with the United States of America? Pakistan is allied with the United States. Can anyone say that Pakistan today has greater self-confidence, greater power to resist, than we possess. At the slightest opportunity they went and signed a treaty with China. What earthly gain is there by aligning with Peking or with the United States of America? It does not mean that we are hostile or we are ungrateful. We are very grateful for the help that they have given and we are asking for more. But we must make ourselves quite clear. But it does not mean that we are hostile if we do not join them or form any alliance. I would, therefore, plead that this suggestion for having alliances that has been going on for a long time should be given up and should be buried once for all.

The United States herself has said that India can remain non-aligned. England and America had always been talking about alignment, but after the Chinese aggression they have felt that this is not the time to press for

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

it. There was not a single newspaper of importance in London or New York which pleaded for another line. They could have said that they would not give us arms unless we formed into an alliance with them. That is the way, Sir, that the foreign policy of other countries is conducted.

There is a view that all Communists are one and we should not only fight with China but also with the Soviet Union. That will be the biggest blunder that we would be making. Communist countries today and have always been functioning as nation States. If they do not believe in national frontiers, why is China always looking after areas which are Chinese. Cannot the Chinese part with a piece of land to be under the Soviet Union, under the dictatorship of the Proletariat? Are there two Communist countries in the world which have submerged their sovereignty in the manner in which the capitalist countries of France and Germany have done? Now they are placed in a position where they have to be together, and once the position is changed you will find that they will function as nation States.

The reason for all this attitude of aggressiveness is simple. In NEFA we had a reverse. Unfortunately, some of the highest men in the land described it as a humiliation. Naturally, it hurts you and you want to hit back. After all, it was nothing but "hit and run" business. Germany was defeated and her leaders were tried and hanged. She did not feel humiliated. With one single reverse, they say it is humiliation. They have gone back. Why have they gone back? Why did not they proceed on to the oil fields of Assam? It was because they felt our strength here.

A lot is said about Chinese armed might. The ingredients of power are changing. Today China has a five million strong army. That does not frighten anybody. Look at Cuba. Look at Suez. There were 4,00,000

people in Algiers. There were 30,000 people in Cyprus. Sir, the centre of gravity of power blocs and the content of power is changing.

Therefore, I plead humbly that we build up our defence and, at the same time, see that we do not just by emotional reaction take a step which is harmful to the country and which will make it more difficult for us to take a bold step which we may think to be proper at a later date.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Singhvi—He is not there. Then, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri—He is also not there. Members send in their names and show their eagerness to speak but do not remain in the House. Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was very much intrigued at hearing our dear colleague Shri Nath Pai asking the Prime Minister about our Charge d'affairs in Peking having attended a banquet in celebration of the Sino-Pak agreement over Kashmir. But I was much more intrigued that neither Shri Nath Pai nor any of his friends or party leaders outside the House ever raised any question about the wisdom or the advisability of this interminable round of talks with Pakistan even after the signing of the Peking-Pindi Pact.

14.58 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

I was much more intrigued at the thought that none of them ever raised their voice against the manner in which the United States Ambassador for India has been present at every venue of the talks, not in the actual talks but in the places where those talks are held. And, invariably he comes out with a Press conference where he supports the continuance of these talks and fresh Indo-Pak agreement in spite of what Shri Nath Pai described as Pakistan's stab of India in her back in the shape of the Peking-Pindi agreement.

Now, in this connection, I have two questions to ask of the Government. After the Sino-Pak agreement which was solemnised a few days ago and which would come into force at once—it should not even go before the Pakistan National Assembly for ratification, and yet it would be operative from the date of its signing—what are the reasons that are persuading the Government to continue these talks and finding out the possibilities of any agreement with Pakistan over Kashmir or other issues? Do they want us to believe, or do they want their countrymen to believe, that there is any earthly possibility of any agreement between India and Pakistan over such a vital issue as Kashmir when we have not been able to solve even minor issues that have been irritating the relationship of these two countries for the past fifteen years? Recently, in the context of the Indo-Pak negotiations, a foreign observer, and a very competent observer at that, Mr. Kingsley Martin of *New Statesman and Nation*, gave a very lucid picture of the whole situation between India and Pakistan, and this is what he has to say:

"In India one may hear much irrational talk about Kashmir, but it is possible to discuss the matter without heat. Since the Chinese invasion, many conservative Hindus are prepared to drop their prejudices and advocate a compromise in order to achieve a better defence of their country. But to talk to Pakistanis, especially to politicians, is to find oneself battered by waves of confused and baseless propaganda..... But for India as a whole Pakistanis display an extraordinary mixture of fear and contempt. I have been repeatedly informed in Pakistan that India started a bogus war with China knowing that America would send them supplies which would enable the Indian army to invade Pakistan. In East Pakistan I was told that no one

had been alarmed when the Chinese advanced almost to the frontiers of East Bengal, but that it was generally assumed that the Indian army which was sent to defend Assam had really come to invade East Bengal."

This being the dominant psychology in Pakistan, what do the Government expect as a result of these talks? They have not only not stopped the talks after the Sino-Pak agreement over Kashmir, they have decided at Calcutta to prolong these talks and to carry them onward to a fifth round at Karachi. We do not know whether the fifth round will not be carried to a sixth round also. Again, in the proposed Karachi talks, the subjects that would be discussed, as reported in the press are—I do not know whether any common ground has been found out with regard to Kashmir—several other boundary disputes like Gujerat with West Pakistan and Tripura and Assam with East Pakistan. I do not know whether the pending disputes with regard to West Bengal border and East Pakistan would also be taken up, though there was no mention about it in the press. It was also mentioned that the question of Pakistani infiltration into Assam would also be taken up. What is really behind the mind of the Government in regard to carrying on these talks? Why are these talks not terminated? Do Government really want the country to believe that there is any possibility of any kind of agreement with Pakistan, knowing the background of Pakistan's mind as we do?

It is quite clear that the United States as a power has a good deal of interest in some kind of Indo-Pak agreement for the common defence of, what they call, the Indian sub-continent. The Ambassador of the United States, speaking before pressmen on the 15th March, that is, just on the day the Calcutta talks terminated, said that the United States has a great interest in Indo-Pak agreement and he added:

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

"The interest stemmed from its serious concern with the security of the sub-continent. The United States had committed very heavy resources to this task. There can be no question that we are seeking unity and understanding and the Chinese are seeking division."

Professor Galbraith forgot that he almost stated that he wanted that Pakistan and India should join up and align themselves with the global policy of the United States' strategy, so far as Asia was concerned.

In that connection, I was also a little intrigued by what has appeared in yesterday's *Hindustan Times*—I do not know whether the news item is true or not—about the visit of Shri Patnaik, the Chief Minister of Orissa, to the United States. It is said that the United States military experts have advised Shri Patnaik that India need not acquire the latest supersonic planes in order to fight China or for India's defence, but they could very well do with less powerful and less speedy planes. If this report is correct, the question arises why these considerations did not weigh with the United States Government when they sent star fighters, the speediest and most powerful fighters to Pakistan under the US-Pak pact only a year back, which impelled us pell-mell to send our Defence Ministry representatives to different countries in search of speedier planes to match Pakistan's strength. My fear is that somehow or other the United States is interested in more or less seeing that Pakistan and India should join up and both the countries should be kept in such a way that they are permanently dependent on the United States for defence equipments and other things. So, in the background of all these things, we have to ask the Government one question. In what way do they think our defence would be strengthened, particularly our defence against any possible aggression, any future invasion from China, by hold-

ing this kind of talks and negotiations with Pakistan? And whether we should not also suggest to the United States, as best as we can, that this kind of a thing, the United States Ambassador going about and holding a press conference immediately after the holding of every Indo-Pak meeting smacks of an undue interest, an undue zeal in these matters which is neither to the ultimate interest of the United States and Indo-US friendship nor also to the interest of India. So far as these Indo-Pak talks are concerned, I think, we should make up our minds this way or that way very positively and tell the world that after the Sino-Pak pact, there can be no further negotiations. And let us also think what will be the result. Already, China has taken up one chunk of Ladakh and Kashmir. Pakistan has given away, has made a present of it, one chunk of Kashmir to China. Still we are going on with our talks. Uptil now, I do not know whether we have evolved any basis. But the proposal is that there should be some kind of a division or some kind of a partition of Kashmir. But, then, what remains of Kashmir? For what are we having the talks? What would be the result of these talks?

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): We have not agreed to partition.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: That is a suggestion that has come to us.

Shri Tyagi: Not from us.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: But that is a suggestion that has come to us. We should know what is the basis of the talks with regard to Kashmir and with regard to various other issues that we have with Pakistan. That has to be told very clearly and plainly, so that the people may not get confused ideas over the whole thing. That is all I wanted, in this context, to ask the Government.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to

support the demands for grants that have been presented on behalf of the External Affairs Ministry. We all know that the last year through which the country has passed, has been a year of great trial and tribulation for the country. In a sense, it can be said that never before was non-alignment which is the very rock-bottom of our foreign policy called in question as was done by certain events and incidents that took place in the international field. It is true that this year has been a year of supreme test for our policy of non-alignment and I can say that today it can be claimed on behalf of those who have formulated and presented this policy to the nation that this policy has stood the test of time and tribulation. It has been said that this policy should have been abandoned because the absence of alignment was one of the reasons why China attacked India. The leaders of the Swatantra party wanted the country to give up the policy of non-alignment and seek security in alignment. On the other hand, we see that the policy of non-alignment has succeeded. It has succeeded and it has not failed in any way. Sir, when the time of testing came, we found that our policy of non-alignment did not prevent us from seeking assistance or from receiving assistance. I would, therefore, congratulate the Government, and especially the Prime Minister of our country, for sticking to the policy of non-alignment in the hour of our trial and tribulation and for proving to the world that India is not a cowardly country which tenders advice to others but fails to follow the advice it tenders to others when its own interests are involved. It has proved that it does not prevent us from seeking and accepting assistance. It has proved that the countries which were once critical of our policy of non-alignment have begun to realise the important contribution that non-alignment can make to the lessening of international tension. Countries which had pooh-poohed our policy of non-alignment and called our

policy of non-alignment unethical came forward to accept the right of a nation, a sovereign nation, to independence of judgement, came forward to offer unconditional assistance without laying it down as a condition that non-alignment should be given the go-by. If this is not a tribute to the policy of non-alignment, I want to know what should be accepted as a test to which this policy should be put.

My hon. friend opposite, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee said that it was wrong on our part to expect all countries in the world, especially the non-aligned world, to be vociferous in their support for India when India was subjected to aggression. One cannot disguise a little disappointment at the reaction and response that one found in the non-aligned world when India was in straits. He said, if we had expected the non-aligned countries of the world had come out vociferously in support for India, it would have been a case of India asking for alignment. What is his understanding of non-alignment? When there is aggression committed on Suez, he would expect the whole world "vociferously" to rally behind Egypt or UAR against the Western imperialists who committed aggression. When there is aggression on Algeria or on Angola, when the question of West Irian is hanging fire, he would expect every nation to come forward "vociferously", shout themselves hoarse against Western imperialism. But, when there is aggression committed on his own country, India, and when we rightfully expect the non-aligned nations to support India, because India is a victim of aggression, he thinks we are asking them to align. Align with whom? When did he begin thinking of India as a rallying point for alignment? The very raison d'être of the philosophy of non-alignment is that the nation wants to preserve its uninhibited freedom to take a stand on injustice and aggression from whatever quarter this injustice and aggression may come, whether it may be from the West or the East. The reluctance to take such a stand on

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

aggression, on naked aggression, against a country which has nothing to do with either of the power blocs is certainly something which should cause us concern, whether it comes from the committed world or the uncommitted world. This should lead us, as the hon. Member for Naini Tal who spoke on the President's Address said a few days ago, to consider whether we can take that all non-aligned countries have the same standards of judgment and the same attitudes and the same definitions of non-alignment as we have. India believes in non-alignment because of our ideological anxiety to preserve our uninhibited right to make an independent evaluation of the causes of tension, and our anxiety to preserve our ability to work for easing and eliminating tensions. It is true that apart from an element of historical experience and a degree of great compulsion of circumstances, of current conditions, it cannot be said that all non-aligned countries in the world share our ideas and attitudes on institutions and international trends. Oftentimes it has been said that there are many kinds of non-alignment. There are some countries who have accepted non-alignment because they have been thrown out of the ring. There are some countries who seem to accept non-alignment out of a cynical profit motive, a desire to get the best from both bidders. And there are some others who are small nations, who in spite of the smallness of their size, see in the division of the world into two blocs an opportunity which gives them disproportionate importance, an opportunity to don the mantle of the marginal man who has the historical role of tilting the balance of scales in history. I am glad that the able advocacy of foreign policy that our Prime Minister has given evidence of and the way in which this policy has been followed by our Government have given ample testimony to the world that these charges cannot be levelled against our country, that our own concept of non-alignment is not vitiated by such obsessions and complexes. Nevertheless, in the non-

aligned world, it is necessary for us to realise that there are countries which believe in different social and political systems. There are countries which have not been members of any alliances; which technically belong to the non-committed world, which, without alliances, have built up mighty military machines, and kept on a continuous pressure—relentless pressure—on their periphery, politically, ideologically and sometimes militarily. We cannot ignore the existence of these different political attitudes and beliefs in the non-aligned or under-developed world. We must remember, under such circumstances, that congruence of opinion in the under-developed world is a myth, that it is likely that there will be gravitation of forces even in the under-developed world of like-minded people who believe in democracy and socialism and who do not believe in totalitarianism and the exploitation of current conditions for perpetuating themselves in positions of authority.

China sometimes poses to be a non-aligned country. China is a very clever country. Her leaders are very clever. China is an under-developed country. Utilising her position as an under-developed country, as one of the biggest countries in the under-developed world, appealing to sympathy because she received as an under-developed country, she tries to confuse and obscure the distinction between the under-developed and the uncommitted or non-aligned. By means of international front organisations like the Afro-Asian People's solidarity conference, organisations of journalists and what not, China tries to confuse this distinction between the under-developed world and the non-aligned world, and wants to pose as the guardian saint of non-alignment. Does China believe in non-alignment? China believes in war. China is quarrelling with Russia precisely on the question of the validity of the idea of non-alignment. Our hon. friends opposite, belonging to the Communist party

are ardent advocates of non-alignment. I have already referred to their conception of non-alignment. When they try to tell us that non-alignment is in danger, one is tempted to ask, since when do they believe in non-alignment? Right from the beginning when our Government initiated the policy of non-alignment or since it was certified as something which they could profess in the developing countries of the world? One is reminded of what Lenin said about Snowden and Henderson: that Snowden and Henderson should be supported. "They should be supported not because we believe in them, but we should support them as the rope supports the head of the man who is hanged; we shall take them by the hand as a prelude to taking them by the throat." Non-alignment is prescribed for those under-developed nations of the world which are on probation for baptism and admission to the communist world, I suppose.

