

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

would be made for the suspension of this rule. If that is the way your mind is working, I shall move on that day for suspension of this rule and see how the House accepts it.

Mr. Speaker: It was put before the House and the House took a decision that they are not prepared to sit after 5.30 p.m. At the most, if we suspend that rule, we can sit upto 5.30 P.M. According to the wishes of the House, they do not want to sit beyond 5.30 P.M.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The House does not want to sit after 5:30 P.M. Therefore, the only question is whether we should suspend the rule for the sake of half an hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On some days, we have sat upto 6:30 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: We have. But the House has expressed itself that it will not like to sit beyond 5.30 P.M. Even now, it has expressed the safe opinion.

As far as the notice for amendment is concerned, of course, I have received it and that will go through the regular procedure.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): There is one factor to be taken into consideration. We will be discussing almost all the Demands except perhaps, according to the present programme, Finance and Planning. Can there not be an adjustment whereby the House would be willing to sit for more time to cover that also?

Mr. Speaker: He can discuss with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and myself. We should have some proposal for that in committee. It cannot be discussed in the House.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If you suggest a way, they will probably agree.

Mr. Speaker: There ought to be some proposal.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Finance Bill has been allotted 17-1/2 hours. That means, if we start even as late as 2 P.M. or 3 P.M. on Thursday, we could have 17-1/2 hours, sitting on Friday which is a half day—the other half being taken up by non-official business—Saturday 6-1/2 hours and then Tuesday the 21st. Therefore, we can have some time for the Finance Ministry and the Planning Ministry on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: We will see when we start.

11.18 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs together with the cut motions moved. 4 hours and 15 minutes have been taken and 5 hours and 45 minutes remain.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): When will the Minister reply?

Mr. Speaker: I understand the Minister Without Portfolio will reply to the debate today and the hon. Prime Minister will do so day after.

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedi (Kendrapara): If the Prime Minister is to speak on Monday, that means we will be taking some time from the time for other Ministries. I do not think that is very proper.

Mr. Speaker: It would be only for a few minutes. If we start at 1120, there would be five minutes left for this also.

Shri K. C. Sharma.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): I was submitting yesterday that the central fact in modern life is that of peace in the world and contribution to that effect. I beg to submit that world peace is essential. It is inevitable. Rather it is vital to existence. In this technological age, we shall be compelled to live under conditions when there is peace in the world or we shall not live at all.

The second point is that world peace is not a golden age, not elimination of conflicts, but elimination of a certain way of settling the disputes.

The third point is that for this very purpose, world peace demands exceptional moral efforts. It is vital to our existence, but it does not happen of its own accord, nor does it become automatically agreeable. Peace has been always a desirable thing for the human being, but ever since human life came, peace has not been possible, it never existed in the world. What has been desired for a million years may in this age become a possibility and a fact.

Our contribution to this has been our policy of non-alignment, co-existence and co-operation and the Principles of Panch Sheel. We made our contribution in the disputes in Korea, and Indo-China, and India has very well played the part of honest broker in Asia.

So far as our contribution to the independence and sovereignty and Asian countries is concerned, I may quote Hartmann:

“Nehru went on to cite and take exception to press reports of testimony before the United States Congress by Assistant Secretary of

State Walter Robertson to the purported effect that the United States must dominate Asia for an indefinite period until Communist China has ‘disintegrated’. Nehru declared that ‘the countries of Asia do not intend to be dominated by any country for any purpose’.”

I make this point that these are not the words resulting from infantile cowardice as my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai would like to put it. These are the words of a great statesman who knows where he stands, and who knows what he intends to do. These are not the words that any coward will speak. At that time, in 1954, it was not easy to face the great United States with all the resources at its disposal; it was the founder of the United Nations Organisation and looking forward to the domination of the world in every aspect of life.

Another great contribution to world peace has been our policy of non-alignment. In over 2,000 years of world history, wherever there was rigid bi-polarity, as there was after the Second World War when the two super Powers, the United States and the USSR, were dominating world politics, war was inevitable. Non-alignment resulted in a great country standing aside and not joining either of the blocs. It is just like two bulls fighting, and a mountain standing in between. (*Laughter*).

My great guru laughs at it, but if 450 million people do not make a mountain, I do not know what else will make. We have a great history, and we are a great people. India has been in the centre of one civilisation and has given the word of truth to the world, and our great commerce, culture and religion entitle us to a great say in world affairs. I do not know what else makes a mountain.

So, my respectful submission is that in the world as it existed after the Second World War, the only possibility for peace was that India and united Germany, if ever it is to be

[Shri K. C. Sharma]

united, should remain non-aligned. These two great countries make a great force for peace. India has stayed non-aligned; not only non-aligned, but it pleaded for co-operation, it pleaded for co-existence. In this connection, I would submit that the French philosopher, Fenchon, in his advice to the grandson of Louis XIV said:

"The fourth system is that of power which is equal with another and which holds the latter in equilibrium for the same of public security. To be in such a situation and to have no ambition which would make you desirous to give it up, this is indeed the wisest and happiest situation for a State. You are the common arbiter; all your neighbours are your friends and those that are not make themselves by that very fact suspicious to all others. You do nothing that does not appear to have been done for your neighbours as well as for your people. You get stronger every day and if you succeed as it is almost inevitable in the long run by virtue of wise policies, to have more inner strength and more alliances with powers jealous of you; you ought to adhere more and more to that wise moderation which has limited you to maintaining the equilibrium and common security."

This bi-polarity in the world has been broken, and great countries like Germany, Italy, China, India and Japan have come to play their own part in world affairs. So, now it is impossible that the world destiny can be decided either at Moscow or at Washington. So, the human race at long last has been able to have its say and decide its own destiny.

Much has been said that we have been defeated and we have been humiliated. I beg to submit most respectfully that in human affairs the facts of life and situation do play a part. Never in the history of warfare has a country fighting from below

against an invader from the mountains, been successful.

It has never been so for the simple reason that if a man stands on the third story and fires, the man standing down below has not one chance of killing the man on the third floor; the other fellow has greater chance. So, this is a simple proposition that the men who come down from the mountains have a better chance to attack than the forces down below. In the first place, the forces down below would have no readiness, in the second place, there would be no organisation, and in the third place, they would not find the object of attack so easily. So, it is very difficult for the forces down below the mountains to attack and succeed against the forces upon the mountain. This is a physical disability. Clausewitz says that it is simply impossible to think that the forces down below would be ever able to defeat the forces from the mountains to attack them.

Secondly, in 1812, in the time of Napoleon, and in 1940, in the time of Hitler, Russia was attacked. The enemy forces went a long way, but it was demonstrated that in the end, if the people are stout and resolute, if they do not lose courage, as the Indian people have not lost courage, the long communications involved could be broken and the enemy defeated. So, it is a technique of war that where there are vast stretches, where the invader comes from far away, his long communications can be cut and he can be defeated later on. So, Sir, it is not one battle that decides the fate of war as one sparrow does not make a spring. Modern wars are long-range wars and they are not fought or won in one hour.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): As if one defeat is not enough, Mr. Sharma wants many more perhaps.

Shri K. C. Sharma: Not even the defeat of one war that does not decide

the fate of a nation. History shows that it is the bone and blood the vision of the people that decides the fate of a country. Many a great country has been defeated many a time before but still they are much greater than ever before. It is an infantile sentiment, just as a child thinks that its toy is the whole world and outside its toy nothing happens. It is that sort of thinking that my hon. friend has indulged in.

For our adversary, China, there is a stalemate. There was a stalemate in war in Korea: it was there 1954 in the matter of Ministers' conference in Berlin. When two great people stand against each other and the questions are complicated, it is inevitable that there would be a stalemate and people will think and devise some means as to how best to solve that dispute. A dispute in the modern world is settled either by negotiation or by arbitration or in the last resort by war. No wise statesman takes resort to war if he could ever avoid it. In modern diplomacy because of the prestige aspect it is almost always better to move very slowly than very fast. It is good to have patience and wait and think of devices which could succeed.

The foreign policy has certain basic principles, without which no foreign policy could ever succeed. The first principle is that politics in general is governed by objective laws and human nature in which laws of politics have their roots has not changed since the classical philosophies of China, India and Greece endeavoured to discover these laws, over 2000 years ago. Philosophic principles have had a certain amount of change but human nature has remained the same. Having become independent under certain circumstances, we could not have had any other policy but the policy of non-alignment.

The second principle is the concept of interest which is defined in terms of power against our enemies. The third principle is that political realism does not allow its key concept

of interest defined as power to be fixed once for all. Things change; and change conditions the power interest. My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai ignores the realities of modern world; he wants Nehru to play Caesar or Napoleon. Nehru is the architect of modern India; he played his part well; he has displayed the capacity of the historian and the philosopher, the prophet and the statesman. But he is not a Caesar or Napoleon; Caesar and Napoleon are not possible in the modern world. So, Sir, that infantile cowardice which Mr. Nath Pai refers to is not infantile cowardice but it is the wisdom of a statesman; it is the act of a man of wisdom, and the authority and vision.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): My colleague in his speech did not speak of Caesar or Napoleon.

Shri K. C. Sharma: That was implied. Fourthly, political realism takes note of moral significance of political action. Fifthly, political realism has its science. It is not a random act of a politician.

So, Sir with all respect, I submit that the Indian foreign policy is scientifically built.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members' time is up.

Shri K. C. Sharma: One word about our dispute with China. China is a big country as we stand neither can we defeat China nor can China defeat us. We have to live together. The future of Asia lies in the United States of Asia. A time will come when the people of Asia will combine together to build a future for the people which we dreamt of. A word about Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker: He should not take up any new point.

Shri K. C. Sharma: A word about Pakistan. God made us one country; and the man in his folly cut us into twain. A time will come when we

[Shri K. C. Sharma]

will unite again and Pakistan will usher itself in modern ways of rationalism and reason and there would be no happening again like the present one which we are facing today. One word about Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker: No; he must conclude.

Shri Ravindra Varma.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella): I rise to support the Demands for grants of this Ministry. Listening to the debate during the last two or three days one was struck by an agreeable feature that this time the usual critics of non-alignment did not hold up the policy to ridicule. Even my hon. friend Mr. Nath Pai with his eloquence and delectable sarcasm, was perhaps unwilling to touch anything that he could not scorn, and therefore, left non-alignment alone. We have accepted non-alignment since we believe that non-alignment is essential to preserve our uninhibited right to independence of judgment; since we believe that no action of ours should aggravate tensions and divisions in the world and accelerate the cold war by accepting polarisation and the dichotomy into which the world was being thrown. We accepted non-alignment since we could not identify ourselves and our political philosophy with the kind of democracy that reconciled itself with colonialism, neo-colonialism and racialism, since we could not identify ourselves with political systems that denied the democratic rights of individuals and identified socialism with totalitarianism. We believed in non-alignment, and we believe in non-alignment since we feel that in countries like ours, it is not possible for us to adopt either of the economic systems of the rival blocs. Today, we can say that our Prime Minister, thanks to the policy of non-alignment, has steered our ship through many stormy waters. Today, it can be said that many more countries in the world have accepted the value and validity of non-alignment. Even those who were

sceptic, critical, suspicious and derisive in the beginning, were hostile in the beginning, have come to realise the validity and the value of non-alignment not only as a policy which every sovereign nation has a right to follow, is entitled to follow, but as a policy that contributes to the lessening of the tensions of the cold war.

But, there are some secondary assumptions, some of them perhaps of considerable importance, behind our belief in non-alignment which have recently been called into question. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that these assumptions have received a rude shock as a result of the developments that have taken place during the last two years in the world. It is, therefore, necessary for us to review our diplomacy in the light of these new factors that have emerged.

What are these new factors? Firstly, when we have formulated our policy of non-alignment, many countries were still under colonial domination and the rest of the world consisting of sovereign nations was practically divided into two warring camps engaged in the cold war,—two camps with monolithic loyalties. To-day, the repudiation of the philosophy, of the tactics of co-existence by China, the emergence of an independent or deviationist French policy under De Gaulle, the unseemly competition in which the West is engaging, in establishing trade relations with China, not only selling wheat and cereals, but agreeing to sell petrol and all the vital sinews of war—all these have increased the number of the poles of gravitation in the world. The ambivalence of Pakistan, the unprincipled politics of Pakistan, with its willingness to keep company with the West and at the same time conspire with China, is another factor that has been thrown into relief.

Secondly, we did believe that if we kept clear of the power blocs and military alliances, there would be no provocation on our part to any of the

countries that belonged to either of the blocs to launch on an active policy of aggression against our country or look upon us with eyes of hostility and suspicion. This belief of ours, again, has been called into question.

Thirdly, we did believe that the danger to our countries in the under-developed areas of the world lay in internal subversion, not in external aggression.—Internal subversion, because of the possibility of irresponsible parties exploiting the lack of contentment with the rapidity of progress in the economic field. This again has been called into question. These assumptions or deductions have received a rude shock as a result of the policy of China and Pakistan. We should, therefore, attempt today to find a dynamic diplomacy, that can cope with the new strains that have been put on our policy of non-alignment.

Sir, we have almost been made to realise that the Sermon on the Mount is no substitute for the Penal Code. The Sermon on the Mount enshrines ideals to which everyman must subscribe, but unless it is bolstered up with the willingness to act in the name of society, to defend these very ideals, they will not, by themselves, ensure order in society. No one can hope that the brilliance of one's idols will guarantee them against the attacks of iconoclasts.

A new dynamic of diplomacy is all the more necessary for our country today because of the nature of the tactics employed by our adversaries. We have to realise today that there are some self-confessed enemies in the comity of nations as far as our country is concerned. It does no good to close our eyes to this fact. Not only do we have some self-confessed adversaries but we have unprincipled adversaries who have developed a new technique of international action, the technique and the tactics of nibbling at frontiers, altering the *status quo* in favour of the aggressor and then offering to negotiate our withdrawal thus

corroding the will of the people to resist, making further inroads into the territory of the neighbour and believing that because of the general fear of a total war, the scientific application of the tactics of limited war, combined with offers of negotiation will fluster the enemy, shatter of his morale, and lead to the eventual destruction of the enemy.

Sir, the answer to this is not unrealistic altruism. Unrealistic altruism is not the alternative to alignment. The foreign policy of every nation has to be based on its enlightened self-interest; self-interest is not necessarily selfishness. No Government worth the name can afford to be apathetic to or apologetic about its self-interest. Our diplomacy then has to be based on our own self-interest, to deal with our self-confessed enemies. Our diplomacy must help us to create international public opinion in our favour. It has to discourage or deter the adventurism of our enemies and augment the strength on which we can rely. It has to enable us to cultivate dependable allies in the under-developed world, in the West, and amongst the communist countries.

Last year and the year before, when I spoke on the Grants of the External Affairs Ministry, I referred to the fact that China and Pakistan had launched a diplomatic offensive against our country. I referred to the fact that in the under-developed countries of the world, both these countries, especially China, with all the resources at her command, was creating a situation in which sympathy and understanding for India were becoming rare. I suggested then that it is not enough if we believe in Government-to-Government relationships at the United Nations. It is not even enough if we have our embassies in everyone of these countries, but it is necessary for us to counteract the propaganda at every level in every circle in which public opinion is formed in those countries. It will take too much courage to say that we have done this. In fact, my hon.

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

friend Shri Khadilkar said yesterday, and Shri Nath Pai also said that today the number of our friends, dependable friends, is shrinking. I agree with them. Vaingloriously, if we claim that China has been isolated, our claim will bear no relevance to reality. Amongst whom has China been isolated, and who has isolated China? Is China isolated amongst the communist parties of the world? Is it possible to think that in Asia there are not many communist parties that support the Peking line that in Europe, communist parties are not being split to set up parties which support the Peking line?

If you look at Chou En-lai's tour of Africa, if you look at the splitting activities, if I may say, sir, refer to them in parlance which is acceptable to hon. Members at your extreme left you will see that China still does command considerable sympathy and support in the world. It is not by under-rating your enemy that you can overcome your enemy. If even Russia, with all her might, with all the support she enjoys in the communist world, is hesitant to ostracise China from the world communist movement, it is because she has realised that China has touched certain chords in the under-developed countries of the world, that she has exploited racialism, under-development, to allege that Russia is one of those countries that suffer from a Chavvinistic superiority complex, one of those who are industrially developed, one of those who are white. Pakistan derives its support not only from the west, not only from China, but also from some other areas, because of the religious sympathies it can evoke from some Muslim countries in the world. Sir, you are aware that very recently Pakistan helped in organising a tour of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem in the Arab countries of the world, which resulted in statements being made by some of the most respected dignitaries of the Arab world, supporting the demand for self-determination in Kashmir statements like—"I am supporting

it not because I am a Muslim, but because all my life I have fought for self-determination for my country; therefore, I support the demand for self-determination in Kashmir."

To deal with such enemies, we must have a dynamic diplomacy. One should not, as my friend, Shri Sharma who spoke before me said, think and talk in terms of what happened 5,000 years ago. India was a great country 5,000 years ago. People respect India's past, but people should respect India's present too. Vainglory and the belief that if we ride the high horse like Lady Godiva we can go out to claim the tribute of the world will only enable us to see many closed shutters and windows in the world. I am afraid that for fear of taking initiative; we have often allowed ourselves to be stampeded by a bumptious section, of the non-aligned. We cannot allow the fear of fallibility to immure us in immobility.

The under-developed world is not a monolithic world. Last year when I spoke of the various conceptions of non-alignment, I pointed out to this House that it was wrong to endure that because there are certain common aspects in our past experiences, because there is a degree of similarity in our present problems, there should be identity of views in the under-developed world either on the solutions for our problems or on the methods to be employed for the solutions of these problems. We know that there are among them countries who, for various reasons, maybe pique, maybe the need to divert attention from domestic instability and failures, maybe due to an ambition for global or regional leadership, are willing to dovetail their politics policies with those of China. We cannot take up the position that we will look upon our friends and on the friends of our enemies with the same eye. If we are not able to distinguish between our friends and those who are willing to play our enemy's game, we will

not be able to maximise the support that we can gain in this region. Our policy, therefore, must not be one of equal warmth or lukewarmness to all. We must follow a policy which is flexible, dynamic and realistic enough to recognise and utilise the evident nuances and gravitations in the under-developed world

Now I come to my respected friend, Mr. Khadilkar. He said yesterday that our position in the Afro-Asian world has suffered because of the predicament that we are in after the aggression of China. He suggested that if we could take the initiative and settle with China, we could win back our friends and enjoy a position of eminence and respect in the under-developed world. The solution that he offered, if I am not mistaken, was that we should negotiate with China, not stand on prestige and perhaps be willing to trade Ladakh for the recognition of the McMahon Line on the north-east. It was a very bold suggestion that he made before the House and I congratulate him for his boldness.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): I never suggested that Ladakh should be exchanged for recognition of McMahon line.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I am thankful to my hon. friend for his explanation. But the impression that he created on me and perhaps on the House was different. I am sure his clarification will be of immense help in understanding whatever he wanted to put before the House.

It appeared to me when I listened to him yesterday that he was putting the cart many kilometres before the horse. Have we lost our position in the under-developed world because we become victims of Chinese aggression? Or, did China make this move in the belief that our hobbled diplomacy will hardly be able to cope with the situation and garner the sympathy of the world. Mr. Khadilkar certainly implied—and I would like to be

corrected if I am wrong—we should not stand on prestige.

An Hon. Member: We have no prestige left.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I want to know whether a nation defends its territory only for considerations of vanity or bourgeois sentiments of prestige? Or is it the inescapable duty of a Government to defend the territory of its sovereign State. I want to know whether a nation can entertain separate norms for different areas within its sovereign territory—one for a territorial core that has to defend at all costs, and another for the periphery or the kernel that can be sacrificed to buy time or peace? I myself come from what may be described as the so-called periphery and therefore, I am concerned with this theory of defence. Can we buy time or peace from a bullying aggressor? How many miles south of Ladakh or the McMahon Line shall we reach the cartographical coordinates that will transform prestige into self-respect and make it incumbent on the Government make it the inescapable duty of the Government, to defend our territory? It is not a question of prestige. Where does prestige end and self-respect begin I should remind Mr. Khadilkar that blades of grass that bend before every wind are fit only to be trampled upon. They are respected by none. I, therefore, submit that the House should not entertain this panicky counsel of capitulation. No Government that is worth its name can make a virtue of its weaknesses, even if it makes a virtue of necessity.

Shri Khadilkar: May I remind him that we were negotiating regarding Pakistan in Kashmir over sovereignty also?

Shri Ravindra Varma: If my hon. friend would have his way, that would be a precedent to negotiate with China and, therefore, I can now say that my earlier apprehension has been proved correct.

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

I submit that what we have to do to regain our position in the Afro-Asian world is to shed our apathy and fear of initiative and adopt a policy of active and dynamic diplomacy.

I must now say a few words about Kashmir. Hon. Members who have spoken before me have welcomed the release of Sheikh Abdullah and expressed the hope that this would lead to the restoration of tranquillity and normalcy in the State. I join them in welcoming the release of Sheikh Abdullah. But the release of the Sheikh has posed many new questions before us which we cannot ignore. We have always held the view that the accession of Kashmir was legal, valid and irrevocable, that the UN Resolution enjoined us to hold a plebiscite only after the withdrawal of Pak. raiders and after normalcy had been restored, that the continuous and persistent refusal of Pakistan to act in accordance with the UN resolution and withdraw the raiders from the occupied area had rendered it impossible to proceed with the next phase, merely a plebiscite, and that this phase had been rendered unnecessary by the subsequent events that have taken place, by the free and fair elections that had been held in Kashmir, elections through which the people of Kashmir reaffirmed their faith in accession. Now are we going back on these views that we have held and expressed? Has the Sheikh given us any reason to believe that he has come round to our position? Is there any prospect of a political settlement with him on the basis of such common views? If that is not the case, if there are no common views, if his views remain what they were and our views remain what they are, what can the Government do? Permit secessionist propaganda? If not, will the Sheikh be permitted to create a situation in which, because he does not recognise that elections have been held in a fair manner, he compels the Government to accept his contention through agitation, non-

cooperation and the pressure of international and national public opinion? What then will we do? Hold elections and run the risk of the Assembly voting for a revision of Accession? Or, while holding that the will of the people has been verified, accept the proposal to re-verify the will of the people, but this time separately in Jammu, Ladakh, Kashmir Valley and the area held by Pakistan? What will be the result?

12 hrs.

I am not posing these questions for any answers. I know that it is wrong to expect the Government to answer these questions at this time in the House. But I do want the Government to consider these questions. I pose these questions so that the Government may give their thought to all these possibilities that may arise in time so that there may be no danger of our being confronted with unanticipated situations, no danger of our being stampeded into a policy of drift.

Sir, I have taken the time that you have allotted to me. I would have liked to mention something about external publicity and concurrent accreditation, my usual complaints. Last year I expressed surprise at the criteria that are being followed in concurrent accreditation of our Ambassadors. I wondered whether it was geographical proximity or political affinity, and said I had finally come to the conclusion, that it was alphabetical proximity. There is no change in the situation. If anything, it has become worse.

Last year I had occasion to point out the fact that there is a disproportionate distribution of our information and publicity, centres, that there are very few in Africa, only 2 in Latin America, and the few that are there in Africa are in the English-speaking areas that there is hardly any centre in the French-speaking areas. I do not want to go through the usual rigmarole—that is how it is treated by

the External Affairs Ministry, it seems.

Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Mr. Speaker, may I have your permission to speak sitting?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Thank you. Sir, I have been at a great disadvantage to have been asked to speak after the eloquent speeches of those who preceded me. I have no doubt that we have enunciated very laudable and high principles in our foreign policy. We stand for world peace; we stand for disarmament; we want all international quarrels to be settled peacefully; we have also not carried out the defence of our borders vigorously lest it might result in a nuclear world war and humanity may be destroyed. We have offered to our neighbours to sign with us a "no-war agreement". Further, we have no designs on the lands of other people. We have placed our foreign affairs in the hands of a great statesman of the world and also a great world historian. In international affairs, we have adopted a policy of non-alignment and neutrality. We are assured that our representatives in the foreign countries are of the best and we also have been told that there is nothing more that we can do in the matter of publicity and that our publicity is very good. With all these advantages, may I know why we have failed wherever our vital interests are concerned? Even the United Nations Organisations, whom we have supported by sending our armed forces and our civilians to keep peace where peace is disturbed, even that does not seem to help us. Our small neighbours do not care for us. Is it because, as it always happens, when people are good and honest that they have to suffer martyrdom? Are we suffering martyrdom on account of our goodness, or is there anything else which is wrong with us? It is time that we have a

fresh look at ourselves. Maybe, the fault lies neither with other nations nor with our fate but it is in us.

What have we done? We have gone wrong in this that we have deliberately or unconsciously blurred over the different aspects of our foreign policy.

The foreign policy of a country is not a single or unified conception. It has three distinct aspects. The first is the enunciation of principles which must be re-adjusted according to changing circumstances.

The second is the strategy and the third is tactics or diplomacy. What is the general principle of our foreign policy? It has been summed up in what is called non-alignment. This non-alignment has become not only a principle of our diplomacy, of our foreign policy, but it is like a moral principle with us; it has become like a *mantram*. When we say that we are non-aligned, it means that it includes our principles, our strategy and our tactics. Ask anybody what is our foreign policy and he will say "non-alignment" as if everything can be solved by simply repeating this *mantram* of non-alignment. We also seem to believe that we alone, of all the nations in the world have invented this conception of non-alignment. But if we look around we will see that all countries in Asia and Africa that have recently achieved their independence are non-aligned. Burma is non-aligned. Ceylon is non-aligned and Indonesia is non-aligned. Even Tito is non-aligned. But one peculiarity of these non-aligned nations is that they believe they are non-aligned but nobody else believes that they are non-aligned. They are inclined either to the West or to the East.

We must also know that historically several nations have been non-aligned. America, for instance, was for a century and a half non-aligned. It had nothing to do with the quarrels that were going on in the world. But it was non-aligned only about the quarrels in other continents. When it

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

came to the question of America, they did not say that they were non-aligned; rather, they enunciated the Munroe Doctrine.

But we are non-aligned whether we gain by it or we lose by it. England was also non-aligned after the Napoleonic Wars and it called this as a policy of splendid isolation. They did not say they were non-aligned. In political science a country that is at war is called a belligerent country, not a non-aligned country. In this there is confusion about the use of words.

Then, why do we call America and Russia as not non-aligned? It is because there is a cold war between them. I submit that between us and Pakistan and China there is a greater cold war than between Russia and America. Russia and America have not taken possession of each other's lands; but China and Pakistan have come into our territory and taken possession of our lands. We are therefore, in a cold war and being in a cold war we cannot say that we are non-aligned. We can certainly say that we have no military alliances with any other nation; but that is a negative conception. We have been told by the highest authorities here that our non-alignment is positive, it has dynamic potentialities about which my hon. friends, the previous speakers talked.

However, though we are non-aligned, we get massive military aid from the West. This we got when our territory was invaded by China. Up to that time, even up to the time when the emergency was declared, our Prime Minister and our former Defence Minister said that any military help from outside would involve us in the cold war. It seems, afterwards these views have been changed. When we found ourselves in a difficulty, we did not hesitate to take help, military aid, from the West. This is not how a careful nation manages its foreign affairs.

However, as soon as the enemy went back, we forgot the help or we seemed to forget the help that we received from the West. This is very clear from the way in which the air exercises were allowed in India. Though we had asked them yet the way the whole thing was managed was very ugly. Also, there was an agreement about the Voice of America in which also we did not come out very well.

We must remember that it is not possible for India to stand alone and be able to defend itself against China. We will have to take military aid and we must realise that the most of military aid can come only from the West. We can get something from Russia; but it will bear no proportion to the help that we get from America. We must also remember that alone we cannot even oppose China.

But today it is not China only; we will have to fight on two fronts. Even Hitler, because he fought on two fronts, came to grief. Let us not be in that position. No country today can defend itself alone however powerful it may be. It is good that the West does not want any military alliance with us, but we must recognise that we can get massive help only from the West.

So far as Communist China is concerned, we had warnings when it invaded Tibet. What did we do? We allowed that buffer state to be conquered. We recognised not only the suzerainty of China over Tibet but its sovereignty also. Today it is being disputed whether the word 'suzerainty' was changed into 'sovereignty' by our Ambassador, Panikkar, who is no more with us; or whether it was changed by the Foreign Department presided over by our Prime Minister! Even when the mistake was found out, nothing was done to correct it; rather, we slavishly followed the lead of China and always described Tibet as the 'Tibetan region of China'.

