

[Mr. Speaker]

mittee, constituted under the late Department of Education, Health and Lands Resolution No. F. 254 34/A, dated the 28th May, 1936, as amended from time to time, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, one member from among themselves to serve as a member of the Indian Central Jute Committee vice Shri G. Basu ceased to be a member of Lok Sabha."

The motion was adopted.

12:38 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

This is almost a periodical resolution that is considered by this House, and it is a good thing; both for the House and the country, if I may say so, and for the Government, that this is so considered and various aspects of this problem are debated here.

The foreign policy of a country, obviously and primarily, has to deal with the interests of that country, with the defence of freedom of that country, freedom and integrity, with the advancement of that country. At the same time, these questions have to be viewed in any mature consideration of the problem in the wider context of what is happening in the world. No country is isolated and can pursue its own path regardless of what is happening elsewhere.

Therefore, our foreign policy has always been looked at by this House, in view of the context of the world, more especially from the point of view of advancement of peace and co-operation in the world. In the ultimate analysis, if I may say so, although I do not know whether this particular aspect has been laid stress of in this House previously, most thinking persons realise now that there is no future for the world except ultimately, not perhaps too soon, by the development of some kind of a world order. That may not be near enough to us today. But it was good to realise that it is in this developing context that we have to view events that happen in the world and in our country. In any event, quite apart from the possibility of a world order coming into existence within a fairly short time, we are most interested, and this House and this country repeatedly said so in the maintenance of peace in the world and so we have laboured for peace and disarmament which is a prelude to that peace and for the other aspects of this problem. In doing this, we have naturally co-operated with, in the United Nations, other similar minded nations in measures to ease tensions and conflicts. And because we attach value to this policy and because we inherited, if I may say so, an outlook and the approach, we have followed a policy which has been called a policy of non-alignment; that is, maintaining India's independence and freedom to take decisions on national and international questions that may arise on the merits of each case and not attaching ourselves to any military bloc or to have any alliance for military purposes with any other country. We think that this policy is right basically; it is right from the point of view of any idealistic approach. It is right as events have shown during the past few years from the practical point of view. We think it is right now here today and any swerving away from it would be harmful to our

interests, to our freedom and to our integrity apart from not serving the cause of world peace. We have sought and played our part in various peace-keeping operations in various parts of the world, by active participation in the disarmament committees and we have signed, as the House knows, the partial test ban treaty and have supported the principles of peaceful co-existence.

Another aspect of our policy is naturally the rapid economic and social development of India and in so far as the foreign policy helps in that we have to pursue it subject, always, to keeping the main principles for which we stand. We have received considerable help from the consortium countries including the United States and also from the USSR and other socialist countries in the implementation of the current Five-Year Plan and in assurances to help for the Fourth Plan. We realise that with all the help we may get from abroad it must be remembered that the main burden falls on our own country and the bulk of the resources for implementation of the Plan has to be found from our internal resources. To this has to be added now the heavy burden of defence expenditure in order to strengthen our defences, especially in view of the Chinese invasion. While we have inevitably to strengthen our defences because of our conflict with China and because of the aggressive postures adopted by the Chinese Government, even in regard to China we are keeping the door open for peaceful settlement of differences and have made it clear that if the Colombo proposals are accepted *in toto* we would be prepared to take the next step for consideration of our conflicts. We have further suggested that we are prepared to refer the matter to the Hague Court or to have arbitration by agreed arbitrators. To these two latter proposals, although they were made months ago, we have had no formal reply from the Chinese Government.

In regard to Pakistan it has been our consistent attempt to settle all our differences and resolve them peacefully. This necessitates climates which help in such an approach. That climate is totally absent at present on the part of Pakistan. In fact the position has considerably worsened recently because of the various attempts made by Pakistan recently to join with China on the sole basis of aggression against India. It is clear that Pakistan and China have nothing in common and in fact till recently, or even now, Pakistan is tied down to various military alliances directed against China. Yet curiously these approaches have been made and all kinds of statements appear from time to time to show that great love now existing between Pakistan and China. It is based not on any affection or love or common ideals but purely for aggression against India.

In the international sphere one of the most important things happening recently has been the test ban treaty signed by the United States and the USSR and England and subsequently adhered to by about 100 countries. This by itself is not a very big thing but it is a historical development and a very big thing seen in the perspective of what has been happening in the past years and the repeated attempts to make a break in the arms race. We have, therefore, welcomed this as the world has welcomed it, apart from very few countries who have objected, notably China and a few other countries. This has led to an entente between United States and the USSR and an opening out of other avenues of possible settlements. From the world point of view this is the biggest thing that has happened and we hope that this will continue and ultimately result in full disarmament.

Another very vital and very important thing that has happened recently is the progressive deterioration of the relations between China and the Soviet Union. Perhaps hon. Members who may not have followed this may

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

think that this is a new development but actually it has its roots in the last several years. In essence you may say that almost the seeds of it were sown from the moment when the new Chinese Government came into existence. In the last four or five years this has been developing and now it has reached a point which sometimes looks as if it was not very far from a break. Inevitably any such conflict between the Soviet Union China has far-reaching effects on the world and on us.

We have been living for the last many years, since after the last war ended, in an atmosphere of cold war. We have often protested against this. We have tried our best to keep away from it because we think that cold war is bad, fundamentally bad; morally and ethically bad; and practically bad. And it is dangerous when behind the cold war the nuclear weapons are hidden somewhere. Perhaps it may break out; that cold war was in effect between the two sets of countries: the communist and the anti-communist. It was said by some people that it was a cold war against international communism, and by the other side that it was against international capitalism or imperialism, colonialism and the like and mountains of literature have been published on this and speeches delivered, and what is more, people's passions have been swept this way and that way. Gradually it has begun to appear that ideologies, however important they might be, are less important in governing international relations and national interests. Under the cover of ideologies other interests play.

For the last few years, in fact, since the war, the fact has become apparent that the two great, biggest powers are the United States and the Soviet Union, and the other so-called great powers take a back place. If there is to be peace or war it will depend on the Soviet Union or on the United States. Naturally the others may en-

courage it or hold it back. No doubt their ideas come into conflict; their systems of Government and economic policies are different. But I do submit that the real conflict was not on their ideologies, whatever people may talk about it, but the fact that two greatest powers in the world, each one of them, dislike the other and want to limit each other's power and authority because they look upon each other as a rival. It was a kind of thing that happened repeatedly in history; even now great changes take place. So, the change was happening on a world scale.

Many have talked about international communism; We see a tremendous break in the communist world, that is between the Soviet Union and China, and some other countries too, but mainly between these two. So, this concept of international communism, monolithic, has been shaken. We see on the other side among the western nations, sharp differences which pull them in different directions. Even in this atomic ban treaty, France has not agreed to sign it, for various reasons. So we see that these two major power blocs are confronting each other; armed to the teeth, and representing different ideologies. This has undergone a great change, and is undergoing a great change. Unfortunately, people's ideas do not keep pace with the things that are happening in the world. Unfortunately, some of our hon. friends on the opposite side are getting so stuck up in their grooves of thought that they do not see the changing world and do not keep pace with it. They repeat the same slogans and they think that they are going through a deep thinking process by repeating them.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या यह देश के विदेश मंत्री बोल रहे हैं या किसी स्कूल के अ-यापक ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दोनों हालात में आप को खामोशी से सुनना पड़ेगा ।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : इतनी बात तो मामूली विद्यार्थी भी समझ सकता है ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): The Prime Minister himself had said at the time of the Chinese invasion that he had lived in a world of unreality. (*Interruption*).

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): All the understanding is concentrated on the other side.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member rightly remembers what I said. I was talking about the changes. I am free to confess that all of us, and certainly I will include myself also, sometimes do not keep pace with the changing world and changing events.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Hear, hear.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am glad Acharya Ranga has grasped the point.

Shri Ranga: At long last, after 30 years of stewardship, you have realised it!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I said that sometimes the people are not moving in relationship with the changing world of today. This talk of communism versus anti-communism governing the world is no longer wholly relevant. There are conflicts of course between ideologies, but it is not wholly relevant. There are changes taking place on both sides of the world and both are governed more not by ideological approaches but by national interests. Today, as between Soviet Union and China, there may be differences in ideology. I am not competent to decide or express an opinion about that. But fundamentally it is a conflict of national interests and international approaches. Therefore, we in India fortunately in a large measure have kept outside these ideological conflicts;

the mere fact that we adopted non-alignment helped us to keep aside, apart, from these ideological conflicts which have a tendency to smother the mind and prevent thinking rightly, because when one thinks of limited conflicts, one is excited about it and does not see things dispassionately and objectively. So, the attitude of non-alignment helps to keep the mind straight to some extent; it does not completely prevent us from going wrong but it does help.

Our problems are today—we can discuss them at length—are about our conflict with China and our tension and conflict with Pakistan. These are two of our major problems, apart from economic and other problems. But even these problems have to be seen in this larger context of the world and not separated from everything just as if we were two persons cut off from the rest of the world and trying to down each other.

I do not propose at this stage to say much about China or Pakistan partly because I have made statements about that several times in the course of the last two or three weeks in this House, and partly because I would prefer to say something after I have heard hon. Members throwing some light on those problems.

Shri Ranga: Throw some light. You are in a position to do it. (*Interruption*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We are not competent to throw more light than you can. We are in the dark!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Another aspect to which I would like to refer is the major development that is taking place in Africa. During the last few years a large number of African countries have become free and independent and are facing new problems. Still, in spite of that, some countries in Africa, notably the Portuguese colonies, are fully under the Portuguese colonial domination, and till that is removed—South Africa, with its

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Apartheid and racial doctrines which are a continuing menace not only to the people there but to the whole of Africa and the world—we have to struggle against colonialism and racialism.

I would like to refer next to the Addis Ababa conference which was held sometime ago this year where all the Heads of States of Africa gathered together and achieved a remarkable measure of unity, in spite of their differences. That was a very happy sign and we must congratulate them and help them so far as we can.

13 hrs.

One matter, which has been referred to recently in the course of questions is Nepal. Our relations with Nepal are particularly good at the present moment. Some hon. Member asked me to say if there was absolutely no difference in outlook. I cannot say that in regard to a large number of hon. Members of this House that we are all completely alike and there is no difference. That kind of question does not permit of a suitable answer. But as countries, we are cooperating. We recognise each other's view-points. We do not interfere with each other and we hope to further each other's good.

Ultimately, foreign policy, however much we may play about with it, depends on the strength of a country. It does also depend on some other factors. For instance, the part our foreign policy and India has played in international affairs in the last ten years or so has been far in excess of our internal strength. It has been able to play that part, not by throwing our weight about—we have no great weight to throw about—but because of the correctness of our policy, which was appreciated in other countries and which drew their attention; and, India counted far more than its either military or financial or economic strength was entitled to. Normally, foreign policy depends on

military strength and economic strength. We have neither, enough I mean, to impress or make any difference to the world. Nevertheless, our foreign policy succeeded in a great measure. I am not referring for the moment to our troubles with China and Pakistan. I am saying generally, considering that apart and it is for us to consider whether that policy, which has brought us such good results and increased our prestige and position in the world should not be continued with such variations as circumstances may demand.

The world today is full of problems. Some people remind us, "Why haven't you settled with Pakistan all these years?" My reply is, that is not due to any attempt on our part to avoid a settlement. We have tried hard and we will continue trying hard. But apart from that, it is well to remember that most of the problems today in the world go on from year to year, without settlement. Take the problem of Germany, a major world problem. Take the problem of Berlin, a very major problem. When people advise us and criticise us for not settling our problems, it would not be polite for us to answer in this strain, but it is well to remind them how world problems continue to drag on, because they have roots in other matters and it is not merely a question of bargain.

Take the problem of Indo-China. In spite of the agreement in Geneva seven or eight years ago when the French finally left Indo-China, in spite of that, in spite of the international Commissions there and the great interest displayed by other powers, the problems are not being solved and they continue. Somehow they are connected with wider international problems.

Even our conflict with China has become to some extent connected, although the two things are separate, with the increasing conflict between the Soviet Union and China. Looked at from the point of view of China,

it is probably far more important for China to be on good terms with the Soviet Union to get economic and financial help from the Soviet Union, than to have an adventure in India. Some people imagine that China's aggressiveness in India was partly due, I do not say wholly, to the growing deterioration in its relations with the Soviet Union. That may be so. Anyhow, there is no doubt that it affects us. It is a matter of major importance what a great power like the Soviet Union does, what attitude it takes towards China, towards India and other countries.

But I would beg to say that in spite of the world having so many problems and continuing problems, which go on from year to year because the roots are deep and each is connected with another problem, so that till some solution is found for the basic problems, the other problems are not solved, still I would venture to say that the general outlook in the world today is somewhat better than it has been in the past. It is a more peaceful outlook. It aims more hopefully towards a peaceful world and towards a solution of world's problems. That may or may not apply to our immediate problems with China or Pakistan, but that atmosphere does help. In this larger context of international affairs, our weight has been cast—and I hope will always be cast—in favour of the preservation of peace and cooperation between nations and I hope we will not be swept away by momentary passions and lose sight of that real objective which every country in the world should have.

Sir, I move.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Prime Minister indicate his attitude towards Malaysia? It is a burning issue of the day. In his foreign policy speech, should that be omitted? Today is the day for Malaysia.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I could have dealt with it at the end. With regard to Malaysia, exactly a year ago, when I attended the last Prime Ministers' Conference at London, this question was brought up before the conference in the context of Great Britain gradually withdrawing from its colonial territories. We naturally thought it was a good thing for Great Britain to withdraw from its colonial territories and we expressed our willingness that this should be done. That was our attitude. Many months afterwards, some trouble arose in regard to this in Indonesia and the Philippines. We hoped that this matter would be amicably settled and what little we could do, we did to that end. It did appear several times that there was a settlement on these points. The matter was referred to the U.N. for finding out the views of certain inhabitants in south-east territories. The U. N. sent some observers and they have, I believe, reported that they are in favour of this amalgamation and formation of Malaysia. Naturally, we accept the report of the U.N. So far as Malaysia is concerned, my colleague, the Minister for External Affairs, has gone to represent us at Kuala Lumpur during this announcement and celebrations. We hope that the slight friction that exists between Indonesia, Philippines and Malaya will be settled satisfactorily and Malaysia will have a good start.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

There is one amendment by Shri V. B. Gandhi. Is he moving it?

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): Sir, I beg to move:

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

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the policy of the Government of India."

Mr. Speaker: Both the original motion and the substitute motion are now before the House. Now, about the time limit for speeches. The time limit ordinarily will be 15 minutes for every speech, but so far as the leaders of groups are concerned they might be permitted from 20 to 25 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Up to 30 minutes in your discretion.

Mr. Speaker: Well, if I see at a certain moment that I should extend it even up to that I shall do so.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: About the total time to be allocated for this debate, Sir, the Business Advisory Committee, if I remember aright, allotted 8 hours plus the Prime Minister's two speeches.

Mr. Speaker: No; only the reply.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I thought it was both the speeches.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad we are having this discussion exactly on the eve of the United Nations Assembly Session where the issue of colonialism is very likely to be predominant. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister's reference to the question of Africa in that connection. I have noticed in certain quarters a prognostication, a tendentious report, that because of the Chinese aggression India's role in the United Nations has been crippled. I do not think so and, as the Prime Minister said, in spite of our weakness in the military and economic spheres we do still pull considerable weight in international affairs, and I hope that in the forthcoming session of the United Nations

Assembly our delegation will play its due role.

When this House met last Friday, a petition was presented on behalf of more than ten million people of whom a hundred thousand demonstrated with discipline and dignity in the streets of Delhi in a manner which was without precedent in the history of this city, and in that demonstration it was made clear that large masses of our people take a firm stand against aggression whether from China or from Pakistan or from any other quarter and at the same time they take a firm stand in favour of the policy of peace and co-operation of all peoples with a view to advance to a socialist future.

Non-alignment is a primary instrument in the achievement of this basic objective of peace and world co-operation, and it is a pity that non-alignment has been menaced by reactionaries who but for the windfall that Chinese misadventure has given them would have found no footing whatever in Indian life of the present day.

Quite often the Prime Minister has spoken very courageously about India's policy and I recall specially his speech in the other House, but I am afraid that the basic foreign policy of India continues to be under sustained and very mischievously motivated attack by reactionaries in India and abroad, and my fear is accentuated by the fact that the waverings and the weaknesses of Government help forward such attacks. I know the Prime Minister does not like us to say it, but the fact is that India's image in the eyes of our Afro-Asian friends, who matter a great deal more in the last analysis than the money bags of the West, is rather sullied and distorted lately to an extent that even on occasion our non-alignment has come to be suspect, our anti-colonialism has appeared to be somewhat tepid. This has led to a position where our own friends are confound-

ed. The Prime Minister must really wake up to this kind of thing which is happening and take steps to see that it is not allowed to go on in a manner which is disastrous to the interests of our country and to the peace of the world.