China has launched a diplomatic war against us. I would remind the hon. House that, speaking one year ago on the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry, I said that China was on a diplomatic war path against India even as Pakistan was when Pakistan and India came into being as separate countries. China has enormous advantages. She has the advantage, above all, of the perennial presence of a fifth column—ideological fifth column—in every one of the under-developed countries of the world. She is fighting a war of ideological expansionism. She is uninhibited by the accepted codes of international conduct. She has got help from ethnic groups of overseas Chinese in some of the Asian countries and even in some countries of Latin America. She has the help of International front organisations. She uses money, publicity, her news agency "Hsinhua" and the radio which goes on beaming its vituperative propaganda, aimed at the people of Latin America, Africa and Asia.

We cannot combat this with hesitation and indecision.

We must realise that we are at war with China. War today means not only war on the battle front; but a war of minds, war of nerves. We must nerve ourselves for this war of nerves. It is not with a hobbling gait that we can run the race against China. We cannot be paralysed by the apprehension that we will be misunderstood as aspiring for the leadership of the under-developed world. We must accept the strategy of initiative and discover a comparable dynamics for the excellence of the principle of non-alignment.

In the under-developed world there are many small countries which have had to seek security in military alliances because of their size, because of their position in the throbbing periphery of the communist world and because of economic inadequacies. We cannot afford to alienate their sympathies by giving an impression of apathetic aloofness or condescension. We must approach not only the Government, represented at the United Nations as my hon. friends have been saying, not only approach Government through our missions wherever we have missions; but, we must remember that it is necessary to touch and deal with every sector of public opinion, every sector in society which moulds and reflects public opinion: whether it be trade unions, whether it be youth organisations, or organisation of journalists, workers or peasants. If our Embassies and legations are not able to do this, we will never be able to succeed in this diplomatic war against China.

Coming to the question of external publicity, last time too, I had referred to this question. Looking through the report of the Ministry, one finds that there are 51 Information units. How are these Information units functioning? It is not enough if you produce literature and throw them about. Our Embassies, our legations,

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

our Information units must be prepared sufficiently in advance to anticipate the attitude of our Government. There cannot be any hush in these matters. There cannot be revelation in instalments in this matter, it is not enough if they are equipped to explain *post hoc* about events. They must have the ability to psychologically prepare the country in which they are expected to operate about our attitudes. On the Colombo proposals, for example, I was informed by a friend who had the opportunity to visit three of our Embassies during those days that in one Embassy, he was told that India was bound to accept these proposals, in another Embassy he was told that India was bound to reject them and in a third, where a respectable civilian officer was in charge, he was told that no instructions had been received.

Again, when you look at the distribution of these Information units, you will find the disproportionate distribution. In Africa, there are 9: practically nothing in the French speaking areas of Africa. In South America, there are two. How many countries are there in South America? In Europe, there are 12. Asia has 20. I do not want to go through the list. I want to refer to another point and then conclude, and that is the question of concurrent accreditation, to which I referred last year also.

I wonder what the policy is, what are the criteria behind decisions on concurrent accreditation. Is it geographical contiguity? Is it political affinity? Last time, I thought it was geographical contiguity to some extent. Our Ambassador at Rio de Janeiro is accredited to Venezuela. This time, I find in the report that our Ambassador in Santiago (Chile) is accredited to Colombia, which is at the other end of Latin America. Across Peru, across Bolivia, across Brazil, he flies. He is accredited simultaneously to the southern and

the northern extremities of Latin America. There are similar and even more difficult feats that our representatives are expected to perform in being simultaneously accredited to Accra, Conakry, Monrovia, Free Town and Mali. Is it any wonder when one asks whether the criterion is political affinity or geographical contiguity? I find that yet another criterion has been introduced this year and that is alphabetical proximity. That is why Chile has been clubbed with Columbia. I do not want to go into other matters for lack of time. I will say this. In the light of the very serious challenge with which we are confronted, in view of the fact that our war has to be won not only by the Defence Ministry but also by the External Affairs Ministry, in view of the fact that the viability of non-alignment has now been proved, I hope our Government will succeed in evolving a new dynamics of non-alignment which would answer the purposes it is called upon to fulfil.

Shri Manaen (Darjeeling): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demand for the Ministry of External Affairs. Even when we are discussing the Demands of this Ministry, the threat of Chinese attack cast its long and dark shadows across the horizon. It is most distressing that a country like India, wedded to non-alignment and committed to solutions of disputes by peaceful means, is caught up in a whirlpool of armed conflict with China.

Sir, what exactly China will do or what her intentions are, is very difficult to forecast; but what we can forecast with a certain degree of certainty is that the future attacks of China will be met with adequate resistance. One thing has emerged very clearly from the Chinese invasion of India, and that is, the triumph of our policy of non-alignment. My hon. friend, Shri Varma, dealt with this subject at length and, I am sure, proved beyond doubt that the policy

of non-alignment has stood the test of the times.

Sir, we did have reverses in the beginning in the eastern sector, particularly. Whether these reverses were due to bad generalship or on account of our unpreparedness or on account of the superior strategy of the Chinese army, these are all of very little consequence. What is of great consequence today for us is the triumph of the policy of non-alignment. As Shri Varma has made it abundantly clear, the policy of non-alignment does not necessarily preclude our country from seeking help or receiving it for the defence, for the protection of the integrity and the honour of our country.

Our negotiations with China may be on the basis of the Colombo Conference proposals or any other proposals. We have decided, we are determined, to negotiate with China as long as negotiations will make any sense. Our Prime Minister has emphasised on a number of occasions on the value of negotiating from a position of strength, and, I am sure, Sir, we have been able to place ourselves on such a position from where we can negotiate with greater advantage.

Sir, I come from a constituency which is almost meeting ground of a number of countries, a confluence, as it were, of many countries. It is Darjeeling about which I am speaking. On the north there is Sikkim. On the east there is Bhutan and on the west there is Nepal. Of course, Pakistan also touches on the fringes of the district.

Sir, particularly after the Chinese aggression and the sinister motives of China which are becoming more and more evident every day, the significance of this border and of the countries around it has greatly increased. I would have very much liked to discuss about the problems of this live border, but I have to put it off for some other occasion. For

the present I would endeavour to confine my observations to Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan.

It is really very gratifying that the recent visit of our hon. Minister of Home Affairs, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to Nepal has brought about a good change in the political climate. We cannot win the friendship and love of Nepal—or, for the matter of that, the friendship of any country—by giving aid or some material help or by trying to be a big brother to such a country. Shri Shastriji has said about it. He has made it clear that we do not intend to be a big brother to Nepal. What is required actually is that human touch, that sympathy and that goodwill, which goes a long way in bringing about better relations between the nations of the world.

I am sure the only remedy perhaps for ensuring and for improving the friendship and better relations between Nepal and India is that the people of this country have to learn to love and respect the sovereignty and the freedom of Nepal. The people in this country should again learn that under no circumstances should the relations between Nepal and India be strained. When I say that relations between Nepal and India have got to be friendly, I do not say this in order to get some benefit or for any strategic advantage. Unfriendly relations between Nepal and India to my mind is something which will absolutely be out of harmony, which will discordant, and which will not be in the scheme of things. Questions of our historical and cultural affinity, economic inter-dependability and geographical proximity are all points which have been repeated many times. There are certain aspects which are more important and of greater value. For example, Sir, can we forget that thousands of sons of Nepal are today fighting on the borders of India to defend our integrity and our freedom? I say this, Sir, that these men, these young Gurkhas who are coming from Nepal, do not think for a single passing mo-

[Shri Manaen]

ment that they are fighting for the defence of an alien country. They feel that the honour of India is their honour.

Again, Sir there is another side of the story. There are thousands of Nepalese who are settled in India. The common conjecture is that there are some three million Nepalese settled in India. The same rights and privileges that the citizens of India enjoy are enjoyed by these Nepalese who are settled in India. The Government of India or the State Government have never questioned even by implication the rights and privileges of Nepalese who have settled in India. The Nepalese settled here take part in general elections. Some of them are even elected to the State Legislatures and to the Parliament. Example is not far to seek. I myself have been elected to this House; and in the other House, Rajya Sabha, Shrimati Maya Devi Chettry is there. Then again, Sir, let us not forget that the 1950 revolution of Nepal was successful partly because of the help and the goodwill of India. Nearly four hundred years of the autocratic Rana rule would not have come to an end in Nepal had it not been for the goodwill, and had it not been for the help and the support given by India to the cause espoused by King Tribhuvan. Let me not be misunderstood if I say that Rana rule in Nepal would have been delayed, if not postponed till today, had it not been, as I said, for the support and goodwill of India which the people and the Government of India gave to that great revolutionary and emancipator of Nepal, late King Tribhuvan.

Sir, I would say that Nepal also has to play a positive role. A great responsibility has fallen on the leaders of Nepal and more so, on the King of Nepal. It is perhaps for the first time in the history of Nepal, at least in the history of the past 413 years, that the King of Nepal has some say in the matter of administration in Nepal. He is no more a puppet at the hands of Ranas. Any

false move now by the King would push Nepal into the venomous tentacles of the Chinese dragon. Let not the posterity in Nepal say that the leaders of Nepal gave a wrong lead to the nation.

Our firm resolve should be made clear to Nepal that we will stand by Nepal in the hour of her need. If we convince Nepal of our sincerity I am sure that flood-gates of love and affection for India will be thrown and open by the people of Nepal.

Now, Sir, let me say a few words about Sikkim and Bhutan. As far as Sikkim is concerned, I am surprised why the complete accession of Sikkim on the pattern of Jammu and Kashmir is not being examined by the Government of India. Four important subjects like Foreign Policy, Defence, Communications and Currency are under the Government of India and then again we have the Dewan in Sikkim who represents the Government of India in matters of administration. Sir, this demand for accession has been there for a long time. If I am not mistaken, the first popular demand for accession of Sikkim with India was made as far back as 1949 or 1950. I would personally like to appeal to our Prime Minister that even before this question of accession is examined we should have one representative in this House from Sikkim particularly in view of the accession of four important subjects to India. Of course, Sir, I submit respectfully that before such a question is examined, the Palace and the people of Sikkim will have to be consulted, and, if it is done at all, it will have to be done with the free will of the people of Sikkim.

Now, I come to Bhutan. I say with all emphasis at my command that unless we orientate our approach to Bhutan and be a little bold and realistic in our approach, I am afraid Bhutan at a later stage will prove to be an Achilles's heel in the defence of the Himalayan region. I under-

stand and I agree that the status of Bhutan is different from that of Sikkim. Bhutan is not a protectorate as Sikkim is. By the Treaty of 1949, Bhutan has agreed that its external relations will be guided by the Government of India. The Prime Minister of Bhutan, Mr. Jigme Dorji, has made it amply clear that his country has full confidence in India's assurance to defend Bhutan's interests. Then, our Prime Minister has said on a number of occasions that any attack on Bhutan would be considered as an attack on India. If these pronouncements are not to remain as mere platitudes, we have got to find out some practical solution and some practical and realistic approach to the whole question.

Hon. Members of this House know that the Bhutanese people have a wealth of love and admiration for India and her Prime Minister. This House knows that Hindi is taught widely in the schools of Bhutan, and I am sure that there it is more readily and more willingly accepted than perhaps even by people of some parts of this country. Bhutan is no more a locked country. She has opened her doors and windows to the world, and new roads, and new bridges are bringing Bhutan every day closer and nearer to India and to the rest of the world.

Considering all these aspects, and in view of the changed circumstances and in view also of the Chinese threat that is hanging over our heads, why should we not examine, and why would it not be possible also to examine, the question of negotiating a fresh treaty with Bhutan at least in order to have better defence arrangements and better defence organisation for these two countries? I personally do not understand the logic of telling a friend or telling a man that I would help him and yet I leave him absolutely helpless and defenceless at the mercy of the ruffians.

Finally, I have to say one thing about the report of the Ministry of External Affairs. In Appendix II there seems to be a mistake, which rather amused me. I am sure that this mistake can be attributed to the carelessness of the staff of the Ministry of External Affairs. This Appendix II bears the heading 'Indian Information Units Abroad'. I underline the word 'abroad'. Under item 21, we find 'Kalimpong'. I am sure that Kalimpong is within India and not abroad. In fact, I had a little doubt, and I consulted the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, and I found there also that the word 'abroad' meant 'in foreign land'. About these information centres, I would say that I personally do not object to having this centre in Kalimpong? But I would ask why we cannot have such an information centre, for example, in a place like Paro which is the capital of Bhutan? I am surprised why we are always thinking of having these information centres only in the big and glamorous cities, and we do not think of having such centres in countries in which we are vitally interested. Of course, I do understand that our officers who are used to tarred roads, cinema houses and perhaps clubs etc. will find it a little difficult to work in a place like Bhutan.

Lastly, I would appeal to our Government that we must make efforts to understand and also make ourselves understood to, our smaller neighbours nearer home, rather than make efforts and sometimes even waste our efforts at attracting lime-light and glamour elsewhere.

Shri M. Muhammad Ismail (Manjeri): A reference was made by a Member on this side of the House to certain remarks made by the Head of the State of Pakistan regarding our Prime Minister. That remark applied not only to what the Prime Minister of India did but to what the people of India are to do in regard to their own rights of choosing their leader. The Head of that State does not stop even with that. He goes

[Shri M. Muhammad Ismail]

further and he gives a panel of men from amongst whom we have to choose our leader. This kind of conduct is not known in the international world. It is against all decent behaviour and decorum. This is in contrast to what was being done in our country.

Some time ago, a Member of one of the Houses made certain disparaging remarks about the Head of that State. Then, it was our Prime Minister who stood up and said that such remarks ought not to be made about the Head of a State. This only shows the standard of international conduct, or even the standard of ordinary behaviour that some people have in that part of the world.

Again, with regard to the talks that have been going on between India and that country, the same kind of behaviour has come into play. When it was agreed that we must have talks and negotiations to settle our disputes peacefully, the talks were arranged. But just when the talks were going to begin, on a previous occasion, our delegation was confronted and our country was confronted with an announcement that an understanding had been reached with China. It is in the context of the aggression by China that all these talks are taking place. India was patient and the delegation sent by India was hard up to it to show patience, and they went on with the negotiations. We did not stop with that. Now, in the series of talks that were held in Calcutta, they were confronted with a much more serious situation. Pakistan had not only taken no lesson from the objections which not only Indians but also other decent people in the world took to what was done on the previous occasion, but they have gone further and have concluded a solid treaty, a treaty about not their own territory, but our territory, though it may be under dispute. It is for settling that dispute that these talks are being

held, but then Pakistan goes and agrees with China and gives to China what is vitally important not only to her but to the whole sub-continent. Nobody can condone this. However, again, the Indian delegation has been exercising almost impossible forbearance and went on with the talks. Whatever that may be, this action of Pakistan does no good to Pakistan herself, and this does no good to anybody, and this is against all cannons of international law and international behaviour, not to speak of ordinary decency and fairness. But then, they must know with what sort of people they are dealing on the other side. They, the Chinese, have shown utter disregard of all human feelings and of what the other people in the world might think.

Recently there were certain announcements made by Chinese spokesmen regarding their relationship with Russia. They have been indulging in certain criticism; this is concerning the relationship of Soviet Russia with the Chinese. They have made it clear, if there was any doubt about their idea—they have said so previously—that in their view war with the other nations of the world is inevitable. They are not for peaceful co-existence irrespective of the different ideologies of nations. Therefore, they say very clearly—there is absolutely no doubt about it—that they mean war with everyone with whom they are not able to agree. Now that principle of inevitability of war is in operation against India.