After having accepted the sovereignty of China over Tibet we began our fraternisation with it and we raised the cry of 'Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai'. There were several associations, called India-China friendship associations.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Peace Councils also.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am sorry to say that these associations existed up to the time the Chinese attacked us in 1962.

Shri Ranga: They were patronised.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Government gave them grants.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: These associations were given grants by the Government. If I mistake not—I stand to correction—they were sponsored by leading Congressmen.

When in 1960 I blamed the Government for not being aware for years about the expansionist designs of Communist China, our Prime Minister said:—

“Right from the beginning of 1950 or at any rate from 1951 when the Chinese forces came to Tibet we had this problem before us.”

What did we do? Again, the Prime Minister added:—

“Looking at my old papers I am surprised myself to see how we had referred to that contingency—

(the contingency of the danger from China)—

of expanding China, nine or ten years ago in our papers”.

Yet, we did practically nothing. We did not even inform the country about

the danger because, as was written in one of the Prime Minister's letters to China where he said that that would excite the people—as if a country may be invaded and the people should not get excited; people should remain calm as if nothing had happened.

Shri Ranga: They continue to remain unexcited.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Afterwards when the act of aggression could no more be concealed from the people, our Prime Minister said that we were not up against Communist China but against expansionist China. He said that whenever China was united and powerful it was always aggressive. Of course, that shows his knowledge of world history—and he is right. But then, if that is so, if we are not up against Communist China, I do not see how some of our Communist friends side with China. I do not think they are siding with expansionist nationalism. But they know, they are siding with expansionist Communism.

Then we had a treaty with China in 1954. We knew that the Chinese maps were going round the world showing parts of our Himalayan territories as theirs; but in 1954 when we had a treaty with China, we made no mention in that treaty about our borders. It was necessary because our borders were with Tibet and not with China. But we did not mention this point; only, the Prime Minister said that he talked of it and the other man said, “Yes, these are old maps; we shall see to it”.

Shri Ranga: In the drawing-room fashion.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: After that what did we do? We had certain rights in Tibet and we gave up those rights not in favour of the Tibetans but in favour of the aggressive Chinese. This is something which is

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

strange which I cannot understand. I am obliged to say—and I am very sorry for it—that it seems that the British Government was more careful about Indian rights than we ourselves have been. They recognised the suzerainty of China but they never allowed China to have any hold upon Tibet. Not only that. In all international treaties, they called Tibet along with China to sit at the same table.

Where do we stand today? We have suffered humiliating defeat. It may not be humiliating to some Congressmen but I am sure it is humiliating to the country. China retired but it wants to have talks with us.

Shri Ranga : Go to Bandung.

Shri J. B. Kripalani : In history, a defeated nation can sit at the table with those who have defeated it, only to its disadvantage. Another thing is that some very philanthropic nations, without our consent, brought out what are called the Colombo proposals, and we were in haste to accept the Colombo proposals because we were not prepared to do anything more strong than that. We have been waiting for more than a year, a year and a half, for China to accept these proposals. In the meantime, China is consolidating itself on our borders and even our Defence Minister has so often said so. The other thing is that because China is not accepting these proposals, we keep on repeating that we have accepted these proposals giving a delusive feeling to the people as if these proposals are in our favour.....

Shri Ranga : As if they are honourable.

Shri J. B. Kripalani : ...as if they are honourable. But these proposals are absolutely dishonourable to our country which said once that there will be no negotiations unless our territory is vacated.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun) : We have not accepted any proposal. We have accepted only talks.

Shri Ranga : The proposals were accepted by the Prime Minister. He said so.

Shri Tyagi : As a basis for negotiations.

Shri J. B. Kripalani : Why do the Chinese go on postponing and postponing acceptance? It is because they know they have reason to believe that ultimately we will accept what they want us to accept, and the signs of this are very clear.

Shri Brij Raj Singh-Kotah (Jhalawar) : No.

Shri J. B. Kripalani : My hon. friend and colleague, Mr. Masani, pointed out a letter that had been written by the Prime Minister of Ceylon to her counterpart in China that she had been assured by India that India will not occupy the territory vacated by the Chinese. Whether this letter is there or not, the fact remains that we are not going to occupy that territory. The Government has said that we are not going to occupy that territory because we have left decision to the Generals in the field, to the military authorities. May I ask when did they leave decisions of such things to the military authorities? Did they consult the military authorities when they ordered cease-fire in Kashmir at the instance of the Governor-General, Lord Mountbatten? Did they consult the military authorities when they asked our soldiers to march on and drive away the Chinese? Whenever it suits their purpose, they bring out this plea that they have to consult the military authorities. But they have never consulted the military authorities and they promptly say—this is a cloak—that we do not allow military authorities to dominate over civil authorities

However, our politicians have not understood the danger of our army being at the foothills. They do not understand that if our army is at the foothills, the Chinese can come to the plains. When they have once come over to the plains, they can spread themselves. If the Chinese have got to be resisted, they have got to be resisted at the heights. If we do not resist them there, I think, we are doing a very great mistake.

The net result of our bungling is that the Chinese are consolidating their positions on our border and what is worse is we have all along left the initiative to the Chinese. While we have done nothing to regain the lost territory from the Chinese, we have also given them an opportunity to join up with Pakistan. It is a well-known maxim in international politics that an enemy's enemy is our friend. This maxim was laid down by Kautilya more than 3 centuries before Christ. But the misfortune is that China and Pakistan have been acting upto that principle and we have been kicking at the enemies of the enemy. We never condescend to talk to them. Further, we are shy of people who are willing to be our friends. While we have diplomatic relations with our enemies, with China and with Pakistan, we have no relations with Israel though Israel is willing to have relations with us. We can learn many things specially in agricultural co-operation from its people.

There were several occasions when we could have come to an agreement with Pakistan. For instance, when we had an upper hand at the time we entered into a treaty about the waters in the Punjab, we were in a formidable position. Yet we did not make a package deal with Pakistan. We should have told it that there can be no talk about the waters of the Punjab rivers unless all our outstanding problems are settled once and for all. In politics, when you miss an oppor-

tunity, it never comes again. The one thing that Gandhiji knew was that he never missed a proper opportunity to do things. We have been missing our opportunities time after time. Now what happens? We have to defend our country against two powerful enemies and very proudly our Defence Minister says that we are ready to meet both the enemies.

Shri Ranga: Bravadoes.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He does not know that once the army has been unsettled, it is very difficult to bring in its discipline. Apart from that, does anybody believe that we will be able, even with the military advance that we have made, to meet the onslaught of two enemies that we have on our borders? It is only some gullible people who might believe it. But China does not believe in it, nor does Pakistan believe in it, nor does anybody in the world believe in it. It is an absurdity. Today, even the biggest nations cannot stand alone and resist another nation, what to talk of combination of nations.

I do not want to talk about our relations with Pakistan excepting to refer to them in brief.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I shall finish in a couple of minutes.

Shri Nath Pai: This is his first speech in the whole of this session. So, let him have some more time.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: That is also true.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let him have some more time.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I want only a couple of minutes more.

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

I must warn our Government of any hasty step taken in panic. Pakistan has told us that the riots in East Pakistan are due to the expulsion of the Pakistani infiltrators from Assam and Tripura. They tell us that the carnage in East Pakistan will not stop if these infiltrators are not allowed to remain in India, even though they love Pakistan. I hope that no compromise will be made on this issue of the infiltrators.

The question then is this. What are we to do? Is there any way? I am clear in my mind that there can be no transfer of population. We cannot oblige our Muslim friends to leave their own homeland; though I know that that was the only solution that was found feasible in South-East Europe, between Turkey and Greece, yet, I believe that we cannot have this solution. What then remains? Let the Government make up its mind that everybody who comes, that is, every member of the minority communities who wants to come to India is accepted. I think that this will be less dangerous to us than periodical killings and the degradation of human nature. This is the fourth time that Pakistan has done this mischief. Even at the time of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, I raised my voice, and I said that this Pact was not going to be carried out. And I say that any pact with Pakistan cannot be carried out. So, let us once and for all make up our minds and not think of coming to terms with Pakistan but do what is to be done for the minorities. And let the Mussalmans who have decided to make this country as their home remain with us. This is the only course. I know that it is a very difficult course to adopt, but it is not more difficult than the vivisection of the Motherland. It will be an easier solution than the division of the country into two parts.

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): On this, as on the previous

occasions, there is very considerable agreement in regard to the foreign policy and even with exceptions in regard to the conduct of the administration by the Government and the faith in the leadership of the Prime Minister in regard to foreign affairs and the basic principles laid down. I think that it is appropriate on this occasion that we should be very concerned about the problems that affect us very immediately, but at the same time, no country, least of all a country of our size and with the stature of its statesman, can ignore the big changes that are taking place in the world, particularly since we met here last time about three or four months ago. This has not been confined to just one country. Even in the two giants of the world, namely the Soviet Union and the U.S.A., there has been a considerable reappraisal in the light of these changes. Much has been printed about changes in relation to the U.S.A. Since my time is limited, I shall try and confine myself to the essentials required in regard to these changes and then deal with just some of the others.

I would first deal with this aspect and then go on to some of the more important and explosive and other situations that exist at the present time, and then deal with Pakistan and finally with Kashmir, and in between deal with our position in regard to what has been called non-alignment.

In the United States, there have always been reappraisals of policy. It is a great mistake to think on account of the very forceful nature of some propaganda that in that vast country re-thinking does not go on. That took place in the time of Mr. Dulles, a man of great intelligence and in personal relationships extremely courteous and friendly, who went through what was called the agonizing appraisal which placed that country in the

position that she has occupied in juxtaposition to the Soviet Union on what is called containing of communism. But, now, during the last few months, there goes on a re-examination, a re-examination in which President Johnson, and the leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate, that is, in the Foreign Affairs Committee, have participated. While it is not possible for me to go at length into it, I can do no better than summarise the conclusions of this, as set out in the American newspapers. The first is that the net result of all this is that a changing world may have invalidated many of the fundamental premises of U.S. foreign policy. The second is that far-reaching policy changes might be in order. The third is that the difficult task of *re-educating* American public opinion would be required.

Following that, President Johnson, speaking to a Labour meeting said this:

"The world has changed, so has the method of dealing with disruptionists of peace. General war is impossible, and some alternatives are essential..... The people of this country and the world expect more from their leaders than just a show of brute force."

This is a very considerable departure from what has been called negotiating from strength, having an edge over the other person, brinkmanship and all those other policies that have gone on. This does not mean that any great advance has been made on either side. This largely arises from the fact of the atomic stalemate where what has been called the stage of over-kill has been reached everywhere, that is to say, the stage of each country having more bombs that can exterminate the world more than once so that neither of them will use them; and then, perhaps, by a devious

route, we return to the pre-atomic state of war and diplomacy.

Therefore, these changes in this way are imperative. At the same time, President Johnson makes another statement which is also very important to us, especially as there are many good things in it. The alternative to non-alignment is alignment; the modification of non-alignment is alignment or that someone is waiting somewhere to receive us with open arms and so on. The contours of the world are the same. And this is what President Johnson has said:

"The U.S. can no longer mash a button....."—that is the American phrase for 'press the button'—

"... and get the nations of the world to do its bidding."

That is, there is a recognition of the individuality of nations, that it is not possible to twist their arms or regiment them any more or even to buy them with money. There are some nations which react more to it than others. This is the general change that has taken place.

Then comes the other statement which is not so authoritative, but which, according to all the information that is available to us, is making a very great impact, and about which even the American Secretary of State has said that while he does not agree with some of the things, as for example, in regard to Cuba or in regard to South Viet-Nam, he is generally in agreement with the whole of the approach. This is from Senator Fulbright, who had not in the past been regarded as a person who would quickly come out with a thoroughly different policy. And in his statement, he refers to what has been called the myths of American policy. That is to say—it is not my word, it is his—it has been raised upon certain myths and those myths have to be exploded,

[Shri Krishna Menon]

according to him. I will not refer to all of them. But the basic one that concerns the world as a whole much more than anything else is this, when he says, "this myth that the communist bloc is a monolith composed of governments which are really not governments at all but organised conspiracies determined to destroy the free world"—he calls it a myth—"unless this is exploded, we are not likely to move anywhere nearer peace". There are a large number of things which he has said, with which I fully agree. This is characteristic of the life. For example, when for the first time, what has been called bi-partisan policy came into the United States, Senator Vandenberg, who did not occupy any position except that of an elder statesman of the time, came out with public speeches of this character to bring about changes. Those vast changes did not end there. Perhaps I would read to you the other changes when we come to discuss and consider this question of non-alignment.

The other side of this picture is that there has been no progress at Geneva during the last two years. The 17-nation Disarmament Conference has not been stalemated. But it does not move on. I think the very considerable change that is taking place at Geneva is that the non-aligned group of powers have become inert, inactive or whatever initiative which they have taken is not so much in content as in the way of language, in the way of approach and something of the kind of an aligned character, attracting the hostility of both sides.

Only the other day, the Indian delegation made a plea that the proposals that have been made for the destruction of large quantities of missiles carrying nuclear heads should be accepted. This was turned down by the west. That was to be expected. This has happened so many times. At no time are proposals accepted; if they

are accepted, there is something wrong with the proposals!

But I think that the non-aligned group of countries, in which we have a considerable part, could perhaps have presented it in a different way, because Americans have always objection to accepting things in principle. It may be possible to get them round in some other way. At any rate, we have now come to a position with this question of destruction of missiles, of which the Russians are supposed to have several hundreds—medium and long-range—when it constitutes a great danger to Western Europe on the one hand, and on the other, the United States is concerned about their use in South Viet-Nam.

Secondly, another big change that has taken place, which, unfortunately for the human race is not very much spoken about, is the use of chemicals in warfare. In the territory of South Viet-Nam, this country, and particularly our Prime Minister, has a very serious moral responsibility. We exerted considerable pressures in order to bring about peace in that area and we were able to persuade the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom to accept responsibility for this matter and at various times to come together and prevent the eruption of war. A former Prime Minister of England, Sir Anthony Eden (now Lord Avon) could with benefit claim some personal responsibility in that at a critical period he stopped an explosion into war there.

In Viet-Nam, there was what has been called defoliation—removal of the leaves; denuding of forests not by cutting down forests but by destroying the foliage—by chemical means, which is the beginning of chemical war. The second and other methods are also being used. In Viet-Nam today, there is a considerable western force in the person of American troops to the extent of 10,000, and while

there is a very small number and there are periodical revolutions sponsored from wherever it is, this is one of the greatest danger spots of the world, even more than Germany, so far as we are concerned.

Then we have two or three other matters that have arisen. One is the relation between the Soviet Union and China, which has very important repercussions on our position. These are not ideological differences, as are spoken about. If they were ideological differences, they would not lead to the present situation. These differences have arisen from Chinese expansionism, where China, going back to the time of Chenghiz Khan or the pre-Tartar rule, claims territory, somewhere about 300,000 square kilometres, which includes integral parts of Soviet Asia. Therefore, some newspapers have it that there have been conflicts of one kind or the other. We may discount all that. These are territorial claims of an expansionist China, whose history, unlike what is written in western books, is not expansion from the coast inwards but expansion from the heartland outwards, absorbing every neighbouring country. That has been her history for the last three thousand years.

Then there is the position in regard to the Sino-Indian border where, on the one hand, there is an alliance between Pakistan,—which is a military ally of the western countries, both in SEATO and in CENTO, and the west,—and on the other,—we do not know what to call it,—there is, what some call, a companionate marriage between China and Pakistan, in regard to our troubles. So we have a kind of mix-up of what is called alignment and non-alignment. One would have to deal with it in detail later.

Thirdly, there is meeting at Geneva an Economic Conference, an economic conference of vital importance, and like all non-political affairs it receives less attention than it otherwise should.

This has been prepared for the last five or six years, in which this country has taken a considerable part, and from its very origin incurred the hostility of the United Kingdom and the United States, but was supported by the rest of the world, including Latin America because of their belonging to the have-not areas. This economic conference, to a certain extent, represents the changes in the world, away from what has been called the GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade,—which was hatched at Havana soon after the last world war, before colonial countries including ourselves became independent. The GATT—it may be considered as putting it inaccurately, but that is more or less the way to understand the situation—is merely an extension of the principle of imperial preference, that is to say, they give to the under-developed countries droppings from the table to consolidate their powerful monopolies. We have been members of the GATT. We have put up our fight there as best as we can. Now we are in a situation where the idea of One World is being extended more in the sphere of economic relations.

The other matter is the changes in Latin America. There has been a revolution in Brazil, the consequences of which it is very difficult to foresee. But it is rather a loss from our point of view because in Brazil, liberalism had come to the top and social justice and social welfare was being expanded. But the sinister part of it is that like the revolution in Guatemala five or six years ago, the pattern of this was delineated in the press of other countries long before it took place.

Then I would like to say a few words on the question of non-alignment. It has been rightly said that when one is asked, 'what is your foreign policy?', one's answer is 'non-alignment'. Of course, it depends on whom you ask. It is not possible either in this country or in any country in the world, that the masses of the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

people or what is called the man in the street can give a discourse on foreign policy. This is one thing that projects itself. That is to say, before the first world war, I suppose if you asked an Englishman about it, he would say alliance with France; some other person would deal with it in another way. Non-alignment, I ventured to submit on the last occasion, is not the foreign policy of this country. It is a situation imposed by or brought about by circumstances, a method that is used for our own security and advancement of our own interests, and, even more, for the slowing down of the movement towards world war or the accentuation of world tensions. So, it is not as though non-alignment is a medicine or tablet or something of that character. It has shown vast changes at various times. Non-alignment exists only because there are alignments, or a tendency to draw people into alignments.

What are the changes that have taken place? In the past, the aligned countries, whether it is the Soviet Union or the United States, have been regarded in various degrees as canvassing for the support of undeveloped countries, and sometimes making them the battleground. What I read out a little while ago shows a different state of affairs. There has been a greater toleration, a greater understanding of this among those who are diplomatically opposed to it, who regard neutrality, as they call it, as an immoral doctrine. I have heard them so many times saying that it is a highly immoral doctrine.

To make this very brief, we are now in a position where there are not two blocs in the world, but several blocs in the world. There is on the one hand the Western and the Eastern blocs, traditionally so called, with a degree of loosening up, which may go to the extent of the atomic isolation of France; also, to the extent of

the disputes between China and the Soviet Union, there has been a loosening up in that way. Not only that. There is the formation of other blocs, where, on the one hand, around atomic isolation, there are several people; on the other, China is trying to cultivate friends in various parts of the world, not without success as was being said. There is also formation of smaller groupings of this character, not as a Pan African Organisation, as sometimes it is taken I suppose, but there is a tendency of various countries in Africa to gravitate towards one or the other; some gravitate towards France, others try to form groups among themselves.

So, today, in 1964, non-alignment is not merely a question of our taking into account two great groups which can be identified, who, strange as it may seem, speak the same language, the language of power, and trying to keep ourselves free from the purpose of world war, assisting in the process of atomic disarmament and lowering of tensions. That is not the only position. Now, what is its consequence? My submission is that non-alignment, therefore today is more necessary than ever before, because it is not only a question of getting away from these two identifiable people, but keeping also away from all those peoples and even those who canvass, with all its consequences.

It is not a question of striking a balance-sheet and saying: has there been success or otherwise. If we accept the policy of this country as peace and co-operation abroad and a society with social justice at home, which is the policy of the Government as far as I understand it, then it means that we have to pursue this position where the changes that take place in the internal structure of society in terms of its economic relationships, in terms of production relations, and also in terms of the imbalances that exist inside the country.

and as between different countries of the world have to be eliminated more and more.

It is increasingly recognised particularly by the developed countries, in spite of the speech of Mr. Bell at Geneva, that the existence of the undeveloped countries, and their remaining in an undeveloped state, are a danger to the balance of power as such and the maintenance of the standard of life of the advanced countries.

It is also increasingly recognised, though perhaps not in the same terms, that even countries that are very prosperous, whose aggregate national income is phenomenal, also suffer from poverty. Only a few weeks ago, President Johnson, in a message to the Congress asking for a grant of 980 million dollars, said this was for a war against poverty. We are familiar with that. We would have thought it was in China, India or Timbuctoo or somewhere else, but this was a war against poverty in the United States; and this long statement goes on to say: "We have done a great deal, but in this vast land of ours, in spite of everything, a fifth of our population is denied opportunities." And this is in rich America which has all the capital of the Western world after the Industrial Revolution which did not carry the caste systems of Europe, which had vast expanding frontiers with no limitation on land, which had an affluent society where self-help was the base of development, which today has the largest national income and the highest technological development, where there is legislation to prevent excessive development of monopoly in the way of trusts; in spite of that, there is poverty, and a fifth of the population are denied opportunities. Why? Because of the imbalances that exist. In other words, poverty comes from these differences that exist and to the extent that it impinges upon foreign Powers, creating two worlds or multiple worlds, in this way it affects us really.

So, non-alignment today has to be rethought not in terms of "shall we run from here to there?", but in terms of the factors which come within the impact of this non-alignment. There is also canvassing of non-alignment largely by expansionist countries. All the countries of former imperialist traditions, apart from China—I do not want to mention any name, it would be embarrassing for the Government—go round and try to collect people. Why? Because large numbers of countries in this world are not in those two blocs. And those who would speak about the failure of the non-alignment policy, as I heard from those benches, should look at this world and see that these countries which have emerged from colonialism, which have everything to gain, taking a very short-term view, of course, by joining one of the power blocs, have stood away from that, because they have statesmen of experience, in this land and others who know that the internal independence of a country has to be projected in international relations. In my submission, until the time comes when independence means to us very little, unless and until the time comes when the decisions in regard to us, as in the British times they were made in White Hall, are made in some other Hall, there can be no abandonment basically of the conception of non-alignment, which is merely a projection of a nation's independence in the sphere of international relations.

Secondly, we are in no position to take on our own opponents, Pakistan and China; we are in a worse position, therefore, to take on the quarrels of other people, and any alignment in any way means that we have to, unless, of course, we follow the very worthy example of Pakistan, and say we are aligned to the West and we are also aligned to the others, but that is tolerated by one side or the other for its own reasons that may not be in our possession.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Thirdly, non-alignment does not mean, in my submission, a touch-me-not attitude, never has it meant that. I think it has been repeatedly mis-stated in this country that because we have been non-aligned, we have not got this, we have not got that. If we have not got this or that, it is either because our resources are not equal to it, or because the other person's desire to give is not equal to it. Non-alignment is not that touch-me-not attitude. Non-alignment means that in the establishment of our relations economic or cultural relations, or even in our procurement of military goods, or whatever it may be, we may not be partial, we may not allow the desire to be on one side or the prejudice against the other, to colour our situation.

So far as we are concerned, military procurement goes on from the American side, the British side, some of the European countries, from the Soviet side and some of the Eastern European countries, and even from the Arab countries. So long as we take care that the procurement of economic goods and military goods, or whatever be the goods, from this country or that country, does not outweigh our economy, does not stifle our capacity for self-expression, so long as, in our desire to grow, we do not kill the seeds of growth, then non-alignment remains.

Non-alignment is not merely a matter of the External Affairs Ministry, or an item of foreign policy. Non-alignment means the maintenance of relations with impartiality and good judgment and integrity, and basically in our own interests. This is one of those things which cannot be divorced from political relations by the country's statesmen.

13.00 hrs.

We want to have peace in the world not because we want to go down in history as a peace-loving country. The poorer and larger the country,

the more its problems, and this becomes a very domestic issue. This is the most domestic of all issues. It affects our economic and cultural life, the relations with our citizens. What is more, it affects the problem of liberty inside the country and our capacity to speak the truth. There is an old saying that the first casualty in war is truth. Therefore, the continuance of the non-alignment policy has to take into account the changes that are taking place, not only the two principal parties as before, but also the emergence of other nations who are now trying to keep these alliances in a similar way, which has vast consequences, namely proliferation of atomic weapons. So far these weapons have been for all practical purposes confined to the United States and the Soviet Union in that both these countries, for their own reasons, for political reasons, have agreed on one thing and that was not to distribute atomic weapons though there were limitations in this in the sense that the Russians accused Americans of giving atomic weapons to Germans or to the members of the NATO—how far it is true or otherwise it is difficult to say—and the Americans say the same thing, that is to say, that the Warsaw Pact countries had got it although there is no evidence to show if they are true—the proliferation of atomic weapons which with the growth of technology has now begun to reduce to conventional weapons where it is possible for a soldier to carry them or a group of them could do as they carry mountain artillery or things of that kind.

Therefore, if non-alignment was beneficial when there were only two blocs, when there are more blocs today, it is more necessary because otherwise we are likely to be caught in all the troubles that come up. We shall create more disalignment in one way and more enmities in the other way. It is also a deplorable fact that among the emerging countries there is not much unity not only of ideology

but of even practical purposes. It is to be understood that it is part of the after effects of the Empires which have ruled over them for a long time and as a consequence of that they never had to take responsibility for taking decisions or face consequences or venture to do so. Therefore the pursuit of non-alignment with integrity is essential for our purposes and I would with great respect submit to the Prime Minister that it is not sufficient for us merely to regard this as largely concerned with military alliances. The sacrifice of this country's independence in terms of its economic relations, the sacrifice of this country's capacity to deal with the power of monopoly over us which would ultimately reach the orientation of policies not only by pressures from this side but from everywhere else and what is more would very considerably mock a' the future of this country by having to service debts and what not, the removal of the basic position of development which is self-help in that way, does not mean a kind of inaccurate conception.

We have also to understand that none of these great countries or even newer ones are in a position to turn round and say: if you join us you will get all the others. That is not the position at all. That is all I can say about non-alignment.

In regard to China, we have always said, not only now, but at any time that we will negotiate even with a devil but we will not negotiate on the basis of the surrender of our sovereignty in the beginning. We have agreed to the Colombo proposals and the Prime Minister has repeatedly said in this House, not only a long time ago but very recently. I believe, last week or two days ago, that there will be no departure from this. It is my respectful submission that having regard to the position that has arisen between the Soviet Union and China, having regard to the position between the western world and China when there is a great deal said about capturing the Chinese markets in the

context of the scramble for the Chinese market, it would be a weakening of our position if we shifted from this and once shifting from there, it will be very difficult to draw any line. This is not a hard and fast or orthodox position. The position that we have taken is: you have committed fresh aggression in 1962; but we are prepared, for this purpose, for the sake of negotiation, leave other things alone; this fresh aggression must be vacated if we are to talk: otherwise there could be no belief in even the limited *bona fides* that are required. In this connection I would like to submit to the Prime Minister that it is not to our advantage, in fact it carries some peril, to keep this what is called Colombo group of powers, so limited in their membership because a dozen countries or each one of them is likely to be tackled by China, one after another and in this influenced background some of them may be affected and they may withdraw the Colombo proposals. The majority of them were with you; they are saying all this. But then we did not create these Colombo set of powers; they came together but we are the parties on whom their activities make their impact; without us it has no meaning. Therefore, this Colombo circle by whatever means of diplomacy has to be enlarged; it is not to become a kind of monopoly, a kind of experts on the situation, who in addition to our opponent, will be able to say: you must do this or that. 'Honest brokers' is only an English phrase; there is neither brokerage nor honesty about this usually.

That takes us to the usual charge in this House against the Government that our external publicity is bad and that is why we do not have so many African friends. I hold no brief for the Government in this matter. I have some little experience of this and I think it would be very fallacious and very naive to think that large quantities of photographs and glossy prints and literature sent to our chancelleries and public relations officers

[Shri Krishna Menon]

is going to make any difference to anybody. We get them ourselves and I know where it goes. Public relations in other countries is largely made by the content of the policy that this country has. The position to be able to be effective in regard to various matters, whether it was Korea or Indo-China or disarmament—it was not because there were a number of pamphlets it was because the world people thought that we would not shift from this position of the pursuit of peace, we will not be dragooned by anybody, that we would probably be willing to say, if we believed in it, something even if it was not convenient, we would probably do what Mr. Fulbright now says: to think the unthinkable. It is only by conveying our sense of integrity, our sense of courage that we will really attract them. I hope I am not over-stating the position. From what little knowledge I have, there is a degree of reservation in regard to some of these new countries about where are we going. Nobody wants to be more royalist than the king.