I was very glad to notice in yesterday's papers a Press statement made by the leader of our delegation to the United Nations, Mrs. Pandit, which was a forthright elucidation of some of the aspects of our foreign policy. I noticed with some interest that our friend Shri Ashoka Mehta, who used to be in the House till the other day, is to be a member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations. So it is good that a capable man who does not belong to the ranks of the Congress is going to the United Nations. But I have one feeling that as a Member of Parliament and also otherwise we have found himself very often somewhat vociferously unfriendly towards the socialist world, and while perhaps he has been as vehement as some of our friends here in his criticism of non-alignment, he has been a consistent supporter of what is called, the 'Western Bloc'.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): It is a sheer nonsense.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It remains to be seen how effectively he can present our non-alignment policy before the United Nations. Sir, I am not going to take lessons in sense or nonsense from the hon. Member from Gauhati. But I know very well, it is a matter of fact....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is absent. The hon. Member from Gauhati is not here.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I forgot. I did not associate the hon. Member from somewhere in Maharashtra with the kind of ejaculation which is so characteristic of the hon. Member from Gauhati.

I told the House that I am very glad that he is going as a member of the United Nations Delegation, but I am
1228 (A1) LSD.—5

only waiting to see how far he is presenting the basic policy in regard to foreign affairs of our country. I say this because I do have very serious misgivings on account of the fact that whoever goes to the United States, whether the relay-racing ministers or the peregrinating Members of Parliament, there seems to be an effort on everybody's part to try to persuade the United States, specially, that by non-alignment we do not mean anything more than this, that we are on the right side of the United States. It is not so simple as all that. That is why I do have misgivings and I present them, for whatever they are worth, to this House.

The Prime Minister has referred very appropriately to the Test Ban Treaty which was signed, if I mistake not, on the 15th of August this year. Even though it does not mean, as the Prime Minister indicated, the end of all our troubles, it is a matter of world historic importance, and it is a very good thing that India was one among the very first countries who signed this treaty. This is a treaty of much importance. It has brought about such a kind of change in the atmosphere that even West Germany has swallowed its pride and prejudice and signed a treaty which G.D.R. also has signed as an equal participant. It is rather surprising that a very peculiar triumvirate has come up in the world today who say that they would not be a party to the test ban—a sullen France which announced its own test in the sorry remnants of its *ci-devant* Empire, a sulking Albania and a China discredited for its recent ultra revolutionary antics in regard to India and other matters relating to the international Communist movement. So, this queer triumvirate is there, but we need not worry over it much; on the country, we should be pleased that the isolation of China in the international sphere, is taking place so very clearly.

But I wish our Government not merely to say that "we welcome this treaty, we have signed it, it is a

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

partial fulfilment of what we have ourselves been pressing forward—the Prime Minister's role in that regard is very notable—but we have to try, as far as we can, to follow it up and we should raise our voice in support of the idea bruited in many places that there should be a non-aggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact powers, we should try to see that nuclear-free zones are established in Africa and also, why not, in South Asia in this area of the world, including our own country. We might also try, in view of the United Nations having already discussed the question of the economic implications of the test ban treaty, we might try so that Afro-Asian countries, including India, can get the advantage of a new special United Nations fund for development, so that the money saved on account of this Test Ban Treaty could be utilized for the purpose of helping the common people of the world.

I said a little while ago that China has been discredited, and this has been very openly shown in the proceedings of the Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference which met lately at Nicosia. There is no doubt about it that more and more China is losing face with exactly those countries with which she wanted to have the kind of relationship which would enable her to utilize them against us, but it is exactly in other quarters, sometimes cleverly clothed in sinister fashion, that anti-Indian attitude persists.

I have noticed that in the Inter-Parliamentary Union meeting in Belgrade, where our Parliament has sent representatives,—the Speaker's nominee has been represented there—the Secretary-General of that organisation, a very estimable gentleman from France, Mr. Andre de Blonay.....

Shri Nath Pai: He is from Switzerland.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: ...has chosen to make a comment in his report to the Inter-Parliamentary Union that India's bitter experience of the Chinese had led to a "more realistic foreign policy and a realisation that peaceful co-existence does not always pay", and another suggesting that "India may have taken the offensive in the border flare up last October, when Mr. Nehru rather optimistically ordered the army to expel the Chinese from Indian territory south of the MacMahon line". It is a good thing that one of our colleagues, Shri P. Govinda Menon, who was the leader of the Indian Delegation, whipped him up and as a result of that some of these observations have been deleted from that report. But it is good to remember that these friends of ours from the Western countries, the *Burra Sahib* countries, they take up this kind of attitude in which they are past masters and, as far as I can see, nothing is said about them by people who always jump to express their determination to defend India's honour and integrity and all that kind of thing. I want the Prime Minister particularly to give his mind to this matter a little more than he has time to do these days.

What, basically, is the attitude of the Western Powers? I have my doubts regarding the West, in so far as the Chinese question is concerned. Is the West, with its NATO, SEATO and other gesturings, including assistance to us, really persuading China towards peace? Or is it, in Machiavellian fashion, helping to build up China in an indirect way? The British Federation of Industries is holding an exhibition in Peking next year, the United States items of trade can get to China via the United Kingdom and Pakistan, Japan has its natural market in China, China feeds its population with Australian and Canadian grain and we, on our part, open our defence front to the West. Instead of helping to achieve peace by bringing China to reason, at least over

the Colombo proposals, the Western countries exploit the situation for their own ends. We have got to realise this, we must aim at self-sufficiency, which means economic development, and our defence production and military establishments should be our own. They should be our own and not a field for experiments, not a thoroughfare for Westerners, as appeared to be the case when certain recent incidents took place.

I do not wish to repeat, but over the question of the Voice of America agreement we have seen what happened. The Prime Minister has said, and very correctly, "if not revised radically, we shall do without the transmitter". I fear that we cannot mend it, we can only end that sort of agreement. But here again I have another fear to which I must give expression. The Prime Minister has his own entourage which behaves very dubiously. There were reports in the press, repeated over and over again, and no disclaimers came from the External Affairs Ministry's publicity apparatus, whatever it is, reports in the press that a high-ranking officer in that Ministry had very much to do with the finalisation of the Voice of America Agreement. It is reported also that the very same high-ranking officer, whose name was mentioned in the press, but I would not mention it here, is going to be elevated to the prize post in the Ministry of External Affairs, a most extraordinary state of affairs and I wish the Prime Minister applies his mind to it.

Then, the Prime Minister, a little while ago, referred to our friend, the Minister of State, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, having gone to Kuala Lumpur. She is the Minister of State, and she is the Minister of Foreign Affairs, as far as our country is concerned. She goes to Berlin on the invitation of the West German Government. She goes and she looks at the Berlin wall, about which she knows nothing, I expect, from what she says. Therefore, the papers report, on the 8th of July 1963 the *Statesman* carries the news in bold letters in a box, that

Shrimati Menon looked at the wall and she said it was "an indictment against itself at a time when we are striving for one neighbourhood and one world", she said this about the wall.

Shri Ranga: Hear, hear.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I hear Acharya Ranga saying "hear, hear". Perhaps, Acharya Ranga, Shri Nath Pai and others of that description applaud this sentiment of Shrimati Menon. I do not know.

We have no business, no Minister of State or Deputy Minister has any business to make such a statement. With the German Democratic Republic we have not yet full diplomatic relations, but we have very friendly trade relations, and the Prime Minister has repeatedly told us that, after all, we are trying to develop friendship with this country, it is only for extraordinary reasons that we are not able to open full diplomatic contact, here is a country which was the first among all European countries to condemn the action of China in relation to India, here is a country which has the finest economic collaboration with India which has in Calcutta built a beautiful planetarium which is unique in this country and in most parts of the world, here is a country which should be recognised diplomatically straightaway, here is a country which is openly maligned by the Minister of State for External Affairs on the basis of some information—I can vouch for it, she knows nothing, about the whys, hows, where-fors and all that sort of thing about the Berlin wall—but she has done it. I do not understand how the Prime Minister carried on with the entourage which he has got.

There has also been the matter of the Joint Air Exercises and I am afraid no satisfactory answer has come as yet. I am not going to repeat what I have said earlier, but very stern vigilance is needed, because it is necessary for us to see that our country does not become the thoroughfare open to all dubious foreign elements, elements representing exactly those imperialist

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

interests which were so far trying to grab the entire resources of humanity,

This morning, I do not know, the Prime Minister, answering a question, about Shri Phizo, showed an attitude which I find impossible to understand, the very strange indulgence shown to certain people. More particularly, Sir, I bring in, with your permission, the name of the Rev. Michael Scott, because I am angry beyond measure that a man like this description, who is pampered by the Prime Minister, for heaven knows what reason, because he lunched with the Prime Minister and talks with him to his heart's content, for God knows how long, here is a man, Rev. Michael Scott, who writes in the *London Observer* of the 25th of August, purporting to tell the truth about Nagaland, the "truth" within quotation marks. He says there are people in danger. Then, I am quoting:

"At present Nagas are being threatened by the Indian Government with air attacks which, failing assistance from abroad, must mean physical extermination for the resisters and starvation for the villagers who support them."

Then he goes on to say:

"If you have seen your villages burnt, your women raped, your crops destroyed and your unaided defence during eight years of jungle warfare being finally reduced by jet aircraft attacks, you might look at things otherwise. Thousands of human beings have been atrociously treated and are now threatened with extermination."

This is the way the reverend gentleman talks. I do not know why and how he gets the freedom of this country. It is because of the dog-collar of a clergyman that he wears or because of the old school tie? I do not know whether he went to Eton or Harrow. But I do not know why this kind of a person should be enabled to come into our country and to do the kind of

propaganda which he is doing with some egregious effect that I quoted from the *Observer* of the 25th August.

Then, I am glad, Acharya Ranga is also here. There are people in our country who go against the basic policies of our country in the most egregious fashion and go scotfree. The Government does not say a word about it, possibly because of reasons of patriotism they are to be pampered—I do not know. As regards the question of Kashmir the hon. Prime Minister said himself, very rightly, that we are not going to present Kashmir on a platter to Pakistan. We say, "God bless you! You have said the right thing." But what does the leader or the supreme of Acharya Ranga's party, Shri Rajagopalachari, who, as my non-friend, Shri Khadilkar—he is not here—said, the other day is the Grey Eminence of Indian politics, say about it? He writes in his paper—

"There is nothing stupendously difficult in, nothing indeed so easy as, making Kashmir and Jammu state autonomous as it has been before 1947 and either making it a territory of the UNO or giving it the protection of both Pakistan and India."

He says this.

Another little fellow trooping behind him, Shri Shiva Rao, who was a Member of this House when I first came here—you know him—writes on a solution to the Kashmir problem and Heaven knows who finances its redistribution on a mass scale. It comes to me because it is distributed freely. I am not going to pay anything for Shri Shiva Rao's contribution to humanity's thinking. But "A solution of the Kashmir problem" is the title of what Shri Shiva Rao writes and it is reprinted from the *Hindu*. What he suggests is that Kashmir should be made an independent State guaranteed by India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, the Soviet Union, America, Britain and everybody of that sort.

We are always told sometimes in a manner which makes my blood boil that we are traitors to the country and so on and so forth and by innuendoes, by clauses, by prefaces, by preambles to questions and all sorts of things this thing is repeated over and over again. But this kind of treacherous activity goes on.

Shri Ranga: Question

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In the last session of Parliament we passed a Bill. The Bill said that whoever questions the territorial integrity of our country is committing an offence. I remember, our friends of the D.M.K. were angry about it because from a theoretic plane they were putting forward the idea of certain areas of India not quite belonging to it—very wrongly I believe. But anyhow they were just putting it on a more or less theoretic plane. They were the people who were made the target of that Bill. We all supported that Bill and these people go on saying to their heart's content with impunity—and Acharya Ranga sits here with impunity—that Kashmir should be handed over to Pakistan or Kashmir should be made an autonomous State altogether or that Kashmir should be guaranteed by India, United Nations and by everybody. What is this? This is nonsense. This is something which this country would not tolerate.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Acharya Ranga has not said that.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): He is sitting here. He has not denied it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Acharya Ranga is the spokesman in Parliament, which is the national forum, of the party of which the supreme leader is Shri Rajagopalachari. If Acharya Ranga is condescending enough to dissociate himself from this statement of his leader here in this House to-day I shall be highly grateful because he is a very good friend of mine and I do not want to have any quarrel . . . (Interruptions).

This is a question which is worrying me, that is, the right reaction's treacherous policies regarding the calling—in the other House they did call for Western armed forces for defence and the hon. Prime Minister gave them a rapping good reply. But what gives them the temerity? They defy our basic principles because they have been allowed to fatten and grow since the period of the Chinese aggression last year. For certain reasons perhaps this is necessary for the Government to pamper these people only in order to be able to use them against us. But as far as we are concerned, we do not hesitate to shout from the housetops what we believe to be a correct policy. We might very frequently make mistakes. Whoever does not? I am not ashamed about it. I might be very sorry when I make mistakes, but I am not ashamed about it. We might make mistakes but whatever we come to be convinced of we shout from housetops.

We have said over and over again that basically the foreign policy of our country, non-alignment, world peace and cooperation—is something which has got to be built up and consolidated so that our country really can grow in a new world of peace, happiness and prosperity. That is what we have been saying. But we are singled out here in this House and also by other devious methods outside in order to be dubbed as unpatriotic by these wonderful patriots who are having the run of the country and doing, God knows, what damage in that process. Must we let them carry on this nefarious work because we are grateful to the United States particularly. I have no time to go into that question or I could have shown that after all the United States is not quite so friendly as we might imagine them to be.

Who are our friends? They are the disinherited of Africa and Asia. I think of the great march in Washington—250,000 people, black men, whose rights had so far been trampled into the dust in the land of freedom,

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

marching in the streets of Washington 250,000 strong with determination and dignity. It was a demonstration to the world of a new evangel, a new spirit, a Spartacus coming to Washington, a new God, so to speak, arriving on the scene of world affairs. Only the other day—the hon. Prime Minister would know him; other people might not—there died at the age of 95 Dr. W. E. B. du Bois, a Negro scholar of America, who went to Ghana in his last days helping to prepare the *Encyclopaedia Africana*. He is the real inspiration. He was a Communist, but he is the real inspiration of this wonderful movement, as Dr. Martin Luther King has openly and publicly acknowledged in the course of that demonstration. Here is this demonstration. This is as a result of the impact of the resurgence of Africa.

I remember, how in 1937 Rabindranath Tagore wrote a wonderful poem on Africa. He said how this Africa is now being humiliated by brutes who are so conscious and proud of their power that they do not know the meaning of human dignity. Now Africa has risen. A new dimension has been added to world history. A new quality is added to international affairs. It is in this atmosphere that we have to work.

But India is hesitant. India on so many occasions is hesitant. We find that even in regard to a country, like, South Viet Nam, where the Buddhists who were so very near to us have been persecuted, India had to be prodded by Ceylon before she could express her feelings in regard to that matter even though India, as the Chairman of the International Commission, has a very special role in that regard. In regard to South Viet Nam we needed prodding, but in regard to Malaysia to which the hon. Prime Minister has made reference we did not hesitate to work post haste. I do not mind Malaysia being formed. If, as the hon. Prime Minister tells us, there is an expansion of the area of free-

dom in that part of the world, we certainly welcome it. If the people of those areas want Malaysia, let them have it. I do not for a moment wish them not to have Malaysia. But was there any special reason when against Malaysia voices are being raised not only in Indonesia and the Philippines but also elsewhere and when the United Nations was going to meet only tomorrow, was it necessary for us to be sending not only our hon. Minister of State but also our messages to be openly published in the papers with a lot of fanfare and that sort of thing? I do not mind Malaysia. I do not wish the hon. Prime Minister to misunderstand me and misinterpret what I am trying to say. But I do say this that in regard to Malaysia we are quick enough and in regard to Algeria, South Viet Nam, Angola and so many other things we are not so quick. We are not so quick because we have changed. We are waiting upon the United States and are closing our eyes to things. This is why so many dubious things appear. Our Foreign Office should be more responsive to what is happening in Africa and Asia.

When the hon. Prime Minister sent a message to Mr. Jomo Kenyatta at the time of the conference at Addis Ababa, that was a magnificent act, an act of inspiration, a very good thing. But he never follows it up. What we need in this country is a nation-wide movement, a pronounced movement, conducted by all patriotic parties in this country in support of African peoples who are still suffering under Portuguese and other domination. To that I call the Prime Minister to lend his great support and the support of his Party.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, I may take 5 minutes more and then conclude.

Mr. Speaker: Five minutes will be too much.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not ask your indulgence too often.

Mr. Speaker: I would not mind. But his second speaker will have to suffer.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I will finish as quickly as I can.

I will mention a matter which I have sometimes mentioned in this House before and that is in regard to our diplomatic service. I know the Prime Minister has a weakness for his proteges. I know only good man says, "Love me; love my dog". But why not see how the diplomatic service fails egregiously? Why not see the career diplomat who does not know many of the basic assumptions of our life is dominating the show? I read only the other day in *The Hindustan Times*, of all papers, dated 7th April, 1963, an article written by Shri Sri Prakasa who was himself our first High Commissioner in Pakistan. He says:

"...though outwardly High Commissioner I was only a sort of Joint Deputy High Commissioner in Sind...."