Our other neighbours should know as sensible people that they are not going to be left free. This war is not only against India. They have involved us in this war now because they think that we are the chief impediment in their progress towards world domination. It is world domination that they have got in view. In their view of things, war is in-

evitable, and war will come upon every nation that is against that domination. Therefore, it is in the interest of every nation bordering on India, every South-East Asian nation, to see that they are contained, that the Chinese are put in their proper place. South-East Asia will be their first target. Now India has become the object of their attack. Our immediate neighbours, Pakistan, Burma and other countries will be next in the list to be handled by the Chinese. This is a matter which is clear even to the man in the street. But I do not know how the politicians of the world are not able to understand it.

Whatever it may be, whether we have to come to an understanding with our neighbours or not, our duty is very clear, that we must go forward with our preparations and we must always be on the alert because they have put their cards on the table and declared that war is inevitable. The war is not for settling any border disputes they may have as they are alleging and justifying it, but for world domination. Therefore, we have to take that attitude and go on with our preparations. At the same time, we must make it very clear to our neighbours that our position is not in any way motivated by any rivalry to any other people but is only a matter of pure self-defence. It has been made very clear, and nobody in the world can show his finger and point any instance where we had the least shadow of expansionist ambition. It is the other's propaganda. It is here that it is felt necessary that our propaganda should be effective—I do not mean to use the word 'propaganda' because there is an odium attached to it from the way in which propaganda was carried on during the last two wars and at other times too. Publicity should be the word. What is actually our position? It must be known to the people. We cannot say that it is not our concern; that is, what the other nations think about it; it is very much our concern because in the world we cannot

be isolated and we cannot be alone. Therefore, our publicity must be still more energetic and still more fruitful than what it has been hitherto, particularly in middle-east and other countries which are very near to us, Asian and African countries. Those people are very much engaged on their own domestic affairs and so many influences are working upon them, influences from one bloc and another bloc. They are exerting themselves in every way upon them. They must also in a special way be made aware of what we stand for. We stand for freedom of every nation in the world, particularly Asian nations and African nations who have been suffering the thralldom of subjugation for centuries. That must be made clear to them and also to the African nations who are in the formative period of their freedom. Therefore, one of our cut motions refers to the strengthening of propaganda in these areas.

I want to come to one or two points concerning our own people. You will find from the report of last year that about 21,000 people were allowed to go from India on Haj pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina and other places. This year it has come down to 15,000. I can understand that in the position in which we are placed with regard to our foreign exchange difficulties, this number has been reduced. However, we must also take into consideration the increased census figures from year to year and the desire of the people to perform their duties, of people who are able to do so. In fixing the numbers, therefore, I hope the Government would not be so rigorous as they seem to have been this year.

With regard to the condition of the pilgrimage, previously a health certificate was considered necessary. This year, for the first time, they made it a condition that an affidavit made before a court of law must be produced. For people in the villages it is not an easy matter to bring such an affidavit, and that too in a short time that they were given to produce it during the

[Shri M. Muhammad Ismail]
current year. However, on representations to the Government this condition has been removed.

Then with regard to certificate of health itself, in the list of diseases which, would not entitle people to go on this pilgrimage is included diseases like diabetes. Diabetes is a disease like diabetes. Diabetes is a disease which many people, young and old, are having now-a-days. It is not an infectious disease; it does not cause any inconvenience to the co-passengers who go on pilgrimage or to others. Therefore, I do not understand why such diseases have been included in the list of diseases. Government will have to consider this point also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is time for him to conclude now.

16 hrs.

I shall finish after making just one point more. The Government must kindly persuade the Saudi Arabian Government to allow more guides to accompany the pilgrims, so far as the pilgrims of Kerala are concerned because a very large number of pilgrims from the southern region come from Kerala. At present, only two guides are allowed by the Saudi Arabian Government, and that number is not sufficient or adequate to carry out the duties that are to be discharged by the guides. The pilgrims are put to a lot of trouble. Therefore, the Saudi Arabian Government must be contacted in this matter, so that more guides may be appointed in future years.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I rise to lend my support to the Demands for Grants under the Ministry of External Affairs, that have been placed before the House. The demands for all the services under this Ministry I suppose have been placed before us. Before I say a few points on our foreign policy and the functioning of the External Affairs Ministry, I feel it is necessary to say something

about the foreign service and also about the other matters about which mention has been made by one of the hon. Members from the Opposition, Shri Nath Pai.

About a couple of years back, I had occasion to see at close quarters the functioning of some of our embassies, about a dozen of them, and a number of consular offices also. In spite of the fact that it is hardly 15 years since these services have been established, I was very happy to find that their performance is second to none. At that time, I also found quite a number of young men working as First or Second Secretaries and also some young men working as Ambassadors in certain places. At the same time, I wish to say that we have really some very capable men,—of course, it is not necessary to mention names—who have been manning some of these services of ours outside, in foreign lands. Nowadays, this service has attained so much of importance. Our consular offices, embassies and legations are represented by men of ability and understanding. I feel these are nowadays the doors and the windows through which the foreigners in foreign lands could know our country and have an idea of our people and also know how we are behaving there, where our embassies are working. Keeping that in view, and looking at the performance that each and every embassy has been rendering, I can personally say that their work has been magnificent and admirable all along. No doubt things have been changing fast. In a number of countries some fast changes have taken place to such an extent that nobody could expect such changes to take place so rapidly. Therefore, we must concede that it is not easy for consular personnel who are living far away from our land, to know instantaneously the mind of the country or the policy of the country in which they function in such circumstances. It is

difficult for them to judge a matter or an occurrence which has taken place, instantaneously. Such lapses are there and may be there. It will be so on the part of everyone. So, it will not be correct on our part to talk about such things especially when our services have had little past experience in such matters. When we compare this foreign service with that of the countries which have been in this field for over a century, I would say that the comparison is odious; it would be saying something about which one knows very little or nothing.

When we talk about the functioning of the British or the American foreign service personnel or their embassies, or the missions of older and more experienced countries, we can safely say that the people who have been working in this field for the last several centuries have had greater experience of work in a number of countries in foreign lands. Therefore, their performance is naturally expected to be of a better standard. I know from personal experience how difficult it has been for the Ministry of External Affairs for some years past to get suitable men to man this service. I know so many cases where people have opted for the service in the IFS, and later got out of it and in fact, a number of references were brought to the notice of Prime Minister of India where people got out of the service and work elsewhere. After the first few years, I personally feel that we are coming into our own and our foreign services, Embassies, Missions and Consular Services are getting better and better. I do not agree with the impression which was tried to be created by some friends about performance of our foreign Missions, though on the contrary I feel on the whole the performance of our Embassies and foreign Missions has been really good.

One hon. Member, perhaps Shri Khadiilkar, mentioned about the state-

ment issued by the Dalai Lama. I personally have a feeling that such things should not have happened. Our country has given asylum to Dalai Lama and he and his people are supposed to stay here on certain conditions. It does not lie in the mouth of the Dalai Lama or for anybody else from his party to say things which might involve our country in a controversy in diplomatic matters. Therefore, our Government should see that these things do not happen.

I am in full agreement with the observations made by my hon. friend from Darjeeling. I am very happy that at the moment our relations with Nepal are getting better and better. I was happy that recently our Home Minister visited Nepal and after his return from that place, things are taking better and better shape. I also agree with what my hon. friend said about Bhutan and Sikkim. We must be very cautious and see that we keep our immediate neighbours in tune with the policy and programmes that we follow here. We should also keep in view what their feelings towards us are and also should keep the interests of our neighbours in mind. While talking about our neighbours, I would say that two immediate neighbours have created a lot of problems for us. One is Pakistan and the other is China. With regard to Pakistan, there has been some mention today also about the talks that are going on. Since the last one year or so that I have come to this Parliament, I do not know whether my friends are aware of all that Pakistan has grabbed from us. My feeling is that our people know only that Pakistan is simply in possession of a part of Kashmir. With your permission, Sir, I would submit that it is not only that over one-third of the territory of Jammu and Kashmir State that existed prior to August 1947 is with them now, but there is something more. The better part of the strategic areas of that State, which we need for India, is in their

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

hands. The Sword-Arm, the men who fed our armies, are entirely with them. Then, the areas contiguous to the plains where we have industrial and mineral raw materials known for the last so many decades are also with them. The entire water resources are with them. If the rivers Indus, Jhelum and Chenab pass through Kashmir that is a part of our country, it will have no meaning, because that water can never be harnessed and it can never be utilised by us. They can utilise all that water. In fact, they are utilising it. They have set up the Mangala Dam. It is a very big multi-purpose dam near Mirpur where about a hundred villages have been submerged. Over and above that, the world has seen that it is possible for them to construct a strategic road right up to Gilgit in no time. Even though for the last ten to twelve years we have been trying our utmost, we have not been in a position to construct an all-weather road from Srinagar to Leh. Take the case of population. When we come to our part of that very frontier, we find mostly Buddhists who are proverbially backward and also are a sort of lethargic people in that sense of the term. On the contrary, the people on the other side of Gilgit are hardworking people who earn their livelihood by doing hard work. It may be that more area comprises our part of Kashmir today, but in view of what I have already stated, the benefits that accrue from the area that is with them are far greater than the benefits that we get.

They have rendered most of our forest areas almost unworkable by making the roads on flow of the course of river Kishen Ganga. Over and above that a number of forests are with them wherefrom they get the deodar timber.

Sir, it is an established fact that they have committed aggression and legally and constitutionally they

have no right to be there. On the other hand, we have started these talks. I have always said, that I would certainly wish them well. But we must not forget that the starting of these talks create a number of other problems. Today, in that part of the country, the people feel some sort of uncertainty again developing. They feel that some new things are going to come. What they are I cannot say. As some hon. friends from both sides of the House have said, even though these negotiations are going on, nothing has come out and nothing is going to come out of them. But these talks are creating a number of difficulties for us. Keeping these things in view, our Government must come out boldly with their views. Of course, our Prime Minister has said, about three times I believe, that whatever may be the decision it will be consistent with the basic principles for which we have stood so far. They are: firstly, the principles of secular democracy; secondly, that we do not believe in the two-nation theory, that we do not believe in the theory that because the majority of the people in a particular area profess a particular religion that area must go to them. Whatever is left, can be talked about and a decision taken.

Some hon. friends talked about the cease-fire line and the *status quo* on the cease-fire line. That too is a matter which needs a lot of understanding. It cannot be simply said like that as it was done at that time when the cease-fire line was drawn. That was very incorrect. It is most detrimental to us and to our interests. Therefore, the time has come when that also must be settled once and for all.

My hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai said one or two things, about China being isolated or not. I can say safely that the performance of our Ambassadors and the way in which our Ambassadors have been briefed by the Exter-

nal Affairs Ministry has been such that it can be said without fear of contradiction that China has been to a great extent isolated today. If it had not been isolated things would not have taken the shape and form that they are taking today. As far as this aggression by China on India is concerned, the world as a whole, except for a few exceptions here and there, know our problem and they are sympathetic to us. It could not be done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude. I have got a long list to go through.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I will finish in two minutes. Let me say something about external publicity. Some of my hon. friends have raised their voice against external publicity. I am in absolute agreement with that. Our publicity is very weak. Not only that, there are some other weaknesses also. I have found that young men, bachelor young men, without any experience are recruited in our foreign service. I would suggest that no bachelor young man should be recruited and sent out to these embassies. That is point No. 1. Secondly, the Commercial Secretaries must have got good grounding on matters concerned with commerce and industry. I have visited quite a number of our embassies in foreign countries and have met Commercial Secretaries some of whom know everything except commerce and industry. This is very important today when politics and commerce are inseparable things. Regarding external publicity, we should give our best attention to it and see to it that it is linked up with the publicity inside the country. With these words, I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Shri Heda (Nizammabad): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it surprises me that after having stood so firmly by the policy of non-alignment ever since our independence and after having achieved a position in international

politics and attained prestige for our country and for our leader and having done some service in avoiding war, now a section in our country has started doubting the wisdom of this policy of non-alignment. What surprises me more is that a sort of campaign has been launched by Rajaji, whom we respect for his sharp wit and intellect and for his past services. We had a number of occasions to disagree with him fundamentally in the past, in 1942 and some other times and even now.

When Rajaji was in Washington, I happened to be there, where I myself was a witness to a scene where men after men and women after women were coming forward and telling him that Indians are respected in the city of Washington and the whole of America because of our policy of non-alignment. Because of this policy, we have got the prestige. Because of this Indians can sit and talk with anybody on par. One of the objectives of Chinese aggression was, as has been generally accepted, to see that India was pushed into the lap of the Western bloc. What the Chinese cannot obtain by a few hundred thousand men in Ladakh, NEFA and other places by their aggression they would attain by what these friends are advocating. They are trying to push us into the lap of the Western block which is another objective of Chinese.

Again, we are mixing the two things—the policy of non-alignment and the basic nature of our political structure. There is no doubt about it in the minds of American leaders, also in the minds of Russian or Chinese leaders. When Mr. Khrushchev says that Chinese are their brothers while Indians are their friends—it is a very significant statement—it means that Chinese are their brothers because both of them believe in Communism, and Indians believe in democracy and non-alignment, and because of our non-alignment they have been beneficiaries time and again and, therefore, Russians call us

[Shri Heda]

their friends. Similarly, in the American minds also there is no doubt about the character of our political structure. They know our democracy, and, therefore, when the time came, without any hesitation, without a moment's thought, they came to our aid and started sending that military aid on such a massive scale. I think, it is hundred per cent correct to say that whatever we asked for, was sent by them and was sent far faster than we had imagined. So, there is no doubt about the basic nature of our democracy either in the minds of Americans or Britishers or in the minds of Russians. Then, what is the particular advantage, that Rajaji and others feel, that we will be deriving by joining SEATO or NATO or something or other? There is no misunderstanding. So, the policy of non-alignment is limited to joining of a military bloc. So far as the basic character of our country is concerned, there is no doubt about it that we are a democracy. We have avoided joining any military bloc and, I think, we did rightly. Not only we were benefited by it, but the entire world was benefited by it. Today, the situation is a little different and the whole world is lucky for that. Now, the leaders of these two blocs, military blocs, Russia and America, are able to talk straight. There was a time when there was no communication between them and, therefore, India provided a vehicle, a communication, by which the thoughts could be exchanged and disasters could be avoided.

In fact, when I was in America at the time of the Cuban crisis, I found the feeling there, "Now the crisis has come and the Third World War may start any moment." President Kennedy had thrown his gauntlet and the entire initiative was in Mr. Khrushchev's hands and any moment the War would have started. So, the people in America had started thinking that had India not been weak because of Chinese aggression, at that

time it was just possible that India might have come forward to avoid the possible War. The War did not come and the entire world heaved a sigh of relief. This is entirely a different matter. I am only stressing this point with a view to show that because of the policy of non-alignment even America was the beneficiary and they were seeing the logic in our stand. When the entire world has started feeling that there is the logic in the stand of non-alignment, when all the countries of Asia, America and Latin America, have started feeling that way and started aligning themselves with the policy of non-alignment, it is very strange that a section of this House, a very powerful section, is coming forward and attacking this very basic policy of our non-alignment.