That takes us to Pakistan. I shall try to finish, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I would like to look at Pakistan in this way. We have all along looked upon Pakistan as though these are border problems to be dealt with by the State policy in various ways; that it is concerned about religion; it is concerned about the incompatibility of some persons with the others or something of that kind. It is time to consider whether Pakistan's position basically does not arise from its irreconcilability to the frontiers of Pakistan; that is to say, she does not regard partition as a settled fact; that is only the beginning of further expansion. If that is so, why must we continue to negotiate? We must not say anything in this House or very loudly in the country anything to embarrass the negotiators or weaken their hands. We have to take into account that powerful neighbours are the strongest of

the enemies. Here we have a situation for the last 16-17 years, where we did not have one week of peace, where our borders have been penetrated everywhere, where in the background of our desire not to have army clashes we have policed the frontier by civilian police and things of that character. We have now come to a position; while we do not develop, what the Prime Minister called the Maginot mentality, we have to reconcile ourselves to the position that these four methods that were used of penetration, of subversion, of aggression and creation of propaganda against us abroad, these things are to be met on all the fronts as though between nation and a nation; and whatever our commitments may be, whatever our preoccupations may be, whatever the rest of the frontier difficulties, we should not forget at any time that this is an imminent danger, and what is more, an imminent danger, which if we do not come out well out of it, the morale of our people would be seriously affected. Furthermore, there are not today two opponents. Pakistan and China are one opponent. That is one factor. The other factor is probably not so easily accepted or welcomed, and that is the position of Pakistan in regard to Kashmir or in regard to our position; she would not have been able to take her position from 1955 but for western assistance; she obtained her share of weapons, equipment, troops and everything else from them. Obviously, it stands to reason that neither their size nor their training were superior to ours. Her capacity to blackmail us, her capacity to pressurise us, her capacity to use the international influence was practised and breathed upon our shoulders. This arises from her alliance with western countries from 1955 onwards, and the answers that our Prime Minister got at that time were: "If you want arms we will give you also". That was the position.

Therefore, we have to take a very definite position in regard to this, and

we may not weaken our resistance capacity as against 'hem by our reliance on resources which have to be developed. The worst part of it is this: that even this companionate relationship with China, considering the western alliance, particularly the SEATO, was like this. I remember very well, that after the conference in Geneva some countries were not very keen on setting this up, but only two of them. That was set up particularly to contain China and to contain the situation in this way. How can it be that when the resources of the western countries, or the weapons of those countries have been classified, she has her relationship with a powerful communist country, the policy of the other alliance being to contain communism. How is this condoned? If it is not condoned, how to connive at them?

Also there is a vast economic position that remains: 85 per cent of the goods and development of China comes from the Soviet Union. After the aggression on India by China there has been no supply to China from that quarter either of petroleum or other goods. Even before, China by her arrogance, had turned out from China a lot of Soviet experts and even tried to cut their throat. I doubt sometimes that in her desire to get rich quickly, that is, to develop her industries quickly she has set up a large amount of plants with her technology; we do not do that here. Therefore, we have to recognise this fact. In our dealings with alignment or non-alignment, we have to realise that any relationship that accentuates the forces on these sides, their influence which endanger our security and our security in these matters, is of very considerable peril, because of the very large link on our frontiers from East Bengal over Assam and I do not know whether there is family planning there or not, but they will certainly try to change the composition of the populations wherever there are penetrations or in their own areas, so that in any area afterwards it may be said: "Now, take a plebiscite."

Sir, there is a great deal more that can be said on this matter.....

Mr. Speaker: He should try to conclude now.

Shri Krishna Menon: Yes, Sir, I shall conclude soon. So far as Pakistan is concerned, therefore we now have to regard this as a major factor in the defence of our land, whether it be in regard to equipment or in regard to the outspoken relations of the people, as in the Kashmir debate to which I shall come in a moment, where there has always been an expression of very great gratitude to the British delegation on the one hand, and then it goes on to say, therefore the United States delegation and therefore the others were on our side. We are grateful to them. This goes on everytime, and that takes me to the position in regard to Kashmir.

It is strange that in all debates, whether in this House or elsewhere problems relating to Pakistan are tied up with the Home Minister or what not—domestic questions—but when it comes to Kashmir, which is as much an integral part as Agra or any other place it is regarded as a matter of foreign affairs. My submission is, first of all we must get our mind accustomed to this idea that the aggression on Kashmir, any attempt to partition Kashmir, to deal with Kashmir one way or the other, is to deal with India. Any attack on Kashmir is an attack on India. The partition of Kashmir is the partition of India. It is not as though a tentative something; it is the whole of the Union that is being attacked, when a part of it is attacked. It is not possible to attack the whole of the country at any one time; you must begin somewhere. And therefore whether it is in Kerala or Baroda,—wherever it is—of course, we cannot say Baroda which is not there as such now—if they are attacked, it is an attack on India. An attack on the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an attack on India. That is the position. We ourselves have not got

[Shri Krishna Menon]

accustomed to this position because of the very early history in this matter.

Therefore, we have stated this under the instructions of the Prime Minister. This has been stated not today but in 1948. There are some people who think that we thought of this only later on. I think even two days ago I heard in these buildings and elsewhere that we have changed our mind about this, that or the other. Sometimes, it has been said that it is because some people are aggressive or intelligent, this, that and the other. But what did we say in 1948?

Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar said:

"I would now proceed to review briefly some of the detailed provisions of the draft resolution presently under consideration. By way of anticipating a possible claim from the other side, I desire to say a few words on the question of accession... 'whether the State of Jammu and Kashmir is to accede to India or Pakistan.' The contention has been advanced that the accession is for a temporary period (Shri Krishna Menon: To do that it will be necessary to repeal an Act of Parliament) and a limited purpose and when that period elapses and that purpose has been served, it ceases to be operative."

This was the position on the other side. And Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar answered this way:

"We on our side, repudiate this claim (Shri Krishna Menon: This is as early as 1948 . . .) The accession which took place on 26th October 1947 was both legal and lawful. It has been followed up by India in the discharge of all the obligations that her acceptance of the accession has imposed upon her. She has saved the Jammu and Kashmir State from disintegration."

Nobody would be talking about plebiscite today if India had not prevented her being destroyed.

"She is now resisting those who are attacking that integrity even today. She is protecting the State's large population from the unfriendly attentions of raiders from outside."

This is what was said.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to go into what is in the minds of many people about the release of the former Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah. To my mind, it is a domestic question. It does not come in this debate at all. The release or imprisonment of anybody in this country, while it may in a broad sense deal with human rights or whatever it is, is purely a domestic matter and it has no international implications whatsoever. Some may view it internationally, but no one else can say, "this is what you have done and you got this result or the other result." It is purely a domestic matter, and as stated by the Minister without Portfolio, it was a decision taken by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir no doubt in consultation with the Government of India, within their exercise of the constitutional rights. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Krishna Menon: Therefore, we are more concerned today about congratulating ourselves about repeating this argument, and the position of the Government has been stated and restated even in the last few days: the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India is full, final, complete and irrevocable. This is so in international law; this is so everywhere.

A long time ago, in the United States, there arose an argument whether Texas could walk out of the union. There is a Supreme Court

judgment on it. I would not read the judgment. It was a matter about the Texan people and the Whites. The judgment was that they could not walk out. "You need not have come in, but once you have come in, you cannot go." That is the experience everywhere. Now, we are told that we have made some commitments with regard to the plebiscite. I need not go into the details of this matter. Let me say that we have made no such commitment, and even if we have made any such thing, if it is an argument, there are other considerations implied. But over and above that, let me ask, was Pakistan created by taking a plebiscite among the people who are in Pakistan now?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Krishna Menon: Was this Independence of India established by taking a plebiscite among our people? These are political settlements that have been reached, and there is, so far as I know, not more than one instance in the whole world where a plebiscite has decided the future of the people. It may be a very good thing to speak logically about it, but it is a sad thing to say that masses of people, who are not political scientists, who are not statesmen, who are not historians, who are not administrators, should be asked within the hours of 8 in the morning and 8 in the evening to put a cross-mark and say yes or no. That is the meaning of a plebiscite.

There is something important that has been said about it. This matter will come up before the Security Council again, and they would be mentioning all this, more or less what may be happening here in Srinagar or somewhere else. That would be so because it is a periodical exercise. It is fought on the agonies; we have to suffer; it is part of the continuous pressures on this country. It is part of the investment or the capitalisation on the Prime Minister's sensitiveness and generosity. It goes on the whole time. Therefore, I would like

to make a submission. In the present Security Council, there are six countries which are totally new; they have never been there at all. In regard to the personnel, with one or two exceptions, they have not been there except during the last two or three years. Therefore, we are really addressing a new body. Therefore, any kind of sensitiveness about repetition does not come in. If you go to the international body of 10 or 15 people, particularly the Latin American, African and Asian countries, the word "self-determination" has a magic. It is put as though it is a clean slate and here is the Indian army suppressing Kashmir, not the Indian army resisting Pakistan. Therefore, it is necessary to reiterate the position that Kashmir was invaded. The invasion started even before the 15th August when the State forces were resisting the forces of Pakistan, when not only the Commission, but Mr. Korbél, one of the Commissioners in one of his books set out how he found out the invasion. I could have read it, but I have no time.

Now there are questions raised in this matter. One of the doubts in the mind of some of our own colleagues is whether the summoning of the Constituent Assembly in Kashmir does not in some way make a concession to the principle of self-determination, challenges the accession and go on. Fortunately for us, history points the other way; not anybody else's history, but our own. I think the older statesmen over here will perhaps be able to recall that there was more than one Constituent Assembly at the time just before the independence. The Constituent Assembly in Kashmir, as was called by the Head of that State, said in the Preamble, "This arises from accession". It is from the accession that the Constituent Assembly proceeds. It says in so many words. It says, from accession they go on to the Constituent Assembly.

When the Security Council was twitting us on the fact that "you are

[Shri Krishna Menon.]

rushing it; you are speaking so long in order to get over the 26th and in order to get the Constituent Assembly pass it", we told them that whatever the Constituent Assembly does makes no difference to the accession. It may decide all sorts of things, but it will not challenge or break up the unity of India with Kashmir which was established on the 26th October 1948. It is not possible unless the Constitution of this country is changed by constitutional processes. Under the constitutional amendment adopted several months ago, even secessionist propaganda becomes unconstitutional. So, the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir has its origin itself in accession.

There are two matters to which I want to refer. The time has come when we must really as an independent nation at least feel a little disturbed about the making of our foreign policy elsewhere. Either I was right or wrong, I constantly said, one thing about our foreign policy is that there is nothing foreign about it; we make it ourselves. Now we are told by very convenient special correspondents of Indian newspapers who perform more than corresponding work that the State Department is considering extending the cease-fire line to a width of three miles. It is 500 yards now and within that 500 yards, Pakistan is sending its civilians and policemen who come and shoot our people and we cannot do anything because they are not soldiers. If you extend it to three miles, always the suggestion is that the supervisory force or the observers, whatever you may call them, should be increased in the three-mile area. If you want large number of observers, it is only another name for a United Nations Emergency Force, something which we opposed tooth and nail. Afterwards in the Security Council, we said that in no circumstances we will allow foreign troops to be put up on our soil, either on this side of the cease-fire line or on that side, because both are our sovereign territory.

First this suggestion comes and then it is extended. There are some lawyers, who whenever they have got a weak case, argue, "let us assume this; let us assume this". They go on till the evening assuming, and by the evening the assumption is forgotten and only the end remains.

The other one I saw was that certain original arrangements of military alliances must be contemplated in South-East Asia in order that non-aligned countries like India may come in. We are going to have a kind of paper edition of a military alliance for us to come in. We will accept or reject it, but making our policy abroad in this way is something very objectionable.

There is this problem which originally has been attributed to a great American statesman as to what is called independent Kashmir. I will not go into the details of that controversy, but I will just read out from the Constituent Assembly proceedings one small paragraph:

"The third course open to us still has to be discussed. We have to consider the alternative of making ourselves an Eastern Switzerland, of keeping aloof from both States but having friendly relations with them. This might seem attractive in that it would appear to pave the way out of the present deadlock. To us, as a tourist country, it would also have obvious advantages. But in considering independence, we must not ignore practical considerations.

Firstly, it is not easy to protect our sovereignty and independence in a small country which has not sufficient strength to defend itself on our long and difficult frontiers bordering on many countries.

Secondly, we must have the good-will of all our neighbours. Can we find powerful guarantors

among them to pull together always in assuring us freedom from aggression? I would like to remind you that from August 15 to October 22 of 1947, our State was independent and the result was that our weakness was exploited by our neighbour, with whom we had a valid stand-still agreement. The State was invaded. What is the guarantee that in future too we may not be the victims of similar aggression?"

These are Sheikh Abdullah's words moving the resolution in the Constituent Assembly. There can be no independent Kashmir except an American Kashmir. There can be no independent State under the roof of India. There can be no independent State with a powerful State like the Soviet Union on the one hand, China on the other and hostile Pakistan!

There are some facts of history, which I do not want to mention because I do not want to embarrass the Government, where we have theories of this kind. They are headache enough. So far as we are concerned, every foreign policy must be basically moved by self-interest of a nation. Some people argue that Prime Minister said sometime that he would consult the will of the people. Someone says, the elections were fake. I do not want to go into all that. The fact remains that under well-established international practice—I do not want to quote the doctrines—it is true that if there are two or three alternatives, the country affected by those alternatives is entitled to choose what agrees with her interest. That is international law. Therefore, it is not proper to throw in our face that we were willing to allow the Commission to come here. The Prime Minister has said, this is a hospitable country; you may come, but we do not accept your resolution. We have done this all along. We are not to be indicted for generosity. We are not to be indicted for the desire for conciliation.

My point, therefore, is that whatever happens in Kashmir is not in Kashmir, but it is in India. Therefore, we shall tell the Security Council that they have to go back to the whole question of aggression, namely, they invaded. What is more, they have said, they have not invaded. They had quarter million of our people before invasion. They took over the areas on the other side of the cease-fire line. In 1964, there are not only penetrating into the cease-fire line, but they are violating our international frontier in Jammu, which is an international crime of a higher magnitude.

It is not sufficient for us to say that self-determination is too late or anything of that kind. There can be no self-determination for parts of a territory. It is not self-determination, but it is secession, which is a very different thing. We cannot submit to secession, because basically it is upon the conception that the majority of the people in Kashmir are Muslims and the others are Hindus. We cannot preach the prospect of blood bath that would follow in any pursuit of this ideal. This country has carried these burdens for 15 years and we are not going to be dragged to the United Nations, to say that for 15 years, we have been telling them lies; for 15 years, we have been distorting the doctrines; for 15 years we have been quoting the law in a tendentious way. We are not going to be put in that position.

What has happened in other parts of the world? Are there going to be self-determinations in various territories in Africa which have broken away from the empires, where the empires are still trying to come back? Only last week we read about the prognostication of the United States about subversion of the Congo, and the Portuguese invasion, which I suppose, means another attack on it. That is to say, when there is an attempt on the part of empires to come back—the empires do not change their habits; they may change the spots in

[Shri Krishna Menon]

their skins, but they do not change their habits—and the empires still being what they are, they come here not only with the flag and the gun, but they penetrate through our vitals, suck our blood and do everything which de-vitalises the nation, which is against our economic interests. Our approach in the past has been, lest that they may take advantage of the changes that have taken place, the whole basis of our non-alignment policy has been, if we want security, if we want assistance, we will take it from all sides in order to strengthen ourselves; one party may not be willing to give aid against China, another party may not be willing to give aid against Pakistan, but at no time could we disclose the lines of our security, any more than we have done so far.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of this House to a grave news that has appeared in the Indian press today. It is reported in the *Hindustan Times* that the Seventh Fleet of the United States has entered the Indian Ocean secretly. We are already facing tension and threat from countries like China and Pakistan on our land frontiers. Are we to face again another threat and tension on our sea frontier also? Our government's position on the question of the Seventh Fleet entering the Indian Ocean has not been in line with the other non-aligned countries. At least now, at this juncture, when the Seventh Fleet of the United States has entered the Indian Ocean secretly, we wish that our Prime Minister makes a forthright declaration that we disapprove of this move of the United States, because it is prejudicial to the interests and independence of our country.

13.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I take this opportunity to raise certain problems with regard to the State of Pondicherry arising out of

our responsibility. We have approved of huge grants for the development of Pondicherry. We have conferred the status of a 'C' State for the development of democracy in Pondicherry State. As such, this House has a responsibility to see that the demands granted in respect of Pondicherry are not squandered away and the new powers conferred are not misused. And yet it is corruption, nepotism and disarming officialdom from the discharge of their duties that are rampant in the State on a big scale.

We are making substantial allotments to help people belonging to middle income group to build houses in that State. Recently, a lady whose family possessed huge properties and who owned a house of her own, applied for a loan for building a house under the middle income group housing scheme. The department concerned approved and sanctioned a loan of Rs. 20,000 under the middle income group housing scheme and Rs. 5,000 from the house building society. Why did the departmental officials approve of the loan of Rs. 25,000, knowing full well that she comes from a rich family and is owning a house? They sanctioned it against their own conscience because the lady was the wife of the present Minister of Co-operatives in the Pondicherry State. We have recently come across cases of metamorphosis of males becoming females and females becoming males. But the State of Pondicherry is providing us with a case of metamorphosis where a Minister's wife becomes converted to middle income group and the low income group. It is quite strange.

A year and a half back, a gentleman owning property worth Rs. 7 lakhs to 8 lakhs was granted a loan of Rs. 15,000 to purchase a tractor. To this day, the tractor has not been purchased but the money had been spent otherwise. While summary proceedings and attachment have become the order of the day against the ordinary peasants in our land why is it that

the officer concerned dare not take any action for recovery against this particular person? It is because the person involved happens to be the brother of the Minister for Community Development and Agriculture in Pondicherry State.

The State Government have granted a licence for alcohol for the manufacture of varnish to a paint factory owner in Pondicherry. Recently, he misused the permit for procuring 4,000 gallons of alcohol from Anakapalli and sent it straight to Maharashtra State instead of using it inside Pondicherry. As per rules, export licence can be granted by the State Government only on production of import licence from Maharashtra State. In this case, the department not only permitted the person to misuse the alcohol licences but also obliged him by going out of the way to issue an export licence even without the production of Maharashtra State import licence. Why did the officer not dare resist this move? Because, the person who misused the licence in this instant case is the son of the Minister of Revenue under whom these very officials are working.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir on a point of order. I think my colleague must have quorum in this House to hear him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The bell is being rung. . . . Now there is quorum. He may continue his speech.

Shri Umanath: There is unheard of nepotism and favouritism corroding the administration of Pondicherry. Recently, a gentleman was appointed as UDC in the Pondicherry administration. Within three months of his appointment, this UDC was suddenly lifted as a Superintendent of the Cabinet, next only to the Under Secretary. Any day, he may become an Under Secretary. He had no qualifications whatsoever required for the post and a number of senior officers were overlooked to favour this UDC within three months of service. Why?

Because, his only qualification was that he was the son of the Chief Minister of Pondicherry State. He had no other qualifications whatsoever for that.

Shri Nath Pai: Very serious matters.

Shri Umanath: This House granted the Demands and conferred 'C' State status so that the people of Pondicherry may benefit, but we see that the funds are being collectively looted by the Cabinet and the wives, sons and daughters of Ministers. As we owe a responsibility to the people of Pondicherry, I demand a top-level enquiry commission to go into the conduct of the Ministers of Pondicherry.

Another major field of corruption and of nepotism is the system of Ministers becoming Chairmen of municipal councils, directors of co-operative societies and even trustees of temples. This is not only a field of extensive loot of the funds of these institutions by the Ministers and their friends, but it keeps the departmental officials from taking any action against any of these erring institutions, since the Ministers themselves are on the administrative boards.

Recently, the Pondicherry Municipal Administration auctioned the right to collect parking dues from buses to a lower bidder to the detriment of the public revenues, just to oblige a favourite. On appeal by the highest bidder, the High Court of Madras held as follows:

"In the instant case, we are fully satisfied that if the petitioner had not been improperly excluded from the auction at that stage, the bid would have gone far higher and that there has been a detriment to the public revenues by the exclusion of the petitioner at a stage which was not a final stage of the auction."

After the decision of the High Court the department dare not take any action against the person who

[Shri Umanath]

conducted this auction because the Mayor himself conducted the auction. And who is the Mayor? The Mayor is the Chief Minister of Pondicherry State. How can the Department dare take any action against the Chief Minister? Many Ministers including the Chief Minister being Mayors, directors of co-operative societies and temple trustees not only disarm the departmental officials from discharging their duties but also pull down the prestige of the government itself. The Government must intervene in this situation and rectify the position.

A violent campaign of hatred against everything Indian is going on inside Pondicherry. I want to draw the attention of the House to this. It is such a serious matter. It is directed against the Indian Constitution, the Indian laws and Indian jurisprudence. This campaign of hatred is being led by the Chief Minister of Pondicherry himself through the press, platform and the State Assembly. The Chief Minister's visit to Mahe last month was used by him to launch a powerful attack against our Constitution. The Special Correspondent of *Mathrubhumi* reported the Chief Minister as saying in its issue dated the 5th March, 1964—

“He was against the introduction of the Indian Penal Code and other Indian Laws in our Territory.”

Shri Nath Pai: Our territory?

Shri Umanath: Yes; that is what the *Mathrubhumi* correspondent wrote.

“Still now he is against it. He is of firm opinion that the French Constitution and French laws are better than the Indian Constitution and Indian laws. Therefore, he is against the introduction in Pondicherry State of any Indian law.”

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Disloyalty.

Shri Umanath: Is this not an open attempt to keep Pondicherry out of the Constitution even after its liberation?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mere treason.

Shri Umanath: Is this not an attempt to blackmail this House from further extending Indian laws into Pondicherry? Is this not incitement of the people against the Indian laws already extended, with a view to sabotage them?

The Chief Minister overstepped the bounds of law, morals and decency when he referred to our Rashtrapati by name, and abused him with unutterable words, in a closed door meeting of the Government servants in November 1963.

Dr. Ranen Sen (Calcutta East): He should be arrested under the DIR.

Shri Nath Pai: These are matters which are treasonable and, I hope, we will get sufficient reply to this and it will not be slurred over by giving us lectures about non-alignment, if what the hon. Member is saying is true. It is a question of the constitutional sanctity of the country. I hope, you will direct the Minister to give proper reply. We do not want homilies, lectures and lessons about non-alignment.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I hope, it will be conveyed to the Prime Minister and the Minister without Portfolio.

Shri Umanath: The Rashtrapati was accused of being instrumental in extending the laws and then abused. I want to know whether this House is going to tolerate this treachery and treason of a French agent on Indian soil. I demand that a special enquiry be instituted into the anti-Indian activities of the Chief Minister of Pondicherry.

A major question is regarding the necessity to extend the Bar Councils

Act and Advocates Act to Pondicherry State which would permit lawyers from other States to appear in Pondicherry courts. This House was told by the Minister of State for External Affairs the other day, that the Pondicherry Government opposed the move on the grounds that the lawyers in Pondicherry were capable of administering Indian laws. She also added that she was not competent to say whether the Pondicherry lawyers were capable of administering Indian laws. It is not denied that lawyers in Pondicherry had their schooling only in French laws and are never acquainted with Indian laws. More than 200 Indian laws have recently been extended so far to Pondicherry. Does it require any competence to see that lawyers who do not know the law cannot protect the interests of our citizens in Pondicherry? Does it require any competence on the part of the Minister?

I am raising the demand for extension of Advocates Act not with a view to defend the right of Madras lawyers to practise in Pondicherry. I am raising it from the angle of the right of the citizens in Pondicherry themselves. When millions of citizens in other parts of the country could enjoy the right of having a lawyer of their own choice from any part of the country. Why should the citizens of Pondicherry living under the same Constitution be denied the right even to engage a lawyer knowing the law under which one is accused or charged? Why should he alone be compelled to a panel of lawyers who do not know the law?

The Chief Minister's opposition arises out of his anti-Indian bias. The State Government anticipates that the non-availability of lawyers who know the law, would result in failure of justice to the citizens, which in its turn would rouse their anger against the Indian law itself and that would provide them the necessary mass sanction for the withdrawal of Indian laws. When the opposition of the State Government lacks factual basis

and when it is projected for unfair purposes, is it not the duty of the Government of India to use their power under the Concurrent List and protect the citizens in Pondicherry by extending the Advocates Act?

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the continued operation of a French fascist law in Pondicherry, even after liberation. While our Constitution confers the right to hold meetings and processions, with reasonable restrictions imposed during certain temporary periods, the French law of 1935 permanently prohibits meetings and processions unless particularly and on each occasion permitted. This law was promulgated in 1935 by Laval on dissolution of parliamentary institutions with a view to suppress, anti-fascist movement. This law was extended to Pondicherry when the liberation struggle began in August 1947. The first act of the Pondicherry Government, on our conferring the Part 'C' State status on it, was to use this French fascist law to prevent the celebration of the Martyrs' Day on 30th July 1963, in memory of the martyrs who fell to French bullets in 1936, a day that was celebrated every year ever since 1936 and, to associate with which sentiment, our Prime Minister visited Pondicherry once. This House should demand of this Government to abolish this French law which permits victimisation of our martyrs in their graves.

Parliamentary institutions in Pondicherry which are the creations of our Constitution stand the threat of assault. Enraged by the fact that the legislative set-up recently conferred by us, permitted the elected representatives to expose corruption and nepotism, a hooligan assault was organised by the Chief Minister and his party at the entrance to the Assembly, to terrorise the Opposition from exercising its right to move a motion of 'No confidence'. The circular letter of the Chief Minister's party calling upon his followers to come to the Assembly gates on the day the 'No

[Shri Umanath]

confidence' motion was moved, *inter alia* reads:—

"A group of traitors seated as opposition in the Assembly are going to introduce a 'No confidence' motion against our Chief Minister's Cabinet. Let us treat this day, 18th March 1964, as the day of pledge to liquidate every person with Communist leanings in any part of this State."

As per this circular hooligans were brought to the Assembly gate and an assault on the Opposition members was organised in the presence of the Deputy Superintendent of Police on the 18th March, 1964. The next day the Leader of the Opposition, Shri V. Subbiah and his wife who is also an MLA, were attacked and abused as they stepped out of the Assembly. Law and order having broken down, the entire Opposition refrained from attending the Assembly since then. That position continues.

Sir, in a book written in 1951 entitled *Problem of French India*, the Foreign Secretary of the Indian National Congress described the group of henchmen of French imperialists as follows—

"This group",

namely, the group of henchmen of the French imperialists—

"This group is led by Messrs Goubert and Muthu Pillai who are party bosses par excellence. Goondas are their mainstay. With the aid of money and liquor they can work wonders in Pondicherry."

This is the Congress Secretary writing. Again, on how the Assembly was conducted by them, the author wrote:—

"Mr. Goubert completely dominated the Assembly and got a set of resolutions approved by

the ignorant and nervous members in the correct Hitlerian style."

That was written by the Congress Secretary. It is the same Mr. Goubert that is heading the Government even now, today. This explains the corruption, nepotism, anti-Indian campaign and breakdown of law and order in Pondicherry State.

Shri Nath Pai: Only in Pondicherry? What about Delhi?

Shri Umanath: I am referring to Pondicherry now. The All India Congress, knowing the anti-national nature of this pro-French group has made alliance with them to avert the Communists coming to power through elections.

Shri Nath Pai: That may be a good idea.