And that was because the 'haw haw' members of our foreign service, who out-Blimp Col. Blimp, dominate the situation. These *pucca sahibs* might be very wonderful in their own way, but they do not understand so many things. I could refer to so many matters like their lack of French in such areas as Cambodia and Saigon. There is, in the July 1963, special number of the *Economic Weekly*, allegation in a signed article that in Cambodia and Saigon there are many occasions when on account of lack of French our diplomats do not seem to understand what is happening. Quite apart from that, we fail in the United Kingdom; we fail in the United States. I tried to ask a question earlier today as to why we cannot make an impact in such countries and why Pakistan gets away, with it. Pakistan poses to be an injured party every time. A per-

son like Bertrand Russell and, a person like Prof. Toynbee are in favour of Pakistan or even in favour of China. In the United States everybody is in favour of Pakistan as against us. Again, here is a report in the *Economic Weekly* of the team of journalists who went to Britain and who discovered that even the British Labour Party were more friendly to Pakistan than they were to us. What has happened? Why is it like that? I am not against Pakistan. I am not in favour of putting up the Hindu-Muslim question. I feel I am completely secular. But at the same time, why should we allow Pakistan all the time to pose as an injured party? Why is it like that? I have heard these reports. The Prime Minister may have heard more about it that when in their cups, some of our foreign service people, when asked, say, "If you ask me the truth in regard to Kashmir, on a matter of principle, Pakistan really has the right". This is the kind of thing that they say in America or in Britain. They do so because they do not understand. In Africa and Asia, they do not fraternise with Africans. They are more happy in the company of western diplomats. I know there are exceptions. I do not wish the Prime Minister here to come up and say, "You are not thinking about so many people who are doing very good work". I know. They are doing very good work. But they are exceptions to the general rule or there would not be in the press unanimous attack on the behaviour of our diplomatic representatives abroad. From Indonesia to the Atlantic shores of Africa, Indian representation is by no means a shining example either of Indianness or of diplomatic efficiency.

I conclude now. Basically, our country pursues the right policy in international affairs but our hesitations and mistakes and the terrific impact of foreign and native reactionaries on these policies distort the image of India in the eyes of our

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

friends and prevent us from functioning as we should. I do wish the Prime Minister—when he formulates the policies he does it so well—implements them so that no objection can be taken by the like of us.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister said that India's position in the world, except for our conflict with Pakistan and China, has very much improved. This is the confession, according to me, of the failure of the Government. If excepting our conflicts with China and Pakistan, we are making a great progress, I would like to know what that progress means in terms of national interest. It is the duty of the Foreign Minister and the Government of India to so develop our foreign relations as to improve our position *vis-a-vis* Pakistan and China.

13.46 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

My hon. friend, the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party has just now said that our position *vis-a-vis* Pakistan is very weak and that our officials in the Foreign Ministry have been ineffective in the propaganda that they have been carrying on in various countries including the West and also the East. India's position is not as well understood as that of Pakistan. What does that mean? It means that the Prime Minister as well as his bosom friends, Communists, are in agreement over this that the Government of India has failed in its foreign policy so far as Pakistan front is concerned.

Secondly, there is China. My hon. friend Shri Hiren Mukerjee said that China is completely isolated. Why has he been bold enough to make that statement? It is because their other friend, other uncle, the Soviet Union, is at present at logger-heads with China. And when China and the Soviet Union are in conflict, the Communists in different countries had to

make their choice and in our country also they have made their choice by going into two blocs—one the USSR bloc and the other China bloc. My friends cannot deny the fact that there is China lobby in our country amongst our Communist friends and those Communist friends who have gone into China lobby have been sincere enough in claiming that. They have done so and they have borne the consequences. They have paid for it and they are carrying on their activities overground as well as underground. That is why they think China is isolated. But does China care for it being isolated? Does it not welcome isolation? Here is an authority who has written a new book which I am sure the hon. Prime Minister must have read judging from the remarks that he has made in the other House as well as in this House in regard to China and Soviet Union relations. It is entitled *The New Cold War Moscow V. Peking* by Edward Crankshaw. He says:

"The powerful and unscrupulous government of a land of 650 million operating on its own, completely untrammelled by any international obligations of any kind...."

She is happier because she has no international obligations, not even obligations towards the Soviet Union.

"however tenuous, is a disconcerting element in itself. When that government makes a determined bid for the moral leadership of the existing Communist Parties of the backward countries and offers a focus for embryo parties in many lands where politics has so far not moved out of the tribal stage, it becomes formidable indeed. Mao Tse-tung almost certainly believes that the future for India, for Africa, belongs to Communism...."

And there is a Communist lobby here.

"This is the very spectre he invokes to frighten not us (who

are not worth frightening but Russia. What does Khrushchev believe? And what happens when Khrushchev goes?"

Therefore, the Chinese spectre is now haunting the Communists who are associated with USSR and their leader Khrushchev. That is why my hon. friend says, China is isolated. And it is that isolated China which does not at all seek these international obligations. The Prime Minister has advised our representative there at the United Nations to help her to go into the United Nations, obtain a permanent place in the Security Council and have the power to veto just as unscrupulously and as freely as Russia has done during the last so many years. We dissociate ourselves from this policy. Nevertheless, I see some change—one would like to welcome it, but I am not quite sure how far we would be right in welcoming it—in the attitude of the Government also in regard to China; judging from this morning's papers, according to the news contained therein, the Indian Delegation to the UN seems to be at least thinking now of asking for membership in the United Nations for the two Chinas which have been there, that is, Formosa and Mainland China. I would like to know from the Prime Minister a little more about this matter, and I would like to know how they look at this particular problem.

Then, I come to the other point that has been raised by my hon. friend the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party. He put a question to me and to my leader Rajaji, in regard to Rajaji's views about Kashmir.

I wish to remind this House, because I have stated it once before, that in our party manifesto we have stated 21 principles, and on 20 principles, we have stated our party's attitude. On the 21st principle, we made it very clear that our members would be free to express their views and popularise all those views also in regard to all other matters. Kashmir is one of them. The Hindi question or the

language question is also one of them. On these questions, Rajaji has held those views and he is entitled to hold his views. To the extent that the country is wise or unwise in looking into them, in examining those views and in accepting them to the extent that it finds them acceptable, well, it is in the interests of the country to do so.

So far as we as a party in this country and in this House are concerned, in regard to Kashmir, I would like to know why it is that the Prime Minister allows that conspiracy case to go on for all these years. Why has he been satisfied, in keeping, with all his love of civil liberties—all of us have stood for civil liberties—one of the great leaders of the Kashmir area and the Kashmir people, Sheikh Abdullah, once a bosom-friend of the Prime Minister, in jail and in detention during those years, and now under this pretence of a conspiracy case, in jail, for so many years? Does this redound to our credit? Does it in any way help us in our approach to the Kashmiri people *vis-a-vis* the Pakistanis, or enable us to grow to be in a position some day, if we may have to do so, to persuade the Kashmiri people to choose their comradeship with India by an overwhelming majority? I want answers to these things.

Then, my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee was saying certain things with the tongue in his cheek, I am afraid. He talks of treachery....

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): May we know what your views are on Kashmir? We are interested in knowing them.

Shri Ranga: I have already given you one. First of all, solve this particular problem of Sheikh Abdullah, and in regard to the rest of it....

Shri K. C. Sharma: He is under trial and the judge will give his judgment.

Shri Ranga: This is a stumbling block in our way in gaining the comradeship and the consent of the people of Kashmir to be with us, if at any time, Government were to find it necessary to implement their own promise made long long ago of having plebiscite....

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj) Why all these 'ifs' and 'buts'? Why not state your views clearly and in a straightforward manner?

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend talks of treachery. Was the Prime Minister a traitor to this country when he made an offer to the Prime Minister of Pakistan to let Kashmir be divided between us according to the *status quo*? He was not.... (*Interruptions*)

Some Hon. Members: The hon. Member has said that the Prime Minister was a traitor. He should withdraw those words.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Ranga: Why don't you follow me? He was not a traitor. It was not treachery for the Prime Minister to have made that offer....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must withdraw those words.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): They should be expunged.

Shri Ranga: Was the Prime Minister a traitor? My answer is 'No'....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's words were that he was a traitor to the country. He should withdraw those words....

Shri Ranga: I said: 'Was the Prime Minister a traitor to the country?..' (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's words were 'Once, the Prime Minister was a traitor to the country'.

Shri Narasimha Reddy (Rajampet): He says that he did not use such words at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should withdraw those words.

Shri Ranga: There is no question of my withdrawing anything. Let me explain....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, they will be expunged.

Shri Ranga: Why don't you listen to me? If you will kindly look into the records, you will see exactly what I have stated.... (*Interruptions*). Why don't you listen to me?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have clearly heard the hon. Member. His words were 'Once the Prime Minister was a traitor to the country'.

Shri Ranga: Would you not listen to me? If, as you say, those were the words that I had uttered, then they can be expunged, and that is a different matter. But what I have said is this: 'Was the Prime Minister a traitor?'....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: To the country.

Shri Ranga: ...And my answer is 'No'.

Therefore, if the Prime Minister was not a traitor, when in spite of the fact that the whole of Kashmir is supposed to be a part of our country in the Constitution and everywhere else, he was prepared to discuss with the other Prime Minister or his opposite number as to the division of Kashmir on the basis of the actual occupation, then, surely, it does not lie in the mouth of anyone, not even this friend who belongs unfortunately to the Communist Party, in spite of my friendship with him, it does not lie in their mouth to try and say that those people who offer these solutions in regard to Kashmir

can possibly be traitors, not to speak of saying that they are traitors....

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: (Jallore): Does my hon. friend support that view of his leader?

Shri Ranga: It is very unfortunate indeed. I do not hold that view. What more need I have to say?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What is my hon. friend's criticism of him?

Shri Ranga: Why should I criticise? That is a view, and I look at it as you look at it, and you have to consider that view for whatever it is worth.

Now, there are certain areas of agreement between us all. The other day, I was very much pleased to find an open letter to the press signed by Members of all political parties,—I am not quite sure about the Communists, but all other parties are there—a letter to the editor, or to the press, appealing to all friendly countries all over the world to see that the Buddhists are not persecuted in Viet Nam and that in Viet Nam a really democratic regime comes into existence. It is that kind of an atmosphere of unity that we have to engender in regard to as many problems as we possibly can in regard to India as well as other countries.

I also welcome the advent of Malaysia. I know that my friends the Communists have many mental reservations, and some of their friends are protesting against the advent of this new nation and new country. But it is a good thing that it has come into existence, and it is a well known fact that through that the democrats all over the world hope to be able to stem the tide of Chinese communism.

We are also glad that the Test Ban Treaty has come to be a reality. I am glad that with the co-operation of the Prime Minister a Gandhi Mission was sent to various countries, some members to the Soviet Union

and some members to America and England, and among them there was my leader Rajaji also. It does not redound to the credit of my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee to say that Mr. Shiva Rao is a little man. Mr. Shiva Rao was one of the honoured members of that mission. President Kennedy paid tribute to the good work of this Gandhian mission, and Khrushchev also appreciated their work. The most important of their suggestions came from Rajaji himself, if we are to believe what Shri Shiva Rao has revealed to us. They were appreciated by all these people, and we are glad that as a result of these efforts made by our people as well as by other people, by our Government as well by other Governments, the test ban treaty has come to be a reality.

14 hrs.

We are also glad that Government is receiving aid, has asked for aid from countries all over the world and is receiving from almost all countries. The Prime Minister seems to think that we on this side do not at all change, that he alone is prepared to change. At the same time, he is prepared to share the compliment with everybody that all can be weathercocks. It is not so. When the time comes, we are also prepared to appreciate a good gesture from an erstwhile politically unfriendly country. We did not expect Soviet Russia to come to our aid in the manner in which she did at the time we needed it. We all know at the time we needed it that Soviet Russia was not in a position to render us that much help that she is prepared to give today. Why has this change taken place? Because at that time she was still hoping against hope that China might possibly remain within her fold of friendship and leadership. Now she knows that China is no longer going to be so. The three-week long discussions between the pundits of the one side and the pundits on the other side proved futile, and therefore, she appears to have made up her mind to

[Shri Ranga]

come to our rescue a little more openly than at that time. To that extent we welcome this change.

Unfortunately for us, our country has not been developing as friendly relations with the South-east Asian countries as there is need for them. We have not done enough to develop either cultural contacts or trade relations as briskly and as successfully as necessary.

Secondly, there are people of Indian origin, lakhs and lakhs of them, living in a number of these countries in South-east Asia as well as in Africa, especially in East African countries. It is true we have done the right thing in saying to all these people that they should make up their mind as to the citizenship they would like to have, Indian or that of the local country, but in spite of it, even in regard to those people of Indian origin who have chosen to be citizens of those countries, is it not the duty of our Government to use its good offices to see that their conditions are improved are not worsened, that their relations with the local Governments are not turned to their own chagrin and dissatisfaction just because of the wayward policies of the local Governments. Unfortunately, our Government has failed in this regard especially, and their failure has become quite glaring so far as Ceylon is concerned.

Recently, the railway workers and the staff in one of the East African countries unwisely chose to go on strike. Then they were given an ultimatum. Afterwards they gave up the strike and went back to work again, but the local Government wanted to treat them harshly, to dismiss them, to subject them to victimisation. What did our Government do in order to help them? Is it not the duty of our High Commissions in these countries intercede on behalf of the people of Indian origin with the local Government in order to see that their con-

ditions are improved, that they are not victimised, and also to give our people timely advice in regard to any kind of struggle that they would like to have with the local Governments? So far, our Government has failed on that front.

Then, we have to develop neighbourly relations with Afghanistan, Iran and other countries of the middle East. We have not done enough in that direction. What is more, we continue to fail to recognise Israel. Why? I do not know. Surely, so many African countries where there are Mohammedan populations with Mohammedan leaders also in charge of their governments have recognised Israel. I do not see any reason why our Government should continue to refuse to recognise Israel.

Our Government is trying to view everything from the viewpoint of Soviet Russia and its friends. It is something like the tail wagging the body. The Communist Party gives the order here. It has begun to interfere even in the civil service, in regard to officers, in such matters as which particular officer has to be sent to which place, to which department and so on, and it also tries to interfere in the constitution of the Ministry and all the rest of it. No objection, because they have every right to make suggestions, but from Soviet Russia these suggestions come either directly or through our friends and the Prime Minister goes on re-orienting foreign and international policies in the light of that. I can give any number of instances.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Give one.

Shri Ranga: It is necessary for the Government to try to see that if it wants to remain in a kind of non-alignment, in suspended animation, it should not lean all the time towards Soviet Russia. It should not lend its ears to Soviet Russia alone

and reorganise the social economy here and its foreign policies in order to suit the wishes of Soviet Russia and her friends and satellites.

Is it not high time, especially in the light of what is happening between China and Pakistan, that we declare ourselves in favour of the independence of Tibet. The Communist friends here who are waxing eloquent on the freedom of all the other countries, and asking our Government to go to the rescue of the poor Portuguese colonies and so on, are so silent on Tibet because they have already swallowed Tibet and like crocodiles they are masticating and digesting it. Is it not the sacred duty of our country to declare ourselves in favour of the independence of Tibet and offer to do our best to help the people of that country in achieving freedom? In this direction, I would suggest that the Dalai Lama should be given every freedom to function as what he is, the real and temporary head of these people, until they make up their mind in a democratic manner to have their own democratic government.

Then, there was this Voice of America proposition. Who thought about it? We did not think about it. Nobody suggested it. It was the Government which thought about it. They needed it. Why? Because they realised the power of the communists and their propaganda machine. Here is an American journal, the A.F.L. and C.I.O. News of Washington which quotes the USIS Chief, Edward Murrow, as saying that last year the communists went from 30 million to 40 million books in the number of books they published in the non-communist bloc countries. In addition, they cause to be published outside the Soviet Union about 100 million more. They were doing so much work, they are doing it. Even today communist literature is circulating in our country in a surreptitious manner, and what is it we can do against it? The Prime Minister him-

self has confessed that we do not have enough money, and therefore we cannot have enough news services, CID, espionage and all the rest of it. Therefore, we have to depend upon somebody else. For that reason, they thought of this Voice of America deal. What happened? Soviet Russia sent in a hush hush manner her objection. The next day the Prime Minister turns round. And who is this Prime Minister? He is a person who has been the Foreign Minister of this country every since this country achieved political freedom. For the past 16 years he has been Foreign Minister. Is it right that he should do so even from their own point of view? When I was speaking from that bench, as one of the front benches of the Congress, I suggested it was high time for the Prime Minister to give up the Foreign Ministry. He would not agree. Shri Jaya Prakash Narain made the suggestion. He would not agree. That was not even the first occasion. As long ago as 1949, in the Congress Working Committee deliberations, I made that suggestion. Why did I do so? Not because I did not like the Prime Minister, but because in every other important democratic country in the world you find that the Prime Ministership and the Foreign Ministership are kept separate.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Macmillan was Prime Minister and Foreign Minister.