The second point that I would like to take is about the publicity to which a number of hon. Members have already referred. I am sorry to say that I may not share the optimism of my hon. friend, Shri Sham Lal Saraf for whose judgment I have got very great regard. I had been to many countries and I had contacted a number of embassies. I would just narrate one instance. I went to a very big Embassy and I wanted to contact the Ambassador to whom I had already written from India. When I contacted the receptionist, she was good enough to tell me that there was no use of my thinking to get an interview for the next three or four days. I told her, "I am a Member of Parliament and I have written to him". She said, "Well, what does it matter? I have never come across a Member of Parliament. Give me your address, telephone number of the hotel where you are putting up. You will have an interview in course of time." She further asked me, "What is the work?" I told her, "I have no work. I just came to pay my regards." So, I had to go back. And I was surprised to find that by the time I reached the

Hotel, there were two telephone calls from the Ambassador himself who had noted the date when I was arriving and the place, that is, the Hotel, where I was staying. He had sent me a communication asking me to go and see him. So, this is the callous attitude of our Embassies towards the public men, towards the businessmen, towards everybody else unless they are interested in them. The whole difficulty is this. When I went to Cairo and to Rome, what did I find? I could not communicate with the receptionist either in English or in Hindi or in any other Indian language that I knew. The receptionists in those places did not know these languages. They spoke Italian or Arabic. This is the state of affairs.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf was good enough to admit that so far as commerce and industry are concerned, our Embassies have got very little knowledge and therefore they are not so good or so efficient in that matter. We are lucky in one thing. We have got thousands and thousands of students in England, in America and all over the world. Similarly, we have got thousands of businessmen in all ports and big cities. These people can be utilised by the Embassies for spreading our ideas, spreading our policy of non-alignment and also information about our requirements for the Third Plan very successfully and affectively. Because these people have contacts with those countrymen and informally and in friendliness and in a cordial atmosphere, they can assemble and discuss in their own way. Unfortunately, our Embassies do not keep in contact with them. In England, the Indian student world gets more information about India from British organisations than from Indian organisations though the fact remains that our High Commission is one of the biggest offices there. The same is the case in the U.S.A.

This time, the student community and other Indians in those countries felt very much and they started collecting for the N.D.F. But, they

did not know where to send the money, how to contact and in some cases, I have come across cases in which 2, 3, 4 letters were written to the Embassies and they were not getting any reply. Copies of the Third Plan are just not available anywhere. Student organisations write again and again, but they do not get that material. I have gone into long details. My own observation is that our Embassies are not adequately staffed, and therefore they also find it difficult and they are not able to take up the job. Somebody should be appointed in our Embassies to contact these two classes of people which is very important from two different points: one is the student community and the other is the business community: not only to get their help, but to employ them and to take advantage of their existence there to fulfil their own objectives.

The last point that I would make is this. When I visited Assam last November and December, I went to NEFA. I found that there was an upsurge of national integration. Assam is a strange State. People with various languages live there. People of various creeds and communities live there. All of them were feeling as one. But, this sense of national integration remained only till the fear of Chinese aggression was there. As soon as that vanished, again, the same things are there; accusations against each other started. What do we find? People from NEFA who came to Gauhati felt as perfect strangers in Gauhati itself though it was not very far from the place they had come from. They could not speak in the language of the people there. Their race was different. Their food was different. Their religion was different. Everything was different. Their social structure was different. We have created so many blocs, air-tight blocs in one small State. The same is the story in every hill State there, in every district. Why? Even every valley has got a different pattern of tribes and they

[Shri Heda]

are isolated from each other. Naga Land is a perpetual problem. Therefore, it is time that we re-think our policy so far as integration of the hill and plains people are concerned.

The gravity of the situation has been increased because of the infiltration in some areas. Whatever may have been the reasons in the past, the infiltration that continues even now should be stopped, and certain arrangements should be made so that the people who are in excess there may be shifted and usefully employed in other parts, and they may be spread or dispersed so that nowhere in any particular part of Assam which is very strategic, a particular community or a particular class or a particular language group can create a problem. This is important not only from that angle but also from the military and the defence angle. Since most of the important sections of Assam are under the External Affairs Ministry, I do hope that the Prime Minister will give his thought and see that all the people of Assam feel one with each other in the time of emergency and fight the Chinese aggression as one man.

श्री बिशनचंद्र सेठ (एटा) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस से पहले की मैं फारेन एफेयर्स के सम्बन्ध में अपनी भावनायें आप के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करूँ, मैं माननीय सदस्य, श्री हेडा, को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि कांग्रेस की ओर से इलेक्ट होने के बाद भी उन्होंने हमारे एम्बेसिज और विदेशों में स्थित हमारे राजदूतों के सम्बन्ध में अपनी सच्ची भावनायें इस सदन के सामने प्रकट कीं। मैं भी इस विषय पर कुछ बोलना चाहता था, परन्तु मैं समझता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य, श्री हेडा, के भाषण के पश्चात् इस सम्बन्ध में पुनः कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। उन्होंने ने दो स्पष्ट शब्दों में बताया कि विदेशों में हमारे जो राजदूत रहते हैं, हमारे लिए वे विदेशी हैं, हो सकता है कि जिन देशों

में वे स्थित हैं, उन के लिए वे देशी हों। हमारे देश के जो लोग विदेशों में जाते हैं, उन के लिए इस देश के राजदूतों से मिलना और उन में सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना लगभग असम्भव सा होता है। यहां के किसी सेंट्रल मिनिस्टर से सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना सफल है परन्तु दूसरे देशों में जाने के बाद वहां पर अपने राजदूतों से मिलना एक महान् प्राबलम है।

जहां तक नागा लैंड का सम्बन्ध है, एक बात को मैं अभी तक नहीं समझ सका हूँ। हमारे देश की जितनी प्रान्तीय समस्यायें हैं, वे होम विभाग के द्वारा तय हूँती हैं, परन्तु नागा लैंड को विदेशी विभाग में रखा गया है। क्या इस का यह अर्थ नहीं है कि सरकार को इस बात का विश्वास और कॉन्फिडेंस नहीं है कि वे लोग हमारे हैं? इस बारे में मैं आप के सामने एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण बात रखना चाहता हूँ। अभी चन्द दिन की बात है कि जिन मि० स्काट के यहां मि० फिरो भारत से भागने के बाद रहे, वही मि० स्काट हमारे देश में पधारे और उस के बाद चाइना को जाने वाली शक्ति-यात्रा पर गए उस की फोटोवर्नी में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, परन्तु मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन मि० स्काट ने मि० फिरो को हमारे देश के विरुद्ध पञ्चक करने में सहयोग दिया और अपने पास रखा, वही मि० स्काट मि० फिरो का एक पत्र ले कर आदर्शिय प्रधान मंत्री के पास गए, परन्तु आज तक देश को नहीं बताया गया है कि उस पत्र में क्या था मैं सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब वह नागा लैंड की प्राबलम को, पांच लाख लोगों की छंड़ी सी समस्या को हल करने में सफल नहीं हुई है, फिर देश के सामने उपस्थित बड़े बड़े खतरों का मुकाबला और इतनी बड़ी समस्याओं को कैसे हल कर सकती है? यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है, जिस पर सरकार को गम्भीरता से विचार करने चाहिए।

विदेशों में स्थित हमारे राजदूतों के सम्बन्ध में एक पक्ष तो माननीय सदस्य, श्री हेडा, ने इस सदन के सामने रख दिया है। जो दूसरा पक्ष शेष रह गया है, में उस को प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ। आज सारे संसार में हमारे दूतावास बिखरे पड़े हैं और उन पर विशेषतः अमरीका और इंग्लैंड में, बहुत खर्चा हो रहा है। जब इस देश पर चाइना का एप्रेशन हुआ, तो उस समय हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर का संसार के साठ देशों को विशेष पत्र भेजने पड़े। विदेशों में स्थित हमारे राजदूतों की लियाकत पर इस से ज्यादा बट्टा क्या होगा कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर को यह पत्र भेजने की आवश्यकता अनुभव हुई। अगर हमारे राजदूत काम्पैटेंट होते, तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर को किसी प्रकार का पत्र या सूचना भेजने की आवश्यकता न होती इस से भी ज्यादा दुख की बात यह है कि भारतीय राजदूत उन देशों के शासनाध्यक्षों और नायकों के सामने प्रथम मंत्रों की ओर उन पत्र की भावना को भी स्पष्ट नहीं कर सकें, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप भारत का एक गौरवपूर्ण पत्र भेजना पड़ा। हमारे राजदूतों की योग्यता का यह चित्र है, जो कि मैं ने आप के सामने रखा। दुख की बात है कि हमारे दूतावासों पर इतना ज्यादा खर्च हो रहा है और उन के सामने इतना बड़ा कार्यक्रम था, फिर भी वे अपने कर्तव्य में असफल रहे। इस प्रकार के एक नहीं, अनेक प्रमाण मैं आप के सामने रख सकता हूँ।

अब मैं आसाम के सम्बन्ध में एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न रखना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर काफी बड़ी मात्रा में मुसलमान पाकिस्तान से आ चुके हैं। मैं इस बात को न केवल प्रधान मंत्रों के सामने बार-बार रख चुका हूँ बल्कि इस समस्या के बारे में इस सदन में भी कई बार बोल चुका हूँ। इतने इम्पोर्टेंट मैटर को हिन्दू-मुसलमान का क्लर न दिया जाये। मैं तो सिर्फ नेशनल प्वायंट आफ व्यू से, देश की सुरक्षा के विचार से, इस

समस्या को आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। जैसा कि हम सब महसूस करते हैं, प्राइम मिनिस्टर के स्टेटमेंट से भी गम्भीरता जाहिर होती है, यदि कोई नवीन संकट खड़ा होने की आशंका है और अगर कोई इस तरह का पड़्यन्त्र हमारे सामने पुनः आया, तो क्या हम आसाम को बचा सकेंगे? आसाम को बचाने के लिए यह नितान्त आवश्यक है कि इस प्रकार के जितने भी लोग वगैर परमिट के वहाँ आ गए हैं, उन सब को पूरी सख्ती के साथ वापस भेज दिया जाये।

पाकिस्तान के साथ चल रही समझौता वार्ता के सम्बन्ध में कई सज्जनों ने बड़े अच्छे विवेचन के साथ सदन में अपने विचार रखे। हो सकता है कि यह समझौता वार्ता सफल हो, हो सकता है कि यह असफल हो। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि एक बार करोड़ों हिन्दुओं ने अपने आप को शरणार्थी बना कर उस पाकिस्तान को छोड़ा, जो कि थोड़े ही दिन पहले भारत का हिस्सा था। आज उन क्षेत्रों के हिन्दुओं में यह भावना फैल रही है, उन के हृदय में यह डर है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि पहले की तरह हमारी सरकार कोई इस प्रकार का समझौता कर ले, जो उन क्षेत्रों में रहने वाले हिन्दुओं को पुनः शरणार्थी बनने के लिए विवश कर दे। मैं आप के द्वारा यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को इन महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्नों पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिए। देश की ये समस्याएँ ऐसी नहीं हैं, जिन को छोटा समझ कर छोड़ दिया जाये। इस प्रकार की समस्याओं से सारे संसार की शान्ति और स्थिरता डाँवाडोल होने लगती है। ऐसी स्थिति में इन समस्याओं पर इमी गम्भीर दृष्टिकोण से विचार करना पड़ेगा।

जहाँ तक फारेन पालिसी का सम्बन्ध है, मैं एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण बात सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। कांग्रेस के

[श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ]

कई मित्रों ने फार्गेन पालिसी की बहुत प्रशंसा की और कहा है कि वह बड़ी कामयाब साबित हुई है। परन्तु मैं बड़े दुःख और साहस के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस में ज्यादा असफल पालिसी संसार में कहीं भी नहीं हो सकती। चाइना का हम पर हमला हुआ बताया जाये किन्तु किन्तु राष्ट्रों ने चाइना के बारे में इस प्रकार के शब्द कहे, जिन में चाइना के प्रति घृणा प्रकट होती हो। ऐसी कोई बात नहीं कही गई। हमारे पास महानुभूति के जो पत्र आए, उन का मूल्य मैं केवल इतना मानता हूँ कि जैसे अंग्रेजी के शब्द "सारी" का प्रयोग अगर कोई बात हो गई, तो शब्द "सारी" कह दिया बस सारा झगड़ा खत्म हो गया। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरे देशों में महानुभूति के पत्र आना तो स्वाभाविक था, परन्तु प्रश्न यह है कि क्या दूसरे कंट्रीज ने हमारी इस मान्यता को माना है कि चाइना एग्सेसर है और उस ने भारत पर हमला कर निन्दनीय कार्य किया है। ऐसी कोई स्थिति जब नहीं हो सकी तो यह इस बात का प्रमाण है कि संसार के राष्ट्रों में हम उस प्रकार की सद्भावना प्राप्त नहीं कर सके जो भारत के लिए अपेक्षित थी।

अपनी मानसिक स्थिति का एक विचार मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री जी की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि अगर इस बार चीन ने हम पर पुनः हमला किया तो उस को मुंह की खानी पड़ेगी। ठीक है। परन्तु उस में मैं एक संशोधन करना चाहता हूँ। मेरा ऐसा आत्म-विश्वास है कि अगर हमला हुआ तो वह चीन के द्वारा नहीं बल्कि वह पाकिस्तान के द्वारा चीन करवायेगा और उस वक्त अमरीका और इंग्लैण्ड की तौल-जाप की जाएगी। अगर अमरीका

तथा इंग्लैण्ड उस वक्त भारत के साथ होते हैं तब चीन निर्णय करेगा कि अब उसे क्या करना चाहिये। मैं ऐसा विश्वास करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि हमारे ऊपर अगर पुनः हमला हुआ तो वह चीन के द्वारा होगा बल्कि मेरा मन कहता है मेरी आत्मा कहती है कि अगर आईदा भारत पर हमला हुआ तो वह चीन की भावनाओं के अन्तर्गत पाकिस्तान द्वारा कराया जाएगा। उस की एक मिसाल हमारे सामने है : पाकिस्तान ने जो जमीन चीन को सौंप दी है, पाकिस्तान ने जो भूमि चीन को दी वह अपनी नहीं बल्कि जिस जमीन का झगड़ा था, हमारे आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी अनेक बार कह चुके हैं कि एक एक इंच जमीन का हम पाकिस्तान से ले लेंगे, और जैसा कि अब चीन के बारे में कहा जा रहा है कि एक एक इंच जमीन हम वापिस लेंगे, वह जमीन अब हमारे लिए एक तूफान बन गई है। अब उस जमीन को भारत किस तरह से वापिस लेगा मैं समझ नहीं पा रहा हूँ। अब बड़ी क्लीयर पोजीशन हमारे सामने है। जब तक चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों के साथ आप में लड़ने की सामर्थ्य नहीं जो भी हिस्सा उन्होंने हथिया लिया, जो भी हिस्सा उनके कब्जे में चला गया है, उस को आप उन के कब्जे से निकाल नहीं सकते।