Shri Umanath: Concession after concession to this pro-French group is leading to stepping up of anti-Indian activities in Pondicherry State. I wish to warn that if Government of India does not put a stop to this policy of acquiescence and intervene timely, thousands of patriotic masses who revolted against the French rule then, will lead a popular movement in Pondicherry, in defence of civil liberties, against corruption and nepotism, and for their right to function in the legislature under our Constitution.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I heard with great attention the speech of our ex-Defence Minister. Since 1952 I have not seen eye to eye with him. I have always been a critic of his actions, even when he was our High Commissioner in Great Britain. I would have easily swallowed all the words that he had used and perhaps I would have supported the views that he has expressed about Kashmir—I hold practically the same views which he expressed—but coming from him they do not carry conviction. What did he

do as a Defence Minister? He allowed Ladakh and NEFA to pass out of our hands? It is good that, after all, wisdom has dawned upon him.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Too late.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: But whether they will carry conviction with his old friends is a question. We have been crying hoarse for a number of years. I personally opposed the release of Sheikh Abdullah and I could foresee what Sheikh Abdullah has been talking today. But our cry has been a cry in the wilderness. Sheikh Abdullah had the guts and the cheek to make an utterance about Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee that he did not know either about the illness or the death of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee till very late after he actually died. It is a shame and a disgrace for that gentleman to say this, because I know personally—I was present on that occasion—and several times I had contacted Sheikh Abdullah on phone, not personally, and every time Sheikh Abdullah refused to have any access to Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee or to render any help to him whatsoever in the nature of any treatment. He stood firmly against any proper treatment being given to Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee and when he died, this callous gentleman did not come down even to see his body off. Even when the body was being taken on to the aeroplane, he stood aside about ten yards away till Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad called him and said: "जेव्हा साहब, अब तो आदमी मर गया है, कंधा तो लगा दो"।

It is this gentleman who has now the guts to say that he did not know about the death of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee and he wanted an inquiry to be held. He does not remember his own words that he had uttered 11 years back. It is this man whom we have released, it is this man whom we have discharged from prison and it is this man whom we are now letting loose for doing actions that he

wants to do. It is the policy of some blind people.

Sir, I agree that Kashmir is our internal affair. It has nothing to do with the international politics. We are unnecessarily giving it the shape of international policy and of foreign policy. We should certainly guard against it. It is because of our own doing that the thing has been taken to the United Nations. It would have been better for us that instead of releasing Sheikh Abdullah, we could have withdrawn the case from the United Nations. But we have not done that.

Now, the question comes before us: what is our foreign policy? A long lecture has been delivered. Some people have thought it is a question of non-alignment, it is a question of alignment. I say: is it a policy? Have we got a policy? We have no policy. There is bankruptcy of policy. There is absolutely no policy that we have been able to pursue so far. Where is the question of non-alignment? Are we non-aligned? Can we analyse our actions? Are we non-aligned? What happened when Hungary was raped? Did we raise our voice as non-aligned people or as neutrals? We did not do it. What happened when Suez was attacked? We immediately attacked the United Kingdom. What for? Were we non-aligned or were we merely suffering from some sort of a fear complex? What happened to Israel? Why is it that even today we have not been having diplomatic relations with Israel? Are we afraid of somebody? Is it a policy of fear complex about other nations? We feel as if all others are very big and powerful nations and we are the weakest nation in the world. Is that the policy of non-alignment or is it a policy of fear complex that has taken roots with us? Were we non-aligned when Tibet was raped, when genocide was committed? We allowed genocide in Tibet notwithstanding the fact that we had the treaty with Tibet. Tibet had a different nationality, a different

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

nation in itself. Tibetans had nothing in common with the Chinese and yet we allowed the Tibetans to be destroyed. Why? It is because we did not want to displease a great big brother of whom we ourselves were afraid! China realised it immediately. The moment we did not open our mouth, she understood, "Here is another fellow who is afraid of us." It is this which has brought about misery for us. What did we do? Nothing.

Then, the question of Malaysia came. We have got very friendly relations with Malaysia. It is a small country, it is a small nation, and yet the lion-hearted Tunku Abdul Rehman who came here had the guts to say, "What Pakistan does is not approved by us" and he gave expression to his own thoughts. And where are we? We simply recognised Malaysia. But we had no words to condemn Indonesia. Why? Why are we afraid of Indonesia? If we are non-aligned, then let us be lion-hearted enough to say in this world what is truth and what is not. We have got a motto. 'सत्यमेव जयते' But do we respect it? Have we got the guts to say it? It is the lack of guts which has brought us into this present position where isolation is full and complete. India is not liked by anybody. India is looked down upon by each and every nation. In Burma we are not respected; in Thailand we are not respected; in Kenya we are kicked out; in Zanzibar we are kicked out; from Ceylon we are kicked out and in South Africa we are treated worse than untouchables and unapproachables.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We are not liked by anybody. It is in this position that we find ourselves and we want to claim to be a great nation. What is wrong with us? Can we not appreciate this position? The only thing that we are hankering for is

certificates. Whose certificates do we want? Do we want the certificates of the Arabs, or do we want the certificates of the United Kingdom, or do we want the certificates of the United States of America, or do we want the certificates of the U.S.S.R? Whose certificates do we want? We do not want the certificates of our own people. Our own people are not going to certify us to be very good and competent persons. The certificates coming from others calling us goody-goody are not going to help us. The country is today being looked upon as being very small in the eyes of the whole world. We say here, we can depend upon the veto of Russia not to allow the motions of Pakistan to be carried. We thought that Russia was a great friend of ours. Nobody is a friend of the weak man. It is only rarely that a brave man comes round and says, "I am your friend." Everybody in this world wants to be a friend of the strong. Looking at the growing importance of China, not trying to create trouble with China and trying to keep friendship with China, who went on supplying all the arms and ammunitions that were necessary to China? From where did all the petrol come? We were not only stabbed by those persons whom we could call as friends but we were also stabbed by the friends in the Commonwealth. I was very recently studying the figures of international trade between Commonwealth countries themselves and when I looked at the figures of supply of petrol and petroleum products to Hong Kong, it pained my eyes. Huge quantities of petrol was supplied during 1962-63 to Hong Kong. What for? Even if people in Hong Kong were consuming 10 gallons of petrol every day, each one of them, even then they would not have consumed that much petrol. Where did the petrol go? All the petrol went to China. Still, we never approached the United Kingdom to do anything in this regard. We are one of the countries in the Commonwealth, and yet we could

not prevent the U.K. from acting in this manner. What type of friendship have we got?

14 hrs.

I was surprised at the way in which Shri Krishna Menon suggested that mere publicity would not do. I say that publicity is the most essential thing in this world today. You cannot give it up, and you cannot afford to give it up. It is this entire lack of publicity which has brought us into the present condition in which we find ourselves. Why has this publicity not been done?

Each one of us in this Parliament may not see eye to eye with the Congress Party, but we are second to none in our patriotism; we are not lacking in patriotism. Why is no use being made of eminent Opposition Members for carrying on patriotic activities for India in the foreign countries?

I do not want to criticise anyone, but still I cannot refrain from saying this. Why are people sent out to foreign countries, who do not know when Vatsyayana was born, and who do not know whether Shankaracharya existed? It is from these people that we suffer greater and greater damage to our cause and we suffer greater and greater agony than we should. God save us from these friends who are being sent out to carry on propaganda for us!

As regards the policy that has been followed so far, on one fine morning, some correspondent writes that it is the best policy, this policy of non-alignment has achieved marvellous success and so on. I do not know where that success is. Where is it noticeable, and how is it noticeable?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In the imagination.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Is there anything tangible that we have achieved as a result of this foreign policy?

Here was another friend who was talking only and entirely about Pondicherry. He might be justified in talking about Pondicherry. But he opened his remarks by saying that the Seventh Fleet had come to the Indian Ocean and had been holding exercises. What is wrong with the Seventh Fleet holding exercises? The wrong only happens when we mortgage our ideas and we pledge our ideas to the others, and when one thinks in terms of some Fatherland sending some messages here. It is in the Fatherland sending some messages here which are then translated into this country that there is greater difficulty than in the Seventh Fleet having exercises here. Who are those fathers who are sending those messages? I say, Sir, that we have depended too much upon them. It is because of their working that we have a lobby which is called the China lobby in our own place. What is this China lobby? How does it exist in our country? Then, we have this French lobby today being disclosed as existing in Pondicherry. What is this thing happening in our country? We have also had a Pakistan lobby all along. In this House, speeches are being delivered in favour of Pakistan, and yet we are not doing anything to check these things.

Again, in regard to Goa, why have we kept Goa, Daman and Diu as separate? Why have we kept Pondicherry, Mahe, Karaikkal, Yanam etc. separate? Why have they been kept separate like this? I cannot understand this. If Chandernagore could come in and could form an integral part of India, what prevents all these territories from becoming part and parcel of Tamil Nad or of Maharashtra or of any other State as the case may be according to their location? What prevents those areas from being integrated fully and wholly?

When Ajmer was separate from Rajasthan, I remember there was a Member here from Ajmer, by name Shri Jwala Prasad, if I remember his name aright, who had the audacity to

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

suggest here that the culture of Ajmer was different from the culture of Rajasthan. I then represented Rajasthan, and I could not brook that kind of thing. Today, we are being told that the culture of Pondicherry is different, the culture of Goa is different, the culture of Daman is different, and the culture of about 20 people living in Diu is different, and we swallow it. It is this policy that is creating trouble for us.

Thousands and thousands of Hindus have been killed, but we are afraid to call them Hindus, and we are only prepared to call them as minorities. We are not able to use even our normal language also. We are afraid of using normal language. We are giving the liberty to Sheikh Abdullah to do what he likes and create a moratorium on our thinking. How can things be going on like this? What for have we invited the Home Minister of Pakistan here? To talk about what? The first thing that the Home Minister of Pakistan wants to talk about is 'Do not drive out 28 lakhs of Muslims who have entered India'. Subversion is being carried out in our country by these people, and yet we are not able to challenge it, and we are not able to control it. What type of foreign policy have we got?

I come again to this proposition, and I do assert, that we have got no foreign policy. We have no policy at all. We have no brains, and we cannot follow any policy at all. The only policy that we follow is the policy of a coward afraid of a goonda. That is the only consistent policy that we have followed. We have bowed before whosoever has shown goondalism, and we have always kicked our own people who have been docile. We have got a saying in Gujarati that:

“नबलो माटी रांड पर शूरो”

If a husband cannot go and do the beating outside, he comes and beats his wife. This is what is happening in our country. Our men are put behind the bars under the Defence of

India Rules for even talking something, for even giving expression to their views. We are not even allowed to express our full thoughts in this country. And then we are being told that our foreign policy has succeeded? In what way has this foreign policy succeeded? Has this policy at all succeeded? If at all it has succeeded, it has succeeded in bringing a bad name to us all over.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Disgrace.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is this very shameful aspect that is being presented to us in this respect.

Why should we not have more cordial relations with those with whom our ways of thinking on democratic lines are not in conflict? But it is a strange policy that we are following. We do not know the countries which are really democratic in the same sense in which our country is democratic. Those countries do not call themselves democratic. They are satisfied that they are democrats. But let us look at the Democratic Republic of Germany or the Democratic Republic of something else or the Democratic Republic of some third country; it is these democracies that are creating troubles for us.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: So-called democracy.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: They are not democrats and that is why they want to add this epithet or adjective or attribute to their names, and they think that otherwise nobody would call them by that name; they want to call themselves as democrats by adding this adjective to their names. We are also in that muddle. We have not realised ourselves whither we are going, and we are leading our nation into a pitfall, a very serious pitfall, at that. From the mire into which we have put ourselves it will be very difficult to extricate ourselves.

We allow the aeroplanes of other nations to fly over our territory. We are always big brothers. Even if China wants to fly over our territory, even if Mr. Chou En-lai wants to fly over our territory, we say 'All right, let him go'. But what is happening where our trade is being affected from Afghanistan and goods are not being allowed to be brought across Pakistan into our country? They say 'We shall not allow your goods to be brought across our territory'. For how long is this to go on? And yet we are big brothers, and we say 'Take away as much coal as you want from us; take away as much water as you want from us, and do not pay for it; take away our Rs. 55 crores' and so on. What is all this? When are we going to open our eyes in our own self-interest and in the interests of our self-preservation?

It is most essential that some particular type of alignment—not alignment in the context of non-alignment versus alignment—of our policy itself must take place, and that alignment must be the alignment of a brave man and it must not be the alignment of a coward; it must be the alignment of a man with vision, and it must not be the alignment of a blind man; the alignment that I am thinking of must be the alignment of a prudent politician, and must not be the alignment of an ignoramus. It is the lack of this proper alignment of our policy which has brought our country to this present unenviable position in which we find ourselves where there is nobody to come to our help and we have to run up all the time.

Even in the United Nations, our words do not count. Every time Pakistan rushes up and wants to have a meeting of the Security Council and to raise a discussion there. But here we are making applications saying 'My Lord, grant an adjournment'. What is this position? Why are we seeking this adjournment? Can we not ask: Come on, close the chapter of all that has been going on? Sir,

it is a shame and a disgrace for our country that our case has not been put forward in the proper manner in which it should be put. What has happened today? For the last two days, those who are reading papers know about the publicity that has been given to what Sheikh Abdullah is uttering and how we are being put into traps. Nobody remembers that. Nobody wants to remember that. You know, mass memory is always very weak and mass memory requires reiteration over and over again and that reiteration must come from a very solid source. We should not merely close our mouth. We should not merely say, let the caravan go and let the dogs bark. That will not do. The dogs have done great deal of barking and it is their voice which is being heard and nobody knows whether the caravan exists or not.

It is high time, Sir, that the Foreign Ministry should take into confidence all the opposition members, and at least those who have got no extra-territorial affinity. At least they should be taken into confidence. In the interests of this country, in the interests of our nation, India, every effort should be made to see that proper and rigid propaganda is carried on to expose the game of Pakistan. Pakistan has adopted this one single policy to preserve its dictatorship, a country which wanted to have a democratic set-up from 1947 and which till today has not even got the adult franchise. It is this country which has developed a hatred-mania for us. Nothing else comes out of their mouths. They have developed this hatred policy about India and the sooner we expose these things the better it will be for us. I agree with Shri Krishna Menon in this respect. I welcome the words which he uttered for the first time today that Pakistan is not one; China is not another; but China and Pakistan are one and both are our enemies, both are our great enemies, and that these enemies must be fought completely on all the fronts.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the very outset I would like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for the way in which he has presided not just over the destinies of this country, but over the Ministry of External Affairs for the last seventeen years. He has given a lead, not only to this country, but to the whole world for peace and disarmament. I also want to congratulate him that he has secured the services of the Minister without Portfolio to shoulder his heavy burden. The hon. Minister without Portfolio has been the little dynamo of our party, and wherever he has been fixed he has given energy to the administration.

Sir, much has been said here about non-alignment. Therefore, I have no intention to add anything to it. But I can say this much that last year when this House discussed this demand there were many doubting Thomases here and even this morning our esteemed friend Acharya Kripalani pointed out that we should try to get more aid from the United States of America and from the United Kingdom. But we know it very well that at the time when the Chinese attacked us and many of us got unnerved, we started looking towards the United States of America and the United Kingdom. We found that not much aid was given to us. Instead of giving us aid they tried to see that we should present Kashmir on a plate to Pakistan. Instead of giving us aid, they tried to interfere in our affairs. At the same time we found that there have been certain other countries which have given us massive economic aid. We have also found that the gallant Republic of Czechoslovakia stood by us in the Security Council while the British delegation opposed us. We have also found that Mr. Khrushchev supported our stand on Kashmir as well as on China.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : दो में से किसी एक के साथ ही मिल जाइये ।

अगर अमरीका खराब है तो दुमरे के साथ ही मिल जाइये ।

Shri Ansar Harvani: I consider it my duty to express my gratitude to these countries. Something has been said about Pakistan. Unfortunately, after seventeen years of freedom, this country has not understood the complex of Pakistan. We should know that Pakistan was created on hatred of India. We should know that after 17 years of freedom, Pakistan till today has not achieved nationhood. A nation is made of the different things, namely, common history, common culture, common language, common interest, etc. But I want to know here and now as to what is the thing that is common between East Pakistan and West Pakistan. The only thing that is common between East Pakistan and West Pakistan is hatred of India. The moment they reconcile to India, the moment they enter into a friendship with India, their nation would break and there will be dismemberment of East and West Pakistan. East Pakistan will go on one side and West Pakistan will go on the other side. Therefore, Sir, I pointed out that even if we present Kashmir on a plate to Pakistan the problem between India and Pakistan will not be solved. I assure you, Sir, the moment we present Kashmir to them, they will start demanding a corridor between East and West Pakistan. Those of us who feel that all the questions between India and Pakistan can be settled on the basis of Kashmir question are living in delusion; they do not know about the nature of Pakistan. At the same time we should understand another thing. There is great difference between the people and the rulers of Pakistan. The people of Pakistan are our brothers; the people of Pakistan are our sisters; they have our culture, they have got our traditions and our history. But today the people of Pakistan are groaning under militarist regime. There is no freedom. We hang our heads in shame, the entire world hangs its head in

shame, at the way in which they have treated the minorities in East Pakistan. But at the same time we should understand it very well that they have not only ill-treated the minorities in East Pakistan. We have been talking about it and these days we are talking loudly about it. I do not resent it. But, at the same time, have the politicians of this country, has this Parliament, have the people of this country, ever thought of the atrocities that were committed, that are being committed on the Pathans in the Frontier Province which we call Paktoonistan? Do you know it, or do you not know it, that day in and day out Pathans are being bombarded with the aid of American-gifted bombers which have been given to Pakistan?

Their villages have been bombarded by Pakistan. We know it very well that that great soldier, that valiant soldier of Indian freedom, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan has been persecuted. Have we ever thought of the suffering of the people in Baluchistan and Kalat, where people have been tortured, where people have been murdered, where people have been hanged? We never thought of it. After seventeen years of freedom in India, Pakistan considers that we still live in the days of Jinnah. We are two countries. We have two different systems. Here is a country with adult franchise. Here is a country led by one of the greatest democrats that history has ever produced, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. In Pakistan there is military dictatorship and a mule captain is keeping the people under his iron heel. Therefore, we should not equate India with Pakistan. We should not equate the question of Hindu minorities and Muslim minorities in the two countries.

Let us send our greetings to all the Hindus of East Pakistan and all the Pathans of West Pakistan who are fighting for their independence and for the liberation of their country. I know it very well, the day is not far

off for them to end this regime and there will be two independent States, East Pakistan and West Pakistan.

There are many things which cannot be talked on the floor of the House, but I will make a suggestion to the Prime Minister and to the Ministry of External Affairs, that they have got to do something to give support to the forces of liberation which are arising in Pakistan. We have not made any contact, of course. These are things not to be discussed on the floor of the House. We have not made any contact with the people who are fighting for Paktoonistan. We have not made any contact with the people of Baluchistan. We have not given any help to the people in Dacca who were rising. I assure you, Sir, if these communal riots had not taken place in Khulna and Dacca the people of Khulna and the people of Dacca would have overthrown this regime.

Therefore, the time has come when some sort of apparatus or machinery has got to be created which may organise the help and support to the resistance movement in Pakistan. I remember the days when Prime Minister, accompanied by his close associate, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, stood on the ashes of Barcelona and sympathised with the Spaniards who were saving their republic. I still remember the days when the rising took place the Prime Minister gave his full support to the Czechoslovakian people. If we can sympathise with the great republic of Spain and Czechoslovakia why cannot we sympathise with the people who are fighting for their freedom in Pakistan?

If we could sympathise with the Spanish Republic, which was disintegrated, I do not know why we should not sympathise with the people of a nearby country who are fighting for their freedom and independence. If we do that, the military regime there will be overthrown by the people of Pakistan themselves. This much about our policy.

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

Now I want to say something about our external publicity. Last time, when external publicity was criticised here, our Prime Minister had remarked that it is not a question of the publicity that we give but it is a question of the publicity which is received by the country concerned. In this connection, I would like to point out one fact. It is not only the publicity that we give that should be taken into account but the publicity that is given by somebody. Our ambassadors—who are they. They are *bara sahebs*. Today in Afro-Asian countries, the complaint is being made by China that we are British stooges. The people who were brought up as British stooges, the people who themselves have been British stooges, the people who sold themselves to the Indian Civil Service for Rs. 450 in 1928, when Bhagat Singh was hanged, the people who as magistrates tried patriots in 1932 and 1933 when we were fighting for our freedom, when such people are in charge of our missions abroad, this propaganda goes home, and they really believe that we are British stooges.

Therefore, a new set of ambassadors should be sent, people who are patriotic, people who have got a patriotic background, who have got that impact of the Indian national movement on them so that our publicity may be effective.

With these words, I support the Demands.

Shri Manoharan (Madras South): While discussing the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, this House has the opportunity to assess the working mechanism of our foreign policy and the administrative **set-up** of our External Affairs. I stand here with a sense of frustration and a deep sense of sorrow and anguish. I think our country is facing a crisis today. We are facing a zero hour in the political life of our country. As has been rightly pointed out by my esteemed,

Shri Nath Pai, yesterday and endorsed by my esteemed friend, Shri Varma, and correctly embellished by Acharya Kripalani this morning, we are losing steadily friends abroad. The Afro-Asian countries who had turned to India for inspiration and guidance in the past, are turning away from India. Every nation does view us with suspicion. Our integrity is questioned and our sincerity doubted. Our so-called political diplomacy is at stake, and what is more, our security is placed in jeopardy.

We are talking about foreign policy and its success. I am convinced that we have got enough people who are noted for their intellectual calibre to say something or to write an essay on non-alignment. But I request all of them to have a correct appraisal of the foreign policy of the Government of India which is pursued today. I think ours is a foreign policy which is a terrific flop.

I can summarise the weakness of our foreign policy like this: belated thinking, delayed tactics, sluggish and conservative approach, lethargic attitude and fantastic satisfaction are in toto the reflection of our foreign policy. I am very sorry to suggest that the projection of our country's image abroad is blurred and the international reputation which India has had in the past is dwindling to the point of extinction. I must equally say that the image of our Prime Minister, which once inspired courage and confidence in the minds of millions and millions of our people, is failing. With all respect to the Prime Minister, it is time that the External Affairs Ministry was separated from the Prime Minister, who is, I think, more or less like a charming beautiful lady with all obvious weaknesses, and handed over to somebody who is fit for the job and has a masculine bent.

Soon after the Chinese aggression, we all know how things were con-

ducted by our External Affairs Ministry. The Chinese aggression, if it is a state of mind, continues along with that emergency also. The worst political scoundrel internationally today is China. The cut-throat barbarian stock is at Peking. The crudest vile enemy of humanity is the Chinese empire. Therefore, anybody or any association or any political party in India which subscribes to the Chinese view or ideologically favours China should be declared a criminal number one and should be shunned from our society.

It is political chicanery on the part of the Government of India in still having diplomatic relations with China, which is the arch enemy of democracy. When we suggest that diplomatic relations with China should be cut off, we are reminded by the Rip Van Winkle at Delhi of modern diplomacy. I do not know whether in modern diplomacy one tries to compromise the self-respect of one's country.

In this connection, I feel it my duty to draw the attention of the House to the stupidity of the Government of India in permitting two missions to function in Delhi, one that of North Viet Nam and the other of North Korea. It goes without saying that to allow the Chinese, with whom we waged a bitter war only two years ago, to have representation in our country is to give a veneer of respectability to those would be world conquerers and this would be a mockery and a tragic error. How much more degrading to have dealings with the weak and ugly accomplices of the criminal than with the criminal himself? How much the error is compounded?

The Government of India's weakness, her blindness in continuing to allow such representations to exist, whose primary aim, present and future, is to increase tension and promote misunderstanding between the two principals, is inexcusable.

It seems unnecessary to point out how close the two nations of North Korea and North Viet Nam are to our declared enemy across the border. They are merely extensions of the long arm of Communist China. To prove the minds of these two countries and their declared scorn and hostility towards India, one had only to tune to the Pyongyang Radio broadcast on November 22 after the Chinese aggression. With your permission, I would quote from it:

"Rejecting the sincere efforts of China for a peaceful settlement in viewing such efforts as a sign of weakness, the Indian reactionary ruling circles have steadily encroached upon Chinese territory along the entire border in the recent years. Lately, they have been begging for arms aid from the United States and other western imperialist powers while stirring up further anti-China war hysteria at home. All this shows beyond any shadow of doubt that the reactionary Indian ruling circles have now become the complete lackeys of US imperialism."

There is another piece from the Hanoi Radio, that is in North Viet Nam:

"Indian authorities have departed from the policy of peace and neutrality and tied India closely to the aggressive war chariot of the US and British imperialists, turning India into a military ally of the US and Britain. By following this path, the Indian authorities have gone ever further on the path of militarising India, creating disturbances in the Sino-Indian border area and turning down the offer of direct negotiations to settle the boundary dispute."

Sir, I have got a copy of another news-sheet, the People's Korea, where in there has appeared another remark:

"The Government of the Chinese People's Republic has made consistently every sincere effort for

[Shri Manoharan]

the peaceful solution of this pending question. However, the Indian Government has turned down the reasonable and fair proposals of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic for averting conflict on the border line, stuck to armed conflict and finally of late created a grave situation in the Sino-Indian border area by launching a large-scale all-out attack."

I want to know the Government's reaction regarding these remarks, as they are attacking the very basis of the approach of the Government of India to the border problem, and are questioning the very *bona fides* of the Government of India and the sincerity of the attempts of the Government of India. Both countries have made clear their full support of the just stand of the Chinese People's Republic. Both have called on the voice of their various people's organisations to protest against the Indian expansionist and war-monger friends to support the sincere efforts of the Chinese and to express hope that the Indian side will respond to the praiseworthy and patient efforts of the Chinese People's Republic. What does our present Government do about such insolence? I am afraid she sticks her head in the sand and ignores it. What is worse, I strongly feel, she actually encourages it by allowing the sources of such nonsense a foothold on her own land.

Sir, one example will prove the treacherous attitude of these two missions, North Korea and North Vietnam. As a result of the Chinese aggression, the trade between North Korea and India dropped from Indian exports worth Rs. 34.8 lakhs and North Korean imports worth Rs. 35.2 lakhs in 1962-63 to a mere Rs. 60,000 in the period of April-October, 1963.

The State Trading Corporation, I am reliably told, is negotiating with North Korea. The S.T.C will not trade any goods with Koreans that might have

any strategic value. I am astonished to hear how the Government of India is going to reverse its silent policy adopted after the Chinese invasion not to trade with the allies of the enemy. In this connection, I want to caution the Government that any item that North Korea and North Vietnam seem eager to get in trade from India should be treated by the Government of India as a strategic item.

Sir, I want to get a categorical assurance from the Government of India whether they believe that India is immune from spying activities. Is India protected in some magic way from those who would sow the seeds of rebellion and discord? India is fully as vulnerable to subversive attacks and to the furtive fact-gathering of spies as is any other country. In fact, in this regard India may be more so, since she fails to recognise the enemy and even encourages his presence in her midst. I request the Government of India to limit the number of subversive individuals coming into India under the guise of communist trade and cultural delegations, no matter whether they are from Moscow or Peking infected territories.

The next important point to which I would like to draw the attention of the House and on which I want to make some observations is the issue of Indian residents in Ceylon. This issue has been hanging fire for a long time. This problem has assumed a dangerous dimension and the life and security of the Indian nationals in Ceylon are in great danger.

There are about 10 lakhs of Stateless persons of Indian origin in the Uplands of southern and western Ceylon. They are mostly labourers working in the tea and rubber plantations and are Tamil-speaking. The contribution of the Indian labourers to the development of Ceylon's prosperous plantations is unquestioned. A substantial portion of labour force

required by the Railway and Municipalities hail from India. Even, today the plantations depend on the hard working people of this category. The sweat, tears and blood of the Indian nationals made that island a land of beauty, wealth and prosperity. Hundreds and thousands of Tamil families sacrificed their precious lives for the welfare of Ceylon. The smiling tea plantations in Ceylon today are the standing monuments of hard work and sincere labour of the Tamilian population. They have crossed through fiery ordeals, braved the oddities of time, kissed instantaneous death. No humanitarian Government could afford to ignore the vital contribution of Tamils to the economy of the island.

Unfortunately what is happening today? Nearly a decade has passed since the somewhat ill-fated Nehru-Kotelawala agreement and the problem has only got worsened, not better since 1954. Then lakhs of people in a country of about 10 million people or so kept Stateless and subjected to all the humiliations and handicaps arising out of that status is terribly cruel and deserves immediate attention and solution. This problem of 10 lakhs of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon has assumed such serious proportions owing to the Government's failure to view the problem from a just and human angle.

While I raised this issue here just two years back, the Prime Minister turned round and said how could he interfere in the domestic affairs of Ceylon, which is a friendly country of India. I said that I did not wish the Prime Minister to interfere in the internal affairs of Ceylon. But, I must now add what prevents the Prime Minister of India from expressing his dissatisfaction against the cruel and inhuman acts of the Ceylon Government towards the Tamil-speaking population.

From the same platform, I still remember, the Prime Minister, the doughty champion of the down-trod-

den, violently attacked the *Apartheid* policy pursued by South Africa. With bell, book and candle he despised and denounced the racial discrimination. Here also I think the Prime Minister has a wonderful opportunity to attack again the racial discrimination followed by the Ceylon Government. The problem in Ceylon is essentially a problem of racial discrimination. It is a fight between two races, namely Tamil and Singali. The ruling race, namely Singali which is in majority, of that tiny island wants to eliminate the minority hard-working race of Tamil.