Shri Ranga: In England for instance, the last time that these two positions were combined was in 1922-23 by Ramsay Macdonald with very bad results; and so much so the British people want that these posts should be held by two different people. Therefore, I made that suggestion. Then came the answer that he also saw the strength of my point and was trying to find out one who could possibly be good enough to take up that portfolio. After a while, he said that it needs a man with tremendous patience. I laughed and said is there

[Shri Ranga]

another man who is less patient than yourself? He laughed. That was in 1949. Since then 14 years have gone by. All the time he has been there. Now, what has happened? Circumstances have changed: the world has changed. India's needs have been changing. Yet the Foreign Minister has not changed and the foreign policy has not changed. It has become a dogma and a doctrine, A doctrine of non-alignment. What is this wonderful non-alignment today? It was conceived as a kind of a face or front for us to protect us from too much of an embrace from the Soviet Union or too much of an embrace from the United States and United Kingdom. It can possibly be useful when they are fighting among themselves. But they have come nearer each other and these Communist friends have now made this great suggestion—who have always been opposed to these Western pacts—that there should be a new pact between the Warsaw pact countries and the NATO countries. They want to work towards that. Their foreign ministers are going to meet. Where is then this non-alignment? Yet our Foreign Minister hugs this baby which has grown 16 years old and which he created. He will not give it up because he has become so fond of it.

In America they had Mr. Dulles; everybody complained that he was too rigid and the whole of America waited with bated breath for this gentleman to jay down his office. The rest of the world thought that they had had enough of that man in five years. That was the experience of America. It may be said that the longer a man continues to be the Foreign Minister, or any Minister for that matter, the greater would be his experience. But what sort of expertise has been displayed by a Minister who signed asking people to go ahead thrice, with the Voice of America. Three times he did that. On the 4th time, suddenly when somebody else drew

his attention to it, he discovered that it was not four-square with non-alignment. Therefore, he said that it had to be amended slightly. The latest is that he wants it to be radically amended. What does this speak of? Of expertise? Or of inefficiency, growing inefficiency and growing in competence and a growing unawareness of his own duties, in regard to his own pet theory of non-alignment and various other things also. Therefore, it is high time, in his own interest and in the interest of the governing party and of the country, that the Prime Minister is separated from foreign ministership and the external affairs handed over to a first rate man. During all these 16 years, he even failed to educate people, properly and to train them. The Deputy Leader of the Communist Party referred to this. They are the bossom freinds of the Prime Minister and they say that the one and only Minister of State whom the Prime Minister has trained till now does not even know the meaning of the Berlin wall.

That is the product of the Prime Minister's school in foreign affairs. Is there another person? Yes, there was but that was the man whom the whole country clamoured against and shouted down and in the end out of good grace and good luck also, the Prime Minister, making up his mind, sent out of the Defence Ministry. Barring these two people, who is there? One who is sent to the United Nations today. Is this the manner in which our country has got to develop our experts in regard to foreign affairs? The Prime Minister might say that Ranga is talking through his hat.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude now.

Shri Ranga: But how can Ranga make these observations in an authoritative manner when all the years he has been monopolising as Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. Before we became free there used to be

an advisory body for external affairs and so much material was circulated among us. After we have become free, what is the ridiculous position to which we have been reduced? The Leaders and prominent Members of the Opposition are called to confabulations with the Prime Minister and asked to put some questions and elicit some answers and be satisfied with this. Is this the manner in which any body can be expected to be helped or assisted to learn about our foreign relations? I charge the Prime Minister with having failed as a Foreign Minister and with having failed also to train his colleagues to take his place at the right time—the right time is long past; it is high time already—and with having failed to take not only the Leaders but also prominent Members of the Opposition into consultation and co-operation. Therefore, I say it is high time that there is a change in this Ministry, in the incumbent of the Ministry. If the Prime Minister is not prepared to do it, I can only say that the Prime Minister fails in his national duty towards this country in regard to External Affairs.

Dr. Gaitonde (Goa, Daman & Diu): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have heard with great care the leaders of the two opposition parties who spoke before me. Shri Hiren Mukerjee could explain to us what the international situation today is, and where he disagrees with our foreign policy. In spite of his brilliance and his capacity for marvellous speeches, I was really surprised that stress was laid only on criticism of three or four persons who are not here. On one point, however, I must agree with him; I am solely and completely in agreement with him as regards the Portuguese colonialism. Excluding that I do not think there has been any great contribution from the side of the Communist Party. He had also referred to various events in various other countries. What have those events to do with our policy? As regards Swatantra Party, only one

thing which Prof. Ranga said needs answering. He says that non-alignment was necessary when Russia and America were fighting; now that they are embracing each other, why do we want non-alignment? It shows that he is not very much conscious of what exactly non-alignment is. I would like to give the definition of policy, not in my words, but in the words of the Prime Minister who, many years ago, delivered a lecture in the Colombia University in New York; I do not find a better definition than this:

- “(1) The main objectives of our policy are the pursuit of peace not through alignment with any major power or group of powers but through an independent approach to each controversy or dispute at issue;
- (2) the liberation of subject peoples;
- (3) the maintenance of freedom, both national and individual;
- (4) the elimination of social discrimination; and
- (5) the elimination of want, disease and ignorance which affect the greater part of the world's population.”

While discussing the foreign policy, I would like to ask the Opposition Members which of these things is wrong. Nothing has been said. I will not go into the details of the personal attacks that some hon. Members made. I will go straight into the achievements. We have also achieved something and that something is quite big.

I remember what I had read many years ago when, for the first time, in the ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly, we put forth the first suggestion about atomic tests ban. This was soon after the explosion of the H-bomb in the Marshall Islands. That was in 1954. In the ninth session, we withdraw the

[Dr. Gaitonde]

motion because the opposition was great. In the tenth session, we put it to the vote and we lost. Today, every country agrees, with the exception of China and France, with the test ban treaty. Of course, any idea, when it is new, naturally is criticised. So, after many years, we have been able to convince the various big powers that this idea was a correct idea, and they have agreed.

I will read out something that may be of some interests to my hon. friends here.

"Too many of us think peace is impossible. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable; that mankind is doomed; that we are gripped by forces which we cannot control. We need not accept that view. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings."

One may get the impression that this is from the speech of our Prime Minister. It is not. This is from the speech of Mr. Kennedy. This is from his speech on the test ban. Some years ago many Statesmen all over the world were opposing it. Today they are agreeing to it. I am very happy that this test ban treaty has been signed by almost all the countries.

It is very surprising that although we were the first to put forth the idea of test ban, most of the papers, especially the papers published abroad, do not say a single word about us. What has happened to our propaganda? I will mention certain facts. In December, 1946, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the United States sponsored plan for international control and inspection of atomic energy facilities. Russia refused to accept it. Then, the papers passed on to November, 1951; then July, 1955; November 1955; June 1957. Then comes August, 1958; then October, 1958 and then March, 1959 and so on

up to July 1960. But the most crucial date is not mentioned. That date was in 1954. I cannot understand why our embassies all over the world at least do not do something about telling the people the facts as regards our achievements.

Not only that. Here is a recent book. I do not know whether many of my hon. friends have seen it, because it is too recent to be in the hands of everyone. The book is by Bertrand Russell which has come out very recently, in the past few weeks. Bertrand Russell says something which I think is very extraordinary. He had talks with our Deputy High Commissioner and also with the Chinese Charge d'affaires in London. It is surprising that Bertrand Russell who began with the idea that India was right in this dispute between India and China says at the end that after having talks with both of them he came to the conclusion that India was wrong. This is something I cannot understand. Our facts are so clear. Why is it that our High Commission could not convince Bertrand Russell who is an intelligent man who can understand the facts and grasp the situation—about our position? Even he could not be convinced. I really cannot understand this. Of course, Bertrand Russell, I know, has a type of bias in his writings, though not always.

After having mentioned about our achievements, I would like to say something about the Portuguese colonies. The Prime Minister has referred to them and I would like to say one thing, which some Members of the Opposition should have said but did not say. The hon. Member from the communist party referred it but the Swatantra party did not say anything about it.

After all, this is a human problem and not an issue for party politics.

We have been linked with freedom fighters from Portuguese colonies since a long time, and we fought together against the Portuguese colonialism. But after the freedom of Goa, there is an impression that we have forgotten our friends! This should not happen. I would only stress again and again that we should now put into practice whatever ideas we had to liberate those who fought with us for the freedom of Goa, and who are still under Portuguese colonialism in other parts of the world.

My communist friend has referred only to the colonies in Africa but not in the rest of the world. I have seen this happening in Africa also. In Africa, the African people talk only about colonialism in Africa. In India also some parties, when they talk, talk only of colonies in Africa. Why? There is also a colony in China, Macao. There is another in Indonesia, Timor. Why don't they talk about them? I would request the Government of India to see whether they can help those freedom-fighters who are actively engaged in freeing themselves from the Portuguese colonialism. I would like to inform the Government and this House—I am sure the Government knows, may be the House does not know—that there is today a Provisional Government of Angola. I do not know what is the policy of the Government of India as regards the Provisional Government, whether we can recognise the Government or not. In any case I think there is nothing wrong in keeping contact with them and finding out what are their difficulties and what are the ways of helping them.

But only with respect to Angola, but I believe very shortly other colonies also will have their provisional governments. And then we shall have to decide whether we want to recognise these provisional governments or not. After all, I can assure this House that they will be the gov-

ernments of their future free countries and if we don't help them at this moment, naturally they will not have any sympathies for us. Many times they have drawn our attention to this that when our problem was solved we no longer thought about them, now, fortunately, this problem is coming up in the United Nations. I am quite sure that our representatives in the United Nations will try their best to see that Salazar's Portugal is completely boycotted as long as she does not recognise the right of freedom to their colonies.

Now, Sir, only a few points remain. The first is as regards the "failure of the Government" to which Prof. Ranga referred, and he read from a book. I have also read that book. He read only a part of it. I could have read the rest of it before the House, but I think there is not much time at my disposal. One thing I would like to say, that we cannot say that it is the non-alignment policy that has brought about "the failure" of the Government. Then, as regards the policies of the Government of India with respect to Pakistan and China, I do not see where the failure is. Because, it is exactly because of the non-alignment policy that we have got sympathies of countries from all over the world, including Russia, a communist country. About Pakistan also I do not see any type of failure; but as he has not said in clear terms in what way there has been failure, I do not think any answer is needed.

Before concluding I would like to say this, that it is for the first time in the history of Free India that we have achieved something which will be considered by generations to come as one of the greatest achievements that any nation could aspire for, that is the test ban treaty. And I hope and pray that this would be the first step towards disarmament if all the countries follow the proper path.

Shrimati Lakshmikauthamma (Khammam): Hr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is a happy augury in the international situation that now both the power blocs are convinced that the only way to exist in the world today is co-existence. India, as the propounder of Panchsheel, is very proud that most of the great powers today appreciate the spirit of Panchsheel. Panchsheel has been India's gift to the world which now has won the approval of the great powers in the world. As regards Panchsheel I do not want to repeat what our hon. friend said. Unfortunately he is not here now. I pray for his recovery and wish that very soon he will come back to participate in our discussions. I do not want to repeat what he said, but it is disgraceful to say what he has said about Panchsheel. Panchsheel is like *panchamrit* for a parched world and parched humanity, for a world parched of hope of survival and for a world living in constant fear of total annihilation. It looked at one time as though both the blocs were convinced of a head-on collision and hence they roped in as many nations as possible into their power blocs. And so that stock-piling of weapons went on. Within a short time, however, things become rather confusing to the high priests of both blocs, and now they are convinced that Mother Nature, as an impartial mother, has revealed her secrets to both to the same extent and effectiveness. Total annihilation began to start in the face of both. Mastery over space has become the common heritage, irrespective of the ways of life. Today Russia has very proudly been able to send her first woman into space, and today Kennedy and Khrushchev are in a position to exchange greetings on one another's feats of conquest of space.

The leaders of the blocs also encountered some other problems. They have found to their dismay that not all the entrants into their blocs subscribe to their ways of life. On the

other hand, they had their own excellent reasons for joining the blocs. Pakistan is a typical example for this. From the lap of Washington right into the embrace of Peking is a breath-taking hop, ideologically speaking. But whoever held Pakistan guilty of any ideology at any time? Adherence to an ideology requires strength of conviction, readiness to pay for that conviction, if need be, and involvement in a variety of complications. All these factors have combined to bring about a change in the fabric of world thinking.

India has welcomed, as many other countries, and is very proud to be the first to sign, the historic nuclear test ban agreement. After the conclusion of the agreement the representatives of U. S. S. R. and U. K. continued talks in Moscow on the possibilities of concluding a no-war pact between the East and the West. The idea of such a pact originated from the Russian Premier Khrushchev. Those who took part in the discussions were the U.S. Secretary of State, the British Foreign Secretary and the Soviet Foreign Minister. The Western delegates have said that after consulting their NATO allies they will come to such an agreement. The presence of the U.N. Secretary-General, U. Thant at Moscow at that time is also very significant, showing that the U. N. supports the peace efforts by the big powers. As the Prime Minister said, more than a hundred countries have signed this nuclear test ban agreement, the notable exceptions being China and France. China hopes to produce her first atom bomb in the very near future, and her adherence to the principle of "the inevitability of war" prevents her from accepting any such agreement. France under De Gaulle sticks to the idea of independent national nuclear deterrent. China also disclosed in this connection that Russia refused to help her in producing an atom bomb in 1956. This disclosure is not without its significance inasmuch as it indicates very

forcefully Soviet Russia's anticipations regarding China's attitude as early as 1959. Incidentally, it also unravels a possible clue to the strained relations between the two countries which subsequently took an ideological turn, leading to border tensions recently. The reigning fashion of the world is going to be peaceful co-existence with considerable deflation of the bloc mania, which is now being increasingly regarded as outmoded and unprofitable. In the international sphere, our country by and large was looked upon as a harbinger of peace and co-existence, despite certain enigmatic character attached to our policies for some time in the minds of power blocs. If India has been harping on the above theme since a long time, one can only observe that every idea has to wait until the time is ripe for its acceptance.

Communist China, however, continues to have other ideas, again for her own excellent reasons. History testifies to the fact that one dominant trend in Chinese thinking, down the ages, has been an obsession with the idea of her superiority over all other nations of the world. It is this chauvinism which is the real motive force in the Chinese context—whether it is the imperialist garb or the communist guise which is adopted at a given period in her history. China is not angling for a few thousands of square miles of border territory, even though that may be vital to her at the moment. On the contrary, China is playing for the highest stakes imaginable, namely, the stakes of world supremacy. Therefore, in the given struggle, to reach that goal, no tactics would be taboo, no holds would be barred from the Chinese standpoint. Into this Chinese pattern of thinking, the inevitable clash between capitalism and communism, envisaged by the orthodox Marxist doctrine, fits admirably.

It is an article of faith with China that when the conflagration takes place, both the nuclear powers would conveniently be wiped out of existence, leaving the Chinese in considerable numbers to carry China to her

fore-ordained destiny of world leadership and supremacy. This point of view has been confirmed by Marshal Tito in no uncertain terms sometime ago. China wants that the showdown should be accelerated and the polarisation of nations into two blocs armed to the teeth should take place to hasten the desired catastrophe. It should be especially noted in this context that China hates an unaligned nation more than one aligned to the western bloc. Each nation aligned either way is a welcome step in the direction of the cherished catastrophe. Such is the height of callousness in the Chinese thinking today. How surprising is it, therefore, that the only other party which subscribes to the doctrine of alignment with almost comparable fervour should be the Swatantra Party of India! Though it may look on the face of it purely accidental, going a little deeper into the matter, it is perhaps not impossible to trace the phenomenon to the resultant identity of the right and left reaction in their international approaches. So, the world holocaust in the point where "the twain do meet"!

As regards Pakistan, the Prime Minister has already made a statement in the House ruling out any possibility of reaching an accord with Pakistan on the basis of either internationalisation or division of Kashmir Valley. He strongly deprecated the war-like attitude of the Pakistani leaders and the coming together of Pakistan and China with hatred of India as their common aim. India was always anxious to be friendly with her neighbours, but that was not the attitude of Pakistan. Its main purpose appeared to be to see that India remained weak. Despite this, India offered certain concessions to Pakistan including a 'no war pact', but in view of the rigid Pakistani position these concessions are no longer open and they must be treated as withdrawn, except the "no war pact" which holds good. The Prime Minister also asked those western powers who were insisting on the settlement of the Kashmir question to see for themselves the maligning

[Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma]

propaganda being carried on by Pakistan against India. Pakistani leaders also declared that even if the Kashmir problem was solved, their country would not either go to India's defence or give up its friendship with Peking. The Prime Minister declared that there is little possibility of a settlement so long as Pakistan persists in its irrational animus against India. Meanwhile Pakistan's friendship with China appears to be getting thicker and thicker. However, what Pakistan stands to gain by befriending China is only a partnership in the latter's isolation in the world context.