अब मैं मुजाम्बीक के भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। बताया जाता है कि २२०० भारतीय बहानों ने आ चुके हैं और साठ करोड़ के करीब उनकी जायदाद इत्यादि बहाँ रह गई है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी विदेशी नीति के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि वह अत्यन्त सफल रही है, उसकी इससे बड़ी फेल्योर और क्या होगी कि हमारे देश के वासी, हमारे मिटिजन जिन की संख्या कोई २२०० थी, वे साठ करोड़

रुपये की सम्पत्ति वहाँ छोड़ कर आ गए हैं और हमारी सरकार चुपचाप बैठी है। हमारे बड़े बड़े जनरल पकड़े जाएं, पुलिस के सिपाही पकड़े जायें, हमारे अनेकों आदर्सी पाकिस्तान पकड़े ले जायें, परन्तु हम कुछ न कर सकें, इसमें बड़ी असफलता और क्या हो सकती है। सरकार की बेवकूफी और कमजोरी हमारे सामने है। इस तरह की प्रवृत्ति क्यों दृष्टिकोणचर होती है? इस का एक ही कारण है कि सरकार ने इस प्रकार का दृष्टिकोण नहीं अपनाया कि हम संसार में बलवान राष्ट्र के रूप में खड़े हों। इसका नतीजा है कि इस तरह की कमजोरी एवम् राष्ट्रीय अपमान का हमें सामना करना पड़ता है। अगर हम बलवान बने होते तो इस तरह का अपमान न हुआ होता। पर हमारी स्थिति विपरीत रही। आज सत्य स्थिति यह है कि दबने का कार्यक्रम केवल भारत ने ही अपना लिया है और किसी ने नहीं। हमने ही दबना सीख लिया है पर और किसी ने नहीं सीखा है।

कहा जाता था कि अगर हम कोलम्बो प्रोपोजलज को नहीं मानेंगे तो इसका अर्थ यह होगा कि संसार के अन्य राष्ट्र हमारे साथ नहीं रहेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने आखें दिखा कर भारत पर हमला किया और हमला करने के बाद सारे संसार को आख दिखा कर कोलम्बो प्रोपोजलज को फेंक किसी की बात नहीं मुनी—

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अब खत्म कर।

श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ : मैं ने तेरह मिनट लिये हैं, बाकी सभी ने पंद्रह पंद्रह मिनट लिए हैं। मैं दो मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा।

अगर इस तरह की परिस्थिति हमारे सामने न होती तो मैं आपकी बतलाना

चाहता हूँ कि संसार की कोई भी शक्ति हमारे सामने खड़ी नहीं हो सकती थी। परन्तु हमारी यह दया है कि कोई भी कंट्री हमारे मेजर जनरल उठा ले जाये, हमारे पुलिस के परसनेल उठा ले जाये, इस कमजोरी नीति अपनाने के अलावा और कुछ कर ही नहीं सकते। उसी कमजोरी का यह फल है कि आज संसार के सामने भारत उपहास का पात्र बना हुआ है।

चीन ने जो भारत पर आक्रमण किया है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं एक और चीज कहना चाहता हूँ। केवल बड़े बड़े मिनिस्टर्स की सिपीचिज से अथवा मानसिक संतोष कर लेने से हमारा देश तैयार है, बात नहीं बन सकती। जिस प्रकार का टैम्पो चीनी हमले के वकत भारत में बना था, आज वह सारे का साग नष्ट हो चुका है और लोगों के अन्दर अजीब अजीब प्रकार की भावनायें आ चुकी हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि देश की यह लड़ाई केवल श्रीजारों से या हथियारों से नहीं जीती जा सकती है, लड़ाई को जीतने के लिए यह नितान्त आवश्यक है कि हम इस प्रकार का वातावरण, इस प्रकार का टैम्पो बनायें ताकि आने वाली बड़ी लड़ाई के लिए देश तैयार हो सके। यह कल्पना करना कि लड़ाई नहीं होगी, बड़ी भारी फंडेमेंटल मिस्टेक, बड़ी भारी ऐतिहासिक भूल होगी।

Dr. Gaitonde (Goa, Damai and Diu): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the first few speakers here referred to our foreign policy in regard in different ways. Two of them began by nursery rhymes and the lady Member referred to the political gossiping. I thought that the position could have been inverted; if the lady Member had talked of the nursery rhyme, it would have been more fitting. When I heard some of

[Shri Gaitonde]

the speeches, I felt that the reference made the other day by Shri H. V. Kamath could also be applied here to Members of Parliament, that is, some of the speeches could be taxed.

An Hon. Member: Speeches here or outside?

Shri Gaitonde: Anywhere, when they are out of point. The most important criticism has been as regards the inefficiency in the Embassies. I feel that everybody who has spoken earlier, including the Communists and excluding the Swatantra party, have agreed to the general principles of the foreign policy of India. What remains is really the implementation.

While speaking about the implementation, one of the hon. Members—I believe it was Shri Khadiolkar—referred to me and my work abroad. He referred only to Brazil. I did not go only to Brazil. I visited many other countries. I would like to make it very clear that I did not go on my own but with the help of some Goans. At that time I was not an Indian citizen. Only now I am an Indian citizen. Otherwise, if I do not say this, people might think that the Government of India had sent me. I was not sent by the Government of India. The hon. Member referred to this point because of the work done, and I think he expected that I should say something about what I thought as regards the work done by the Embassies all over the world. I must confess that in some respects—I agree with my hon. friend Shri Ravindra Varma—the implementation is far from being perfect. For example, two embassies gave two different types of advice as to what the policy of the Government of India was.

Now, what is more important for me is, not just to criticise the implementation of the policy, but to make some suggestions. After hav-

ing seen many countries, I feel that two or three things could be done, and our foreign policy could have been implemented in a proper way. First, I am referring to some countries which I know better than other countries. For example, I may refer to South America. In South America, it was fantastic that the ambassador did not know the language of the country. This happens in many other countries also. Spain has a lot of things in all the South American countries, and whatever the Spanish press says is taken up immediately by South America including Brazil. South America has got Portuguese and Spanish languages. I feel that Spain is one of the most important countries where there should be an ambassador and an ambassador who knows Spanish and knows the mentality of the people. I think some time back the ambassador to Spain was the same as the High Commissioner in England. I cannot understand how the High Commissioner in England who deals with the British mentality can deal with the Spanish mentality. The two are completely different.

Coming down to South America, as my friend, Mr. Varma has said, a person who is in Brazil is accredited to some other country which is far away from that place. Even the language is not the same. Therefore, I would suggest that in South America, there may be two ambassadors, one for the Portuguese-speaking country i.e. Brazil, which is a huge country and which has got a lot of influence in South America—and another ambassador who knows Spanish, for the Spanish-speaking countries. This is as far as languages are concerned.

As regards the implementation of the policy and the relation of the embassies with the Indians themselves who are abroad, there is a lot of things to say. Many of our em-

bassies have got different types of departments. One of them is the education department. Wherever I have been, I have never met one single Indian student who is happy with the education department. I think somebody has already said that the students are not at all happy with the work of our embassies. I may say with some experience that whenever a letter is written or some documents are sent, sometimes they disappear. I think this is a very serious matter, where we should be very cautious. We want that our students should follow their careers quickly without any trouble. As far as anti-colonialism is concerned. We have made a very good beginning in 1961 when we held a seminar on the Portuguese colonies. For the first time, parties with different points of view had come on the same platform. But after that what happened? We are free; the Goans are free and it gives the impression that the moment you become free, you forget completely those who are not free, i.e. the Africans in the Portuguese colonies. I would request the Prime Minister if he could help in some way those who are fighting for their freedom. I know that we are doing a lot as far as the United Nations are concerned. We have always defended the principle of anti-colonialism. We have always blamed Portugal when they denied self-determination to the people of Angola, Mozambique, etc. We should not forget that this is not enough. What are we doing for them at this moment? They came here and they left India. We have almost lost contact with them. I would request some organisations like the Council for Africa to take up again the issue and not to lose contact with them. I am saying this not only because of the freedom of the Africans, but also because of the future. In two, three or four years Angola, Mozambique, Guinea and all these countries are naturally going to get their freedom. They need us and we need them. They need our sympathies and we need their sympathies. If at this moment we had begun just now doing some-

thing to attract their attention to India and our attention to them, I believe that we would have done a good thing for our future and for their future also.

If you can provide for some scholarships for the students from the Portuguese colonies in Africa, I believe we would have done a great thing. As you all know, one of the great problems of the African countries which are not yet free is the question of administration in the future. We all know that less than 1 per cent of the population in Angola is educated. They are going to govern themselves. Many times some of them asked me: "What are we going to do". I have told them: "If you have any difficulty as regards administration, you can come to India or go to any other country and learn from now on about the problems of administration". The moment Africa is free, of course, troubles are likely to arise if they are not prepared to take over the Government. Therefore, if we invite them, offering them scholarships for the study of administration, then it would be of great use to them. I would propose that instead of inviting them to Delhi, perhaps it would be better to invite them to Goa because that is the place where the administration was similar to the administration in Angola or Mozambique. I know there are many laws that are now changing. They will have to be changed. Even then it would be easier for them, if they are sent to Goa, to study the administration there.

Now that I am speaking about Goa and the Demands for Grants are also in relation to Goa, I would like to say a few words about what is happening there today. There was a question by one of my friends about labour laws. I think the labour laws and many other acts have been applied to Goa. But I would say, it is not enough that these Acts are applied to Goa. I would request the Government to see that the necessary

[Shri Gaitonde]

machinery to implement them is also there. There is no machinery to implement them. If the proper machinery is there, I feel many of the problems would be solved quickly.

In this respect there are three things that need to be done in Goa. First is about the law and order, the second is about the implementation of the policies and the third is about unemployment. Unemployment is increasing there. As far as development is concerned, we had asked for about Rs. 6 crores every year. I think it has been reduced to about Rs. 2 crores. Taking into consideration the fact that this unemployment will increase and also taking into consideration the fact that for every new employment we need to spend about Rs. 8,000, we can easily conclude that it will not be possible to solve the problem of unemployment if the money for development is curtailed. I would like to remind the Government that we are two Plans behind time. In India we are in the Third Plan. But we did not have the first two Plans in Goa. So, I would request the Government that the money that was allocated in the first two Plans should also be allotted to Goa, of course, in a phased manner.

17 hrs.

Shri Iqbal Singh (Ferozepore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I whole-heartedly support the Demands for Grants relating to this Ministry and the policies followed by this Ministry, which are the basic policies of India. The basis of this policy is the policy of non-alignment. There was so much of talk in the House and outside also about this policy and a little bit of strain was felt on this policy during last October when the Chinese aggression took place. Now things are clearing and everybody in this country is feeling and has the conviction that this is the right policy for India because of her tradition, and this policy has been given to our people by the Government. The Indian Gov-

ernment has an honoured place in world affairs, because for the last fifteen years this policy has been followed unflinchingly by our worthy Prime Minister and the Government of India.

So far as the criticism of this policy is concerned,—of course, I would not say it is due to ignorance—it is due to imprecise information. Also, these criticisms do not take us far. The policy of non-alignment is a political policy, while the critics consider it in the military sense, which is entirely different. That makes all the difference. I feel that this is the right policy to be followed by this country.

As regards the gains of this policy India is much better understood in the community of nations, which is the test of any foreign policy of any Government. Our policies are clearly understood by the world at large and this country has been benefited as a result of it.

As far as our neighbour China is concerned, for some years it professed to be a non-aligned country, though at heart it was not so. Now its intentions are gradually coming up. What Mao Tse-tung has stated about 20 or 30 years ago, he is practising now and it is becoming more clear and patent to us. Here I have to quote what he then said. He then said that neutrality has no room. Then, again, he says that the so-called neutrality is nothing but deception, intentional or otherwise and there is no sitting on the fence, because that third road does not exist. They do not believe in non-alignment, or in the role of a third force. They want the whole world to come down to their own point of view. There is only one view, and that is the Chinese view; the other view is the Western view, which is wrong and hence the conflict. This, in a nutshell, is the basis of the Chinese foreign policy.

In this context, people generally talk about Tibet and say that the whole controversy about India and China started with Tibet. As far as India's relationship with Tibet is concerned, it dates back to many centuries. The religion of Tibet has got its inspiration from Buddha and also from Indian teachers. If we look at the history of Tibet for the last two thousand years, whenever it was powerful it has preserved its autonomy and independence. Whenever China was powerful, it has always tried, if not to conquer, at least to subdue Tibet. And this process is going on for more than 2,000 years. For about 1,000 years, Tibet remained independent. For about 500 years, there were controversies. And less than that, Tibet has remained a part of China or under the suzerainty or sovereignty of China. This process has been going on. Whenever China was powerful, it has tried its expansionism on Tibet and whenever Tibet was powerful, even sometimes the forces of Tibet have gone to the gates of Peking. But, that is an old story. In this country, most of the people say, when in 1950 there was an attack on Tibet, why the Government of India did not help it? It is not for me to repeat that history. It is not for me to change the history. What the Dalia Lama had said on this point, in his recent book, practically made the whole picture clear. What he has said is, when there was a fear of an attack, they sent telegrams to all the countries—India, Nepal, United States of America and UK. What he has written is, that the replies received were most disheartening. The British Government expressed the deepest sympathy for the people of Tibet and expressed their regret to do anything. They could not help the people of Tibet due to the geographical position. The Government of United States of America replied in the same tone. But they even declined to receive their delegation. It was only the Government of India which has asked them to conduct the negotiations so that there may be an agreement. But, there is one thing. That

was a picture in 1950. Now, after so many years, everybody can give the verdict on the history. But why repercussions come when the autonomy of Tibet was a little bit, whatever that was, recognised by China. When the repression comes there for everything that the Tibet stands for, then comes the crisis. And that was the nutshell of it. Now, most of Tibet was just like a child of the Indian civilisation. The sympathy of India lies with Tibet. As far as the sympathy of India is concerned, nobody can dispute about it. But what is the ultimate solution of this problem, nobody can say. One thing is there. As far as Tibet and Tibetan people are concerned, most of the people in this country have got their sympathy for them not due to any other motive but only because of Tibetan religion, Tibetan culture which is the product of the Indian civilisation.

Now, when our two Plans were fulfilled and we were in the middle of the Third Plan, our great neighbour, China, who had remained friendly to us for so many centuries, attacked our country. And that washed away all the ties and all the sympathies and all the feelings that this country had for China. That was the crisis and that is why there is so much talk about China. Today, we have to deal with China on the mainland, Chinese in Formosa and the Chinese overseas. They may differ between themselves, but in some policies, they agree. For instance, on the policy with regard to Tibet, both of them agree. As far as the Chinese overseas are concerned, they are their spearheads of propaganda, information and influence. What is most important for the Government of India, at least in those countries of South East Asia where the Chinese influence is much more, is to counteract this, send people from here, cultural and other delegations, non-officials who can live and who can talk to them. This is the proper time. If we lose time, it may not be so good.

In present day China, there are two main features. One is communism

[Shri Iqbal Singh]

and the other is expansionism. About Communist China, I have nothing to say. I am not expert. No outsider can be an expert on communism. Today, thousands of words are printed in Peking and Moscow and other countries, about who is the better communist and who is not a better communist. This controversy is going on between the two countries. It is not for me to comment. But, there is one thing. About Chinese communism, there are two instances. In April 1945 when some members of the American Congress met Stalin, he described Chinese communism as 'radish', that is red from outside and white from inside. Again, after the invasion of Normandy, when Ambassador Harriman saw Stalin, Stalin told him that the Chinese communists are not real communists, but margarine communists. That has come true today.