The attitude of the Government of India is really discouraging. Recent happenings in Ceylon indicate the psychology of the ruling party there. The manner in which lawful residents are rounded up as illegal immigrants and incarcerated at the Slave Island camp savours of Hitler's hatred for the Jews. On the introduction of Immigration laws in the year 1940, persons who were born and who had lived in that country—whose applications for citizenship were pending—had the choice, but obtained Indian Travel documents to visit the mainland on an emergency. The moment their T.R.P. expired their applications for citizenship were cancelled and they were arrested as illegal immigrants and deported. Strangely enough such harsh and rigorous measures have the blessing of law, but one cannot condone the reprehensible methods employed to arrest long-standing residents engaged in lawful avocations as illegal immigrants.

The Government of India does not like that the relations with Ceylon be strained. I can understand it. But I want to know from the Prime Minister whether he wants this issue to be eternally there bringing untold miseries to the people of Indian origin there. Our people are driven out from Ceylon, our womenfolk molested, businessmen are shot. But, no security is assured.

[Shri Manoharan]

The people coming from East Pakistan are accommodated—I can understand it—by the Government of India with care and sympathy. But the people coming away from Ceylon, 100 per cent of them, are from South-India. No sympathy, no understanding of their problem on the part of the Government of India is visible. Is it because they are South Indians, the fallen race? And, people from East Pakistan are immediately accepted—is it because they are North-Indians, the chosen lot? This is not my question. This is the feeling that is penetrating all over in South-India. I think it is an excruciating discrimination shown by the Government of India towards Ceylon Tamils.

What about the Indians in Burma? One fine morning nationalisation scheme was introduced by the military Government there without any prior notice. No sensible Government would do such a thing. As a result of that, again, the South-Indian people there are put into hardship. The Government of India is watching the show without any reaction. I want to know from the Prime Minister whether he has any genuine idea of helping the Indians abroad and if so, the time is up to try and do what all is necessary for these poor, sympathetic and unfortunate people whose only crime committed in life is they are born in South-India. I hope the Prime Minister will now at least take great care of this particular issue because this issue has been creating a lot of anger in the minds of people in South-India. I hope the Deputy Minister of External Affairs Shri Dinesh Singh, will convey these sentiments to the Prime Minister and do justice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Sivapraghassan.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Before you proceed to another speaker, I want to raise a point of order. You were pleased to inform me that there is no time available today. I shall

accept your ruling, but the point is there is a cut motion on the condition of Stateless Indians in Ceylon. It is a very important point. Let us not give an impression to our people in Ceylon that . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called another Member.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I know. I am not making a speech. I only want to say that on this very important matter you must allow somebody at least to speak. Otherwise, the Prime Minister has no chance of giving a reply to it. If there is no discussion, it will create a wrong impression outside.

Shri Tyagi: On the same point of order, I may submit that it is really something against the procedure. Though there are cut motions, speeches of Members may not be allowed because time is limited, but would you kindly give one ruling? Despite the fact that there have been no speeches, formally the cut motions are supposed to have been moved. The Ministers must be required to answer those cut motions, even though there may not have been speeches on them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They have been moved. It has been announced to the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let the Minister answer the points raised in the cut motions.

Shri K. Sivapraghassan (Pondicherry): I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. Before my doing so, a new duty has devolved upon me, because I had the misfortune of hearing on the floor of this House yesterday morning a slander about Pondicherry affairs from the hon. Member opposite, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, and this afternoon from another hon. Member opposite belonging to the Communist Party, Shri Umanath.

Shri Mukerjee, while referring to Pondicherry yesterday, was inviting the attention of the House and of the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs, in particular, to a Municipal auction that was held recently there and the verdict of the High Court of Madras in connection with the disposal of a writ petition that followed up. With all too brief a mention of this, the hon. Member hurriedly proceeded to mock at the views of my Chief Minister and the ruling party in Pondicherry in regard to the legitimate views of our people for the judicial set-up that we want. The hon. Member also referred to some reports, which he seems to cherish, of "political hooliganism being practised against political opponents there". I refute both these charges with all the strength at my command.

Shri Mukerjee even insinuated that because of the so-called unpleasant verdict of the High Court of Madras, and as a sort of reprisal, so he worded it, the Mayor of Pondicherry, Mr. Goubert—he named him, and took care not to fail to mention him as a Congressman, to serve his party interests I believe—was trying to remove the right of the High Court of Madras from Pondicherry. It is, what shall I say, to say the least, the most miserable misrepresentation of facts.

Our demand for a judicial set-up is as old as years. It is not connected with the Municipal auction that took place and the verdict of the High Court of Madras. I cannot imagine a more unrealistic, unnatural connection of facts. We in Pondicherry believe that the sacred Constitution gives us the inalienable right of telling the Government of India what we want, for we believe that when we got our independence, when we leaped back into the lap of Mother India, we were assured that our wishes would be respected, that our views would be consulted before taking any action. And my Chief Minister was standing on his right, granted by the Constitution and supported by the repeated

assurances of our Prime Minister. What is good for us the Constitution says, and fortunately, we are not under the rule of the Communist Party. I bless Heaven, I thank Heaven for our present situation, because I do not know what would have happened to us under the latter circumstances.

And, after all, what was the verdict, the verdict about which so much was said, by the High Court of Madras? Yesterday I went home and rummaged my papers. I have got a copy of that verdict with me. The verdict of the High Court of Madras says that there was an error in the interpretation of the French laws which are still governing Municipal auction rules, and therefore a fresh auction was ordered. I am quite sure the hon. Member who criticised either did not see the judgment himself directly, or did not care to go through it, or possibly depended upon a coloured, distorted, calculated, misrepresentation of facts from the partymen in Pondicherry.

I quote here two relevant short passages from the judgment of the Madras High Court. Firstly, it says:

"We are not at all convinced that there is any basis for the allegations of political animosity and discrimination."

That is the verdict of the High Court of Madras. Secondly, it says:

"We have no doubt that he (meaning the Mayor) acted in good faith in the discharge of his duties."

Well, I should say that these words of the High Court of Madras must be enough to open the eyes of the most biased and unwilling persons, the Communists, in regard to the irreproachable conduct of the Congress Mayor of Pondicherry in the auction proceedings.

I think I have finished with the first charge that my hon. friend

[Shri K. Sivappaghasan]

opposite, Shri Mukerjee, was disposed to level. As regard the second charge, namely political hooliganism being practised by political opponents there," I agree with every word of it, but it applies not to the Congress Party in power, but to the Communist-sponsored People's Front in Pondicherry, who from an Opposition of 11 in a House of 39.

Shri Tyagi: Hear, hear.

Shri R. Sivappaghasan: I will place the honest truth here. Frustrated by the defeat sustained by the candidate sponsored by the Communists in the parliamentary elections held recently there, frustrated again in their futile attempt to pass a no-confidence motion in our State legislature on the 18th of 1st month and as a prelude to the forthcoming Assembly elections, it is they who have recently enacted an episode of hooliganism within the vicinity of the Assembly Hall with all the police to look on. Such being the case, I am really struck with wonder that anybody, of whatever persuasion, can have the check to frame charges, which are but a bundle of lies, against the decent administration functioning in Pondicherry.

Now, Sir, I come to my experience of this afternoon. At least Prof. Mukerjee's accusations I could understand. He could have done it for his party interest. I am not in a mood to quarrel with it. I owe an explanation to this House, and there ends the business. Perhaps I may be convincing when I say this: We had a performance this afternoon here, a performance of vilification—out and out vilification of a very honest man in Pondicherry.

I would invite groups of people from here, if they are disposed, hon. Members, to pay a visit to Pondicherry, to talk to any man taken at random from the street and know for themselves what be speak of that

great man—Mr. Goubert who is affectionately called the 'Papa' by the poorer sections of the people. After all the communists—communist-sponsored peoples front-out of a sheer, desperate mood, out of sheer helplessness, from distant Delhi, in Parliament House where they have their privileges and have every protection, could not go on losing their tongues and levelling malicious charges which cannot be proved in any court of law.

Another thing is this. I shall pass on to the problems that relate to Pondicherry. Certain accusations were made against the members of the Cabinet. The police is there; the court is there and the forum of the public is there in Pondicherry. Why not use them to find out the truth? I put this plain question to the Hon. Members opposite.

Why should they think of acting in this way? I shall stop for a moment—I do not want to hold a brief for my Chief Minister—all the great men here in Delhi know—that it is the tongue of slander that is trying to throw mud upon him. I was a bit enraged in the beginning but subsequently I was getting amused to look at the treatment we were given the like of which I have never seen before in my life.

Now I propose to devote myself, if you would so kindly permit me, to two or three vital problems affecting the people of Pondicherry—questions of life and death to the people of Pondicherry. In debates naturally, highlights of our foreign policy are discussed in External Affairs. But, Pondicherry matters coming under the category of External Affairs, this is an occasion, the forum, where through you, I can place certain points for the kind consideration of the Prime Minister. In doing so, I shall be as brief as possible. This being my second speech in this House and these being

life and death matters, I hope you will be condescending enough to give me two or three minutes more than what I am entitled to.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No extra time please. You may have five more minutes.

Shri K. Sivappraghassan: There are three important problems. We had our liberation and the liberation has raised high hopes in the people of Pondicherry. Our hopes, I should say, are abundantly realised in certain matters. The benefactions, I should say, coming from the Government of India have some handicaps or some hindrances which have been allowed to continue without any justification whatsoever because Pondicherry is at a distant place and Delhi is too far away from there. The first and foremost problem is the inordinate delay in effecting the reversion of the deputationists in my State. I do not mean such deputationists as have been brought over men who are highly skilled in their jobs, competent to give us the benefit of their experience and long training so as to enable us to switch over to the Indian pattern of administration from the French pattern of administration we had imbibed originally. I do not mean even such officers who are posted there to have an eye, on the use of liberal funds that are being regularly extended to us. But I mean those officers who were brought on deputation in the wake of the *de facto* transfer or sometimes thereabouts which any Government would bring in order to be sure of its ground.

Now, Sir, they go on clinging to the posts for years on end and working for their permanent retention or for their absorption into the local Government, if possible. According to the terms of deputation prescribed by the Government of India, I am told, it is obligatory on the part of the States which entertain them to revert the deputationists to their parent departments as soon as the necessity for their being there ceases to exist in the

States. But as all Pondicherry knows, they are there. This state of affairs is neither fair to the States which have lent their services nor to Pondicherry itself. This is the most crucial point because ours is a small State—a State commanding 40 per cent literacy. The educated youths are good many in number and they stand in sore need of employment; rather welltrained and properly trained, I should say, qualified young men in our services cannot be denied their legitimate promotions for no fault of theirs. Therefore, this delay in the reversion of the deputationists has deprived the local people of their rightful employment opportunities and legitimate chances of promotion. I wish to submit that in saying this I am only echoing the wishes expressed by our State Legislature and by the representative organizations of the people of my State. My latest information is that a delegation of the citizens of Pondicherry met our Lieut. Governor just two weeks ago and urged for the reversion of the officers on deputation and their replacement by local recruitment. When I put in this plea, let me not be misunderstood—I am not actuated by any sectarian motive or provincial bias. The truth is quite the opposite for we are a kind of a composite State with our units scattered about—Tamils, Andhras, Keralites all forming one population and living in perfect harmony as all the world knows. Our long and intimate political integration thus caused by the accident of history has enabled us to achieve, in our limited sphere and in our own small way, emotional integration. When our beloved Prime Minister is again and again arguing for this, we can never be a prey to disintegrating forces. Our cry is only a cry for our self-existence, for our self-preservation, just the same as every other State does. Nothing more, nothing less. I may also point out that this will result in the reduction of the administrative expenditure on the part of the Government of India because there will no longer

[Shri R. Sivappaghasan]

be any need for granting deputation allowances.

Another demand, the second one, is the restoration of Central scales of pay to the employees of our Union territory. I may submit it to this House that immediately following our merger, multifarious development schemes were set on foot in Pondicherry, need arose for starting new departments and new services. In this context, new posts were created—all in Central scales of pay and allowances. Then all on a sudden, there was a switch-over to the Madras pay and allowances. Since then there have been requests, time and again, for the rectification of this unjust departure. When I say unjust, I stand by it, and that too for these two reasons. First is the case of discrimination against Pondicherry. While the Union territories of Delhi, Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Goa are treated with Central pay scales and allowances, we wonder why Pondicherry alone should be so unfortunate as to be treated on a different footing. Pondicherry and Goa both emerged from foreign rule and both continue to be separate units as Union territories. Both belong fortunately, according to us, to external Affairs. Both are treated alike in over so many matters. Why then should we be discriminated in respect of emoluments alone. We are extremely grieved and hurt to think over this. I should not be misunderstood if I submit that the French scales of pay obtaining in those days were far higher than the local scales of pay. So this discrimination, I think, has been agitating the minds of our services. The intensity of the feelings of the affected persons can be gauged from the fact that they all sought an interview with our Prime Minister who was gracious enough to visit Pondicherry in June last. Therefore, I pray that justice must be done without further delay. One more point and I have finished. There is the problem of the confirmation of

employees in the services of our State Government. All these employers have been recruited from time to time to the State services since 1954 and there are also those left over by the old French regime. They work on a temporary basis. Nine long years have passed, Sir,—more than one third of the period of the active service of Government officials—still this continues to be a problem.

So, I pray that the sooner their confirmation is done, the better it is for the happiness of my people.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara). Non-alignment has been openly attacked and has been partially criticised. The foreign policy of a country has three face or three dimensions. In the first place, it has got its great ideas; then it has its execution, and finally its propagation. I want to deal with all the three places of our foreign policy. What have we got to be ashamed of in regard to our foreign policy? Non-alignment is a part of it as Mr. Krishna Menon mentioned in his speech. Our foreign policy is like a ship which has gone out in the far seas—it may have faced storms and it may have got a sound thrashing of the ways of the sea. But the ship has come back to our harbour. The pilot might have been weary. The pilot is now ready to hand it over to another pilot and the ship is allowed to go again for fresh incursions and adventures. Great ships have been damaged in the war either due to storms or enemy firing. But they have come back to the port. Just like a great ship which has come to the port, our foreign policy has also essentially remained in tact. Shri Kripalani said that we entertained both non-alignment and neutrality. There is no world like 'neutrals' in our dictionary. The mighty voice of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was heard when Israel, Britain and France attacked Egypt over the Suez. Both Nehru and Labour leader demanded of the invaders to Gaitskel 'get out immediately'. Those clarion voices helped to vacate aggression. I was surprised

that Mr. Swell has said that we have no friends. But we forget friendship with the UAR which remains longest, as it originated in common sufferings. Our non-alignment prevents us from making military alliances; it does not prevent us calling the Chinese fellow-Asians and then dub them as cunning and undependable devils when they commit aggression. We must be able to make friendship with the small nations of Asia and Africa. When our country is invaded we do seek military assistance; that does not mean that our policy has failed. Foreign aid extends foreign influence on a country. Those who favour private sector and do not want socialism in this country, claim that non-alignment has been drowned in the vast sea. However, the same time this non-alignment has helped us to take the aid from whatever quarter it comes when we are in distress and when we are attacked. When we get foreign military aid, foreign influence also comes with it; that influence can damage the whole of our life—cultural life. This is the worst part of it. We have lived thousands of years; we have our own civilisation. When this kind of intervention into our national affairs, there is a danger. That is the danger; we ever want foreigners to run our hotels. Ten Hilton group is coming to India. We have got capable men in this country who can with a little training run our hotels and can make them the best hotels in the whole world.

15 hrs.

With regard to non-alignment, I must say that we are a great country; let us not lose faith in our great country; we are a great people; we have a great past and we have had great leaders and great ideals. We cannot look to the future with pessimism. Our hon. President said it was a great act of faith to release Sheik Abdulla. The hon. Minister without portfolio turned quite a good spade of work in Kashmir with calmness and firmness thus paved the way for the release of Sheik Abdulla. We must not hesitate to do the right thing

with courage. We have done what we should with courage and statesmanship. When over a hundred people were to be hanged in Hungary during 1935 uprising, we pleaded for clemency. These are things we shall not forget. Who was then neutral? Our Prime Minister walked across to Harlem Street in New York to meet Castro of Cuba when he went to attend the UN meeting. Is that neutrality? When justice is trampled under foot, we shall always rise our voice and we shall not fail.

Then, let me come to the execution of that policy. Before I do that let me refer to what my friend Shri Swell said; he said that we should have crossed the cease-fire line. I wish to tell him that we can cross the cease-fire line only at the cost of a war . . . (*Interruptions*). Just as much Germany cannot cross the line and rush into Poland, into Polish parts which she claims belongs to her, we cannot cross the cease-fire line be it in Kashmir or NEFA except at the cost of a war . . . (*Interruptions*). I did not interrupt anybody while speaking. Why should I be interrupted? I am not going to yield. We shall not also surrender to Chinese blackmail . . . (*Interruptions*). Our foreign policy in regard to China is very clear. We shall defend our territory and strengthen ourselves and if there is any more incursion in our territory we shall be up in arms and that may lead to war.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Recover our territory.

Shri Joachim Alva: At the same time we cannot stop talking to anyone. If Sheik Abdulla wants to talk to Pakistan people, let him speak; that has been the policy of our Prime Minister. We do not want to stop anybody from talking to anybody. It is better that people talk and come to some understanding. But it must also be understood that Kashmir is our strategic lifeline and we cannot allow anyone to cross the strategic line and invade our country. It is to be remembered

[Shri Joachim Alva]

that there are hundreds of our young men are guarding the frontier there, away for years together from their wives and children. We cannot forget the sacrifices made by our heroes nor can we forget that after the Chinese had grabbed our territory, Kashmir has more and more become our front line, our lifeline; we cannot give it up; any settlement arrived at should take that into account.

We have neglected many areas: Ceylon, Cambodia, Indonesia, Turkey, Malaya, Tunisia, U.S.A. Iran and Iraq. I shall start with Ceylon. After she became the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mrs. Bandaranaike told a special correspondent of the Hindu that it was a woman politician of India who was responsible for her inspiration to enter public life. What has happened since then that she declares on the floor of Ceylon Parliament that the foreign policy of Ceylon is not the foreign policy of India. Now, there must be bureaucrats who may interfere; perhaps the mighty personality of Jawaharlal Nehru is not working on the minds of the bureaucrats in our foreign Ministry. Unless that is done, the friends that we have got near us will be out of our lives;

Cambodia's Prince Sihanouk, who also came to our country, is an easily accessible man unto his people. He invited the big powers to neutralise his frontiers. We needed a man of calibre to be in Cambodia. I do not know who is our ambassador there. We needed a man of calibre to bring round the UK and the USA to agree along with China that Cambodia's frontiers should be neutralised so that she may feel secure, surrounded as she is by two armed SEATO neighbours. When Prince Phouma of Laos went to Peking last week he was received with great *eclat* and then he came back pro-China. Cambodia has been driven Chinawise. All these great areas are slipping out of our hands.

What about Malaya? Malaya, a tiny country, firmly and loudly raised its voice condemning Chinese aggression against India. But we have not demanded that Malaya be included in the second Bandung Powers' Conference whilst attending it ourselves. Why are we anxious to get into the Bandung Conference? President Nasser said he was not attending that Conference; he was forthright about it. He only allowed his ambassador to be there.

I feel that we must stick to our friends, big or small they may be. Otherwise, they will not stand by us in times of crisis. When President Aref came to India, why was he not taken to the border with East Pakistan from where Hindus and Christians and the minority communities people were being drawn out mercilessly. A donation was declared by President Aref in Pakistan but no such declaration was made in India for the benefit of the refugees who were coming out of Pakistan. Instead of taking him to Bangalore, they should have taken him to the eastern borders. Somebody needs to prod our people in the External Affairs Ministry to do these things.

In 1954, we had the privilege of seeing the then Ex-Turkish President Inonu now Premier of Turkey. He was the only man in whose house we saw the photograph of our Prime Minister. Yet the other day, when Pakistan's delegation on Kashmir visited Turkey, Turkey expressed support for Pakistan's stand on the Kashmir issue. What were our representatives doing there? It may be a tiny country, it is in the shadow of the Kremlin. We should cultivate these countries. Premier Inonu was a great admirer of Nehru and he proudly showed us the photograph of Nehru in 1954. They could not have changed so very basically. They have to be informed of the position by us.

I shall say nothing about the United States of America. Times of distress

and deaths are great occasions when we have to show our sympathies. There was President Kennedy's death, President De Gaulle, the German President, and leaders of other countries rushed their high dignitaries but we missed a great occasion. We should have rushed the Prime Minister of India or the President of India to express our great sympathy. towards America especially after America had been so sympathetic towards us when the Chinese chose to attack us.

In regard to publicity, the less said the better. Dawn has got a long story yesterday that the Catholic Archbishop of Dacca, an American national, had said something about the Christian minorities on the eastern wing of Pakistan and that the Pakistan authorities have been trying to get him. They cannot easily get him or lay hands on him as he is an American citizen. He can say what he likes. If they do anything to him, Pakistan would really be worried. Where are the External Publicity men doing when there is a message like that in the *Dawn*? Where are the great External Publicity people? Can they not tell us the story that the Catholic Archbishop of Dacca, an American citizen at that, has been condemned in Pakistan and the Pakistan authorities have been trying to get at him? We know nothing about him. He cannot be touched because he is an American citizen!

There are a lot of things I can say. Take Tunisia. The brother of the Foreign Minister of Tunisia, Mr. Taiab Slim, was here the other day. Taiab Slim had spent a lot of time in India when Tunisia was not free and he is today the United Nations representative of Tunisia. Yet, when a Kashmiri delegation from Pakistan went to Tunisia, a fortnight ago, President Bourguiba said, "You are our brothers and we shall stand by you." Either

we have an embassy there or we send our most dynamic man there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Joachim Alva: I shall finish in five minutes, Sir. We want our dynamic young men to go and fill all the Missions in Africa. The old ICS people who could not have reached positions beyond those of Collectors in India had they remained here, have taken up the best posts in our diplomatic Missions everywhere in the world. They are not prepared to go out and work hard in the field of Africa, because the climate is very hot there, and perhaps their children cannot be sent to the great cities of learning in Europe and America if they are to work in Africa. But today it is the bounden duty of the Ministry of External Affairs to fill the heads of Missions in Africa, with the type of people to fill those places where there is a vacuum also in Asia, in far flung Asia and Africa, and see that they render good service to us.

I shall not say more about publicity. We talk about foreign correspondents. Does anybody worry about foreign correspondents? I was told the other day that three foreign correspondents *Christian Science Monitor*, *New York Times* and *Washington Post*—sat together and they found that 35 per cent of their time and money was spent on electricity and water supplied by the New Delhi Municipal Committee. The nabobs of the New Delhi Municipal Committee must be really taken to task. Why should these foreign correspondents take all their time and money for electricity which is cut off frequently and for water which does not flow, and all the rest? The Prime Minister said that much will depend on the despatches foreign correspondents send from here to their papers abroad. If they are not put in their proper frame of mind, how can they write fair and objective things? Not that we want to bribe them, but we must see that they are comfortable.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Then, the Nigerian team came to India, but they did not see the hon. Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting. Who stopped that? The bright boss of the Ministry of External Affairs publicity department? My friend Shri Nath Pai, for the second time, brought up the point, and so I had a little laugh at it, because at what he said even for the first time, there was no effect at all: It was spraying water on ducks' back! He mentioned the way in which the report is drawn up: the visits of the VIPs are mentioned—A, B, C, and 1, 2, and 3. They just tabulate and print these things, and that is how this is done and the whole thing takes a lifeless, uninspiring book-form.

Now, I would like to quote what a Veteran Indian journalist in London, Mr. D. V. Tahmankar, wrote in the *Deccan Herald* about the external publicity. Much of what he says is true, and what he has said is what we have also been saying from our end. In the beginning of my speech, I had listed execution, and propagation of foreign policy as the most important elements, and here is what he says:

"We should worry if India's case did not get enough publicity and publicity of the right kind. But here again it is no use blaming the British press. Have we in our office men who are capable of approaching the right man on the right newspaper and explain to him India's position? The fact is that the P.R.O. Office of India House suffers from too many limitations. The selection criteria should be the candidates' journalistic ability, charm of manners, wide knowledge of India's history, politics, social conditions and economics. Once he is select-

ed and posted abroad he should be given a free hand and not asked to act as a post-office for distributing handouts of ministerial statements and the Prime Minister's speeches."

I would say more if I had a little more time. I have many more points to bring home. I would only say that the definition, execution and the propagation of our foreign policy—all these three should be tackled together. The Indian Military officials and Civilians who were in Algeria, who were in Congo, were paralysed because there was no dynamic hand to guide them in Asia or Africa. I said when I came back from Africa that if China becomes strong, or Chou En-lai becomes strong in Africa, that will be over our dead-bodies! Our safety will have been threatened from two sides! The Chinese have done things effectively there. The Chinese have driven out British influence and other Western influence from Africa. They are driving out the American influence too. They seek to nullify our influence in Africa though we have been pioneers there. The position will become worse if we allow the Chinese to have a hold over Africa after having come so near to us on our borders. This is something which we must take good care of; otherwise, all our efforts will be paralysed.

The External Affairs Ministry must have a strong hand. Let him be the Minister Without Portfolio or any other Minister. We do not mind. But the guiding hand of the External Affairs Ministry should command a hundred-fold dynamic activity, including great ideals which can help the Africans, which can appeal to Asia. We shall not follow a second-hand policy. The Africans have an independent mind of their own today. They are not going to take ideas through anyone, from any country. India should fill that vacuum and fill it well indeed.