The recent thirteen-day visit of the King and Queen of Nepal to this country marks a happy stage in the development of its relations with this country and it has produced fruitful results. The Himalayan Kingdom of Nepal has always been treated as a younger sister of our country. India has gone out of its way to help Nepal in every possible way in its developmental activities. It has not only taken the shape of major long-range projects like Trisul, but in recent gestures like the granting of facilities for land transit to Pakistan, Indian aid to Nepal is concrete and consistent. King Mahendra has expressed his country's gratitude to the Government of India for the aid that we are giving for the development of communication, agriculture, forests, education, etc. History, culture and nature have bound the two countries closely for a long time. President Radhakrishnan has said that,—

"When we have so many things in common, when we are neighbours ourselves, your security and stability are as vital to us as our security and stability are vital to you."

The Chinese Foreign Minister, Marshal Chen Yi, made a mischievous remark sometime ago that if any country attacks Nepal, they will not keep quiet. But Nepal's leaders, however, know what is what. In a significant speech at the Indian Independence Day celebrations at Kathmandu, the Chair-

man of the Nepalese Rashtra Pan-chayat declared that "an attack on India through Nepal could only be made over the dead bodies of the Nepalese". A very significant feature of Nepal's progress is the recent revolutionary change in the personal laws of the Nepalese. Nepal's social and legal structure in several important matters will now be very much akin to India's and greater friendship will result therefrom, based on identity of outlook and approach.

About non-alignment, it has been so many times explained and the fruitful results of our non-alignment policy have been seen by everyone in the world. But some of our friends refuse to see the real nature of our non-alignment. The suitability of our policy of non-alignment was never in the past so unambiguously demonstrated to our friends as it has been in the context of the Chinese invasion. Our friends feel that the policy of non-alignment has been inhibiting the flow of aid to us from the west. If anything has been inhibiting the flow of this aid from the west, it is the attitude of blackmail adopted by Pakistan and not our policy of non-alignment. Further, in the history of the international communist movement, India, a non-communist country, has very dramatically indeed supplied the touchstone to separate progressive thought from sectarian reaction. India is not only non-aligned *vis-a-vis* China, but is firmly aligned with all other important nations of the world, from both the power blocs as well as outside the blocs. In spite of myriad clarifications and elucidations, a good deal of misunderstanding and distortion persist in the understanding of non-alignment. The word 'non-alignment' *prima facie* gives the impression that it is essentially a negative concept. The common explanation given that non-alignment means not joining any of the blocs also strengthens that impression. Nothing, however, would be more confusing than to look upon non-alignment as a negative concept. Non-alignment does not mean self-imposed isolation. It

does not mean unabashed opportunism. What non-alignment does mean is the continued exercise of a nation's right to judge and act on a given issue, when the issue presents itself, in the manner in which a free nation wishes to judge and act. A non-aligned nation judges an issue whereas an aligned nation prejudges it. A non-aligned nation has all friends and no particular foes, whereas an aligned nation always finds the whole world divided into friends and foes with the exception perhaps of non-aligned nations.

A non-aligned nation does not merely express its opinion and keep quiet thereafter. On the other hand, its non-aligned character comes to an end the moment a decision on merits is arrived at on a given issue. Thereafter, so far as that issue is concerned, the nation does align itself and very actively too, if necessary, with all like-minded nations. Thus, the gist of non-alignment would be positively to take decisions on merits and negatively not to line up with any party or persuasion in advance.

I feel convinced and I hope my hon. friends also will feel likewise, that our non-alignment policy is correct in principle and profitable in practice. Again, there are profits and profits. What may seem profitable today may prove to be suicidal in the long run. The quest for short cuts and unprincipled stunts is bound to come to grief early or late. Despite one's continued disillusionment at the erratic behaviour of nations, it is never wise to become too cynical about principles and too squeamish about immediate political dividends.

Non-alignment as India understands and follows is a positive dynamic policy. It is correct in principle, being in complete conformity with national sovereignty and independence. It has been, by and large, found profitable in the interests of the nation, and without causing any detriment to national interest it has promoted and is likely

to promote more than any other policy peace and understanding in the world. It has the approval of the people.

People only feel that we should be more prepared irrespective of our non-alignment. India's policy of non-alignment is entirely pragmatic and not dogmatic. India's policies have never betrayed any trends of dogmatism either during her long and arduous freedom struggle or during the equally arduous post-freedom struggle to achieve socio-economic emancipation. Indeed, the only dogmas that have appeared on the politico-economic horizon so far are the attempts to exhume the putrifying carcass of unlimited private enterprise, feudal resurrection and reckless bloc mania so vigorously advocated by the Swatantra party.

Even though in the economic field, we have been making rapid advances and at the recent meeting of the consortium it has pledged aid to India to the satisfaction of our country. The recent exhibition in Moscow which was opened by Mr. Khrushchev also shows that we have great prospects in international trade. All this, I am sure, indicate that we have attained great results in the national and international fields within these few years.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is high time that we decide for ourselves that we give up speaking of empty platitudes and come to brass-tacks. For long we have watched how the international situation is growing, and in the international situation we had the position before us that the world was found divided into two camps. One was thinking in terms of nationhood and the other was thinking in terms of international party politics. Slowly but surely, as the Prime Minister admitted today, the nations have become conscious of the fact that something like nationhood exists everywhere.

The relation that have now developed between Russia and China are

[Shri U. M. Trivedi.]

indicative of the fact that mere believing in particular ideologies will not help the nations to come together. Similarly, we have the peculiar picture of Pakistan hugging China—one a dictatorship with not even the rudiments of democracy established, the other a mighty imperialist minded so-called communist country out to destroy the greatest democracy in the world which is struggling for its existence for the sake of bringing peace in this world. How these two ideologies can work together must be an eye-opener to most of us, and those in our country who have got extra-territorial love may open their eyes and come to this conclusion that after all it is the nation which counts and they must work for the uplift of the nation rather than for their ideology which is obtaining elsewhere.

Sir, our relations with most of the foreign countries have not been very happy. Except that some good words are said about our Prime Minister or about some of our leaders, we lack entirely the sympathy of those who are about us. What are the reasons for it? How is it that there is not much love lost between us and Burma? The same is the case with Indonesia. Even in Ceylon we are hooted out, and no one seems to care what our sentiments are. Even with the best of intentions, in the United States of America even today there is a feeling that we are some sort of wrong-doers as against Pakistan. How is it that this feeling persists, and how is it that we have not been able to meet the propaganda that is being carried on against us by Pakistan?

Sir, in this world and in today's world, even the best may be made to look the worst by sheer propaganda. Goebels had developed the theory that by repeating a falsehood very often and continuing that falsehood unchecked a thing which is white may be made to look black. Similarly, unabashed propaganda against us by Pakistan in the United States and in the United Kingdom has led

to this position that we have not many friends there. Some people on the higher tops do realise our difficulties but, yet behind their back they have still got a feeling that we are some sort of wrong-doers. Are we not in a position to wipe out that feeling?

Is it not a sort of war between us and Pakistan that is on? What is a cease-fire? The very expression "cease fire" indicates that we were at war with those with whom we have got this cease fire. We have been very complacent in our attitude, in meeting the Pakistani menace. It is no satisfaction to us that we send protest notes. Sir, there is a saying in one of the smritis of Yajnavalkya which says that a king who levies taxes on his subjects, if he is not able to protect his subjects, is sure to go to hell. Well, most of the present-day people may not believe in the hell or heaven theory. But the fact still remains that there cannot be a worse type of ruler than one who cannot afford protection to the citizens over whom he rules. What is our position today? In season and out of season, year in and year out, for the last seventeen years, I should say for the last fifteen years, we find that accusations are being made against us by Pakistan. We know the accusations are false but we are coerced to give them money, we are coerced to allow them to take water and we are made to look fools in the eyes of the world. Genocide is practised against a large number of people in Pakistan and masses are being destroyed, and yet we have not been able to make use of the United Nations for the protection of the small Hindu minority that exists there. And what is happening against us today? Infiltration in Assam is going on, infiltration with a motive and we trust them. We are very trustworthy, nay, very trusting people. We have said that we are very secular. Being secular, we do not, naturally, interfere in the religious affairs of the people. Being honest people, we think that the others may be equally honest, though

our experience in the past has been otherwise.

15 hrs.

Very recently, we have found that our police was able to detect espionage against us, a spy ring, by actors with Hindu names and Mohammedan origin in Bombay. They were carrying on espionage. It is going on even now. We have found that in the cities of Delhi and Calcutta Pakistani spies are working and yet, because of our gentlemanly attitude—I would call it cowardly attitude rather than gentlemanly attitude—we refrained from making to the world known that here are spies working in our country. We did not disclose it. Knowing full well the temperament of the rulers of Pakistan, we allowed them to take advantage of three or four days, during which we never disclosed the espionage by Pakistan spies, until they came forward with allegations or rather counted-allegations that we had our spies in Pakistan, rather a retaliatory step, and we had to swallow it. Every time we have been made to look fools.

The position of Kashmir today is worse than what it was ten years back. We have not moved an inch to get back the huge territory which was seized from us by Pakistan, now in the hands of Pakistan. We have lost a further territory of 12,000 sq. miles to China and we are not able to take it back. Now, negotiations are there and mediation is contemplated, to do what, to give away a portion of Kashmir, to make some arrangement to give away a portion of Kashmir, so that whatever is gone in Ladakh may go but no further grabbing by the Chinese may take place. What an idiotic way of thinking is this? Can we not cry a halt to this and determine for ourselves what should be our attitude for driving out the aggressor?

It is unfortunate that hero-workship in our country should have grown to such an extent. There is the saying in Sanskrit

“महती देवता ह्येवा नररूपेण विष्ठति” and we continue to feel that one who sits at

the top has got some emblem of divinity in him. Yet, those are not the ideas by which we can be moved today. We have seen in the countries about us, even in the greatest amongst them and wealthy amongst them, how leaders have been treated. In England, Anthony Eden, the prince charming of those days of England, committed a blunder and he was sent out. Chamberlain went away and no body cried over it. Churchill went away, a man who brought victory to England, saved England from utter calamity; yet, when he went away, nobody cried over it. This is democracy. In these days of democracy, a man does not count. What counts is the nation, After all, what are we here for? the greatness of the nation. What is this Parliament for? For achieving greatness for our country, to move our country to great dimensions. The aim and object for which we are meeting here and deliberating is to see that our country flourishes and becomes popular.

Yet, in whichever direction we look, wherever we cast our eyes, we find the other nations are not well-disposed to us. What happened in Burma? Let us cast our eyes there? There were 14 lakh Indians in Burma in 1940 and a little more than two millions when Burma was separated from India. But what is our strength in Burma today? And what type of expropriations have taken place there? How is it that medical officers who were being recruited about ten months back and big advertisements appeared in the press, these advertisements were suddenly withdrawn, an order was passed that all Indian doctors must go away from that country and others are being recruited from other countries?

The Chinese menace is there, growing for a number of years. Since 1947 it was growing and we have not been able to check it. We had many friends in Burma. We had good relations with Burma and yet our propaganda miserably failed. Why? Because, proper men were not posted to meet the demands of the Burmese

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

and pacify them, although we could have very well pacified them and established good relations with them.

What has happened in Indonesia? A Minister from Indonesia goes and makes a statement against us? A Minister even from Ceylon goes to Peking and makes a statement against us. Where do we stand? These are very small nations no doubt, but even then, so many small ones will make one big one. Our relations with these countries can be improved only when they feel that we are strong. In this respect, the saying of the man in the is quite relevant. "चमत्कारे नमस्कार"

less we are strong, we can show power, nobody is going to abide by us or yield to us. So, the policy of the man in the street must be followed in the case of nations also. We cannot just sit complacently, talk big philosophy, talk nice things and then suffer humiliation when the opportunity comes. What a greater humiliation can there be for a big country like India, for a country which back to be defeated by a people who were known to be so afraid of an ordinary policeman that in the streets of Hong Kong 50 or 100 people would be herded by just one Indian constable, the very same people can stand up against us and not only stand up but defeat a big army of so many divisions, take some of our army personnel as prisoners and take away all our arms. It is a matter on which we should hang our heads in shame. What was the reason behind it? Why has it happened? It is very often said that we are not a very rich nation and, therefore, our spies are not very effective and that our espionage is not very effective. Leave aside espionage, I am talking of the counter-espionage that must be there to protect ourselves and to protect our country. This must be done. We cannot afford that things should leak out from our country and be sold to others. It is this picture which is before us. What effort have we made to meet it? This is what was uttered by one Mr. Chakravartty—I remember in the

month of July—I think who happens to be our permanent representative in the United Nations. What did he say? He said that we cannot have diplomatic relations with Israel because we have a big Muslim population in our country. Are we guided by considerations of pleasing the Muslim population here? Then tomorrow we will have a Christian population and there are Christians living in other foreign countries. What of that? What relation has the Indian Muslim got with a foreign Muslim. How are we going to tolerate this position? How long are we going to tolerate this position? How long are we going to continue that position: because the man is a Muslim, therefore, he is not one of the nation? If that theory exists, we are doomed. We ourselves decided that that theory must go, that there is one country, one nation alone and that is the Indian nation. It is the goodwill of that Indian nation which must determine our foreign policy. It is not the minorities that live in country which should determine our foreign policy. I should say, "Do not count them in terms of a minority, but count them only as Indians". There may be muslims in America; there may be Muslims in the United Kingdom. These are not the factors which determine the foreign policy in these countries. Other nations, I should say, have recognised Israel and have got diplomatic relations with Israel. We have also recognised Israel. But we are afraid to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. Why? Can such a reason be advanced by us? I say, the policy dictation, the foreign policy dictation, must be the dictation of the Indian nation and for the benefit of the Indian nation, for the good of this country and for the good of no other country. We should decide it for ourselves. It is true that we must not make an effort to disturb the peace in the world. But when we say that we should not make any effort to disturb the peace in the world, we must also realise that the anxiety must be felt all over

the world. It should not be the anxiety of the Indian alone. It should be the anxiety of one and all who live in this world. If others are not afraid of disturbing the peace in the world, then certainly we must give a blow for a blow or more than a blow to bring the man to his senses. A *goonda* will not cow down or will not hesitate to beat you simply because you *salam* him....

We have done enough in our own way to appease China. We have protested—one protest, two protests, hundred protests—and have made protests after protests. But what is the result? Absolutely no result. It is only now that our strength and defence has risen; it is only now that we are trying to equip ourselves with better weapons that probably China has come to realise now that it will not have the easy way which it had about twelve months back. The might must be shown, but not only a mere show will do but it must be exhibited and that exhibition will become necessary for us today, not tomorrow. We are not to wait for tomorrow because we have been humiliated and humiliation must be retaliated and must be vindicated and that vindication can only come when we drive out the Chinese forces from all those posts which they are now occupying and which we claim as our own territory. It is the only territory which we want. We do not want an inch of their land. But from our land they must be thrown out lock, stock and barrel and it is then only our position in the world will establish.