Today, after a few days we have received one White paper. Correspondence is going on between the Government of China and the Government of India and so many White Papers are there. China is an expert in confusing matters. They always write long letters, not only to clarify the position, but to confuse the position. They are experts and they always do it in long communications. That is the complaint of the country and even the complaint of the Prime Minister also.

During the War, Churchill's special representative to Chiang Kai-shek De Wiart has written a most interesting thing. This is what De Wiart has written. I would quote if my Communist friends do not mind; it does not concern them;

"There was only one answer to the communists and that was defeat. To me the right time for negotiations is after a victory; when backed by force, words seem to attain a meaning not so well understood before."

Today, we have to deal with expansionist China. China has remained

expansionist whenever China was powerful. It is old history; it is old story. They are repeating today. This story is not confined to Mao Tse-tung. It is the story, at least theory of the Chinese leaders of the present century: Dr. Sun Yat-sen, Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung. There are border disputes today and sometimes they say this area is there and this area is not there. This is always the sign of imperialism and expansionism. I will only quote what the Chinese leaders have said. First Sun Yat-sen. He was the great founder of the Chinese Revolution. He has done great work for China. In his mind also, what was the fate of the other countries? What was the fate of South East Asia? He said:

"Korea, Formosa and Peng Fu to Japan after the Sino Japanese war, Annam to France and Burma to Britain.... In addition the Ryukyu island, Siam, Borneo, Sarawak, Java, Ceylon, Nepal and Bhutan were once tributary States to China."

The same feelings were expressed by Chiang Kai-shek when he was powerful. The same is the feeling of any imperialist and they were the watch-words with Hitler when he was in the Bavarian Castle as prisoner. The same feeling was expressed by Mao Tse-tung when he was talking to his first biographer, Edgar Snow. Mao Tse-tung says:

"I began to have a certain amount of political consciousness, especially after I read a pamphlet telling of the dismemberment of China.... of Japan's occupation of Korea and Formosa, of the loss of suzerainty in Indo-China, Burma and elsewhere."

As to where the 'elsewhere' lies, that is for the world to see. We should see at least that that 'elsewhere' is not India, because more of the Chinese territory had been taken by the USSR

or the predecessor of the USSR Government, namely the Czarist Government of the last century; or that 'elsewhere' may lie in South-East Asia. But I hope and I have great faith that that 'elsewhere' will not be India.

Shri T. Subramanyam (Bellary): Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Chinese People's Republic is reported to have stated that all political power comes out of the barrel of a gun, and that sums up his approach to the basic conception of politics. But we have not been followed this sort of policy. We have been following an exactly opposite policy of not breaking heads but of counting heads. Within the framework of a democracy, we have tried to achieve the socio-economic prosperity of forty-four crores of people by mobilising our resources, human and material. While we were engaged in this stupendous task, suddenly, behind the facade of cordial and friendly talks, China mounted up a massive invasion against India last October and November, and then, afterwards, proclaimed a unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal. After that, the Colombo powers met at Colombo and they came forward with certain proposals.

When the Prime Minister of Ceylon went to Peking with her colleagues there and explained these proposals, we felt that China was about to accept them and that it might be difficult for India to accept them. That was the position as it obtained at that moment. China was talking of a positive approach, a constructive approach and all that and it looked as if we might again be placed in the wrong in the diplomatic front. But when the Ceylonese Prime Minister came to India and came forward with the necessary clarifications, we accepted them *in toto*. Now, China says that there are two sets of clarifications, which the representative of the UAR who represented the UAR Government, namely Mr. All Sabry had denied in Cairo, stating that there was only one set of clarifications

and not two sets of clarifications.

So, we did a good thing by accepting the proposals of the Colombo conference. It was a diplomatic triumph for us, and we acted ourselves in the right by these powers.

Friends very often criticise us about the policy of non-alignment, and that has been talked about a great deal. It has been our basic policy. Some critics in the West also say that it is an opportunistic policy and we try to play one bloc against the other and try to get benefits from both and thereby we try to serve our country. That is not so. In fact, this policy of non-alignment stems from our policy of being friendly and cordial and serving the cause of peace in the United Nations. That is really the basic tenet of the charter of the UN itself. Neither did we take up a tone of moral superiority in the UN by advocating this cause of non-alignment nor did we do anything else of that kind. In fact, ten years back, when this was advocated by our representatives in the UN, then the representatives of both the blocs, Mr. Vyshinsky on one side and Mr. Dulles on the other, roundly abused us in the strongest possible terms and said that our neutrality was a hypocrisy. China wants us now to give up this policy of non-alignment and there is another set of people, in our own country, who want us to do the same thing, and that is the Swatantra Party.

We have received help from all countries, particularly from the USA and the UK. Russia also has come forward to help us with MIGs and also to help us in setting up a factory for manufacturing these MIGs. And friendly collaboration has been received from nearly 25 other countries. The Afro-Asian nations also have adopted non-alignment. Russia and the USA have advocated neutrality in the case of Laos, and they will probably agree that neutrality would be the best thing for all the States of the Afro-Asian countries.

[Shri T. Subramanyam]

I will say a word about the Sino-Russian differences because we have to take into consideration that important factor also. There is a vital difference between the approach of Soviet Russia and China, though now some attempts are being made to patch up those differences. My own feeling is that besides being ideological, they are much deeper. Russia believes in co-existence while China believes in the inevitability of war. In the present context of nuclear equipment, the theory of the inevitability of war would only lead to mass destruction of humanity. There is no doubt about it. But China goes on bandying words against Russia, accusing her of being guilty of revisionism, adventurism and capitulationism and all that. She stages a massive attack even on the propaganda front and then suddenly comes round and says: 'No, no. I suspend all this. Let us come and talk together'. On the military front also, she has been doing this thing. Of course, ultimately, this is a matter for the Russians, but there is a consistency in China adopting a sort of strategy both on the military front and on the propaganda front.

Political power, as I just now stated, according to Mao Tse-tung, comes out of the barrel of a gun. Russia has had the tragic experience of what this gun meant, in the last war. She has seen two world wars in one generation. She knows about it. Nearly 20 million Russians became casualties in the last war, and thousands of cities and towns and lakhs of villages were razed to the ground and destroyed. They know what war means. I am convinced that so far as the Russians are concerned, they are opposed to war. They are for peace. So also are the people of the USA.

De Gaulle, a good critic, who is now trying to establish a union of the western States of Europe, says:

"Russia is well endowed with land, mines, factories and wealth

and hence inclined to oppose the ambitions of that yellow multitude which is China, numberless and wretchedly poor, building power at immense cost, looking around the vacant area, over which the nation must one day spread".

The reference probably is to Siberia. That is how he analyses it. Now instead of propagating the inevitability of war, various States, particularly various countries in Europe, are trying to overcome their prejudices with regard to national sovereignty; they are out to build some sort of extra-national union in Europe. There are definite trends in this direction. They now feel that any opposition to this sort of union of the western States of Europe would be wrong. 'Not to attempt it, when the idea is in the air, is to come dangerously near the position of those people who used such good argument in favour of the horse as against the steam engine, or who said it was an act of folly to give vote to the working class'. That is how they interpret it. They say they must welcome it.

Then they say that principles of national sovereignty are shallow, outmoded, poor and wrong theories—this is how some of their thinkers describe it. Arnold Toynbee says:

"I believe we have the choice between uniting politically on a world-wide scale or committing mass suicide. Therefore, any move on the part of any of them to subordinate their national sovereignty to some wider union, is for me a victory of the human race"

"We must aim far beyond this. We must aim at nothing short of world unity..."

"So I see a united Europe as a step towards a united world and that is why I am for it."

There are similar trends in Asia, West Asia particularly, and in Africa also.

The stresses and strains are merely the birth pangs of the world State to come; though not in the immediate future, it is bound to come. That is the only solution. A global realignment is taking place just now. Hitherto France was aligned with the United States. They are now trying to bring another union in Europe as a sort of a third force between the United States and Russia. It may not come now but in some years it is to come and then our policy of non-alignment would certainly be the most desirable. Naturally it would serve the cause of humanity and world peace.

There are 110 States in the UN which are discussing not about the inevitability of war. It is left only to China. It is the only country in the whole world which believes in it today. She is isolated on this issue. The UN is now active in discussing about disarmament. It has set up an 18 nation disarmament committee at Geneva with a view to reach an agreement on a treaty on general and complete disarmament measures, to reduce international tension and to put confidence among the nations and the discontinuance of all nuclear weapons. The situation is now slightly better. Some progress was made at Geneva on a treaty on the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests. There is agreement between the nuclear powers that so far as tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under-water are concerned, they do not require any control or inspection arrangements for detection or verification. There is, however, difference of opinion with regard to detection and identification of underground tests. The number of inspection that America requires would be about 8, while Soviet Union is prepared to allow only 3.

With regard to our neighbours, I must say that talks are now going on between our representative, Sardar Swaran Singh and Mr. Bhutto of Pa-

kistan. In Swarn Singh we have got a very able and competent representative who has got a good grip over the basic issues, details and facts. I only wish that he should succeed. Any adjustments that may be made would be of a minor nature. In this context, what Shri Saraf says is true. At present there is an air of uncertainty in certain regions of Kashmir. That is bad for the development of the regions. I hope some way be found to avoid this.

Then there is the question of our relations with Burma, Ceylone, Afghanistan and Nepal. Our relations with Nepal were bad for sometime. But the situation has very much improved and our relations have strengthened by the last visit of our Home Minister, Shri Shastriji. In a successful and effective manner he has brought about a good atmosphere in our relations.

The Chinese aggression is an evil but sometimes good comes out of evil. Inertia and complacency were overtaking us. But this Chinese aggression has unified us as never before and strengthened our resolve to defend the country and freedom. We must mobilise all our resources and get all the help that we can from friendly countries. Ultimately we have to depend upon our own production and our own capacities. We stand for progressive forces and we want to leave for the future generations of India a free and happy India.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Speaker. Sir, the concepts of both alignment and non-alignment have become, obsolete, because, as a result of the thermo-nuclear stalemate, Russia and America cannot wage war against each other. The cold war between them has come to an end. Foreign policy is becoming, if it has not already become, obsolete, because, as a result of the thermo-nuclear stalemate, Russia and America cannot fight amongst themselves. The thermo-nuclear stalemate has forged an unbreakable bond of unity between Russia and America which neither ideological differences nor the claims of the allies and the satellites can weaken.

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

All attempts of the allies and satellites to create differences between Russia and America are bound to fail.

I am prepared to say that we should enter into a military alliance with the United States of America, if President Kennedy states publicly that within a specified period of time to be determined by him the American troops will drive out both the Chinese and the Pakistani troops from the Aksai Chin area, the so-called Azad-Kashmir, area, Chitral, Hunza, Gilgit and other areas of Kashmir, which have been integrated with West Pakistan. Barring economic and military aid for which we are indebted to them the western powers do not want to get themselves involved in a war against China.

I am not in favour of either a war or a political settlement with either China or Pakistan. I stand for a policy of stalemate with both.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member might not be very happy with me since I called him so late.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am thankful to you.

Mr. Speaker: I have purposely done it so that he can refresh and enliven a tired House with his address.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: A nation state must have both friends and enemies. It is very rarely given to a nation state to choose its friends and enemies. Fortunately, China has chosen India to be her enemy. This has strengthened our power position. China is on hostile terms with all those three countries which surround her—India, Russia and America. China will have to bend, if it is not to be wiped out.

We have not committed any mistake on the question of Tibet. It is in the interests of India that China remains in Tibet.

An Hon. Member: Question.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: As long as China remains in Tibet, both Russia

and America will have to remain our side. The withdrawal of China from Tibet is neither possible nor desirable.

Mr. Speaker: It is not to reason why!

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The reasons will follow. The condition precedent to the withdrawal of China from Tibet is the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war leading to the dismemberment of China into six Russo-American satellite States—Tibet, Sekiang, Mangolia, Manchuria, North China and South China. The whole of the Afro-Asian land mass will be divided into two spheres of influence—Russian and American, if such a contingency arises. Tibet will be liberated if and when India, China, Russia and America hand over their defence portfolios to the United Nations Organisation.

From a theoretical point of view, China can be driven out from Tibet by either Russia or America. The defence of India will remain the responsibility of Russia and America till China remains hostile to India. Russia and America, till Tibet remains a bond slave of China and till the thermo-nuclear stalemate lasts. Whoever controls Tibet will be India's enemy number one. The whole defence system of India—the best in the world—will be shattered to pieces if China is driven out from Tibet. The centre of political gravity as far as India is concerned has shifted from the North-West Frontier to the North-East Frontier. Russia will become our enemy number one if she drives out China from Tibet. America will become our enemy number one if America drives out China from Tibet. Pakistan, a satellite State of the U. S. A., has made our political life miserable. India will be sandwiched if an American puppet regime is established in Tibet as well.

Singly neither Russia nor America can drive out China from Tibet. A Sino-American entente will be established the day Russia tries to drive out China from Tibet. The Sino-

Soviet Pact will be resurrected the day America tries to drive out China from Tibet. Russia and America cannot join hands together for the purpose of driving out China from Tibet unless a full-fledged war breaks out between India and China. No such war can break out unless China attacks India. Both India and China will be destroyed by Russia and America if a Sino-Indian war breaks out. This fear is bound to prevent China from attacking India.

But if our Prime Minister thinks that China or Pakistan or both are going to attack India, he should meet Mr. Khrushchev. Both China and Pakistan will be prevented from attacking India if either Russian troops are inducted into Kashmir or a public warning is given to Pakistan and China by Russia. The induction of Russian troops into Kashmir cannot be a greater catastrophe than the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war. My suggestion for the induction of Russian troops into Kashmir should be rejected if there are methods other than that of the induction of Russian troops into Kashmir by following which the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war can be prevented. The Prime Minister alone is in a position to say whether there is any real danger of the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war. My suggestion for the induction of Russian troops into Kashmir should be rejected if there is no real danger of the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war. Mr. Khrushchev will never agree to the induction of Russian troops into Kashmir if he thinks that there is no danger of the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war. If a Russo-American agreement has been arrived at on the basis of the division of the Afro-Asian land in general and of India and China in particular, into two spheres of influence, Russian and American, Russia will neither give a public warning to China and Pakistan not to attack India nor agree to the induction of Russian troops into Kashmir.

Russia alone is in a position to prevent the outbreak of a Sino-Indian

war. The Kashmir problem will be solved automatically if the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war is prevented by Russia. There will be either a stalemate or a political settlement if a Sino-Indian war does not break out. We should stand for a stalemate if Pakistan and China do not withdraw from Chitral, Hunza, Gilgit, Puncyal, the so-called Azad Kashmir and the Aksaichin area. Both Russia and America want to weaken China. India should not betray them by coming to terms with China. Russia and America will join hands with China if India surrenders her territory to China in the Aksaichin area.