श्री विशालचंद्र सेठ (एटा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री मनोहरन ने अभी साउथ क सिटिजेन्स के सम्बंध में, जो कि लंका में रह रहे हैं, कुछ कहा था। मैं इस सम्बंध में बाद में कहूंगा परन्तु मुझे इस बात पर बड़ा मलाल हुआ कि उन्होंने इस बात को सदन के समक्ष इस प्रकार रखा जैसे भारत में जो सउथ के क्षेत्र हैं, वह कोई हम से अलग के क्षेत्र हैं। मैं उन्हें बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश के किसी भी हिस्से में कोई घटना होती है तो उसमें हम सब लोग बराबर के हिस्सेदार हैं और हम सब के दिल में उसके लिये एक सी भावना है।

शेख अब्दुल्ला को छोड़ने के सम्बंधमें, जहाँ तक मैंने अब्दुल्लारों को देखा है और जैसी मेरी कल्पना है, किसी ने यह नहीं कहा कि शेख अब्दुल्ला को छोड़ना नहीं चाहिये। बल्कि हमारे बहुत से माननीय नेता शेख अब्दुल्ला से मिलने के लिये गये और थोड़े ही दिनों से सब तरफ से यह आवाजें आने लगीं कि शेख अब्दुल्ला को छोड़ दिया जाये। हिन्दू महा गमा की ओर से केवल मैं इस सदन में आया हूँ और मैंने डंके की चोट पर बाहर और इस सदन में, निवेदन किया, कि शेख अब्दुल्ला को छोड़ना बड़ी भयानक भूल होगी, जैसे कि आपने अनेकों और भूलों की हैं।

श्री त्यागी : इसका एक्स्टर्नल अफेअर्स से क्या ताल्लुक है। यह इंटरनल मामला है।

श्री विशालचंद्र सेठ : बिल्कुल ऐसी बात नहीं है। यह आप की फारेन पालिसी के अन्तर्गत आता है। मैं यहाँ पर यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उनको छोड़ कर हमारे देश ने बड़ी भारी गलती की है इसे लेकर एक नया तुफान हमारे देश के सामने आने वाला है, जिसकी मैं कल्पना कर रहा हूँ। चूँकि शेख अब्दुल्ला ने सेल्फ डिटेमिनेशन की बात कही है इसलिये यह फारेन पालिसी

के अन्तर्गत आ जाता है। मुझे ऐसा अनुमान होता है कि बहुत जल्दी इस चीज को हमारे देश में सरकार द्वारा मान्य किया जायेगा और इसको मान्य करने का दुष्परिणाम शीघ्र हमारे सामने आयेगा जो बड़ा भयानक होगा। यहाँ पर मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि इस प्रकार की प्रवृत्ति रोकने के हेतु विधान में थोड़े दिन पहले संशोधन किया गया था जिसके अन्तर्गत कोई भी इस देश का घटक, कोई भी इस देश का नागरिक इस देश की एकता के सम्बंध में किसी प्रकार की कोई दूषित कल्पना न कर सके। उस विधान के परिवर्तन के बाद आज जिस तरह की परिस्थिति देश में लाई जा रही है उसे आप जरा ध्यान और गम्भीरता से मुनें। केवल यह कल्पना करना कि कांग्रेस वालों के मुँह से कोई बात निकले तो ठीक लेकिन अगर कोई दूसरा उसको कहे तो वह ठीक नहीं, ऐसा विचार करना गलत है। अपने देश के लिये हमारे दिल में भी वही भावनाये हैं जो आपके दिल में हैं। लेकिन आज प्रत्यक्ष दिखलाई देता है कि काश्मीर के मामले में ढिलाई करने की बात सोची जा रही है। यद्यपि कांग्रेस वालों ने कहा कि किसी प्रकार की ढिलाई नहीं की जायेगी लेकिन मैं अनुमान करता हूँ कि सरकार ढिलाई करने का रास्ता खोज रही है अथवा रास्ता बना रही है। इसी कारण मैं आपके सामने यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप ने इस मामले में ढिलाई की तो देश के सामने एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न पैदा हो जायेगा। आप देखिये कि आपके सामने क्या क्या नई चीजें पैदा हो सकती हैं।

सबसे पहली चीज में शासन में यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि शेख अब्दुल्ला और उनके साथी तथा कुछ और नेता भारत में देश की एकता के विरुद्ध आज भाषण दे अपने विचारों को व्यस्त कर रहे हैं। जो कानून में परिवर्तन आपने किया, क्या उस परिवर्तन की धारायें आप उन पर लागू नहीं कर सकते। क्या

[श्री बिशनचंद्र सेठ]

आप में इतनी हिम्मत नहीं है। शेख अब्दुल्ला से आपने आज पता नहीं क्या चीज अन्दर अन्दर तय कर ली है जिसे आप देश को बतलाना नहीं चाहते। अगर आपने कोई चीज तय की है और आज अगर शेख अब्दुल्ला उस के विरोध में सामने आ रहा है तो क्या कारण है कि कानून में जो परिवर्तन किया गया उसके अन्तर्गत शेख अब्दुल्ला और उनके साथी और जो उनकी बोली बोलने वाले इस देश में और हैं उन सबको क्यों न पुनः गिरफ्तार किया जाये। परन्तु सत्य स्थिति यह है कि जो आप करना चाहते हैं उसे देश से छिपाना चाहते हैं। आपकी अन्तरात्मा दूसरी है और आप यहाँ बैठ कर बात दूसरी बोलते हैं। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने बड़ी बड़ी हिमालियन सरीखी गलतियाँ की हैं और अगर अब आपने कोई और गलती की तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि देश के टुकड़े टुकड़े होने की समस्या पैदा हो जायगी, जिसे मैं आज देख रहा हूँ।

मैं आप के सामने ईमानदारी से देश के हिन्दुओं की भावना रखना चाहता हूँ। काश्मीर में अगर आप इस समय कोई सुधार करना चाहते हैं तो उसका केवल एक ही उपाय है और वह यह है कि इस समय इमरजेंसी लागू है, डिफेंस आफ इंडिया आपके पास है। जो आदमी देश की एकता का विरोध करते हैं उनको भारत रक्षा नियमों के अधीन बन्द कर के काश्मीर में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया जाय साथ ही वहाँ की कौन्सिल और असम्बली को समाप्त कर दिया जाय। अगर आप ने ऐसा नहीं किया तो मैं आपको बिश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर आप के पास नहीं रहेगा और अमरीका का वेम बन जाएगा, और आप केवल द्रष्टा बन कर रह जायेंगे। तो इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि देश के अन्य भाग भी अलग होना चाहेंगे, उदाहरण के लिये नागालैंड

देश से अलग होने की कल्पना करने लगेंगे। जिस प्रकार आप ने एक स्टेट को अलग हो जाने की मन्व्यता दे दी थी तो सारे देश में यही स्थिति पैदा हो गई थी।

भारत सरकार की विदेश नीति को कांग्रेस वालों को छोड़ कर सभी ने असफल बताया है, यद्यपि ऐसा कहने के अपने अपने कारण अलग अलग हैं।

आज हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के गृह मंत्रियों का सम्मेलन हो रहा है। ऐसे ड्रामे इस देश में कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट बनने के बाद न जाने कितने किये गये। गृह मंत्रियों के सम्मेलन की यह परिस्थिति है कि वह कह रहे हैं कि जो पाकिस्तानी हिन्दुस्तान में घुस आए हैं उनको न निकाला जाय, कहा जाता है कि उनको दंड महीने तक नहीं निकाला जाएगा। लेकिन मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि अगर दंड महीने उनको न निकाला गया तो दो महीने बाद सरकार उनको निकालने की बात भूल जाएगी और जो लोग बस गए हैं वे वहीं बसे रह जायेंगे और आप उनको नहीं निकाल सकेंगे। इस प्रकार की बात भारतीय जनता की भावना के विरुद्ध गृह मंत्रियों के सम्मेलन में की जा रही है। इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि जो पाकिस्तानी यहाँ जबरदस्ती घुस आए हैं वे यहाँ से नहीं जायेंगे और अगर ऐसा हुआ तो जिस प्रकार की समस्या आज काश्मीर में चल रही है, वैसे आसाम में भी चल सकती है।

विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। इस सम्बन्ध में जो मैंने कांग्रेस मेम्बरों के भाषण सुने उन से पता लगता है कि उनके मनों में भय छाया हुआ है। वे उसकी प्रशंसा करते हैं। लेकिन अगर आप ईमानदारी से पूछें तो मैं कहूँगा कि इससे ज्यादा असफल विदेश नीति मंसूर में किसी छोटे मोटे देश की भी नहीं होगी। लेकिन हम यहाँ

देखते हैं कि कांग्रेस के सदस्य बार बार गर्व के साथ दुहराते हैं कि हमारी विदेश नीति बहुत सफा है। अगर आप विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में वास्तव में कुछ करना चाहते हैं तो मैं आपके सामने कुछ सुझाव रखना चाहता हूँ। यह सुझाव मेरे अपने नहीं देश के हिन्दू बहुमत की विचार धारा है। मेरा सब से पहला सुझाव यह है कि पाकिस्तान और चीन से सारे राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध खत्म कर दिये जायें। दूसरा सुझाव पाकिस्तान को हमारे देश से कोई चीज न भेजी जाय और न वहाँ से कोई चीज मंगाई जाय। आप उनको कांयला पानी आदि अनेकों वस्तुएं बराबर देने रहे हैं लेकिन उसका पैसा धसूत करने की आप में ताकत नहीं उलटे पाकिस्तान राज आप के सिर पर सवार रहता है। इस लिये मेरा सुझाव है कि पाकिस्तान और चीन से देश को अपने व्यापारिक और राजनीतिक दोनों सम्बन्ध तुरन्त समाप्त कर देने चाहिये।

इसी के साथ जां काश्मीर का केस सीक्योरिटी काउंसिल में है, उसको वापस ले लेना चाहिये। इस मामले में आप अपने आप को धोखा दे रहे हैं। देश को तो इसमें धोखा ही ही रहा है, लेकिन इस मामले में कांग्रेस वाले स्वतः अपने को धोखा दे रहे हैं। हम सभी स्पष्ट देख रहे हैं कि आज हमारे मामले की सीक्योरिटी काउंसिल में क्या स्थिति है। जिस समय यह मामला सीक्योरिटी काउंसिल में भेजा जा रहा था, तो देश में लोगों ने चिल्ला चिल्ला कर कहा था कि हमें अपना यह मामला सीक्योरिटी काउंसिल में न भेजना चाहिये। लेकिन केवल पंडित जवाहर लाल जी ने उस केस को वहाँ भेजा, और उसके बाद जो हमारे केस को वहाँ दुर्दशा हुई वह आप सभी को मालूम ही है, और आज तक वह मामला लटका हुआ है। आप कुछ नहीं कर सके। अतः मेरा निवेदन है कि संसार में अपनी प्रतिष्ठा सुरक्षित रखने के लिये यह नितांत आवश्यक है कि

सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल से हम अपना केस वापस ले लें।

एक चीज और मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। हम कामन वेलथ के सदस्य हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि देश को इससे क्या लाभ हुआ। हम को उससे साधारण सम्मान तक नहीं मिला। लिहाजा मेरा निवेदन है कि हम को फौरन कामन वेलथ से अलग हो जाना चाहिये।

इसी प्रकार हमने देखा कि दस साल तक भारत ने यह प्रयत्न किया कि चाइना सीक्योरिटी काउंसिल का सदस्य बना लिया जाय। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज उस ठेकेदारी का भारत को क्या लाभ मिला। मैं वहना चाहता कि अगर आयन्दा सीक्योरिटी काउंसिल में चाइना का प्रश्न आवे तो भारत को उस पर मौन रहना चाहिये।

इसी के साथ मैं वहना चाहता हूँ कि तिब्बत और श्री दलाई लामा के प्रति हमारी सरकार ने अपने दायित्व का पालन नहीं किया पंडित जवाहर लाल जी ने जबरदस्ती तिब्बत और दलाई लामा को समाप्त किया। मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार का यह नैतिक कर्तव्य है कि वह दलाई लामा को सरकारी को मान्यता दे और उन को मदद दे ताकि वे पुनः तिब्बत में जा कर अपना शासन स्थापित कर सकें।

मुस्लिम परस्त नीति के कारण आज तक भारत ने इजराइल को मान्यता नहीं दी है। मुझे इजराइल से कोई लगाव नहीं है। लेकिन मैं आपकी सेवा में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि केवल मुस्लिम परस्त नीति के कारण सरकार इजराइल को मान्यता नहीं देना चाहती। हमारी सरकार मुसलमानों को प्रसन्न रखना चाहती है। लेकिन मुझे विश्वास है कि आप उन को प्रसन्न नहीं कर पाएँगे। अतः निवेदन है कि सरकार को इजराइल को

[श्री गिशनचंद्र सेठ]

तुरन्त मान्यता देनी चाहिये। मुसलमानों को खुश करने के लिए इजराइल को मान्यता न देना अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमारे लिए बहुत द्योतक है : मैं इस के लिए आप से विशेष प्रार्थना करता हूँ।

इसी के साथ साथ मैं आपके सामने यह मुझाव रखना चाहता हूँ कि आपको चाइना और पाकिस्तान को अल्टीमेटम देना चाहिए। मैं ने इस ने पहले भी यह बात सदन में कही थी ता यद्वा गया कि आज ने दा बरस बाद तुम अल्टीमेटम की बात करते हो। पर अब मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आपको चीन और पाकिस्तान को यह अल्टीमेटम देना चाहिए कि या तो १५ मई १९५४ तक हमारे प्रदेश को खाली करे नहीं तो लड़ाई के लिए तैयार रहें। मैं विश्वास दिलाया चाहता हूँ कि अगर लड़ाई में डरते रहे तो हम नसार में जीवित नहीं रह सकेंगे और न अपनी प्रतिष्ठा कायम रख सकेंगे। अगर आपने अल्टीमेटम देने की बात को माना तो देश लड़ाई के लिए तुरन्त तैयार हो जाएगा और अपनी प्रतिष्ठा की रक्षा करेगा। अगर कमजोरी की नीति अपनायी तो आप कुछ नहीं कर सकेंगे। हमको आपकी कमजोरी का अनुभव हो रहा है। मैं ने एक प्रश्न किया था उस का लिखित उत्तर मुझ परसों ही मिला है। उस में लिखा है कि ५५ दिन में पाकिस्तान ने ५६ बार हमारे प्रदेश पर हमले किये। यह केवल ५० दिन की ही रिपोर्ट है। यानी एक दिन में एक स भी ज्यादा हमले पाकिस्तान ने हमारे प्रदेश पर इन दिनों किए पर हमारी सरकार ऐसे बैठी है कि यह रुटिन सिनेमा देख आए हों। इस, पांच आदमी मारे गए, मवेशी उठा कर ले गए यह सिलसिला करीब करीब आधे दिन चलता है लेकिन इस शासन को कोई शर्म नहीं महसूस होती किसी भी देश के शासन के लिए इस से अधिक लज्जा की बात और क्या हो सकती है ? भारतीय शासन के लज्जाशून्य

होने का इह से बड़ा प्रमाण और क्या होगा कि यह कान में तेल डाले बैठ हुए हैं

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो गया है।

श्री गिशनचंद्र सेठ : बस मैं बहुत जल्दी जल्दी में कह कर खत्म किये दे रहा हूँ। यह प्रॉटेस्ट लैटर्स भेजने से और हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के होम मिनिस्टर्स की मीटिंग में कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। पहले भी हम ने बहुत सी मीटिंग्स देखी हैं।

बर्मा, लंबा और पाकिस्तान जो ४ दिन पहले भारत के अंग थे, जैसा कि मैंने एक पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा, मैं विशेष नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन आज स्थिति यह है कि भारतीय नागरिक वहाँ सुरक्षा में जीवित तक नहीं रह सकते और आप के किये कुछ होना नहीं है। रगून में रहने वाला भारतीय रात तक अपनी जायदाद का मालिक है और सुबह मिनिस्टर्स आ जाती है और उस की दुकान और सब जायदाद वगैरह को वहाँ की सरकार ले लेती है। हालत यह है कि रात को वहाँ सब आदमी सोते हैं, सुबह को मिनिस्टरो लग गये और सारी उन की दुकानों और मकानात आदि सब चीजों को सीज कर लिया गया। उन को वहाँ सुरक्षा मिले, उन की दुकान, मकान और जायदाद इस तरह से हड़प न ली जाय इस के लिए हमारी बहादुर सरकार ने आज तक क्या किया ? यह गवर्नमेंट बस कान में तेज डाले हुए बैठी है। अगर हमारे मिनिस्टर्स खुद वहाँ ऐसी स्थिति में होते और निकाले जाते तब उन को शायद पता लगता कि वहाँ पर भारती नागरिकों की क्या हालत हो रही है। उस हालत में उन्हें पता लगता है कि हों परिस्थिति वाकई में गम्भीर है। लेकिन वे लोग तो यहाँ एयर कंडीशन्ड बंगलों में रहते हैं, हर तरह का आराम व सुख मुविधा प्राप्त है लिहाजा उन को ज्ञान ही नहीं है कि वहाँ पर भारत में क्या हो रहा है।

हो रही है। रात तक उन को दुकान थी, मकान था, सब कुछ उनका था लेकिन सुबह सो कर उठे तो पाया कि वह सारी की सारी चीजें दूसरों की हो गयीं। जब बर्मा जैसे छोटे देश में हम मारे व लूटे जा रहे हैं और जब बर्मा जैसे छोटे देश को ऐसे करने से रोکنने की आप में हिम्मत नहीं है तो तो फिर आप संसार में और किस मुल्क से लड़ सकेंगे ?

इस तरह की इतनीय और लज्जाजनक परिस्थिति आप ने हमारे देश को बना रखी है

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य, अब तो खत्म कर ही दें।

श्री बिशनचंद्र सेठ : जरा सी कृपा और कीजिये। बस मैं खत्म ही किये देता हूँ।

हमारे विदेशी दूतावासों के सम्बन्ध में कई कांग्रेसी माननीय सदस्यों ने बहुत तारीफ की और कहा कि वह बहुत ही कॉम्पिटेंट हैं। परन्तु मैं वास्तव में दूतावासों की जो स्थिति है उसका एक चित्र आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। चित्र यह है कि जिस समय चीन ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया तो उसके लिए पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी को सारे मुल्कों की गवर्नमेंट्स को एक विशेष पत्र भेजना पड़ा। मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह उन की योग्यता का सबूत है ? अगर वह दरअसल में कॉम्पिटेंट होते तो यही काम वह वहाँ स्वयं कर लेते और इस तरह से प्रधान मंत्री जी को पर्सनल लैटर सारे संसार की सरकारों को भेजना न पड़ता। उन की इनकॉम्पिटेंसी का इस से बड़ा सबूत और कोई नहीं हो सकता। इस के सम्बन्ध में मैं केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश का सम्मान विदेशों में बना रहे तो उसके लिए यह आवश्यक है कि आप विदेशों में उन्हें राजदूत बना कर भेजिये जो दृढ़ता के साथ

भारत की सुरक्षा और दृष्टिकोण को साफ तौर पर मजबूती के साथ वहाँ पर रख सकें।

आदरणीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेशी ईसाइयों के बारे में मैं आपस कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। ३०,००० ईसाई पाकिस्तान से निकाल गये ऊस के लिए तो बड़ा दर्द है और शासन कर्ता बहुत चीखते हैं परन्तु उस दर्द के साथ इस बात के लिए भी तो दर्द और चिन्ता होनी चाहिये कि जहाँ पहले इस देश के अन्दर केवल १२०० सफेद ईसाई पादरी काम कर रहे थे आज कई हजार हो गये हैं। करीब ४००० विदेशी पादरी इस देश के अन्दर हिन्दुओं को ईसाई बना रहे हैं। १ करोड़ से अधिक हिन्दू ईसाई बन चुके हैं। परन्तु शासन कानों में तेल डाले हुए बौ हैं और उसके लिए आपको कोई चिन्ता नहीं प्रतीत होती। जो भारतीय ईसाई देश में बसते हैं, अगर वह अपने धर्म का प्रचार करना चाहते हैं तो हमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं है, हमारे देश का संविधान हर एक को इस के लिए आजादी प्रदान करता है, हम भी उसको मंजूर करते हैं परन्तु यह ४००० विदेशी गोरे ईसाई सारे देश में घर घर ईसाई बनाने के लिये घूम रहे हैं और इसके लिये करोड़ों रुपया आज क हमारे देश में पाना की तरह बहा रहे हैं उन को रोका जाय और इन विदेशी ईसाइयों को निकाल दिया जाय। मैं आदरणीय मंत्री महोदय जो कि मेरे मित्र हैं श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री से कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह देश को खत्म कर के ही यह कुर्सी छोड़ेंगे ?

अन्त में मैं केवल एक चीज, खास तौर से कश्मीर प्रश्न के बारे में निवेदन करूंगा कि जैसा कि श्री कृष्ण मेनन ने कहा कि यह एक परिवार का प्रश्न है, मैं उनकी इस राय से सहमत हूँ परन्तु मैं इतना बताना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तो मौखिक रूप से यह एक परिवार का प्रश्न है परन्तु ४,६ या १० दिन के अन्दर यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न बनने वाला है। उस

[श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ]

खतरे को देख कर आप को कोई निर्णय
शास्त्र करना चाहिये ताकि कोई नई समस्या
देश के सामने खड़ी न हो जाय। मैं केवल इतना
ही कहूँगा कि जय हिम्मत से काम चलाइये।
यह कोई घाटे, दाल का दुकान नहीं है बल्कि
४४ कराड़ की प्राबादी वाले देश का शासन-
कार्य चलाना है। अगर आप में हिम्मत नहीं
है तो दूसरों को आने का मौका दीजिये लेकिन
गलत तरीके से काम कर देश का सत्यानाश तो
न करें। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं उपाध्यक्ष
महादय, आप की धन्यवाद देते हुए अपना
स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ।

Shri Iqbal Singh (Ferozepur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I whole-heartedly support the policy of this Government regarding External Affairs. There will be some decisive factors in the formulation of the foreign policy of each country and so also in the case of our country. We are for the preservation of world peace, maintaining friendly relations with all the countries and following an independent foreign policy, not being attached to this bloc or that bloc. India is following, we may say, a policy of non-alignment, deciding each matter on its merits and according to the circumstances of each case, of course, always being guided by some general principles like fight against colonialism. Because of our present successful foreign policy, we have won many friends, as our Prime Minister has said. I do not subscribe to the views of those who say that we have no friends in the world. On the other hand, what is taking place is, China is being isolated day by day from the councils of the world, and that is mainly because of the effectiveness and success of the foreign policy of this country and the effective leadership of our Prime Minister. So, it is entirely wrong to say that the policy of non-alignment and the other policies which we have followed so effectively are not giving any tangible results today.

Then I come to a disturbing feature which is noticed in most of our Em-

bassies. I had been to a few ~~foreign~~ countries and wherever I had gone I had made it a point to meet the Indian people, who were once the inhabitants of this great country of ours. All of them were of the unanimous view that the treatment that is meted out to them from our Missions abroad is far from what it should be.

15.37 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]
Their grievance is even when they write complaints, they do not get any replies for months together whereas if they write to some of the Embassies of some other countries they get the reply in a day or two. In London I was told by some of the Indians residing there that it takes 5 to 6 months for them to get a passport renewed. This is really a sorry state of affairs. I would request Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to tone up the administration so that there will be no occasion for any such complaints about our Embassies, especially by the Indians residing in those countries, in future. Burma Government is following a policy which is hitting the Indians residing there very hardily. Most of the Indians in Burma are engaged in business and now that the Burmese Government has nationalised all business the Indians are out of business.

There are countries like Fiji, Mauritius and British Guiana where most of the people or the majority of the people are of Indian origin. Those Indians as well as we from this side have done our best for the achievement of freedom by those countries. Yet, after the achievement of freedom, the treatment meted out to the Indians there from those newly-independent governments is discriminatory, especially in Kenya and Tanganyika and some other African countries. Indians went to those countries in the early days, did business and made those countries prosperous. In fact, they represent the image of India in those countries. Therefore, it is regrettable that they are not getting equal treatment from their respective governments.

For example, even today the British Government is saying that if Mauritius gets freedom it may join India, with India as a Commonwealth, by a separate treaty because the majority of people there are of Indian origin. In order to prolong their stay there, in this way the British Government is doing in those countries what it had done in this country so that their freedom may be delayed. But the Government of India should take up this matter in its own way; at least their cause should be propagated and put in the proper perspective so that the world may know about it. These are small islands; but they may be useful some day.

So is the problem of Indians in Kenya, Tanganyika and other countries of Africa. They are mostly people who are engaged in trade. They are businessmen; they have gone there to do business. I do not think that all of them are doing all the good things; but still they are the product of this country. There are people in this country also who have got a weakness; so there also there may be some or a few persons who may not be so good as they should be. Their problem is mostly neglected. They might be looked after and our Embassies must have sympathy for them. They say that if we do so much work, they will generally go to India and complain about us and talk of so many of our weaknesses. This is the impression of all the Indians, whether they are in Africa, the U.K., Malaya or Burma. The Government of India should re-orient its policy regarding Indians abroad. They should have a more dynamic policy and should look after their interests. I do not say that they should do such a thing which may even mar the image of India, but still they can be helpful in many ways.

Then, we are offering so many scholarships to African and other students, but very few scholarships are being offered to children of those people who are of Indian origin or who have got sympathy or who have gone from this country and have settled there,

whether they are Indian nationals or nationals of those countries.

I come from a State which is a border State and I come from a village which is a border village. Being on the border with Pakistan, naturally, I have every sympathy with the idea that our country has a close and good relationship with Pakistan. It is in the interest of that area, in the interest of this country as well as in the interest of that country. But I am sorry to say that for the last more than 17 years we have always tried to appease Pakistan. We have always had a good thing for Pakistan. We have always tried to see that the problem of Pakistan is eased. But whereas these things are being done from our side, Pakistan has always betrayed those interests. Now openly they have joined China which at least is not friendly to us and which had invaded our country last year. Nobody knows what is there in that pact.

I have to say something about the Indus waters treaty because that affects that area very much. That treaty is the product of this Ministry. As regards the implementation of this treaty—even in the report it has been mentioned—we are suffering. At least those sufferings may be brought to the notice of Pakistan. All the people from our side want to ignore the difficulties which the people of that area are facing. They say that this will be a new problem. It may be a problem. We have tried to solve that problem for the good of Pakistan; still, there are so many difficulties and nobody even wants to talk of those difficulties.

The other problem is that of evacuee property. So much evacuee property was left in East Pakistan and West Pakistan and that problem is practically a forgotten problem today. We should press for these things. We should press regarding the visit to religious places of the Hindus and the

[Shri Iqbal Singh]

Sikhs that have been left in Pakistan. There are historical places, places of great religious importance, such as, Nankana Sahib and others. The Government of India must at least have a policy to see that so many people will visit them each year and we should have this understanding with Pakistan. There is no use in always yielding to Pakistan. Pakistan is going to be unfriendly towards India. Their actions of the last 17 years have shown this. Their action even of today, their treatment of the minorities in East Pakistan shows this. More than 5,000 people are coming from Pakistan daily. We cannot allow this. We should now have a strong policy as regards Pakistan. That is what I want to say.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक जमाना था, जब हिन्दुस्तान की विदेशी नीति दुनिया के दरबारों और बाजारों में जरा थकड़ कर चला करनी थी। आज न जाने किस बोझ से—कई तरह के कुकर्मों के बोझ से—दबी हुई वह दुनिया के दरबारों में—बाजारों से तो वह करीब करीब हट ही गई है—बहुत लजा कर चलती है। इस के पास महात्मा गांधी का नाम था, पुराने देश की याद, ४०, ४४ करोड़ की आबादी और एक सबल सेना थी। ये चारों शक्तियां क्षीण हो गयी हैं। ऐसा क्यों हुआ? मुझे सब से बड़ा कारण यह मालूम होता है कि जिन चार देशों को ले कर दुनिया की आधी आबादी है—अमरीका, रूस, चीन और हिन्दुस्तान, और जिन में दो देश तो आर्थिक और सामरिक शक्ति के हिसाब से दुनिया की करीब अस्सी सैकड़ शक्ति लिए हुए हैं, हिन्दुस्तान ने इन तीन देशों के प्रति अपना रुख ठीक तरह से अपनाया नहीं इन्हें समझा तक नहीं। अब यह चांका त्रिकोण भर रह गया है। चीन भी गलती कर रहा है। शायद अब थोड़ी रह जायेंगे। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान

ने चीन के समझने में शुरू से अब तक जो भूल की, मैं उस का ही ज्यादा जिक्र करूंगा।

चीन उस जीव की तरह है, जिस को एक बड़ी पीड़ा है, लेकिन उसे पता नहीं कि वह कौन सी पीड़ा है और वह छटपटा कर दुनिया में बहुत कुछ कुकर्म करना रहा है। उस पीड़ा का नाम है मार्क्सवाद। उसने इसे अपनाया था यह सोच कर कि देश के अन्दर विभिन्न देशों के आपसी रिश्तों को असमता को वह इसके जश्न दूर कर सकेगा। थोड़ी बहुत यह पीड़ा मुझको भी शुरू से रही है। दुनिया में दो अरब रंगीन लोग, दबे, पिसे, गरीब, दुखी और एक अरब शक्तिशाली और—सुखी तो मैं नहीं कहूंगा, लेकिन—खुश गारे, यह दुनिया का हाल रहा है। इन में आपस में कितनी गैर-बराबरी है, इस का लम्बा हिस्सा न कह कर खाली मुख्य पांच गैर-बराबरियां गिनाए देता हूं। (१) उत्पादन की असमानता। जितना माल हिन्दुस्तान का आदमी एक घंटे में पैदा करता है, उतना रूस वाला पांच या छः मिनट में और अमरीका वाला दो तीन मिनट में पैदा कर लेता है। (२) दाम की असमानता। कच्चे माल के दाम बढ़ते नहीं हैं लेकिन पक्के माल के दाम धड़ाधड़ बढ़ते चले जाते हैं। (३) हथियारों की असमानता, जिस का जिक्र मैं कर चुका हूं। (४) हुनर और (५) जमीन की महान् असमानता क्योंकि कैलिफोर्निया, साइबेरिया और आस्ट्रेलिया में जहां एक वर्ग मील के ऊपर एक या पांच या सात आदमी बसते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान के आधे हिस्से में और चीन के भी चौथाई हिस्से या जितनी रंगीन दुनिया है, इसके ऊपर एक वर्ग मील के ऊपर हजार आदमियों तक बसते हैं। यह है अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जमींदारी। ये पांच असमानतायें इस दुनिया को खायें जा रही हैं, दामों की असमानता, जमीन की असमानता, उत्पत्ति की असमानता, हुनर की असमानता और हथियारों की असमानता।