श्री पाराशर (शिवपुरी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी विदेश-नीति के सम्बन्ध में हमारे साथियों ने, जिन को हम विरोधी सदस्य कहते हैं, जो कुछ कहा है, उस को सुन कर उन के प्रति अत्यन्त सम्मान प्रदर्शित करते हुए भी मुझे यह कहने के लिए मजबूर होना पड़ता है कि शायद नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने जानने की

कोशिश नहीं की है, क्योंकि मैं यह कहने का साहस तो नहीं करूंगा कि वे उस को जानते नहीं हैं। इस प्रस्ताव को पेश करते हुए प्रधान मंत्री ने बहुत स्पष्ट शब्दों में इस विषय में अपने विचार रखे हैं, लेकिन उस के बाद भी आचार्य रंगा ने एक बहुत बड़ा प्रश्न किया है कि जब छुश्चेव और कैंनेडी एक टैस्ट-बैन ट्रीटी पर हस्ताक्षर करते हैं और जब दोनों ग्रुप्स एक दूसरे के नजदीक आते नजर आते हैं तब नान-एलाइनमेंट की आवश्यकता क्या है। मेरा तो खयाल था कि यदि आचार्य रंगा स्वयं ही अपने प्रश्न का उत्तर पा लेते, तो ज्यादा मुनासिब होता, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि मुझे उन्हें उत्तर देने के लिए खड़ा होना पड़ रहा है। अगर वह नान-एलाइनमेंट का मतलब यही समझते हैं कि यदि छुश्चेव और कैंनेडी एक दूसरे के नजदीक आ जायें, तो नान-एलाइनमेंट की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं होगी, तो उन्होंने न तो भारतीय संस्कृति को समझा है और न ही गुटों से अलग रहने की नीति के अर्थ को ही समझा है।

मैं आप के द्वारा आचार्य रंगा से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि केवल आज से नहीं, बल्कि हजारों वर्षों से हमारी यह नीति चली आती है, "यतो धर्मस्ततो जयः"—जहां न्याय होगा, जहां धर्म होगा, वहां जय होगी। हम आज भी यह घोषित कर देना चाहते हैं कि भारतवर्ष केवल वहीं खड़ा रहेगा, जहां न्याय और धर्म होगा। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने अभी स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा है कि हम हर एक प्रश्न पर उस के गुण-दोष के आधार पर विचार करेंगे और उस के पश्चात् उस के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति निर्धारित करेंगे और करते हैं। उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि छुश्चेव और कैंनेडी के कहने पर यह नीति निर्धारित की गई है।

इस सम्बन्ध में हमारे कई साथियों ने अनेक विदेशी भाषियों के विचार उद्धृत किये और अखबारों के कोटेशन भी पढ़े। मैं भी

[श्री पाराशर]

उन्हें बड़े गौर से मुन रहा था। बिला-शक हम को ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि हमारे सम्बन्ध में और हमारी नीति के सम्बन्ध में दूसरे विदेशी भाई क्या कहते हैं। हम को इस का ध्यान रखना होगा और अपनी नीति के बारे में उन के विचार जानने होंगे और यदि आवश्यकता हुई तो उस नीति में संशोधन भी करना होगा। लेकिन एक बात हम को नहीं भूलानी चाहिए। जब एक स्वस्थ राष्ट्र किसी प्रश्न पर कोई निर्णय ले लेता है, तो उस के सम्बन्ध में दूसरे राष्ट्र के नागरिक क्या सोचा करते हैं, इस से वह विचलित नहीं होता है। यदि संसार में हमें जीवित रहना है—और दशाब्दियों की गुलामी के बाद भी यदि हम आजाद रहे हैं तो उस का कारण कुछ सिद्धान्त हैं, जिन पर हमारे बुजुर्ग चले हैं और जिन पर हम चल रहे हैं। उन में से एक सिद्धान्त यह है—

निन्दन्तु नीतिनिपुणाः यदि वा स्तुवन्तु
लक्ष्मीसंमाविशन्तु गच्छन्तु वा यथेष्टं
अद्यैववा मरणमस्तु युगान्तरे वा

न्याय्यात् पथः प्रविचलन्ति पदं न धीराः ॥
अर्थात् संसार के अत्यन्त विद्वान् पुरुष यदि हमारी निन्दा करते हैं, तो हमें उन की निन्दा से विचलित नहीं होना है। यदि वे हमारी प्रशंसा करते हैं, तो उस प्रशंसा से हमें प्रफुल्लित नहीं होना है। हमें आज भी विचलित नहीं होना है और अपने जीवनपर्यन्त विचलित नहीं होना है। जब तक यह राष्ट्र जीवित रहेगा, जब तक भारत की सन्तानें रहेंगी, तब तक वह विचलित नहीं होने वाला है, क्योंकि उस की नीति केवल यही है—

न्याय्यात् पथः प्रविचलन्ति पदं न धीराः

न्याय के रास्ते पर चलने वाले धीर पुरुष कभी अपने रास्ते से विचलित नहीं हुआ करते हैं। यदि कृश्चेव हमारी प्रशंसा करते हैं, तो बड़ी खुशी से करें। हम उन के आभारी होंगे। चाइना के आक्रमण के

समय, हमारे आपत्ति काल में, यदि कनेडी साहब हमारी सहायता करते हैं, तो हम उन के आभारी हैं क्योंकि भारतीय संस्कृति, भारतीय परम्परा, यह सिखाती है कि जो हमारी मदद करेगा, हम को उस का आभारी होना चाहिए और हम आभारी हैं। लेकिन उन घटनाओं से हमारी नीति का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। हमारी नीति एक बहुत ही विशाल नीति है। मेरा विश्वास है कि एक दिन सब लोग हमारी इस नीति के औचित्य को समझेंगे। चाहे कोई बड़ से बड़े विद्वान् इस नीति की निन्दा करें— एक आदरणीय साथी ने इन को पांच नान-सेन्सिज कहा था—और चाहे कोई बड़े से बड़े विद्वान् इस को बड़े बड़े प्रमाणपत्र भी दें, लेकिन हम को उन की चिन्ता नहीं करनी चाहिए। हमें चिन्ता इस बात की है कि हम दृढ़ता के साथ अपने मार्ग पर चलते रहें। इसी में भारत का कल्याण है।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने अभी कहा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति के सम्बन्ध में कि साउथ ईस्ट एशिया के जो राष्ट्र हैं या उत्तर पश्चिम भारत के जो राष्ट्र हैं उन से हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे होने चाहिये। बिलाशक व शबहा उन से हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे होने चाहिये। इस से हर कोई सहमत होगा। हमारे त्रिवेदी जी ने कहा अगर किसी राष्ट्र से हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं हैं, तो उस का कारण भी बता दिया है। वह कहते हैं कि हमें स्ट्रांग होना चाहिये। मैं आफ दी स्ट्रीट भी यह जानता है। आम रास्ते चलता आदमी भी यह जानता है और वह भी यह कह सकता है “चमकारेन नमस्कारम्”। शक्ति की पूजा होती है और शक्ति प्रदर्शन कीजिए, शक्ति प्राप्त कीजिये जिस से दूसरे राष्ट्र आप की इज्जत करें। लेकिन मैं आप के द्वारा उन से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उधार ली हुई शक्ति का क्या कभी प्रदर्शन होता है और यदि होता है तो कितने दिन तक। अगर चीन ने उधार ली हुई शक्ति का प्रदर्शन किया है और वह एक गुट में शामिल हो गया है और कुछ हथियार

ले कर उस ने कुछ फौज खड़ी कर ली है और दूसरों को डराने धमकाने की कोशिश की है तो क्या हमारे मित्र भी यही चाहते हैं कि हम भी ऐसा ही करें और हमें भी धमत्कार से ऐसा ही नमस्कार मिले । इस तरह का नमस्कार कितने दिन तक चल सकता है ? कुछ ही दिन यह चलेगा । यदि हम शक्ति प्राप्त करते हैं, शक्ति अर्जित करते हैं, अपना इंडस्ट्रियल पोटशल बढ़ाते हैं, अपने राष्ट्र के अन्दर डिस्प्लिन पैदा करते हैं, अपनी सहन शक्ति को बढ़ाते हैं, अपने हथियारों की शक्ति को बढ़ाते हैं, अपना बाहुबल बढ़ाते हैं, तो कोई शक नहीं है कि हमें प्रतिष्ठा मिलेगी, हमें इज्जत मिलेगी । हम दूसरे देशों से मदद ले रहे हैं और लेते रहेंगे । आज संसार में कौन देश है एक दो को छोड़ कर जो दूसरों से मदद नहीं ले रहे हैं । लेकिन हम उधार ली हुई शक्ति पर गवित नहीं हो सकते हैं, अहंकार नहीं कर सकते हैं । इस तरह का नमस्कार लेने की कोशिश हम नहीं करेंगे । यदि हमारी नीति सही है, यदि वह सत्य पर आधारित है, यदि भारत अपने साथ साथ उन देशों का, पड़ोसी देशों का भी कल्याण चाहता है तो इस में कोई सन्देह की बात नहीं होनी चाहिये कि जितने भी छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र हैं वे एक न एक दिन हमारे पास आने वाले हैं और हमारे साथ भाई की तरह से बठने वाले हैं । जिस तरह और मुल्क, हमारे पड़ोसी मुल्क डरा धमका कर दूसरे मुल्कों को अपने साथ लेना चाहते हैं, उस नीति पर न तो हम कभी चले हैं और न ही कभी चलने का हम स्थाल ही कर सकते हैं और न ही स्थाल करेंगे । हमारा निश्चित विश्वास है कि यह जो हमारी नीति है यह अवश्य सफल होगी ।

चूँकि आज थोड़ा सा हमें रिवाँसिस का मुंह देखना पड़ गया तो इस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि हमारी नीति गलत है । हमारी नीति शान्ति की रही है । इस विवाद में पड़ कर मैं ज्यादा समय बरबाद करना नहीं चाहता हूँ

और न ही उस की आवश्यकता है । इस का उत्तर मेरे मित्रों को एक से अधिक बार दिया जा चुका है । हम शान्ति के रास्ते पर चले हैं । जब कभी हम ने थोड़ी बहुत फौजी शक्ति बढ़ाने की कोशिश की है तब हमारे मित्रों की तरफ से उस का विरोध हुआ है इस पार्लियामेंट में और उन की तरफ से कहा गया है कि ज्यादा इस पर खर्च न किया जाय, डिफेंस बजट को ज्यादा न बढ़ाया जाय और जब आज हमारे ऊपर संकट आया है तब हमारे मित्रों की तरफ से हम पर यह इल्जाम लगाया जाता है कि हम ने गुटों में शामिल हो कर हथियार नहीं लिये हैं और हम ने अपनी ताकत नहीं बढ़ाई है । मेरा निवेदन यह है कि मेरे मित्रों को हिन्दुस्तान की नीति जो रही है और जो है उस की आलोचना करने का पूरा अधिकार है, वे करते रहे हैं और करते रहेंगे । लेकिन वे अपने हृदय पर हाथ रख कर इस बात को भी जानने की कोशिश करें कि उन को हिन्दुस्तान की जो उन्नति आज दस पंद्रह बरस के बाद दिखाई दे रही है, क्या वह सम्भव थी अगर उन की नीति पर चला जाता ? वह क्या उन की बताई हुई नीति के आधार पर चल कर सम्भव हो सकता था ? एक गुट में शामिल होने का मतलब होता कि न केवल हिन्दुस्तान की बल्कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति भी डावाँडोल हो जाती ।

थोड़ा बहुत विदेशों में जाकर मैं ने कुछ नेताओं से, वहाँ के नागरिकों से बातचीत की है, उनसे बातचीत करने का मुझे अक्सर भी मिला है । मैं फिलिपाईज में गया हूँ, मैं हांगकांग में गया हूँ और वहाँ के लोगों से मैं ने बातचीत की है । मैं थाईलैंड गया हूँ, वहाँ के लोगों से बातचीत की है । इन सब देशों में मैं ने हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति अश्रद्धा की भावना नहीं पाई है । यदि किसी देश के प्रतिनिधि ने किसी एक अवसर पर कुछ कह दिया जो हमें अशुचिकर लगा तो इसका मतलब

[श्री पाराशर]

यह नहीं है कि वे देश हमारे देश के प्रति कोई अश्रद्धा की भावना रखते हैं।

रोम में मुझे बातचीत करने का अवसर मिला है। स्विटजरलैंड में मैं गया हूँ और वहाँ बातचीत का अवसर मिला है। डेमोक्रेटिक जर्मनी और वेस्ट जर्मनी में भी मैं गया हूँ। अभी मेरे एक माननीय मित्र ने कहा है कि डेमोक्रेटिक जर्मनी को आप मान्यता क्यों नहीं देते हैं। हमारे एक दूसरे माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि इजराइल को मान्यता क्यों नहीं देते हैं। इन दोनों से एक बात स्पष्ट हो गई। जो पूंजीवादी हैं वे संसार के पूंजीवादी गुट के देश की वकालत करते हैं और जो दूसरे भाई हैं, साम्यवादी या कम्युनिस्ट वे कम्युनिस्ट मुल्क की वकालत करते हैं। ये दो तरह की आवाजें दो तरफ से आई हैं और इससे साफ पता चल गया है कि हमारे भाई किस तराजू के पलड़े में किधर बैठे हुए हैं। हमारी सरकार का जहाँ तक सम्बन्ध है, वह जरा से आधार को लेकर किसी को मान्यता नहीं दे सकती है। ऐसा वह हरगिज नहीं कर सकती है। हिन्दुस्तान एक बड़ा राष्ट्र है, उसकी अपनी नीतियां हैं और वे किन्हीं सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित हैं और वह उन पर चलना चाहता है। इसलिए अगर हमारी सरकार ने अभी तक डेमोक्रेटिक जर्मनी को तथा इजराइल को मान्यता नहीं दी है तो हमारे मित्रों को किसी प्रकार की कोई शिकायत करने का मौका नहीं होना चाहिए। और न ही कोई शिकायत उनको करनी चाहिए। उनको अधिकार है, जैसे चाहे वे अपनी बात कहें। लेकिन जो बात उन्होंने कही है उससे मैं पूर्ण रूप से असहमत हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि यदि वह शान्ति से इस प्रश्न पर विचार करेंगे तो वे भी मेरे साथ मेरी बात से सहमत होंगे।

जहाँ तक हमारे दूतावासों का प्रश्न है, मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक उनके द्वारा हमारी नीति के प्रचार तथा प्रदर्शन का सम्बन्ध है, मेरा भी अपना यह

ख्याल है कि उसमें कुछ प्रगति और कुछ तेजी आनी चाहिए। हाल ही में इस दिशा में कुछ काम किये गये हैं। इसको मैं मानता हूँ। अभी मास्को में एक एग्जीबीशन का आयोजन किया गया था और इसी तरह से कुछ दूसरे काम भी किये गये हैं। लेकिन फिर भी जितना अधिक करना चाहिये, जितना अधिक प्रचार तथा प्रापेण्डा करना चाहिये, अपनी नीति के बारे में उतना नहीं हो रहा है। हमें अपने सिद्धान्तों का प्रचार विदेशों में करना चाहिये, अपनी नीतियों का प्रचार करना चाहिये और इस काम में तेजी लाये जाने की आवश्यकता है। एक घटना मैं आपको सुनाता हूँ। आप उसको सुन कर आश्चर्य करेंगे। गांधी टोपी पहने हुए जब मैं स्विटजरलैंड में एक बाजार में से जा रहा था तो एक आदमी ने मुझसे हाथ मिला कर कहा "आर यू मिस्टर नेहरू"? यह बात सुन कर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ। उसे यह भी मालूम न था कि नेहरू क्या हैं। हमारे देश में करोड़ों आदमी रहते हैं और कई उन में से गांधी टोपी पहनते हैं और उसको यह भी मालूम नहीं था कि हर एक गांधी टोपी पहनने वाला नेहरू नहीं हो सकता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे दूतावासों ने, हमारी जो एजेंसियां विदेशों में हैं, उनके द्वारा जितना प्रचार होना चाहिये, नहीं हुआ है। उनके द्वारा यहाँ तक प्रचार नहीं किया गया है कि नेहरू क्या हैं। गांधी टोपी लगाने वाले अदना से आदमी को वह नेहरू समझ बैठे। इस तरह की अनेक घटनायें हैं, जो मैं सुना सकता हूँ। मैं जिस किसी देश में गया हूँ वहाँ के दूतावास में जाने का मैंने अवश्य प्रयत्न किया है, वहाँ के जो अफसर हैं, उनसे मैंने मिलने का अवश्य प्रयत्न किया है। जो कुछ मुझे महसूस हुआ है, वह मैं आपके सामने रख रहा हूँ। मैं बड़े ही नम्र शब्दों में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस दिशा में काफी तेजी और काफी प्रगति लाने की जरूरत है। वहाँ पर इस तरह का प्रचार होना चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान की नीति क्या है,

वह क्या कर रहा है, हमारा पंचशील क्या है, हमारा गांधीवादी सिद्धान्त क्या है, हमारा अहिंसा क्या है जिस पर चल कर हमने आज़ादी हासिल की है और आगे हम विश्व शान्ति को बनाये रखने के लिए क्या कर रहे हैं और क्या करना चाहते हैं। इस काम में हम कैसे सहयोग दे रहे हैं और कैसे देना चाहते हैं।

इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि जब कोई देश प्रगति के रास्ते पर चलता है या जब वह नई आज़ादी हासिल करता है, तो उसके रास्ते में अनेक बाधाएँ उपस्थित होती हैं। मैं अपने देश की तुलना फ्रांस से करके आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ। फ्रांस आज़ादी के कई वर्ष बाद भी खूँखार लड़ाइयों में फंसा रहा जब एक दर्जन राष्ट्रों ने उस पर हमला कर दिया था। मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश पर किसी प्रकार की ऐसी बात हुई है जिससे शर्म से हमारा सिर नीचे झुके जैसा कि त्रिवेदी जी ने कहा है। हम पर हमला हुआ है और हमने उस हमले का मुकाबला किया है। हमें यह नहीं सोचना चाहिए कि हम बहुत कमजोर हैं और चीन बहुत ताकतवर है। अगर ऐसी बात है तो चीनी हमला करने के बाद वापिस क्यों चले गये। आखिर को चीन किसी उद्देश्य को लेकर ही तो आया था, किसी उद्देश्य को सामने रख कर ही तो उसने हम पर आक्रमण किया था। क्या उसका वह उद्देश्य पूरा हो गया है? वह नहीं हुआ है। हमारे भाई ऐसा न सोचें कि हम भेड़ बकरियाँ हैं जिनको उठा कर कोई खा जाएगा। इस तरह की बातें हमारे भाई निराश हो कर कभी कभी कह दिया करते हैं। हम एक संगठित राष्ट्र हैं, ४६ करोड़ का हमारा राष्ट्र है, आज़ादी हमने अपनी ताकत के बल पर हासिल की है, आज़ादी हमें खैरात में नहीं मिली है, आज़ादी को हासिल करने के लिए हमने किसी के सामने झोली नहीं पसारी है। आज़ादी हमने अपने संगठन के बल पर, अपनी बात पर दृढ़ रहते हुए, अनेकों कुर्बानियाँ देकर हासिल की है। मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह शक्ति हमारी कहीं चली नहीं गई