The whole defence system of India—the best in the world—will be shattered to pieces if Russia and America join hands with China, which they will do if we betray them and come to terms with China. The sinister design of China is to wean away Russia and America from our camp. It is with this end in view that China wants a political settlement with India. The whole of the Afro-Asian land mass will be divided into three spheres of influence—Russian, American and Chinese—if Russia and America join hands with China. Russian troops will get out of Kashmir if and when they are asked to do so.

Russian troops withdrew from Austria and Azerbaijan. Russia will not antagonise Africa and Asia for the sake of Kashmir. Those forces which compelled Russia to withdraw from Azerbaijan will be weakened if a Sino-Indian war breaks out. President Kennedy will be very happy if Russian troops are inducted into Kashmir though he may not express publicly his true reactions.

Mr. Speaker: Privately he has done so to the hon. Member?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Sir, I am arguing this point.

Public opinion and party politics are inhibiting factors. Russia and America belong to the same camp. The

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

induction of Russian troops is tantamount to the induction of American troops into Kashmir. There are some elements in Russia and America which are opposed to the growing solidarity between the two countries. It is the pro-Chinese and the pro-Pakistani elements in Washington and Delhi and the pro-Chinese elements in Moscow which will be angry at us if Russian troops are inducted into Kashmir. Kashmir will be handed over to Pakistan if American troops are inducted into Kashmir. If American troops are inducted into Kashmir, a war will break out between India and America on the one side and Russia and China on the other. China cannot be deterred by the induction of American troops into Kashmir. China has taught a lesson to America in North Korea which America can never forget. American troops cannot shoot Pakistani troops if both China and Pakistan attack India. Pakistan is a member of the SEATO and the CENTO. There is no obligation on a member of the SEATO and the CENTO not to attack India.

The NATO, the CENTO and the SEATO will be shattered to pieces if American troops attack Pakistani troops. American troops can be inducted into Kashmir only with the connivance of the Soviet Union. American troops can be inducted into Kashmir if Russia wants to remain neutral in the event of the outbreak of a Sino-Indian war. Russia would like to remain neutral in such a war if she wants China to be defeated by America. American aid to India will not be stopped if Russian troops are inducted into Kashmir. America wanted to give Marshall aid to Russia. America has given aid to Yugoslavia and Poland.

The induction of Russian troops into Kashmir will lead to the liquidation of theocracy in Pakistan and will curb the militant spirit of the Red Mandarins. China and Pakistan can neither wage war against India nor as-

pire to usurp Kashmir by diplomatic methods if Russian troops are inducted into Kashmir. Russia is not interested in territorial acquisitions or in the spread of communist ideology. Her power position will be weakened if all Nation States become communist States. As long as the thermo-nuclear stalemate lasts, neither Russia nor America can establish hegemony over either Kashmir or any other territory. Russian troops should be allowed to remain in Kashmir till Pakistan and China adopt a reasonable attitude towards India. The defence of Kashmir should be made the responsibility of Russia if our military experts think that Kashmir cannot be defended if a war breaks out on two fronts.

Two or three sentences more and I will finish. Russia, unlike China and Pakistan, does not constitute a threat to India. Once Kashmir is occupied by China and Pakistan it can never come back to India even if China and Pakistan are defeated in the end. The sovereignty of India over Kashmir will not be compromised by the induction of Russian troops into Kashmir if the sovereignty of the nation States of Western Europe has not been compromised by the induction of American troops into Western Europe.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Amen.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ।
मुझे माननीय सदस्य से यह जरूर कहना है कि जब वे बुलाये गये तब वे अपनी जगह पर नहीं थे । जो मेम्बर साहब अपना नाम दें, उनका यह फर्ज है कि वे अपनी जगह पर रहें । यह तो नहीं हो सकता कि जब मेम्बर साहब चाहें तब उनको बुलाया जाय ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (विजनौर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत सरकार ने किसी भी गुट में सम्मिलित न होने की अपनी नीति

बहुत पूर्व घोषित की थी। किसी भी गु विशेष में सम्मिलित न होने की नीति का आधार यह था कि भारत स्वतन्त्र रूप से तटस्थ रह कर अपनी राजनीतिक समस्याओं का समाधान और विकास करना चाहता है। परन्तु जब से चीन का यह आक्रमण भारतीय सीमाओं पर हुआ है, उस समय से भारत की तटस्थ नीति को कसौटी पर कस कर दूसरे देश और भारत के भी कुछ व्यक्ति देखना चाहते हैं। मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि जो व्यक्ति भारत की तटस्थ नीति का समर्थन नहीं करते उनमें से आप उन कुछ व्यक्तियों को छोड़ दीजिये जिनके अपने निहित स्वार्थ किसी विशेष संगठन अथवा देश के साथ हैं, परन्तु जहां तक भारत की सामान्य जनता का सम्बन्ध है, वह भारत की इस तटस्थ नीति की समर्थक है। किन्तु इस तटस्थ नीति के भी समर्थक दो प्रकार के हैं। एक तो कम्युनिस्ट और कम्युनिस्टों ने महानुभूति रखने वाले हैं, दूसरे में बाकी सारा देश आ जाता है। लगभग सारे देश की विचारधारा जो इस तटस्थ नीति के सम्बन्ध में है वह यह है कि हम अपनी तटस्थता को सुरक्षित रखते हुए अपनी विपत्ति और संकट को टालने के लिये दूसरे देशों से जिस प्रकार से भी सम्भव हो, सहायता लें। लेकिन कम्युनिस्ट और कम्युनिस्ट समर्थक हमारी तटस्थता की नीति को ऐसी कसौटी पर कसना चाहते हैं जिसका परिणाम यह हो कि पश्चिमी देशों की जो सहानुभूति इस संकट काल में हमारे साथ बनी है वह किसी प्रकार से हिल जाय। संभव है कि उनका अपना यह अनुमान या विश्वास हो कि अमरीका, ब्रिटेन या दूसरे देशों से शस्त्र मंगाने के पश्चात् भारत उनका गुलाम हो जायेगा, या किसी प्रकार उनका दास हो जायेगा। परन्तु इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि द्वितीय महा युद्ध में जब रूस ने अमरीका से शस्त्र लिये थे या सहयोग प्राप्त किया था तब उसका यह परिणाम कदापि नहीं हुआ कि रूस अमरीका के गुट में सम्मिलित होता। आज अगर हम अपने

संकट निवारण के लिये दूसरे देशों से सहायता लेते हैं तो यह तो एक तात्कालिक समस्या है। इससे हमारी तटस्थता की नीति को ऐसे आधारों पर कसना जिनसे जो देश हमें सहायता देना चाहते हैं उनका ध्यान हम से हट जाय, यह एक प्रकार से भारत के साथ ही अन्याय करना नहीं होगा बल्कि उन देशों को समर्थन प्राप्त कराना या समर्थन देना होगा जो हमारी स्वतन्त्रता को खतरे में डालना चाहते हैं।

जहां तक रूस और चीन के पारस्परिक मतभेद का सम्बन्ध है, मेरी अपनी निश्चित राय यह है कि रूस और चीन के साधनों में मतभेद हो सकता है, किन्तु साध्य में किसी प्रकार का मतभेद नहीं है। मोटी सी भाषा में मैं इस बात को यों कह सकता हूँ कि इस विषय में तो भिन्नता दोनों में हो सकती है कि भारतवर्ष में जो साम्यवाद फैले वह चीन के झंडे के नीचे फैलना चाहिये, या रशिया के झंडे के नीचे फैलना चाहिये, लेकिन भारतवर्ष में साम्यवाद का प्रचार या प्रसार हो इस विषय में दोनों एक हैं। लेकिन जहां तक अमरीका और ब्रिटेन का सम्बन्ध है, वे इस विषय में यह चाहते हैं कि भारत जहां तक अपनी स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा करे वहां साथ ही भारत के अन्दर साम्यवाद का प्रचार न हो। भारत स्वतन्त्र रूप से रहकर जिस प्रकार अब तक अपनी नीतियों का विकास करता आया है उसी प्रकार भविष्य में भी अपनी नीतियों का विकास करे। मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि भारतीय परम्पराओं को ध्यान में रखते हुए इस प्रकार का सहयोग प्राप्त करना हमारे लिये कहीं अधिक हितकर होगा जो किसी राजनीतिक स्वार्थ विशेष को मस्तिष्क में न रख कर हमें सहयोग देना चाहता हो।

रूस की ओर से जो सहयोग हमें तीन या चार मिनट विमानों का अब तक प्राप्त हुआ है उसमें भी हमें यह स्थिति देखनी होगी

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

कि तीन या चार मिग विमानों से हम भारतीय स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा कर सकेंगे या नहीं, जब कि हमको उस देश का सामना करना है जिसके पास लगभग तीन हजार विमान बतलाये जाते हैं। और जो उसके पास राकेट या प्रक्षेपणास्त्र हैं वह भी बहुत बड़ी संख्या में हैं।

हम रूस के इतने अंश में आभारी हैं कि उन्होंने काश्मीर की समस्या पर सुरक्षा परिषद में हमारा समर्थन कर भारतीय जनता की सहज सहानुभूति प्राप्त की, लेकिन ऐसे संकट के समय में जबकि हमारे देश को सीमाओं पर आक्रमण हुआ और हमारी स्वतंत्रता को खतरा उत्पन्न हो गया, उस समय हाथ खींच कर काम करने की प्रवृत्ति और विरोधी को सहयोग देने की प्रवृत्ति को आज भारतीय जनता इन परिस्थितियों में स्वीकार नहीं कर सकती।

दूसरी बात मैं वैदेशिक नीति के संबंध में विश्लेषण रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ। बहुत अच्छा हो कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति को व्यक्ति प्रधान न बनाएं। मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि अगर नेपाल में कोयराला की सरकार है तो नेपाल के साथ हमारी सरकार का रुख दूसरा है और जब उसके स्थान पर दूसरी सरकार आ गयी तो हमारा काम करने का और अक्षय्य देने का ढंग दूसरा ही गया। बर्मा में ऊ नू की सरकार थी तो हमारे संबंध अच्छे थे लेकिन ने विन की सरकार वहां आ गयी तो हमारे सोचने का ढंग दूसरा ही गया। जब तिब्बत पर चीन का आक्रमण हुआ तो इस देश के बड़े बड़े नेताओं ने कहा कि यह चीन का अन्दरूनी मामला है, इसमें हम हस्तक्षेप नहीं करेंगे। जब हम उसके अन्दरूनी मामलों में हस्तक्षेप नहीं कर सकते तो नेपाल में चाहे राजतंत्र रहे या प्रजातंत्र रहे हमको क्यों उसकी चिन्ता करनी चाहिये और क्यों इस प्रकार नेपाल से जो हमारे सांस्कृतिक और भौगोलिक

संबंध हैं उनको खराब कर देना चाहिये? यह नीति भारत के हित में अच्छी नहीं रही।

इस बात से बड़ी प्रसन्नता हुई कि हमारे बृह मंत्री माननीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री की नेपाल यात्रा में भारत और नेपाल के संबंधों में जो कटुता उत्पन्न हो गयी थी उसको दूर करने में बड़ी सहायता मिली। मेरा अपना निज विचार है कि जहां भारत और नेपाल के भौगोलिक संबंध निकट के रहे वहां नेपाल के साथ हमको अपना सांस्कृतिक संबंध भी और घनिष्ट करना चाहिये। ऐसा करना भारत के बड़े हित में होगा।

भारत के जितने पड़ोसी देश हैं उनमें पाकिस्तान के विषय में तो मुझे यह विश्वास नहीं होता कि जितनी सद्भावना और प्रेम उससे समझौता करने के लिये भारत ने प्रदर्शित किया है उतनी ही सद्भावना भारत के साथ वह भी प्रदर्शित करेगा। किन्तु इतना अवश्य है कि वह देश जिनकी स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति में हमने मदद दी है, उनके बारे में अपनी विदेश नीति को कसौटी पर कसते समय हम सोचें कि उनके संबंध में हमसे कोई भूल तो नहीं हो गयी है जिसके कारण वे हमारे पड़ोसी देश हमसे अलग होते जा रहे ह और अपने मन में कूता लेकर बैठे हैं। अगर ऐसा है तो हमें अपनी वैदेशिक नीति पर फिर से विचार करके उसमें परिवर्तन करना चाहिये जो कि आज देश की परिस्थितियों को देखते हुए अत्यन्त आवश्यक है। वर्तमान स्थितियों में हमें इन देशों के साथ केवल राजनैतिक संबंध ही नहीं बढ़ाने चाहिये वरन् हमको इनके साथ अपने आर्थिक और व्यापारिक संबंध भी दृढ़ करने चाहिये, और साथ ही साथ उनके साथ अपने सांस्कृतिक संबंध भी बढ़ाने चाहिये। कुछ समय पहले हमने अपने देश में बुद्ध जयन्ती मनायी, थी केवल इसीलिए कि हम अपने पड़ोसी देशों की भावनाओं को अपनी ओर मोड़ सकें। जिससे भारत को उनका हार्दिक सम्बन्ध प्राप्त हो। जब उस

समय हम यह कदम उठा सकते थे तो आज हमको इस प्रकार के सांस्कृतिक पग उठाने में क्यों आपत्ति होनी चाहिये। मेरे अपने विचार में ऐसा पग उठाना देश के लिए अधिक हितकर होगा।

दूसरी बात में कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री को स्मरण होगा कि मैंने पहले भी निवेदन किया था कि मुझे विश्वास नहीं कि चीन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार कर लेगा, और अगर कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को चीन स्वीकार कर भी लेता है तो उन पर वह टिककर रहेगा इस संबंध में कैसे विश्वास किया जा सकता है? लेकिन अब तो प्रधान मंत्री ही स्वयं यह मान गए हैं तथा चीन और हमारे समाचार पत्र भी यह कहते हैं कि चीन ने कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव स्वीकार नहीं किए हैं। अब वे ६ तटस्थ राष्ट्र जिन्होंने कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को बनाया था क्यों नहीं स्पष्ट भाषा में चीन को हमलावर घोषित करते? लेकिन सचाई तो यह है कि उन ६ राष्ट्रों में से चार की सहानुभूति हमारे साथ नहीं है। परन्तु मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब चीन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है, तो भारतवर्ष भी अब स्वतंत्र है कि क्या निर्णय ले और कैसे उस लक्ष्मण रेखा को नाचे। सरकार आज भी कहती है कि नेफा में हमारा प्रसैनिक प्रशासन ही रहेगा, सेना वहाँ नहीं जाएगी। लेकिन जब चीन ने कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार नहीं किया है तो हमको भी अपनी सेना नेफा क्षेत्र में बढ़ानी चाहिये और लद्दाख की भी अपनी चौकियों पर पूरा अधिकार करना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नीति और परिस्थिति दोनों की पुकार है। चीन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को अस्वीकार करके अपनी कूटनीतिक विजय दिखाना चाहता है और दुनिया को भारत की कूटनीतिक पराजय दिखाना चाहता है। चीन की शांति प्रस्तावों के पीछे सद्भावना नहीं है। वह शांति के नाम से भारत पर कूटनीतिक विजय प्राप्त करना चाहता है और भारत का