चीन ने सोचा था कि मार्क्सवाद को अपनाने से यह कुछ दूर हो सकेगी। चीन और अमरीका की जो गैर-बराबरी है उससे चीन संतप्त नहीं है। लेकिन चीन संतप्त है क्योंकि रूस से अपनी गैर-बराबरी वह दूर नहीं कर पाया है। दोनों मार्क्सवादी देश हैं, फिर भी दोनों गैर-बराबर। इसका कारण यह है कि मार्क्सवाद के पास देश के अन्दर की असमानता का थोड़ा बहुत जवाब अपने ढंग से जरूर है लेकिन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय असमानता का इसके पास कोई जवाब नहीं है। यह चीन की पीड़ा है। चीन ने क्या किया। उसने आस्ट्रेलिया का दरवाजा नहीं खटखटाया, साइबेरिया का नहीं, कैलिफोर्निया का नहीं लेकिन दक्षिण कोरिया, दक्षिण वियतनाम और हिमालय का खटखटाया। इसका कारण यह था कि ये कमजोर थे। ब्यूमॉय, मत्सू का भी दरवाजा नहीं खटखटाया। इससे साफ नतीजा यह निकालना चाहिये कि पशुबल, खास तौर से हथियारी पशुबल और उस पर भी खास तौर से कम्युनिस्टी हथियारी पशुबल अपने से कमजोर के ऊपर चढ़ बैठता है, अपने से शक्तिशाली के उपर नहीं। इसलिए मैं यह पहले कह देना चाहता हूँ कि मुझ जैसे आदमी ने अपनी जवानी के दिनों में आशा लगाई थी कि कभी चीन और हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हो कर उन दरवाजों को खटखटायेंगे लेकिन आज मुझे यह कहना पड़ता है कि रंगीन लोगो, अपनी आंखें खोल लो, अगर कोई रंगीन ताकतवर बनता है, हथियारी ताकतवर और उस पर भी कम्युनिस्टी हथियारी ताकतवर जो दरवाजा गागे का नहीं खटखटायेंगा, वह तुम्हारा ही दरवाजा खटखटाने लग जायगा।

यह है आज के युग का राक्षस, चीन, और इस पर कहीं किसी तरह का सन्देह नहीं होना चाहिये। लेकिन हम लोगों को यह भी जान लेना चाहिये कि राक्षस भी गुणी हुआ करता है। यह रावण का देश है। रावण विद्वान था। चीन ताकतवर है, सिर्फ अपने

हथियारों वगैरह की वजह से नहीं। सच पूछो तो गौरी दुनिया में कुछ है ही नहीं। लेकिन चीन की असली ताकत है कि आज वह दो अरब रंगीनों का प्रतीक और प्रवक्ता बन गया है चाहे ना-समझी में और चाहे भ्रम में क्योंकि दो अरब रंगीन समझते हैं कि इस देश के जरिये कहीं हम कुछ हासिल कर सकेंगे, आत्म-सम्मान, बराबरी वगैरह।

15.53 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

इसलिए मैं अज्ञ करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तानी जनता और हिन्दुस्तानी सरकार कभी भूल न कर बैठे कि यह खाली प्रचार का मामला है। यह आत्मा का मामला है। रूस और अमरीका से भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि खाली यह कह कर मत टाल देना कि चीन वाले तो जाति प्रचार अपनाये हुए हैं। जब तक दुनिया की इन पांच असमानताओं का हल नहीं निकाला जायेगा, तब तक कुछ नहीं होगा। उस हल के बारे में मैं आज यह कहने को तैयार हूँ—शायद दस पंद्रह बीस बरस पहले मुझ से भी गलती हो गई हो—कि वह हल केवल रंगीन नहीं निकालेंगे, उसमें गौरे लोगों को भी शामिल होना होगा, जो कोई उदारवादी गौरे लोग हैं उनको भी शामिल होना होगा और हल निकालना होगा। जब ऐसा होगा तब जा कर कहीं आज के युग के राक्षस का हम लोग सामना कर सकते हैं।

यह खाली हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर हमले का या हिमालय के ऊपर हमले का सवाल नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति ना-कामयाब रही है क्योंकि उसने हमलावर को उस सारी पृष्ठ-भूमि में नहीं डाला है कि यह गंतों और रंगीनों का मामला है।

मैंने शुरू से ही हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति चलाने वालों के सामने यह सवाल रखा है। जो कुछ भी हुआ, बहुत बुरा हुआ है। उसका आज नतीजा यह है कि चीन

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

मुखिया बन बैठा है, उस गैर-बराबरी के सवाल को ले करके, गलत तरीके से, उस दुनिया का जो बराबरी चाहते हैं। वह मुखिया न रहे इसके लिए हिन्दुस्तान और दूसरी रंगीन दुनिया को कोशिश करनी है। मैं नहीं कहता कि कोई चीन पर हमला कर दे। लेकिन इतना जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर सिद्धान्त का मजबूत लेते हों तो फिर जिस राक्षसी चीन ने हमारे देश पर हमला किया है, उससे दौलत सम्बन्ध रखना, मेरी समझ में कतई नहीं आता है। उसके साथ बैठ सकते हों, बैठना लाजिमी होता है, जरूरी बैठना पड़ जाता है, क्योंकि दुनिया में राक्षस भी हैं और मनुष्य भी हैं। लेकिन उसके साथ सम्बन्ध रखना, इसका साफ मतलब होता है कि अभी तक हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति ने इस बुनियादी मामले को समझा तक नहीं है।

यह क्यों हुआ है? इसका भी जो मुख्य कारण है वह मैं आपके सामने रखना हूँ। यह दुनिया दो ध्रुवों की है शक्ति के हिसाब से, एक रूस की और एक अमरीका की। चाहे उसको आप अतलांतिकी और मोवियती कह लें। लेकिन अकसर एक बहुध्रुवी दुनिया बनाने की कोशिश की जाती है। खास तौर से उन लोगों की तरफ से जो अंग्रेजों की विदेश नीति का मक्क सीखा करते हैं। इसका कारण यह है कि अंग्रेजों की कुछ आदतें रही हैं। उनको छोड़ दें तो जब से फ्रांस में डिगाल साहब तशरीफ लाये हैं तब से यह बहुध्रुवी दुनिया का प्रचार बहुत चल पड़ा है, अपने देश में तो बहुत चला है। दो ध्रुवों से काम नहीं चलता। बाकी ध्रुव हैं १ अच्छा है, नई ताकत उभरेंगी, इससे संसार में शान्ति हो सकेगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बहुध्रुवी दुनिया एक तो है ही नहीं। इंग्लिस्तान और फ्रांस की शक्ति बिल्कुल दिबाऊ है। उसमें कोई सार नहीं है और अगर है भी तो वह नई दुनिया को बसाने वाली नहीं है। अगर

कभी दुनिया बहुध्रुवी बनेगी तो वह शक्ति के हिसाब से नहीं, मेरी जिन्दगी में तो कम से कम नहीं और ज्यादातर जो लोग यहां बैठे हुए हैं, उनकी जिन्दगियों में तो नहीं। यह दुनिया रूस और अमरीका की ही रहेगी। लेकिन आदर्श के हिसाब से बहुध्रुवी बन सकती है, जिस आदर्श की तलाश करना, हिन्दुस्तान के लोग भी, बहुत तकलीफ के साथ मुझ कहना पड़ता है, छोड़ चुके हैं और वे फ्रांस और इंग्लिस्तान की शक्ति की तरफ जा रहे हैं।

अंग्रेजों की आदत की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान खींचूंगा क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान ने भी उससे बहुत सीखना चाहा है। वह आदत है कम ताकत हों, फिर भी दुनिया पर अपना कब्जा जताते रहो। कैसे? दुनिया को लड़ाते रहो, धीमे धीमे, चतुराई से और जोड़ते भी रहो। अमरीका के साथ प्रेम करते रहो, उसके मित्र बने रहो लेकिन रूस और चीन से भी आंख लड़ाते रहो। यह अंग्रेजी विदेश नीति का एक मुख्य पाया रहा है और आज से नहीं पिछले डेढ़ दो सौ बरस से रहा है। अंग्रेजों ने इससे बहुत कुछ अपने मुल्क के लिए हासिल भी किया है। लेकिन जब हिन्दुस्तान जैसा देश उसकी नकल करने लगता है तो क्या होता है, वह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। दुनिया के बाजारों में तो विदेश नीति दिखाई ही नहीं पड़ती हिन्दुस्तान की और दरबार में बहुत लजा लजा कर के चला करती है।

16 hrs.

अंग्रेजों वामपंथ की एक और खास आदत रही है और ऐसा खयाल है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने या विदेश मंत्रालय ने उसका सबक अंग्रेजी वामपंथ से सीखा है। वामपंथ का मतलब मजदूर पार्टी से नहीं, वामपंथ का मतलब उस जमाने से, स्टेफर्ड क्रिस्स और एलन विल्किंसन के जमाने से आज तक, दोनों "क म" तक है। "क" "म" से मेरा मतलब एक तो किंगडले

मार्टिन साहब से और दूसरे कृष्ण मेनन साहब से है। यह अंग्रेजी वामपंथ हिन्दुस्तान को विदेश नीति का सबक सिखाता रहा है। कैसे? सोवियत संघ के साथ तो मौखिक संगति करो, मुंह से तो सोवियत संघ के साथ बनाये रखो लेकिन पदार्थों के हिसाब से अतलांतिक के साथ रिश्ता रखो, हवाई जहाज अंग्रेजों से लो, कल पुर्जे इंग्लिस्तान से लो, सारा व्यापार इंग्लिस्तान की तरफ रखो लेकिन सोवियत संघ के साथ हमदर्दी दिखाते रहो। इस तरह से आंख लड़ने वाली नहीं है। अंग्रेजी वामपंथ ने हिन्दुस्तान को यह हरकत सिखाई है। इस वामपंथ के बारे में मैं खाली इतना याद दिला दूँ कि स्टफोर्ड क्रिप्स के जमाने से जबकि इटली ने एवेसीनिया पर हमला किया था आज तक जबकि चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला किया है, अंग्रेजी वामपंथ दबे दबे हमलावरों का साथी रहा है। क्यों रहा है, यह लम्बा किस्सा है। अब इसी तरह से अंग्रेजों की विदेश नीति में एक और खासियत रही है कि वह दुनिया भर में शान्ति का कोहरा या धुन्ध फेला दिया करते हैं, जिसके जरिये से वह अपने व्यापार वगैरह का भी काफी बड़ा हिस्सा हासिल कर लिया करते हैं। साफ बात है, चकमा देना जितना अंग्रेजी विदेशनीति को आता है उतना संसार में आज किसी को नहीं आता। कभी, किसी जमाने में आस्ट्रिया का मँटरनिक था। उसने यह कला बहुत निकाली थी, और जो जैमुइट कूटनीतिज्ञ हैं वह भी इस चकमे में अंग्रेजों के हिसाब से एक बुनियाद हैं। कितना भी कहें, वे थोड़े बहुत शक्तिशाली हैं और कूटनीति की कला उन की सैकड़ों वर्षों से चली आ रही है। जब हम हिन्दुतानी उसी चकमे को सीखते हैं तो न तो हमारे पास शक्ति है और न कला है। कला की जगह हम लोग फूहड़ हैं। और फिर नतीजे खराब हो जाया करते हैं। यही सबब है कि हम लोग पिछले १७ वर्षों में व्यवहारकुशलता की खोज में कोई चीज हासिल नहीं कर पाये। व्यवहारकुशल बनों, कोई ऐसी बात कहो जो तत्काल मतलब रखती हो, दूर की बात मत

करो, लम्बी बात करो। अरे, इस से तो दुनिया न जाने कितने १००, ५० वर्षों में बदलेगी। जो आज की दुनिया है उस को ले कर बात करो जिस से दुनिया बदले। यह व्यवहारकुशलता की खोज भाननीय विदेश मंत्री को बहुत रही है। व्यवहारकुशलता कैसी बात है, वह मैं साफ कर दूँ। जो देश नये हैं, कमजोर हैं, अगर वह व्यवहारकुशलता की खोज करने लग जाते हैं तो वह बिल्कुल निकम्मे बन जाया करते हैं। व्यवहारकुशल होना है जिन को, जिन के पास शक्ति है, जिन को दुनिया के फौरी मामले को हल करना है, जैसे कि रूस है, जैसे अमरीका है और शायद किसी कदर अंग्रेज भी। लेकिन जो देश नये हैं, जिन को नई दुनिया का निर्माण करना है, अगर वे भी इस व्यवहारकुशलता के दलदल में फँस जायेंगे तो नई दुनिया कभी बना नहीं पायेगे। उन की कोई मुनेगा भी नहीं। कमजोर की व्यवहारकुशलता कौन मुना करता है। इस लिये शक्तिशाली देशों के साथ व्यवहारकुशलता की बात आज आप छोड़ दें। नतीजा क्या होता है।

आज हम दिन रात अखबारों में पढ़ा करते हैं कि चीन हार गया, फलाने सम्मेलन में हार गया, उस की बात किसी ने मानी नहीं। लेकिन इस के कुछ नतीजे तो साफ हैं न कि उस की बात कही तो गई, आई तो उस की बात। मानी नहीं, लेकिन अब देखो चीन की बात आती है। चीन हारा लेकिन खेला तो सही। हिन्दुस्तान तो पिछले कई वर्षों से खेलना भी बन्द कर चुका है। इस लिये उसने हारने जीतने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता है। आप किसी भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन को देखिये बहुत से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलनों का जिक्र यहां होता है। ज्यादा मैं पसन्द नहीं करता, जैसे कि अफेशिया वगैरह वगैरह, लेकिन उन में हमेशा जिक्र आता है उन बातों का जिस को चीन ने करना चाहा। साथ साथ यह भी खबर आती है, और कभी कभी बिल्कुल झूठी,

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

कि चीन नाकामयाब रहा है। परन्तु उसका सबब है। जैसे सन्तरा सूख जाता है या भ्राम सूख जाता है, वैसे ही हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति भी सूख गई, क्योंकि उसके ऊपर जो थपड़ पड़े हैं, चाहे चीन के हों चाहे पाकिस्तान के, या और सबब से, भले ही वह निजी हैं, उनको ले कर ही वह इतनी उलझ गई है कि अब सम्बा मामला, दुनिया को बदलने वाला उसकी आंखों के सामने रह नहीं गया है। अब तक हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति संसार में गोरी और रंगीन की उन पांच असमानताओं को फिर से दुनिया के सामने नहीं लायेगी, अब तक मुझे डर लगता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति कहीं कोई कदम आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकेगी। हम खाली अपना ही रोना रोते रहेंगे कि चीन ने हम को यह थपड़ मारा, पाकिस्तान ने वह थपड़ मारा, लेकिन उस में कोई विश्वव्यापकता नहीं रहेगी।

इसी तरह से मैं आप का ध्यान खींचू इस तरफ कि हिन्दुस्तान जब अन्न के लिये भीख मांगता फिरता है तो फिर उसकी विदेश नीति चल कहां सकेगी। आखिर एक हद्द होती है। एक हद्द तक ही हो सकता है कि कोई देश या राष्ट्र भीख भी मांगता रहे और साथ साथ बड़ी आदर्शवादिता की डींग भी हांकता रहे।

अब यह दो ध्रुव हैं अमरीका और रूस वाले। उनके बारे में मैं चाहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति साफ साफ बात रखे कि एक तो दाम का सन्तुलन, दूसरी गरीबी को मिटाना। इन दो को ले कर के इन दोनों के साथ रहने की कोशिश करो, वैसी चीजें नहीं जैसे कि अणु परीक्षण बन्द करो जैसे तनाव बन्द कर दो, जैसे शिखर सम्मेलन कर लो, जो कि पिछले दस पन्द्रह वर्षों से हिन्दुस्तान ने किया। अब इस से काम नहीं चलेगा। ठोस बात ले कर आओ, जिस में दुनिया के रंगीन लोग देखें कि हां, अब कोई हमें सुधारने वाली चीज आई है। इसी तरह से मैं अमरीका

और रूस के बारे में यह कहूँ कि पूंज उत्पादन, जीवन स्तर और आर्थिक बराबरी के मामले, इन तीनों दृष्टियों से यह दोनों देश एक दूसरे के बहुत नजदीक हैं। हिन्दुस्तान गलती कर बैठता है जो इन दोनों के बीच में बड़ा फर्क करता है। मुझे लगता है कि अगले बीस या पच्चीस वर्षों में यह दोनों देश एक दूसरे के बहुत नजदीक हो जायेंगे।

अमरीका का सातवां बेड़ा शायद आज ही इधर उधर घूम रहा है। वह लम्बा किस्सा है। इस पर मुझे खाली इतना ही कहना है कि मैं खुद १७ वर्ष तक इस सातवें बेड़े के खिलाफ रहा हूँ, आज भी खिलाफ हूँ। लेकिन क्या करूँ। हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति इस कदर नाकामयाब हुई है कि मुझे यहाँ आज यह कहना पड़ता है कि हिन्दुस्तान के माननीय विदेश मंत्री ने दबी जबान से सातवें बेड़े को अपने समुद्र में आने दिया। ऐसा हाँगज नहीं होना चाहिये। खुली जबान से होना चाहिये। जो नीति अपनाओ खुल कर अपनाओ, हिम्मत के साथ अपनाओ। अगर सातवां बेड़ा आता है तो उस के एवज में दुनिया के लिये और हिन्दुस्तान के लिये कुछ हासिल करो। मेरा बस चलता तो मैं अमरीका से यह कहता कि ठीक है, सातवां बेड़ा आ रहा है, बताओ तुम क्या करते हो हिमालय के बारे में, क्या करते हो तिब्बत के बारे में, क्या कहते हो दामों के सन्तुलन के बारे में और इस तरह से व्यापक विदेश नीति को ले कर मैं मामला कुछ आगे बढ़ाता। रूस और अमरीका की सरकारों से मैं कहता हूँ कि पांच साम्राज्यशाहियों के बारे में कुछ करो। वहाँ की जनता से भी कहता हूँ कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र है न्यूयार्क में, वहाँ पर वह भी कुछ प्रदर्शन करो। दुनिया में प्रदर्शन हों, दुनिया के मसलों को ले कर, दाम बांधने के लिये हों, गरीबी मिटाने के लिये हों।

इसी तरह से सवाल उठ जाता है बिन लगाव की नीति का। एक तरफ रूस की

गोद है और दूसरी तरफ अमरीका की गोद है, और तीसरी तरफ आप बिन गोद के कह लें। बिन गोद वाले देशों में और हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ खिचाव रहता है, जैसे हिन्देशिया है, बर्मा वगैरह हैं। मुझे कहना है कि इन देशों को देख कर मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि बिन गोद वाले देश तो हरजार्ड देश हैं। बिन लगाव की नीति पर हमें कुछ भयंकर रूप से सोचना पड़ेगा। मैं भी तीसरे खेमे की नीति वाला हूँ, लेकिन जिस तरह से तीसरे खेमे या तीसरी शक्ति की नीति को इस विदेश मंत्रालय ने सिगाड़ा है उसे देख कर मुझे यहाँ कहना पड़ता है कि यह निरपेक्ष नीति नहीं है, यह एक हरजार्ड नीति है कि कभी इस की गोद में बैठे, कभी उसकी गोद में बैठे। इस नीति को छोड़ कर एक आदर्शवादिता को ले कर काम चलाना पड़ेगा। ब्रिटिश राष्ट्रमंडल, अफेशियाई देश के ऊपर सहारा और बिन लगाव के ऐसा समझना, यह तीन हमारे लिये बहुत खराब चीजें हैं।

बंसे मेरा इरादा था कि मैं एक किस्सा सुनाऊँ, लेकिन यहाँ पर विदेश मंत्री हैं नहीं इसलिये सुनाना फुजूल है और वक्त भी नहीं रह गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : किस्सा सुनाने का समय भी नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : विदेश नीति को ले कर चांग काई शोक के मामले में १९४२ में मेरे साथ और विदेश मंत्री के साथ जो कुछ हुआ मैं चाहता था कि उसको साफ साफ बतलाता लेकिन खैर उस को छोड़ दीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप अपने भाषण को समाप्त की और ले आयें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं इसीलिये जल्दी जल्दी कह रहा हूँ। जब मैं कभी इतनी जल्दी करता हूँ तो मुझे ऐसा लगता है पता नहीं

मैं अपनी बात कह भी पाता हूँ या नहीं। मेरे मन में शक बना रहता है।

हम शरीर और आत्मा की बात करते हैं। बहुत दफे बातें होती हैं प्रचार की। हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति की आत्मा इतनी खोखली हो चुकी है कि जब तक वह आत्मा ठीक नहीं होती तब तक शरीर को सुधारने से कोई विशेष लाभ नहीं होता। लेकिन फिर भी शरीर थोड़ा सुधारना चाहिये। इस सिलसिले में मैं माननीय विदेश मंत्री का वह वाक्य दुहरा दूँ, कि हिन्दुस्तान के राजदूत का एक विशेष गुण है उसकी बीबी। माननीय मोरारजी देसाई का कहना है कि मैं खूबसूरत चेहरों को पसन्द करता हूँ। लेकिन मुझे भालूम होता है कि माननीय विदेश मंत्री भी खूबसूरत चेहरों को पसन्द करते हैं। लेकिन मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक हमारे राजदूतों का दिल और दिमाग एन तरफ साधारण जनता के साथ और दूसरी तरफ दुनिया के साथ जुड़ा न होगा . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप खत्म करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं दो भिन्ट में खत्म किये देता हूँ।

एक बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश विभाग का प्रचार मंत्रालय रोज एक बुलेटिन भेजा करता है। मैं ने चिट्ठी लिखी और टेल.फोन करने की भी कांशिश की कि वह बुलेटिन मुझे भी मिला करे। आखिर में भी लोव-सभा का सदस्य हूँ, मेरे साथ यह भेदभाव क्यों किया जाता है।

इसी के साथ साथ मैं आप को भाषा के बारे में भी एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। अगर भाषा का मामला ठीक नहीं होगा तो विदेश नीति का मामला भी ठीक होना असम्भव है और इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपके सामने महात्मा गांधी का एक वाक्य रखना चाहता हूँ। गांधी जी ने सन् १९४२ में कहा था—हिन्दुस्तान चाहे जहन्नुम में जाये,

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

अंग्रेजी भारत छोड़ो। लेकिन आज जब मैं कहता हूँ कि हिन्दी चाहे जहन्नुम में जाये अंग्रेजी को हटाओ तो हिन्दी के व्यापारी मुझसे तोराज हो जाया करते हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्या : आज हैं नहीं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं अब खाली हबीबुल्ला खाँ का एक वाक्य आपके सामने रख कर खत्म कर देना चाहता हूँ। वह पाकिस्तान के गृह मंत्री हैं। जो वाक्य उन्होंने कहा है उसका मैं आपको अनुवाद करके सुनाये देता हूँ। सारी चीजें अंग्रेजी में छपती हैं। उसका तर्जुमा इस प्रकार है :

“कि वह नहीं चाहते कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान दो विभिन्न देश विभिन्न लोगों के हिस्से से खड़े रहें, लेकिन एक ही देश और एक ही लोगों के दो हिस्सों की तरह रहें !”

मैं नहीं जानता कि उनके इस वाक्य का कितना मतलब है। लेकिन इसको पढ़ कर मुझे लगा कि वह कहना चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को इस तरह रहना चाहिए जैसे दो शरीर एक दिल या दो जीभ और एक दिमाग। क्या यह बात सही है। पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकारों के बारे में जो मेरी राय है उसको मैं आपके सामने रख कर आपका दुखाना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन मैं पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान को जनता से चाहता हूँ वह हबीबुल्ला खाँ के इस वाक्य के रहस्य को जितनी जल्दी हो सके बूढ़ने की कोशिश करे।

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda):
Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that the trust, status and regard which India has been enjoying among the family of nations during the last decade and even today is due neither to our military power or resources nor to our huge population or vast area,

but is due to our foreign policy which is based on secular democratic socialism, of which our Prime Minister, who is not only a great statesman but enjoys the complete trust and devotion and faith of not only the 400 million people of this country but also a very large number of people in the world, is the architect, I would also like to make it clear that this foreign policy is very much in tune with our internal policy and in conformity with those humane and cultural values for which India has always stood and stands even today. So it is very wrong to say that our foreign policy is foreign to reality. In my opinion, it is most realistic and most dynamic.

I was taken aback by a suggestion made that India's image has been tarnished and the recommendation of Shri Deo in regard to what he called the ambiguous policy of non-alignment. In my opinion, it is a most dangerous recommendation and it would be a dark day not only in the history of India but in the history of mankind if India ever changes from that policy. It will not only badly damage the great image of India, the image of secularism, humanism and democratic socialism, but it will also eliminate the growing possibilities of total disarmament and world peace.

It is needless to emphasize that as far as our national interests are concerned, this policy has stood the serious test of the worst times of aggression, and even those external Powers who have been indulging in various types of alignments, not only approved this policy and appreciated it, but also came to our help.

It is a very humble statement to say that by this policy of non-alignment, India has encouraged all the constructive forces, democratic and socialistic forces, to consolidate themselves not only within the two Power blocs, but also in the continents of

Asia and Africa. It has made a tremendous moral and political impact on the rigid communist system and on the rigid capitalist socialist forces. It has transformed them and liberalised them to a very great extent, and I am sure historians of the future will record in golden words that it is non-alignment which has consolidated all the peace-loving and constructive forces and has been responsible for removing the tensions and dangers of the armaments race and self-annihilation, and also relaxed and transformed the views of the two Power blocs to the extent that this signing of the Test Ban Treaty became a reality.

Millions of people of not only this country but millions of peace-loving people of the whole world, not only approve of this policy of non-alignment, but also believe in the great statesmanship and leadership of our Prime Minister. They are not only placing their faith and trust in our foreign policy by their actions and speeches, but the co-operation and kindness which we have been enjoying shows that the majority of the world, which consists of peace-loving people, is with us.

I was very much surprised to hear the statement of Shri Swell who said that India was becoming isolated. He has not only economised the truth, but he has also ignored the facts.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Followed the facts.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: The majority of the countries are not only friendly, co-operative and kind towards India, but they always try to show their friendship in whatever form they can.

If anybody has got this wrong impression that the countries which are under communalism and sectarianism and dictatorship can ever be friendly with India, they are very much mistaken. Even if they want to be friendly, these people are helpless, and

they can never be friendly with us. They are so much afraid not of India's military power, but of India's policy of secularism and non-alignment. That is why it is very natural for them not to be friendly with India. We should not care for their friendship.

Our decision regarding participation in the Jakarta Conference has proved that India is totally committed to peace, that in spite of the greatest provocation and the greatest injustice done by China, India still believes in peaceful negotiations, in solutions which can be found by negotiation. We all support this joining of the preparatory conference at Jakarta.

Many of us forget this fact that science and technology have brought us so near to each other that no country can ever claim to or do anything in an isolated way. It will surely have its repercussions on all the other nations.

Our stand regarding the Colombo proposals vis-a-vis China has not only been straight, but also very correct. Let us hope that the world may not see the catastrophe of a third world war, and we may be able to solve these problems through persuasion and get our territory vacated through peaceful means.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Amen.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: Our diplomacy is neither based on selfishness, nor self-interest. It has always been based on social justice and peace, and it will always be so.

I very much appreciate the spontaneous support that India's delegate has given by being a co-sponsor of the resolution against the unprovoked bombing of Yemen by British planes. To my mind internal unity of Asia is the most important and it would be very useful if some organisation like

[Shrimati Savitri Nigam]

the Asia Unity League could be sponsored by India or by any other Asian country which may work uniting the countries in Asia. One is very easily tempted to shower bouquets of approval and praise for our foreign policy on our Prime Minister as well as hon. Shastriji when these demands are in discussion. But I do not think that their shoulders need to be burdened by these bouquets. What they need is to strengthen their hands with constructive suggestions. The strength lies in the weakest link and in my opinion our weakest link is our publicity. It is good that a very senior officer has been recently appointed as co-ordinating officer but that is not enough. We should produce more literature and we should also strengthen our embassies, legations and try to see that we not only get correct news from other countries but we may also give the correct news of our right stand to other countries through our embassies. It is time that a complete overhauling of our foreign publicity department is done.

I am surprised that only civilian officers have monopolised these diplomatic assignments. I do not mean to say that civilians should not be given these appointments but I say that more and more political people should also go to their assistance. People with administrative experience, civilian servants plus people who are very clear in thinking and who have got political background should also be given these assignments. Then only we will be able to get that sort of social contacts and political contacts with the people and we will be able to give our right views and get the right views of the other countries to our benefit.