है, वह अब भी हममें है, अब भी वह अपनी जगह पर कायम है। कोई भी व्यक्ति, कोई भी सशक्त व्यक्ति, अपने हथियारों का, अपनी शक्ति का रोज़ाना प्रदर्शन नहीं किया करता है। उसके प्रदर्शन की जब आवश्यकता होती है तब वह होता है। यदि आवश्यकता इस बात की हुई तो उसका सशक्त प्रदर्शन हम करेंगे। हिन्दुस्तान के पास किसी चीज़ की कमी नहीं है।

एक बात बहुत साफ है। हमारे कुछ भाई बड़ी शान्ति के साथ, बड़ ही हल्केपन से बातें कर दिया करते हैं कि हम को इस देश में जा कर प्रचार करना चाहिये, उस देश में जा कर करना चाहिये, फलां देश में हमारी नीति असफल हो गई है, फलां व्यक्ति ने यह कहा है, वह कहा है। व्यक्ति तो समय समय पर न मालूम क्या क्या कहा करते हैं। आपको हर चीज़ को अपने विवेक पर कस कर परखना होगा कि कोई बात ठीक है या नहीं। इतिहास के पृष्ठों को पलटने हुए मुझ १५०० शताब्दी की एक घटना का पता चला। आस्ट्रेलिया के एक नेवल कमांडर ने योजना पेश की थी हमारे देश के सम्बन्ध में कि उनको अगर तीन जहाज और दस हजार फौजी दे दिय जायें तो वह हिन्दुस्तान को फतह कर सकता है। अगर हमारे भाइयों ने इसको पढ़ा होता तो शायद इसको पढ़ कर वे घबरा जाते और समझ बैठते कि हम बहुत कमजोर हैं। लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है। हमें देखना चाहिये कि हम उस सम्बन्ध में क्या सोचते हैं। मैं अपने भाइयों के सम्बन्ध में अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता। यही कहुंगा कि वे भोले हैं और भोलेपन में कुछ कह जाते हैं। उसकी हमें अधिक चिन्ता भी नहीं है हम तो परमात्मा से यही प्रार्थना करते हैं कि परमात्मा उन्हें सद्बुद्धि दे और वतराजू के पलड़े पर ठीक से प्रत्येक विषय को तौल कर किसी निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचे।

मुझे इतना ही कहना था। मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूँ कि आपन मझ बोलने का समय दिया।

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for inviting me to participate in this very important debate.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He has not invited you but only asked you.

Shri R. G. Dubey: The international situation covers a very wide variety of topics, and I should not like to deal with all of them.

I shall refer to a few subjects like the partial test ban treaty, the growing rift between Peking and Moscow etc., but before I discuss these matters, I should like to refer to the remarks made by the leader of the Swatantra Party, Shri Ranga. He as well as Shri Mukerjee referred to the Voice of America deal, but from different angles, I think it will be wise for the House to accept the Prime Minister's statement and leave the matter at that. I do not think there is any point in discussing or questioning the Government's policy about that.

15.31 hrs.

[**SHRI KHADILKAR** in the Chair]

Shri Ranga went to the length of suggesting that because of the Voice of America deal, the Prime Minister should give up the portfolio of Foreign Ministership, and he quoted examples in England and other countries. I am surprised he has forgotten the history of India, our national movement and his own past association with the Congress. He is free to maintain his present views, but he forgets that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, even before the advent of freedom, when he was not Prime Minister or Foreign Minister, was the author of our foreign policy. The Congress resolutions that were adopted from time to time speak volumes about the part he played in fashioning the foreign policy of India.

Considering all that has happened during the last year or two, I must confess that the foreign policy that he has followed has given us strength in the wide world, and possibly is a great saving factor for the future of India also. In the context of the second world war, it was said of Churchill that he was equal to four divisions of the army. I will not be exaggerating if I say that our Prime Minister is also equal to several divisions of the army. It is not after all the army alone that fights a battle for the country or against aggression. The role of the army comes at the last moment. It is actually in the field of diplomacy that we gain strength, and from that point of view, I tried to search within myself whether we had grown weaker, whether we had lost friends in the world. Today the two Great Powers, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., both appreciate India's stand. What more proof is needed for the vindication of our foreign policy?

The partial test ban treaty is a very important event in the history of the world, there is no doubt. After the two world wars, the statesmen of the world were still faced with the problem of peace. After the second world war, there were differences in the allied camp, with Russia on the one side and America and England on the other. Then there was the Berlin issue, the disarmament question, the American spying incident and ultimately the Cuba situation which took the world almost to the brink of another war. But Khrushchev and Kennedy both showed wisdom and statesmanship and a third world war was averted. After all this, for the first time in the history of the world there has been a change for the better. The partial test ban treaty to some may seem not to be quite satisfactory, but admittedly it is a step in the right direction of peace. At the communist conference in East Berlin, Khrushchev gave his philosophy, indicating how he looked at this whole problem. He realises that hereafter war means a nuclear war

which would involve the destruction not only of the capitalist countries, but also the communist countries. The atom and hydrogen bombs make no difference between one territory and another; they will affect all human beings, possibly the whole of humanity will be destroyed. It is this consideration that has weighed with Khrushchev and also with America and England. Some friends repeatedly ask us: why not entirely change our foreign policy? They forget that in the present context, neither England nor America want us to give up our foreign policy wholesale and embrace them simply because they are not in a position to accept the responsibility. We are opposed to the foreign army coming to India. If, for argument's sake, you ask England and American soldiers to fight for us, in the present context of international affairs will they do so? Are they in a position to fight for us? So, ours is the path of wisdom. The Prime Minister has chosen the correct path. The partial test ban treaty, though it has come late, has done some good; the world situation has improved for the better. But Peking is obstinate and China refuses to sign the treaty; so also De Gaulle. These are isolated cases where they are trying to develop trends against peace. I was surprised when Prof. Ranga said that we need not continue non-alignment policy because Kennedy and Khrushchev have come together. Mr. Krishna Menon, the former Defence Minister, said in his able speech sometime back that our foreign policy aims at world peace and world co-operation. Does Prof. Ranga mean to suggest that we should give up world peace and world co-operation? By all means we should prepare our country for defence if China does not improve her ways; we are prepared for it. The communist party is critical of the joint exercises. I fail to understand it. We have received radar equipment already from the U.S.A. and U.K. and so they send their officers for training purposes as it is highly complicated machinery. What is wrong

in it? If Soviet technicians come here or we send our boys to Moscow to get training on MIGs, it does not violate non-alignment; but if the same thing is done in the case of U.S.A. or U.K., then it violates non-alignment! That is illogical. Why have this inferiority complex? If anybody comes, nothing happens. We are prepared to take from Russia and also America. Washington also says this about the Chinese attacks. China is not going to repeat its invasion because the two great powers in the world, America and Russia which are militarily great powers, are not interested in a world war. So, China would not be able to risk any such major invasion against India. There may be border war or border invasion and we must be prepared for it.

15:39 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

There is the growing Moscow-Peking rift. It is very interesting topic for students of political history. As Prime Minister said, it is not purely an ideological issue; some element of it may be there. Even before Cuban crisis, China was talking of Russian revisionism. China thinks of Marshal Tito as a revisionist and a renegade and as a person acting against the basic policy of Marxism. Khrushchev rightly takes note of the present context of things. If you resort to war, as a means of spreading communism, there will be destruction of humanity and that is why Khrushchev rules out war as a means of achieving it. Economic construction or economic development is the only way. There is nothing wrong in it. America also has showed that by way of an example to other countries. There is nothing wrong in it. Russia also shows that there is nothing wrong in it. Somehow or other, Peking has placed herself in an isolated position.

Some people say that our foreign policy is wrong because China has

[Shri R. G. Dube.]

attacked us and peaceful co-existence is gone. I do not see how it is wrong. We have to express and behave in the proper way. China is our great neighbour. We cannot but be in friendship with her, but if China becomes a traitor, an enemy, it is none of our mistake. We are certainly preparing to meet the situation. No price is great for the freedom of the country and for the defence of the country. We are doing that.

Regarding Pakistan, I think the House has to support the Prime Minister's stand entirely. There, Pakistan's attitude has become very strange. Pakistan is feeling that when we are facing another enemy, it could trouble us, and we will be in a difficult condition. So, they feel, why not hit us. I think it should be remembered that India's genius and India's spirit lie in the fact that we cannot be bullied into this kind of action by Pakistan. We are not going to be bullied. We are not handing over Kashmir in that manner. Whatever attitude the Prime Minister has taken in this regard is the correct one.

In some quarters, in England or America, people think that we should change our attitude. How to change our attitude? There was partition of this country for which we were not prepared, but we had to accept it in the interest of freedom. We wanted to become free. There is not one single Hindu remaining in West Pakistan. All of them have come this side. So far as East Pakistan is concerned, there are reports again and again of a Hindu minority exodus. Then there is infiltration into Assam. We have shown the maximum generosity and courtesy towards Pakistan in these matters. It is pointed out that if Pakistan wants to bully us, we are afraid because China is also against us. We are not afraid of Pakistan. We are also not afraid of China. We are prepared to face both.

I now come to the question of South Viet Nam, where the Buddhists are being persecuted. India has always been against such things. We have been a tolerant people and the greatest thing about Indian culture is its religious tolerance. We have in our country large numbers of Hindus, besides Christians and also people belonging to Islam, Buddhism and Jainism. So many religions are there in India. So, if any community is being persecuted because it does not follow the religious doctrine of its rulers it is against the grain of India. That is why naturally our Prime Minister declared that we shall spare no effort in solving this problem in South Viet Nam.

Somebody suggested that we should not attend the conference to be held there if China is invited. It is a very illogical attitude, because we are not to invite anybody. Some other people take the initiative and somebody else is convening the conference. To say that "you do not sit there because the Chinese are invited" is something which is illogical. It passes my comprehension. In such matters we have to go there.

We meet on the eve of the inauguration of the Federation of Malaysia. We are happy that this new Federation is coming into being. We have played some part in regard to the liberation of people in Africa. But Angola and other colonies are also there. Possibly it seems that we have one idea: that is the talk about solidarity of Africans and Asians. I am not against that. We want that the Africans should develop because Africa is backward, and there should be more scope for them. But then this slogan of solidarity of Asians and Africans especially after China invaded India has lost its significance. When we talk of a world federation and the United Nations, why is such a thing called for? By all means, if coloured people are under subjection, they must be set free. I am glad, in

this context, to see that the Negro problem in the U.S.A. is being solved. I am glad that Mr. Kennedy's administration wants to do everything which will remove the disabilities to which the Negro people are subjected. This is one aspect.

Another aspect is South Africa, where the administration wants to continue its domination over the coloured people. All these things are going on. Taking all this on balance, as a whole, I do feel that the foreign policy of the Government of India with regard to the world events is perfectly right. There may be one or two mistakes. It is not that we cannot rectify them. For example, in the light of what has been happening after the Chinese invasion, some of our policies did undergo a degree or a shade of change. That does not mean that basically there was anything wrong.

With these few words, I resume my seat.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Mr. Speaker, Sir, except for Chinese intransigence, the complex of world politics today is acquiring a new direction that has brought international relations into a new focus. Under the ethos and *elan* of the Test Ban Treaty, the East-West dialogue conducted so long in a language of anger and banter has undergone a new transformation. The world glimmers with a new light and hope.

From the point of physical success, the Test Ban Treaty has brought about a sort of nuclear stalemate and created a psychological atmosphere. It has at least put a stop in a sense to dirty nuclear testing. Knowledgeable sources have estimated that in between the U.K., the U.S. and the Soviet Union, they have put off 425 nuclear test explosions. What a tremendous respite to humanity, what a tremendous relief to our unborn generations!

1228 (A) LSD—7.

Since the reasonable attitude adopted over the Cuban issue by all concerned, and issue that brought the menacing shadow of a thermo-nuclear war nearer home, the world is steadily progressing into a climate of sweet reasonableness, except for the rapid intransigence of China and France, a bizarre combination.

Mr. Khrushchev has made a very valuable suggestion. He says that after this Test Ban Treaty, there should be a non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. On the other hand, Mr. Dean Rusk has come out actually with a nine-point programme towards the relaxation of tensions through co-operation. I would say, in the midst of darkening shadows of war in the horizon, there is an enchanting glow today of understanding and reasonableness. The birth of the Malaysian Federation is a landmark in this direction. We wish her well.

The Soviet Union in her forties has sobred down like a woman in her forties. Much of the unbridled excitement and enthusiasm, irrepressibility and irresponsibility of youth is wearing off. This is a happy augury in the international family of life. Under these altered circumstances, I hope and trust that India will be able to play a distinctive role assigned to her by destiny.

If I say that there are visible cracks in the two blocs, Eastern and Western, I shall be guilty of making too naked an appraisal. But the fact remains that the world that was so long bipolar in its composition, is today, under the impact of a new alignment of forces, tending to become polycentric, multi-polar in its complex. Now the conflict is more intra-block and less inter-block.

May I say that the east wind is blowing into the west wind and vice versa. There is a new confrontation

[Shri Hem Barua]

of values in the context of which, the old dialogue between alignment and non-alignment has lost much of its edges and meaning; it is at best a sterile debate. I feel that in the context of international forces today, all nations are aligned and yet they are non-aligned.

Today who can suggest that India should align herself and be a satellite of some power, big or small? Similarly, who can suggest honestly that India, because she is non-aligned, should, without considering the calculus of national power relationships, confine and cripple herself in an atmosphere of grand isolation? I would say, non-alignment is the pole star of India's destiny and all those who say, because of our heavy dependence on western defence aid, that non-alignment has become of late a paper slogan, are sadly mistaken. I do not understand the Communist contention in this. This House is familiar with the support that the Communists have given to non-alignment. Their support is a sham support in the sense that if the Communists by any chance can come to power they will be the first to disrupt non-alignment and align India with the Communist Bloc. In the context of it, the Chinese who say that the world is basically divided into two antagonistic camps, there is only the east wind and the west wind and co-operation between the two is a sacrilege—the Chinese who say that there can be no alternative and therefore there can be no non-alignment, are introducing a dangerous philosophy into international thought and relationship. I would say they have failed to reading the warning on the wall of time. They have failed to realise and understand the dynamics of change.

But I have a complaint here. Our policy of non-alignment often betrays itself by emotional and psychological bias. Our own recent information is that even in the matter of granting visas and passports visitors to Com-

munist countries get preference over visitors to western countries—I am referring to Indian visitors. I do not know how, as reported in the papers, Shri E. M. S. Namboodiripad, the former Chief Minister of Kerala, could be in Peking. I do not understand that.

Now, Sir, another redeeming feature today is that the ideological edges of most of the nations are being chiselled off. The hot line between Kremlin and the White House in order to relieve the cold war tensions, the cold war yielding place to a hot line, is a symbol of developing international goodwill and understanding apart from ideological divisions. From this standpoint the recent, newly established *entente* between Pakistan and China is symptomatic. The only snag in this *entente* is that it is prompted and motivated by power politics and other opportunistic considerations rather than by a genuine desire for international goodwill and understanding. I would say that the misfortune is ours, misfortune born of the Peking-Pakistan axis, because the chosen theatre of operation of the Sino-Pak honeymoon will be India.

China has befriended Pakistan, a country of SEATO alliance. The question that naturally arises is whether China has allowed ideological considerations to over-rule her partnership with the SEATO country. If China has not allowed ideological considerations to over-rule her partnership with Pakistan, I would say, why rage and rumble when India in her hour of crisis leans with this bloc or that bloc for defence aid? I would tell, and from rather the deepest part of my heart, that the choice before the nation today is between freedom and slavery under the Chinese. I do not think that the Indian people would ever choose the latter.

We are confronted with two enemies on our frontier—China and Pakistan—one suffering from revolutionary

chauvinism and the other suffering from impotent anger. It is a fact that we are oscillating today between two contradictory points *vis-a-vis* China. One is the threat of war poised against us by China and the other is the carrot of peace dangled before us by the Colombo powers. It is also a fact that we are today confronted with two cease-fire lines, one imposed on us unilaterally by the Chinese and the other imposed by the Colombo Powers.

Now the stalemate on the frontier has proved advantageous to the Chinese and our position is rendered more difficult. At least one glaring advantage accruing out of it for the Chinese is that they are maintaining pockets of their troops in the 40-kilometre demilitarised zone both in Ladakh and NEFA, without any let or hindrance from our side. Therefore, I would say it is high time for the Colombo Powers to declare to the world that China refused to accept the Colombo Proposals and that any further drift in the matter would only jeopardise our interests. Or else, I would ask our hon. Prime Minister to request the Colombo Powers to say, and if they do not say it, he should himself announce it, that because of the Chinese intransigence the Colombo proposals are dead for us.