समर्पण कराना चाहता है। लेकिन हम इस समर्पण के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं नम्र निवेदन करूँगा कि चीन और पाकिस्तान के समझौते के संबंध में भी प्रधान मंत्री जी कल बहस का उत्तर देते समय विशेष प्रकाश डालें। काश्मीर के प्रधान मंत्री बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद ने अभी तीन चार दिन पहले एक वक्तव्य दिया था जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि चीन और पाकिस्तान का सीमा संबंधी जो समझौता हुआ है और उस संबंध में जो एक दरतावेज पर हस्ताक्षर हुए हैं, उसके अतिरिक्त भी कुछ बातों में चीन और पाकिस्तान का गुप्त समझौता हुआ है। अगर बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद को इस बात की जानकारी है तो यह असम्भव है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को उसकी जानकारी न हो। अगर वह जानकारी संसद को देना देश के हित के विरुद्ध न हो तो मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी सदन को वह जानकारी अवश्य दें।

चीन के विदेश मंत्री श्री च्येन पी ने एक वक्तव्य देते हुए कहा है कि श्रीमती भंडारनायक और कोलम्बो राष्ट्रों ने चीन को अपने प्रस्तावों का जो स्पष्टीकरण दिया है वह उससे भिन्न है जो उन्होंने भारत को दिया है। इसलिये मैं यह भी चाहूँगा कि कल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी चीन के विदेश मंत्री के इस वक्तव्य के संबंध में अपना स्पष्टीकरण अवश्य दें जिससे पता तो चले कि इसमें कितनी सच्चाई है। अगर चीन के विदेश मंत्री का वक्तव्य सही है तो यह बात न हमारे हित में है और न चीन के हित में है।

अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपनी मध्य प्रदेश की यात्रा के दौरान एक दो स्थानों पर कहा कि देश को यह नहीं मान लेना चाहिये कि लड़ाई दूर हो गयी, ज्यो ज्यों गरमियां आ रही हैं लड़ाई की संभावना बढ़ रही है और कोई नहीं कह सकता कि कब लड़ाई आरम्भ हो जाय। मेरा निवेदन है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जिस प्रकार नेपाल और रायपुर में

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

कहा उसी के अनुसार देश को इस संकट की ओर से सदा सतर्क बनाए रहें और ऐसा न हो कि हम पर अचानक हमला हो जाए तब हम नए सिरे से तैयारी करना प्रारम्भ करें। यदि ऐसा हुआ तो यह हमारे स्वातन्त्र्य के लिये घातक होगा। इसलिये हमें जनता को निरन्तर सजग बनाए रखना आवश्यक है।

एक और बात की ओर मैं सरकार का ध्यान विशेष रूप से आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा। सदन के कतिपय सदस्यों ने इस बात की शिकायत की है कि विदेशों में हमारे राजदूत भारतीयों के प्रति अच्छा व्यवहार नहीं करते तो उनसे कैसे आशा की जा सकती है कि वे वहां के निवासियों से अपने कर्तव्य का पालन ठीक तरह से करते होंगे। यह शिकायत विरोधी सदस्यों या विरोधी पार्टियों की ही नहीं लेकिन शासनाखंड दल के सदस्यों का भी यह व्यक्तिगत अनुभव है कि विदेशों में रहने वाले राजदूतों ने उनके साथ अच्छा व्यवहार नहीं किया। मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि विदेशों में जितने भारत के राजदूत हैं उन में अधिकांश सिविल सर्विस के जनता से संबंध न रखने वाले लोग हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि सिविल सर्विस के सभी लोग खराब हैं। उनमें अच्छे भी हैं। उदाहरण के लिए श्री छागला अमरीका में रह कर अच्छा काम कर रहे हैं। लेकिन उनमें से अधिकांश वैसे नहीं है यह मेरा अभिप्राय है। मेरा सुझाव है कि आपको ऐसे लोगों को इन पदों पर भेजना चाहिये जिनका जनता से भी सम्पर्क रहा हो और जो जनता की कठिनाइयों से परिचित हों। ऐसा होगा तो अच्छा रहेगा।

इंडोनेशिया के स्वतंत्रता संग्राम में हमने कंधा लगाया था लेकिन इंडोनेशिया के हमारे राजदूत हमको वहां जो हमारे प्रति भावना थी उसकी सूचना तक न दे सके। और उसका पता हमको उस समय लगा जब कि जकार्ता में एशियन गेम्स के मय हमारे विरुद्ध आन्दोलन

हुआ। तो मेरा कहना है कि हमारे राजदूतों को विदेशों में सतर्क रहना चाहिये।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूं। पाकिस्तान के साथ जो हमारी बातचीत चल रही है उसके संबंध में सरकार की ओर से कहा गया था कि कलकत्ता की बातचीत अन्तिम बातचीत होगी। बहुत सम्भव है कि ऐसा कहने का आधार यह हो कि पाकिस्तान के विदेश मंत्री ने भी यह कहा था। लेकिन अब यह बातचीत कलकत्ते में समाप्त नहीं हुई और कराची के लिये उसका पांचवां दौर रखा गया है। इसके अतिरिक्त दूसरी सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि कलकत्ते की कानफरेंस में असम में जो पाकिस्तानी नागरिक आ गए हैं उनका प्रश्न पाकिस्तान की ओर से उठाया गया जब कि यह समस्या हमारी थी, पाकिस्तान की समस्या नहीं थी। यह सवाल हमारी ओर से उठाया जाना चाहिये था। इसी प्रकार राजस्थान की सीमा पर भी ऐसी समस्याएँ हैं और बंगाल की सीमा पर भी आक्रमण और डकैतियों की समस्या है। इन तमाम चीजों को वहां उठाना चाहिये था।

अन्त में मैं एक बात यह विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश के जिम्मेवार व्यक्तियों को और नेताओं को काश्मीर समस्या के संबंध में जो वक्तव्य देने चाहिये वे ऐसे न होने चाहिये कि देश के लिए अहितकर हों। मैं श्री तय्यब जी का आदर करता हूं और जब से वह अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम विश्वविद्यालय में गए हैं तब से वहां काफी परिवर्तन हुआ है। लेकिन उन्होंने काश्मीर के संबंध में यह वक्तव्य दिया है कि काश्मीर का एक तिहाई भाग जो पाकिस्तान के पास है उसके विकास के लिए काश्मीर का कुछ दूसरा भाग भी हमको पाकिस्तान को देना चाहिये। जब एक जिम्मेवार व्यक्ति ऐसा वक्तव्य देता है तो उसका परिणाम देश के लिये अच्छा नहीं हो सकता। मैं समझता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इस संबंध में घबराहट जानकारी लेंगे।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्रालय की रिपोर्ट में ये शब्द कहे गए हैं :

“अनुभव किया गया है कि केवल अंग्रेजी भाषा में ही सामग्री का वितरण करना पर्याप्त नहीं।”

18 hrs.

विदेश मंत्रालय की अपनी ऐसी सम्मति है। लेकिन इसी पैराग्राफ में दूसरे भाग में यह भी लिखा है कि १९६२ के अंतिम दो महीनों में भारत चीन सीमा विवाद पर अधिकतर अंग्रेजी भाषा में ३१ पुस्तिकाएँ निकाली गईं। चूंकि भारतीय जनता भारतीय भाषाओं से परिचित है इसलिये मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इस चीज को देखें कि विदेश मंत्रालय में भारतीय भाषाओं का सम्मान अवश्य होना चाहिये।

Mr. Speaker: Now, Dr. Colaco.

Before he starts speaking, there is one thing that I might put to the House. We had taken 15 minutes in the miscellaneous business this morning. Then, some time is likely to be spent on another motion that is coming up tomorrow. The House shall have to make up the time by sitting longer. If the House wants to sit longer today, it can do so.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): We can sit for another 15 minutes today.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): We can sit late tomorrow. Since the Prime Minister will be replying tomorrow, I think that it will be better if we sit longer tomorrow, rather than today. Moreover, the speakers are not present here. They thought that the House would adjourn at six o'clock today. So, those who would have liked to speak are not here.

Mr. Speaker: The speakers are present here. There is no dearth of speakers. There might be other reasons.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We can sit till 6.30 P.M. today.

Dr. Colaco (Goa, Daman and Diu): After so many eloquent and sometimes witty speeches that we have heard in this House, I shall not deal now with the general policy of the Ministry of External Affairs, as it is somewhat late. I shall only speak a few words underlining the timely considerations put forward by my hon. friend Dr. Gaitonde, regarding the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, which is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Last Saturday, while justifying some kind of paternalism which seems to prevail, according to some hon. Members of this House, in the drafting of the Government of Union Territories Bill, the hon. Minister Shri Hajarnavis put forward as one of his arguments that the difficult financial position in which these territories are and the help that they require from the Centre were sufficiently elucidative of the matter.

As this has also a direct connection with the Demands for Grants now under discussion, I beg to submit some brief considerations on this subject.

As far as Goa, Daman and Diu are concerned, our financial position was on the whole healthy and sound in the latest years. Since 1957, we had only surplus budgets there, and our revenue was in 1961-62 of the order of more than Rs. 6½ crores. In 1960, our balance of trade was coming practically to be favourable. Our foreign exchange was of the order of Rs. 19 crores. And, carefully weighed, our income per capita was almost double of the all-India figure.

The first deficit appeared only in the budget of 1962-63, after the emergency of the military operation of December, 1961 and was only of a meagre amount of Rs. 25 lakhs, being due to the expenditure of restoration of

[Dr. Colaco]

bridges, roads etc. destroyed by the Portuguese Army on the occasion.

Now, the deficit regarding the year 1962-63, as we see from the Financial Memorandum attached to the Government of Union Territories Bill, comes to about Rs. 76 lakhs, due obviously to so many changes and different trends lately adopted there, and of which the decrease of customs duties is only one of the aspects.

The first conclusion of all that is that in our case, with due adjustments and readjustments, we will not at all become a burden on the Centre, and that will remove at least one of the arguments, if any, against the establishment of a full democratic setup and regional autonomy in our part of the country.

Incidentally, the hon. Minister also told us that the Union Territories were connected practically with the Centre through the Ministry of Home Affairs. That really means that the time has come to give a different heading in the Budget to some of the Union Territories which are still anomalously under the heading of the Ministry of External Affairs. For technical reasons and others also our Bill is proposed exactly by the Home Ministry.

While dealing with this matter, I have to point out also that some near day, Dadra and Nagar Haveli shall cease to come under a different heading from Goa, Daman and Diu, as obviously as the hon. Member, Shri Kamath stressed here, they belonged to Daman and were, in fact, almost its economic nerve. Obviously, the will of the population of that area must be consulted on this matter.

Yet another point—more important than these—is that, given the rise of our revenue in the latest years, the present plan and non-plan budget of a little more than Rs. 7 crores cannot fulfil completely our aims, and I expect that especially in the sector of agriculture, community development,

education and health, a more substantial amount will be allotted. For planning purposes a sum more than Rs. 2½ crores could be granted, given the fact that this new plan is utterly important and timely at this moment. If all schemes are properly implemented, without waste of money or its unhealthy diversion, I think this will be a decisive factor in the life and progress of our part of the country. This also implies that the taxation system to be adopted there must be specially mitigated and adjusted, particularly in the perspective of the last budget proposals, as Goa is itself in some kind of 'emergency' or post-emergency after the military operation of liberation which took place in December 1961.

I am stressing here these points only as a plea on behalf of the larger moral and material interests of Goa, Daman and Diu, whose special individuality has been recognised by Government but which must have as its practical support and backbone a sound and firm economic structure.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi (Dharwar-North): The Demands of the External Affairs Ministry are before the House. The foreign policy of any country cannot be framed one fine morning and kept before the people. The foreign policy of a particular country is the outcome of the actions and reactions of so many factors for years together. Therefore, while criticising the foreign policy of India, we shall have to take into consideration the relations of India with so many other countries, and all of a sudden we cannot jump to certain conclusions also. The foreign policy, because it depends upon the actions and reactions of so many factors, has to be studied in that context itself. I was rather surprised that the foreign policy of non-alignment was criticised by some quarters. For a soldier a person standing before him might be either a friend or a foe. But for a politician

and for a Government it is very difficult to make a clear distinction between friend and foe. There may be foe-like friends and friend-like foes also. Therefore, when the EA Ministry chalks out a particular policy for the Government, it is up to the Defence Ministry to execute it properly. They are so knit together that both are to be studied in a particular context.

An hon. Lady Member from the Opposition remarked that the Indian foreign policy was oscillating. I do not know how she came to that conclusion. Looking to the fact that our policy of non-alignment is being pursued under different and trying circumstances, I do not know how the Swatantra Party people venture to make such remarks. In spite of the fact that the Chinese Government in a half-coaxing and half-threatening way asks the Indian Government to come directly to the negotiating table, not with the interference of the Colombo powers, our Government has adamantly adhered to its own policy of non-alignment and is not going to the negotiating table directly without the interference of the Colombo powers. It was accepted by this House, though not unanimously for my friend Shri Kamath and some Opposition Members had certain objections to it. These non-aligned countries decided to interfere in order to bring some negotiations between the two countries and they made an honest effort. It was apprehended whether it would be possible for India to accept these proposals. India accepted the proposals to go to the negotiating table, as a first step for further negotiations and not as a final setp. All countries have appreciated our acceptance of the Colombo proposals as a diplomatic victory for India. Fortunately or unfortunately, the same has not been accepted by China. Even if China had accepted the Colombo proposals, we do not know how far it would have adhered to them. Anyway, it is quite clear that the proposals have not been accepted by China. India is

thus sticking to its policy of non-alignment, whatever trying circumstances there may be India chose a democratic way of Government and a policy of non-alignment.

The other day I went to Patna on gram sabha tour and one Pressman asked me: Madam, don't you think that there are inherent defects in the democratic system? Every system of Government has its own defects or loopholes. But once we have solemnly resolved to constitute India into a sovereign democratic republic it is up to us to remove all those defects and loopholes and see that India sticks to its policy of non-alignment. India and China started on their own development, implementing their development plans, almost at the same time. India adopted a policy of non-alignment and accepted the policy of welfare oriented schemes whereas China adopted a policy of power oriented schemes. Therefore, China wants to prove that the policy on non-alignment and democratic way of Government were a failure. China wants to see these things destroyed. At the same time, this non-alignment policy has not been resorted to by India as a weak country. There may be countries who might have resorted to non-alignment policy under different and compelling circumstances, but India has resorted to this non-alignment policy by choice, and it has got full appreciation, as can be seen, from many countries, countries forming a particular bloc have not been able to get the support and sympathy of other countries in any great degree, but India has been able to get the sympathy of many of the countries in the world, and has been able to get full help and sympathy, and not only full help in the form of sympathetic words but in the form of machines, in the form of technical knowhow, in the form of military aid, etc. Therefore, non-alignment means militarily non-aligned, but not politically non-aligned, policy of the Government of India that has brought to us the help from other countries also. That is why now, the United Kingdom

[Dr. Sarojini Maheshi]

and the United States of America and USSR have together come to the help of India, and we cannot predict or foretell what would be the state of affairs in times to come. Under the existing circumstances, with the common sense that we have got, with the experience to our credit, this is the policy that we have chosen and we wish to adhere strongly to that policy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. lady Member might continue tomorrow. We have made up the deficiency that was there for today—15 minutes.

18.17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, March 19, 1963/Phalguna 28, 1884 (Saka).