Sir, I am sorry to say that this report is like a repetitive description of accounts on a factual basis. I wish some thought is given in future to give some perspective planning, the real trends as well as our plan, what we are going to do in our relationship

with other countries. It will be helpful if our External Affairs Ministry could give serious thought to the great need of perspective planning in our foreign policy. In the world which is undergoing a rapid change and witnessing such things as are happening today, besides civil servants who are efficient, some men with boldness and insight in these things should be associated. There should be a sort of an advisory group which should work as the policy planning board similar to the one that exists in the US State department. The machinery of co-ordination can be worked out afterwards.

We have to be very patient and tolerant regarding Kashmir. I do not think there is any need to be panicky at all. Whatever Mr. Sheikh Abdullah or anybody else says, the law of the land is always ready to take care of any person who is not ready to work within the framework of our Constitution. I am surprised at the unnecessary excitement as far as Kashmir is concerned. It is an integral part of India and will always remain so. If one person, or even hundreds of persons, get misguided, they cannot do any harm. About such problems what we need is to see and watch patiently. I would also like to say something regarding the happenings in Pakistan in the name of religion. I do not think it is such a great slur on India or anybody as it is the enemy of our country which has made religion its policy. A great challenge has been thrown and I think great harm is being done by the policies which Pakistan is adopting not only towards Pakistan herself but to all the people in India and also to the great religion, to the Islamic religion, which is one of the great religions of the world, which has played a very vital and important role in the growth of civilisation and culture.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): Do you want this harm to Pakistan should increase?

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: I am sorry, I never meant that the harm should be done or it should increase. We have been tortured and people have been tortured. But it is very obvious that it need not be emphasised at all. Equal treatment should be meted out to all the minorities in Pakistan. All the countries within the Islamic fold, whether Arab countries or any other, should all come and bring all their moral pressure to make Pakistan behave properly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Kapur Singh: She is making original contribution to the great subject of Islam.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: In the past, the world has seen worst calamities, whenever any nation or any statesman was caught by a fear complex. So, I would appeal to the people of this country and the countries who are involved and who make a contribution of great importance in the formation of various international and national policies. Let us hope that the world would never see again any such calamity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): Sir, I may be given a chance to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I have called the Minister.

Shri Shinkre: After the Minister, I want to know whether I will be called.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair cannot tell him just at present. I cannot say what may happen in future! I have called the Minister.

The Minister Without Portfolio (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would have very much liked to speak in Hindi, but I know the House generally may not approve of it. Hence I have to say a few words, and I shall refer to only a few

points raised in this House, in English. As the debate has to be replied to by the Prime Minister on Monday, I have obviously to restrict myself only to some of the points as I just now said, referred to by various Members in the House.

I shall begin with Nagaland. I do not want to go into the past history of Nagaland. It has been a painful story, but I am glad to say that the people of Nagaland, on their own,—firstly, some of the non-officials of Nagaland—met in a convention and decided that it was high time that peace was restored in Nagaland. They made a suggestion, or they passed a resolution saying that the official party, the Government there as well as the hostile Nagas—their representatives—should meet and come to some kind of settlement which would restore complete peace there. They mentioned in that resolution four names of Shri Jaya Prakash Narain, Shri Chaliha, Chief Minister of Assam, Shri Shankar Rao Deo and Rev. Michael Scott. After this resolution was passed the matter was considered in the State Assembly of Nagaland and the Assembly also passed a unanimous resolution suggesting that this kind of discussion and negotiation should take place.

The House will be glad to know that the Chief Minister of Nagaland, Shri Shilu Ao, made a categorical statement in the Assembly that the Government of Nagaland would be entirely in favour of this approach and they will do their best to bring about a settlement and peace in Nagaland through discussions with the representatives or the leaders of the hostile Nagas. I am glad to say that this proposition or suggestion has been generally welcomed in almost every section of that State. But to process this discussion is by no means going to be an easy task.

However, as Shri Shankar Rao Deo is ill and not in good health, Shri Jaya Prakash Narain and Shri Chaliha have been contacted and they have agreed to take up this matter. Mr. Michael Scott also has reached there

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

and he is also most willing to take part in it.

One thing has, however, been made clear that these discussions have to take place keeping in mind that the present set-up, that is, the full Statehood of Nagaland will continue and they cannot ask for anything further or beyond that. I mean to say, the question of any kind of independence of Nagaland cannot and should not arise. There has been some doubt in the minds of people that perhaps Mr. Michael Scott stands for something else. He had perhaps formerly talked of independence of Nagaland. But now it has been made clear to him, and he has entirely agreed, that the present setup, i.e. full State of Nagaland within the Indian Union, will continue. That is the constitutional position.

Shri Nambair (Tiruchirapalli) : What is Mr. Michael Scott's interest in that? Who is he?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri : Will the hon. Member kindly put questions at the end? It is not he; as I said in the very beginning, a resolution was passed in a convention in which his name was also mentioned. We had nothing to do with it, nor the Nagaland Government had anything to do with that resolution. It was wholly convened by non-officials of the State of Nagaland. This position has been made clear and I do hope that the talks will start soon. However, in the meanwhile, the leaders of the hostile Nagas or their representatives have to be contacted and only when they have been contacted, it would be possible to talk with them and carry on further discussion. It is a right move. The hostile Nagas have also to realise that we are more or less on a turning point. The time has come when all those who live in Nagaland have to realise the fact that no country can allow any section of its population, or any group of people, to come in contact with a foreign country

visit a foreign country, smuggle arms from there and also take some kind of military training in that country. Naturally, this cannot be allowed. It is not a question of Nagaland alone; in any part of our country it should be considered almost a betrayal against India if any group of people indulges in this kind of action. As this has been done recently and they are still on the move, the Naga hostiles who are coming from East Pakistan, I say it is high time they realise the gravity of the situation. I, therefore, greatly welcome this new move and I do hope that the hostile Nagas will gladly participate in these discussions and change the present trends of Nagaland.

The Government have been trying to do something substantial and we are going ahead with our developmental work. But the difficulty is in, this kind of tension when there is so much of bitterness and violence is often taking place, it is not possible for the development work to go ahead at a fast pace, with the result that both the people and the government have to suffer. It is, therefore, in the interest of the people that the leaders of Nagas, especially the hostile Nagas, avail themselves of this opportunity and restore peace in Nagaland.

It has also to be fully realised that nothing should be done now, in between or during the discussions to create any kind of terror or fear among the hostile Nagas, their leaders and representatives who come out of their hidings for discussions. They should not be touched and a completely different atmosphere has to be created in Nagaland both by the government, the army as well as others.

Then I would say a few words about NEFA. It is in a peculiar position and the conditions obtaining there are somewhat different as compared to other parts of our country. It is true that some of the things mentioned in the Report, to which

a reference was made by Shri Nath Pai, may not seem to be serious, or they should have been put in a different way. I might agree there. Still, some constructive and development work has been going on for some time past in NEFA and during the last 7 or 8 months many good things have been done. Whether it is in connection with education, road making or hospitals, various things have been done, though much more remains to be done. There is a desire in NEFA that the people there or their representatives should get an opportunity to participate in these activities.

It is quite true that they do want that they should have a sensation, a feeling, a sense of participation in the administrative work, specially the developmental work being done in that area. There had been a demand that a committee should be set up immediately to process this matter further and to consider what kind of democratic decentralisation should be introduced in NEFA. Decentralisation in small areas is very important. In that part of our country that is NEFA, being surrounded by him mountains, valleys etc., it is better that smaller units get an opportunity to work independently and to have some autonomy so that every time they do not have to refer matters to headquarters. It has, therefore, been decided to set up a committee and within I think, a few days the Governor of Assam will announce the personnel of that committee.

I might only add for the information of the House that we have set up our administrative units in all those places in NEFA where they existed before the Chinese aggression. The civil administration has been fully established and strengthened in NEFA.

Some reference was made to Goa and to Pondicherry. Goa, of course, has had its election recently and there is one party which has come into power, namely, the Maharashtra Gomantak Party, and which has formed the Government in Goa. The Gov-

ernment of India have given them all necessary help and will continue to do so in future. However, the main point which is engaging the mind and attention of the people of Goa, or perhaps of the Government which is in power, is the question of merger. Shri Nath Pai also raised that question here. He referred to it. Government have always said that we are not against merger as such. But it has been announced, or a policy statement has been made, that the present pattern or set up of the Union territory should continue for the time being. It would be of immense benefit to Goa. Needless to add that the funds which are being provided to Goa at present will not be available after the merger. That is not only my conjecture but it is a fact. I am not speaking against merger but I am merely pointing out the fact that it has to be borne in mind that the present help and assistance being given to Goa is enormous. I say, they need it. All the Union territories, specially the border areas, needed some kind of a special attention from the Government of India and it is the duty of the Government of India to find resources for them for their development.

Shri Nath Pai: Wherever they may be, it is your duty. Whether it is merged with the adjoining territory or not, the help is to be given because they were occupied by a foreign power for 400 years.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: That is not so.

Shri Shinkre: How long at least is this arrangement to continue?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It may be so, but partly it becomes the responsibility of the State in which that area will merge. You cannot completely shelve that responsibility. That State has to take direct responsibility. Further, the point about the merger is what time should be prescribed. If I remember aright, Shri Bhandarkar, the present Chief Minister, himself made a statement some time back

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

that he has no objection for the present set-up to continue for about ten years.

Shri Shinkre: No, no.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri Nath Pai: Two years. This he said in pursuance of a statement which the Prime Minister made and who advised him. He then said, "I am prepared to accept the advice of the Government of India in the hope that the wishes of the people Goa for eventual merger with Maharashtra will be accepted". This is his precise statement.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Well, I might....

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Many people did not raise this issue in the debate because the Government of India had stated that it is not a question to be considered immediately. Therefore, let not there be an impression that Mr. Nath Pai's argument is the argument of everyone of us.

Shri Nath Pai: That is the demand of the people of Goa.

Shri Shinkre: I entirely agree with what Mr. Nath Pai said. That is the demand of the people of Goa.

Mr. Speaker: Let not that dispute be raised here. (Interruption) Order, order. That can be decided separately.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: He is using violence against me. (Interruption).

Shri Shinkre: What stand has Mr. Hanumanthaiya in the question regarding the future of Goa?

Mr. Speaker: It is the same as the hon. Member Mr. Shinkre has.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am glad that the hon. Members from Mysore and Maharashtra are sitting together

and I would very much like that the same spirit is shown outside.

Mr. Speaker: But he does not like them to fight here.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: As I said, the question of merger will have to be considered at an appropriate time. It will be for Mysore and Maharashtra to settle. (Interruptions).

Shri Nath Pai: How does Mysore come in? (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I agree with the hon. Member. It shall be for the Parliament to decide, not for the President.

Shri Shinkre: Mysore does not come into the picture at all.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: As a Member of Parliament, we have the right to have our say. (Interruptions).

Shri Nath Pai: We did not raise it in that spirit at all. (Interruptions) It was not raised in this spirit at all. The main question raised was how does this integral part of India come under the purview of the Ministry of External Affairs. and then some dangerous tendencies of some officials were brought in. I am afraid, Mr. Shastri, contrary to his nature and our expectations of him, is trying to do something rather mischievous. To say how Maharashtra's claim is wrong.....(Interruption). He instigated Mr. Hanumanthaiya. That is my submission.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: No, Sir. On a point of personal explanation.

Shri Nath Pai: He did.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: On a point of personal explanation.

Mr. Speaker: When he gives personal explanation, he will provoke Mr. Nath Pai and Mr. Shinkre to give theirs.

Shri Hanumathalya: When some hon Members say, Mysore has nothing to do with this question. I appeal to you, Sir, as a Member of Parliament, is it my misfortune that I come from Mysore and I cannot express an opinion on an all-India issue?

Shri Nath Pai: Not at all.

Shri Hanumathalya: That is the extreme view some of my friends from Maharashtra take and make the controversy bitter.

Mr. Speaker: We have heard Mysore as well as Maharashtra. If the hon. Minister continues without yielding and he addresses me and not facing the Members, that would be good.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, it is true that I am not as innocent as I look. But the charge made against me by Shri Nath Pai just at present is not at all justified.

श्री व्यापी: इन्नोमेट्ट का उई तजुंमा मामूम है ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: As Shri Nath Pai just now said that the administration of Goa and Pondicherry, should be transferred to the Home Ministry, I am entirely for it and very recently the External Affairs Ministry put up a note suggesting that this should be done.

Shri S. S. More (Poona): When?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But I was surprised that there was objection raised from Pondicherry and it was said that it should continue in the External Affairs Ministry. This difficulty had perhaps arisen earlier also. But in principle, I entirely agree with it that both Goa and Pondicherry should go over to the Home Ministry.

३० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नागालैंड उर्बंसीधम में भी ।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : नागालैंड के बारे में थोड़ा ठहर जायें । यह मामला खत्म हो जाये तो उस के बाद वह भी सम्भव है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह पाकिस्तान से हथियार ले कर आ रहे हैं ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: And we shall try to process this matter further in consultation with both the Governments of Goa as well as Pondicherry.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): May I know why the administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli has been changed recently? It had its own administration, and it was working well. Why was the change made? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nath Pai: Let us not have provincial squabbles.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member had initiated it himself. Now, he will realise that he should not have initiated it.

Shri Nath Pai: I never did it.

Mr. Speaker: He had initiated it.

Shri P. R. Patel: Yes, he did it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: No particular change has been made in the administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli except for the fact that the Lt. Governor of Goa has been formally put in charge....

Shri P. R. Patel: But what necessitated that?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri:....because there was no senior officer or senior authority to refer to in matters which took sometimes a serious turn. There was only the district magistrate to supervise and guide the work of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. It was essential that there should be some other authority to whom a reference could be made by the district magistrate.

Shri P. R. Patel: Was it demanded by the people of that place?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It is not only for the people to demand, but, after all, the Government of India are in charge and have to look after the administration of every territory, and if Government feel that the administration is weak or it deserves support and help, naturally, we take the necessary action. I would like to advise the hon. Member that there should be no fear in the minds of the representatives of Dadra and Nagar Haveli that we are going to do something against their wishes, in so far as that territory is concerned.

Some reference was made about our neighbour States, and Shri Nath Pai, of course, in his eloquent speech—I cannot compete with him at all; in fact, I feel somewhat nervous—spoke in a way as if India practically did not exist and we were nowhere and there was no country who was our friend. Shri Swell also said something like that, I can well understand that there may be a situation in which friends might become our opponents or there may be misgivings even amongst friends sometimes. But in this battle, we cannot get dejected and disappointed on the diplomatic level we have to meet and we have to discuss we might differ; but we may have again to agree. This is a game which we have to play intelligently as well as with tact and determination. But I do not think that the position is exactly the same as has been suggested by Shri Swell. Let us take, for instance, these three or four countries namely Nepal, Burma, Ceylon and Afghanistan. As regards Nepal, there were certain misgivings, but the matter was handled and tackled properly, and during the last two years, our relations with Nepal have considerably improved.

The House will remember that our President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, on the invitation of His Majesty the King

visited Nepal, and his visit created a tremendous impression there.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: You initiated it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am a humble fry.

Then on the invitation of the President, His Majesty the King and the Queen of Nepal visited India. They had a great welcome in this country. Since then, some of our Ministers have also gone there. The Minister of International Trade recently went there. His visit has been very successful. Our trade with Nepal will considerably expand. Besides, it seems a number of industries will be set up in Nepal either by Indian citizens or by joint collaboration between some people of Nepal or concerns of Nepal with people or concerns here. The visit of our comrade and colleague, Dr. K. L. Rao, Minister of Irrigation and Power, has also been very successful. Our projects in Nepal have progressed. Their work has considerably increased and improved and Nepal, on the whole, is satisfied with the progress made.

As regards Burma, it is true that Burma has been trying to keep itself somewhat away from many things. It has not tried to entangle itself in many things. It is not only in the case of India. Burma did not go even to the preparatory conference in Colombo for the non-aligned conference. Burma has sent no representative even to Jakarta.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: That is real non-alignment.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Well, if she had been with China, perhaps President Ne Win would not have visited India when Premier Chou En-lai was to go there, perhaps after a short time only. I do not want to assert much, but it shows that there is some close friendship between

Burma and India, because the President of Burma came here on a private visit to see the Prime Minister when he was ill.

Shri Ranga: Indians are obliged to come away from there now.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Our President has requested him to come to India on a State visit and we expect that he will accept this invitation. We from India also should make a return call. We should go there. There are various matters which could be discussed in Burma. If the discussions are fruitful, they would be good both for India as well as for Burma.

Shri Ranga: There is a regular exodus of Indians from Burma now because of their hostile policy.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am referring to that matter without putting it in such positive and concrete words.

Similarly, in the case of Ceylon, the same problem of exodus is there, to which Shri Ranga made a reference in regard to Burma. There is the question of Indian citizens stateless citizens. This problem exists in Ceylon.

Dr. M. S. Aney: The problem in Ceylon is somewhat different from the problem of Indians in Burma.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Yes, but there are problems, problems of a different nature. These problems have to be tackled.

Shri Ranga: They have not been tackled.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I think it is not impossible to solve these tangles or these problems. I am specially referring to Ceylon.

We have not succeeded so far, yet I think it would be worth while taking up this question of Indian citizens or
228 (A) L.S.D.—6.

Stateless citizens or citizens of Indian origin. This matter, although ticklish, should be taken up, and we should try to find a solution for the same. of course, we can do it only with the help of the Ceylon Government, and I am sure that they will also offer help and assistance in this regard.

17 hrs.

Shri Ranga: No, Sir.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not want to be so pessimistic.

Shri Ranga: For 15 years you have failed.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: There may be difficulties, but courage lies in surmounting these difficulties.

Shri Ranga: It is no good under-applying it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Any how, let us make an effort.

Shri Ranga: Of course, that we should.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do want and I feel that we in the External Affairs Ministry would like to take up this question once again seriously.

Shri Ranga: Good.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: About Afghanistan, need not say much. We have the best of relations with Afghanistan, in order to save time, I do not want to say anything further. I only wanted to suggest that our position in regard to our neighbour countries is not so unsatisfactory as was generally painted in this House. Of course, we have to improve our good relations still further, we should do that. However, there is nothing to feel despondent about this matter.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कोई पड़ोसी है जो चीन के मुकाबले में हमारा ज्यादा हस्त हो ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : यह तो बिल्कुल नहीं कह सकता हूँ, लेकिन आपने इराक के प्रेसीडेंट का कम्प्यूटिक देखा होगा .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं पड़ोसियों की बात कर रहा हूँ । एक पड़ोसी गिना दीजिये जो चीन के मुकाबले में हमारा ज्यादा दोस्त हो ।

श्री त्यागी : सब से ज्यादा गजदीकी पड़ोसी तो आप हैं ।

श्री राम मनोहर लोहिया : लाल बहादुर जी मेरा पड़ोस रखते तो ऐसा हाल न होता ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I shall not go into that because the time is already, I think, past 5 o'clock. There are many things. It is not necessary that the neighbour countries should come out with positive statements. After all, they have also to look to their neighbours, they have also to keep the security angle from their point of view and they have to decide whether they should speak out or should take another opportunity, a better opportunity, when they should do so and say something positive.

I would also in a few sentences refer to Bhutan and Sikkim. I need not say much except that we deeply regret the assassination of the Prime Minister of Bhutan. We are glad that the King of Bhutan has returned from abroad, and will be dealing with the situation fully in Bhutan. Besides being the King of Bhutan, as a man he is greatly respected in Bhutan, and he will undoubtedly bring back normalcy. It is already normal, I do not say that conditions are abnormal in any way; anyway, if there is any kind of disturbance, he will deal with it, and we will, of course, certainly continue our alliance and treaty in full measure with Bhutan and Sikkim.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : राजा का सहारा छोड़ो, जनता का सहारा पकड़ो ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, Bhutan is somewhat independent. We cannot deal directly with them, we have to be careful about that.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : विदेश नीति के मामले में नहीं ।

Shri Ranga: Yes, but we have to stand by the King.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Yes, we must. That is important.

I need not say much about the non-aligned conference and the Afro-Asian conference. The non-aligned conference of course will be held in Cairo in October. We had always welcomed the convening of this conference by UAR, Yugoslavia and Ceylon. Although, as I said, sometimes it is felt that India is not effective, may I say, that in the preparatory meeting or conference at Colombo our Indian representatives played a very important role. They did not try to come into the imelight; it is good that they did not. Yet they played an important role. They were elected or appointed as Chairman of two very important committees and they were also members of other committees set up there. Different representatives of various countries greatly appreciated the work of our representatives who went for that conference.

The Jakarta conference of course is being held. Maybe some hon. Members might not agree. But I endorse what Dr. Lohia has said: you cannot say that you will not go and sit in a conference in which those countries are represented . . . (Interruptions).

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सम्बन्ध तोड़ने के बारे में भी कुछ कहते जाइये । दोनों चीजें साथ साथ हैं ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: The main objection raised a few days before was

why should our representatives go to join the Jakarta Conference as the Chinese representatives will also be there. I would say that it is not possible in the present international situation.

Shri Ranga: Why is it not possible? We are not going to make friends with China and China is not going to embrace us there.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): Does Mr. Ranga want us to be isolated?

Shri Ranga: Why have they refused to have any diplomatic relations with South Africa?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: That is a different matter.

Shri Ranga: How? Because you have chosen to go to this conference and cover yourself with shame.... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Ranga: It is a national humiliation. My submission to you Sir, is that Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri is too good a person; he is not the proper person to deal with this matter; we would suggested that the Prime Minister to deal with this.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: It will be very bad manners internationally.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं कहता हूँ कि क्या यह अच्छा मैनर है कि चीन के साथ सम्बन्ध रहे । . . . (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am sorry; I am being ignored. This is not the manner in which debates are carried on in the House.

Shri Muthyal Rao (Mahbubnagar): Sir, Prof. Ranga's remarks that he is not the proper man . . . (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: I heard them.

Shri Joachim Alva: He is constantly interrupted, Sir; we heard them patiently; we never put them any questions though we did not like some of their speeches.

Mr. Speaker: I hope you would continue to be as good as you had been.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, I would still say, I would repeat, in spite of the observations of my hon. friend Shri Ranga, it is absolutely essential that India should participate.

Shri Ranga: No. no... (Interruptions.)

Shri Nath Pai: Stealthily the journalists were taken.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Has the hon. Minister not the liberty to give his opinion?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: They can say: no, no but I consider it to be an exhibition of weakness on the part of the hon. Members of the Opposition to speak like that no strength, no guts; they do not know where they have to go to; therefore they are always wavering within themselves.. (Interruptions.)

Shri Nath Pai: Why didn't you have the guts till last week? Till last week the Prime Minister was saying: we will not go to Jakarta; it is a fact. At the last minute they took the decision to send Mr. Swaran Singh. They did not take even the medical certificates. Is it not a fact that you took a hasty decision?

Mr. Speaker: I have never taken any such decision.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you know that the Government took the decision, not voluntarily, but you know that the Government have been hustled into it; pushed into it and dragged into it. (Interruption.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Nath Pai: Why should they get excited? The truth of it is there were no medical certificates given to the journalists who, at the last minute, were persuaded to go. They were hoping that they will not be attending. That is the truth.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would not like to use strong words, but I can say that the information of the hon. Member is absolutely incorrect; from the very beginning—it is not last week only—our Deputy Minister, when he went to UAR and Yugoslavia and other countries, even there, he had said that we are not opposed to this conference. We did feel, and still feel, that non-alignment conference is much more important and would be much more useful than the Afro-Asian conference. He has said that and he had said it in this House.

Shri Ranga: Was it not a fact that again and again, when we put questions to the Prime Minister, we did not get a categorical answer to it? What they have decided, they did not tell us at all. They did not take the House into confidence.

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आन ए प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर । यह क्या बात है कि अपोजीशन वाले श्री रंगा साहब आपके बिना बुलाये इस तरह से बीच में उठ कर बोल रहे हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would like to finish, because it is getting very late. But, as far as I remember, the Prime Minister has not said that the Government of India will not be sending a representative—

Shri Ranga: He did not say that we are going to take part. In a stealthy way, you are doing this. It is most unfortunate.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I think it was a correct decision and I think that, as I said earlier, it was right for our representatives to go there. We should not shun or be shy of discussions, and what is there to be discussed? The main point is, preparatory discussions, namely, what would be the agenda, what would be the time, which will be the countries who are to be invited, etc. These are the two or three matters to be discussed in that conference (*Interruption.*) Why should the Government be so nervous or afraid of not being represented there?

Now, I wanted to say a few words about the Arab countries. There is hardly any time. I can only say that we have in the Arab countries the best of friends, and the United Arab Republic is certainly one of them, who have been exceedingly helpful. Recently, there were some doubts in the minds of some sections of the people that Iraq is also not with us, but the recent visit of the President of Iraq has created a new situation altogether, and the joint communique issued by the Iraq President and our Prime Minister is something which was greatly welcomed. We are glad that the two most important leaders of the Arab countries—UAR and Iraq—are with us. I have seen some of the comments in the Iraq press and they have greatly welcomed it and appreciated the joint communique. They have paid great compliments to India, the way we treated their President and the great reception he received in this country.

Shri Nath Pai: In President Ayub's plane. Please answer that. That is a very serious matter, and we are deeply distressed at it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: About that plane, it is a matter which is not so important as to be discussed here immediately at present, but if Shri Nath Pai will like, I can have a word with him. However, if there is any lapse on our part, I would not be afraid of admitting it.

Before, I conclude, although it is not entirely relevant to the discussions today, but, as reference has been made by various Members to it, I may only say a few words about Kashmir. So far as the release of Sheikh Abdullah is concerned, I think that this has been a correct decision. It is not what we did not know the risk involved in it. The Prime Minister himself used the word that there is calculated risk in taking this decision. I knew it and others also knew that Sheikh Abdullah holds certain views. However, I may submit that what has surprised me the most is that Sheikh Abdullah, soon after coming out of detention, should have made such categorical statements in regard to various matters. Even a man like Gandhiji, when he came out of jail, said once, when correspondents went to him and asked him to give a statement, he said he has been in jail for a long time and after coming out, he will like to acquaint himself with the situation and the latest position fully. He said, he will like to meet his friends and comrades and then alone he will be in a position to make any authoritative statement.

What has pained me most is that Sheikh Abdullah, without meeting others, without getting into touch with various representatives and important people, both in Kashmir as well as here, should have expressed such views. They are very controversial views. It shows clearly that Sheikh Abdullah has not fully assessed and understood the present situation in the country. If he had talked and discussed with others, if he had come here, as he wants to come, he would have got an opportunity to sense the feeling of the country as a whole. He has not got it and he had made these statements.

I do not want to add anything to create further difficulties. I will feel

that Sheikh Abdullah should at least carefully express his views on important matters, which are closely connected with Kashmir as well as India. He can, of course, express his views. Nobody can prevent him. There is complete freedom of expression of views in this country. I know Sheikh Abdullah is not deliberately doing it, but there can be no freedom of preaching some kind of independence or getting out of the Indian Union. I do not say he is doing it. Whether it is the Indian Government or any other Government, no Government can allow that kind of propaganda. Therefore, except for that, of course, he will have complete freedom. After all, he is a leader and he has been in jail for a long time. He has considerably suffered. The best thing for him in these circumstances would be to get into touch with his friends, comrades and colleagues and then make his own assessment.

The Security Council is meeting on the 5th of May and the Government of India have made their position quite clear, about their attitude towards Kashmir. What Pakistan might have to say, it is a different matter. But in the Security Council Mr. Chagla has made it absolutely clear that the accession of Kashmir to India is irrevocable and the present relationship between Kashmir and India must continue.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जितने जोर से तर्होगे उतना ही शक होगा ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: That is what he has said in the Security Council. I do hope that further complications will not be created and I do wish that Shri Sheikh Abdullah would not make up his mind one way or the other without discussion the matter, as he has himself stated, with his comrades and colleagues.

10631

Demands

APRIL 11, 1964

for Grants

10632

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Has he been warned?

Mr. Speaker: The House stands adjourned till 11 o'clock on Monday.

17.21 hrs.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: We need not be frightened by any situation. The Government is strong enough to deal with any difficult situation.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, April 13, 1964/Chaitra 24, 1888 (Saka).