This is an old theme, of course, that we placed too much of faith on Panchsheel and all along thought that China was an honest partner to it. This is an old matter, yet I am referring to this because of certain facts. A simple reference to an incident or episode would establish how wrong we were in our estimate. Mr. Chang Wen-tien, Chinese Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs was dismissed. And why? Because this Minister was, I quote:

“a right opportunist who had propounded the erroneous view . . . that peaceful co-existence in accordance with the Five Principles (Panchsheel) and Ban-

dung would be the basis of China's Foreign policy”.

He had to lose his job for propagating this erroneous view that the foreign policy of China was according to the Bandung principles. From this fact it is evident, if at all evidence is necessary, that to China Panchsheel was a tool, a trick of the trade, to camouflage her dirty imperialistic aspirations and designs; it was never an abiding basis of her foreign policy.

China has massed her troops on our frontiers and the question naturally posed is whether China means to attack us again. To me, whether China attacks us again or not is not so much material. To me, what is material is whether we are prepared to recover the 12,000 sq. miles of our territory under the illegal occupation of China or not. The Colombo proposals are not an answer to my question.

It is a fact that China wants to dominate the whole of Asia and the whole of Africa by cold-war tactics. China's border agreements with Nepal, Burma and Pakistan and trade and air agreements with Ceylon and Pakistan are not isolated events. They are a part of a carefully planned sinister strategy, and we forget this fact only at our peril.

China has been very active in the African continent since she was introduced to the Afro-Asian world at Bandung, that is to say, since 1955. I would say that we have almost neglected to take the initiative to get the support of these emerging nations of Africa. What happened? Chinese interests are all-embracing, diplomatic and commercial, political and economic, cultural and social. As against that, what have we done to win the support, co-operation and sympathy of the emerging nations of Africa?

We should not forget that during the last four years the Chinese export figures have gone up impressively over her import figures. And what about

[Shri Hem Barua]

us? We simply live in a universe of illusions in which the world of solid facts does not find a place.

What about our publicity? Our publicity is awfully poor and the one pet argument usually advanced in justification of it, and one point only, is our paucity of funds, paucity of resources. But have we ever thought that within the resources that are available, our publicity has not come upto standards, it lacks in standards, it lacks in vigilance? When this NEFA crisis came to a head, when it developed, China released well-documented literature written in the Japanese language for the consumption of the Japanese people but what did we do? We simply dumped our Embassy at Tokyo with a few bundles of literature written in the English language for the consumption of a people whose knowledge of the English language is awfully limited. This is only one example out of many. It is a well-known fact, the failure of our diplomatic missions abroad is in the matter of dissemination of information, the failure of our diplomatic missions abroad to move abreast with the political developments in this country as also in the rest of the world is too well known to be repeated. What about them? We had an half-an-hour discussion here about financial irregularities. In the matter of finances, they have created a pandemonium and politically they have created a chandler civilisation. And then to crown it all, our Ministers go about making statements. The statement that Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, otherwise a very charming lady, made about Israel at Jordan to the effect that India is not going to give the *de jure* recognition to Israel because India is sympathetic to the Arab force, does more harm than good. I would say, this is a challenge to the fundamental policy adopted by our Prime Minister *vis-a-vis* Israel.

16 hrs.

Then, I come to another point.

About the broadcasting hours of China—Chinese broadcasts—may I cite an example? During 1956, the total broadcasting hours of China to the Central African countries and Egypt was only 3½ hours per week in English. By 1961, from 3½ hours per week, it jumped to 110½ hours per week in English alone apart from broadcast in Swahili, Arabic and Chinese. You must not also forget the fact that in the point of total broadcasting hours, China is the second nation in the world. But what about us? Ours is a sordid tale of half-heartedness and indifference and lack of will and inept mental alertness.

Now, I would say a few words about Pakistan. Pakistan's spite for us, for India, is biological and I would say, even if the Kashmir problem is solved according to the wishes of Pakistan, I am afraid the relations between Pakistan and India would continue to be as bad as before. I must not be misunderstood on this score, not that I do not want that efforts should be made towards the improvement of the relations between these two countries—ceaseless efforts are to be made for the improvement of relations between India and Pakistan—but what strikes me is this. I will simply pinpoint that. It is here where the thinking of the Western powers goes completely wrong. They seem to think that the magic wand lies in the solution of the Kashmir problem and once it is solved India and Pakistan would jointly face the Chinese menace. Here, I want to repeat again that even if the Kashmir problem is solved, the hostility of Pakistan because of the disparity of size between the two countries, theirs and ours, and other psychological reasons is bound to continue. I do not understand the *Daily Express* editorial. It is an astounding editorial.

16.05 hrs.

It advises U.K. and U.S.A. thus:

"Tell Mr. Nehru to settle his quarrel with Pakistan, quit Kashmir and get every Indian Soldier

into position to face the threat from China".

What a perverse attitude!

The suggestion for mediation over the Kashmir problem like King Charles's head is coming up over and over again, of late. But I would say that we must not agree to mediation unless and until we are convinced that Pakistan's attitude over Kashmir has at least undergone some noticeable change, or else it will serve no useful purpose.

Apart from what Mr. K. P. S. Menon, our ex-Ambassador to the Soviet Union has written in his recent book called *The Flying Troika* about our dispute with China, which is very objectionable,—the Prime Minister possibly has read that book—and apart from what another Indian, Mr. Tariq Abdullah, son of Sheikh Abdullah has written in the *Contemporary Review*, a British journal, about 'India holding Kashmir in a concentration camp', apart from these things, there is no denying the fact that espionage on behalf of our enemies has struck deep roots in this country.

The very fact that one of our Air Force pilots was involved in the recent Pakistan High Commission espionage scandal pin-points a significant fact. My reading is this, that China is interested in ascertaining our air strength and effectiveness through Pakistan sources before she decides to attack us again, this time, perhaps, jointly with Pakistan. I am sorry to say, and it pains me to say so, that this is not or the first time that we are betrayed by our own people; we are a wretched nation. When we decided to drop our troops, during the Chinese aggression in NEFA by parachutes, it was an Indian who betrayed the news to China, the exact time and date; I am sorry to say that. I do not know whether the Henderson-Brooks report on the NEFA reverses contains this piece of information or not. When the

fall of Bomdila and Sela was imminent, it pains me to say that**

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Shri Hem Barua: May I confide in you Sir, that I had the misfortune....

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I wish to go on record as saying that it is not in accordance with the traditions of this House to criticise a person who is absent.....

Mr. Speaker: Yes, it is not. I also agree with the hon. Member.

Shri Kapur Singh: ** unless he is here to answer this charge, this observation must not be on the record.

Shri Raghunath Singh: The man is not here to defend himself.

Mr. Speaker: I entirely agree with the objection of Shri Kapur Singh, that we cannot attack people here who are not present here to defend themselves. That has been the tradition, and we must maintain that. That is not fair at all....

Shri Raghunath Singh: Especially when he is not in office.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say that the attack is not merely an attack, but it is the grossest libel that one can make against an Indian? * * I do not know where my hon. friend gets this information from.

Shri Hem Barua: I have deeper sources, and I had the misfortune of meeting these two foreign correspondents. * *

Mr. Speaker: Without going into those facts, he can make his observations.....

Shri Hem Barua: I am sorry for bringing in this incident.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Could I find out if these observations of the hon.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Member will be permitted to be broadcast to the country because of parliamentary regulations and all that, or are you ordering the press not to report this kind of * * observations?

Mr. Speaker: He ought not to have made these observations. That was bad on his part too.

Shri Nath Pai: Will you kindly bear with me? It is up to you to decide which should remain and which should not. But may also know from you and from the Prime Minister whether the malicious attack launched by Shri Hiren Mukerjee on a delegate to the United Nations was in conformity with or in the interests of the country, whether it was proper for him to single out a delegate of the Indian people going to the United Nations, by which he chose to weaken the representative character of the delegation?

Shri Kapur Singh: This is a pertinent question.

Mr. Speaker: If a representative goes there to represent our country, he has to enunciate and pursue the policies that we have here, the policies of the nation. If some Member finds that he has departed from that, certainly he has a right to refer to that in that context. But here, this was quite a different case which Shri Hem Barua. I am very sorry that Shri Mukerjee should have stood up and made observations that were not called for at all, and rather not in desirable language also. But those observations, of course, cannot remain on the record, and I would ask that these might be expunged. The press would also take note of this.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Could I have the courtesy of being told what exactly was the undesirable phraseology which I used? I only asked you whether you were going to permit this kind of thing to remain on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Not the language, but the adjective.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: So far as the other words are concerned, I think they are parliamentary. I do know the English language to a certain limited extent, and I would like very much to be informed where I am being unparliamentary.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have been simply stunned by what Shri Hem Barua has said. It has amazed me.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It has been expunged now.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Quite apart from the fact that it is not customary or usual or proper to mention persons not here,* *

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Will this go on record? This also should be expunged.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: * *

Shri Ranga: He has withdrawn the allegation.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: May I humbly submit that these remarks of the Prime Minister should also be expunged. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: One should speak at a time. Let us at least stick to that practice that there ought to be only one standing at a time. Shri Dwivedy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: After you have ordered the expunction of Shri Hem Barua's remarks, I do not think it was proper for the Prime Minister to come again in defence.* If those remarks remain in the record then Shri Hem Barua's remarks should also be there.

Shri Ranga: Otherwise, both should be expunged.

* * Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Because it is intended that those remarks should not go there, I have to look into the context of the other observations or words that might be connected which might give a clue that something had been said which has been expunged. That also will have to be expunged. I will have to look into the record.

Shri Kapur Singh: I would like to say about what you have said that the principle of the procedure should be clearly understood, that if from the Government Benches laudatory remarks are made about an individual, whether he is a Government functionary or not, then it becomes permissible for others to make non-laudatory remarks also, but since you have expunged the non-laudatory remarks, the laudatory remarks should also be expunged.

Shri Thirumala Rao: A fact was mentioned by the Prime Minister * * There is nothing laudatory of complimentary about it. Not only mentioned a fact * * nothing more than that. Why should the hon. Member object?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Are you advising the press also not to take note of the remarks of the Prime Minister?

Mr. Speaker: The Press always takes note of expunctions, and they do not publish expunged portions. They would first see the record as to what I have decided to be published, and then give it to the press.

Shri Hem Barua: When I think of the treasonable conduct of our own men, Indians, naturally my blood starts boiling.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I again say that he is referring to the exact incident without mentioning the name?

Shri Hem Barua: I am mentioning several cases and putting before you the catalogue of treacheries.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no doubt you will do so. I shall be glad if the hon. Member will do so I have not heard of such cases.

Shri Hem Barua: I have. May I repeat them again? (*Interruptions*). I am mentioning about the book, about the article.....

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are not addressing the Chair at all.

Shri Hem Barua: When I think of the treasonable conduct of our own men, Indians, frankly speaking, Sir, my blood starts boiling. If I were the Prime Minister of India, I would have lined them up, these traitors, against the rampart of Delhi and shot them down, one by one. There can be no compromise between treason and national freedom.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member is talking about.

Mr. Speaker: That was generally about some Indians.....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It seems to me that the hon. Member is talking non-sense.... (*Interruptions*.)

Shri Hem Barua: How can he make a statement like that?.... (*Interruptions*.)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I enquire if 'non-sense' is an unparliamentary word?

Shri Ranga: But the way in which it was said is thoroughly unbecoming of you. You are the Leader of the House.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): Sir, on a point of order. Is 'non-sense' parliamentary?

Mr. Speaker: 'Non-sense' has been used in the morning; nobody took ob-

[Mr. Speaker]

jection at that time; that was used here in his House.... (Interruptions).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty Bar-rackpore): Shri Hem Barua used it against us.

Shri Hem Barua: I have never done so.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nath Pai used it; Shri Hem Barua did not use it. That was the mistake which Shri Mukerjee made at that time.

Shri Hem Barua: I am very much in their mind, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Himatsingka.

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): The Prime Minister has set out at length the policies followed by the Govern-ment, and the results that have flowed from the policy of non-alignment and how it has helped in keeping peace and order in the world. He also said how India stood in the counsel of world.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; there should be less talking now.

Shri Hem Barua: That is the after-math, Sir.

Shri Himatsingka: After the Chinese invasion, things have apparently changed. India was regarded as a very powerful country. In fact our Army had shown its strength in various fields but because of the un-preparedness and the neglect—that was neglected for sometime—we had to taste the bitter experience last October. A country is heard only when it speaks from strength. There-fore, I feel that India should take all possible steps to increase her strength both militarily and economically. That can only be done if we take all possi-ble steps for the purpose. You know that India was respected and heard, before, but not now, and we must get back our former prestige. That can only be done if we raise

our military strength and also are in a position to speak from that strength. Therefore, it is necessary that we increase the strength of the army, equip it properly and also arm it properly. There should be less talk and more work. That can only be done if we really take proper steps at the proper moment.

What happens in the councils of the world? As has been mentioned, our diplomacy is not having proper effect and the result is that what we expect to achieve does not happen. Therefore, it is necessary that our diplomatic representation is stren-gthened and a better class of people who can create a better impression in those countries is sent.

It is very necessary that in the im-portant capitals of the world we make proper arrangements for propaganda. In that respect, we are at a less advantageous position than Pakistan. Of course, Pakistan's case so far as Kashmir is concerned is very easy to be placed before the world. They sim-ply say, "we do not want anything except plebiscite." But then we have to explain the circumstances; Kashmir was raided; the raiders were imme-diatly followed by the Pakistan army; and then there was an enquiry by the United Nations Commission, and the decision by the Commission was that Pakistan must vacate the aggression, and then only the question of plebiscite comes in. These things need proper explanation.

Another thing has got to be borne in-mind. Things may be explained to the President or the USA or the Prime Minister of UK, but we know that such explanations alone are not suffi-cient. You know that the President of the USA is very much mindful of helping India. He promised all kinds of help, but unless he can carry the Congress-men and the senators with him he cannot always carry out his wishes. Therefore, it is necessary that our

propaganda reaches the large numbers of Americans and that we are able to explain the justice of our cause and the necessity for the help that we have been asking.

America and other foreign countries are willing to help; it is for us to take proper advantage of it, and to take the best possible help as may be available. Our communist friends, whenever any help comes from western countries, want to raise some sort of protest, and some times they begin to confuse whether that help should be taken or not. Look at the question of joint air exercises. Certainly, the exercises that have been arranged and are going to take place very soon will be very helpful in giving instruction to our pilots and they will give training about the up-to-date position of the Air Force. Unless we take the fullest advantage, we will not be in a position to meet the aggression of China. Therefore, no one should be heard to say anything against the use of the joint air exercises and the help that the foreign countries are willing to render us in that respect.

Similarly, we can be strong if we are economically strong and we cannot be economically strong unless our industries, especially the heavy industries and other industries, which are defence orientated and which enabled to our defence forces to get what they want are strengthened. What happens at the present moment? Foreign collaborators come with proper schemes on which they have spent a lot of money and thought. They give all possible examination and care and after they have tested the projects, they come here and then what do they find? Some Under-Secretary or a person who does not know much about the schemes is asked to examine and the result is enormous delay. India is not the only country where they can put in their funds for investment. As a matter of fact, as a result of this, these collaborators go away and put their money

elsewhere. So, what has happened is that only 3 per cent of the foreign capital is being invested in India. You can realise the time that will be taken if this is the rate at which the progress is made.

I also remember the remark Sir, that you yourself made in the talk you gave only a few days ago about the delay that takes place here and how it scares away foreign industrialists. I feel it is up to the Government to take note of your experience and benefit by it. I am told when our President went to America, he created a very good impression. But the press did not take much notice of the tour made by the President, simply because the public relations department that should have taken notice of the effect produced, really did not work properly. Therefore, it is necessary that that also should be strengthened and proper arrangements should be made to have a public relations officer, who will take advantage of visits by the President and other dignitaries from our country.

So far as our relations with Pakistan are concerned, our country has been generous in almost everything. In all possible manner, our country has gone as far as it possibly could in the question about canal water and other important questions also. In spite of that, Pakistan, which has taken all the possible advantage from the West—it is one of the members of the alliances—has formed alliances of a different nature with China. Therefore, this is the proper time when our country should take advantage of the position and bring home to the foreign countries that they should not depend on a country like Pakistan, which has taken all the help from the west, but which is still prepared to hobnob with China.

The western countries have been helping Pakistan for the main purpose of holding the communists. So far as the Indian sub-continent or Pakistan

[Shri Himatsingka]

is concerned, communists mean only China. But that is the country with which Pakistan wants to be friendly. That shows how far Pakistan can go to create trouble for India. It is very unfortunate that these two countries, which were born after the departure of the British, should have this kind of dispute. But so far as our country is concerned, it has taken all possible steps to bring home to Pakistan that it will not pay. Maybe on account of difficulties in their own country, may be for other reasons, to divert the attention of their people, they always accuse India and try to point their finger at India. That is the whole trouble with the present authorities in Pakistan.

Therefore, our propoganda has to be strengthened and improved. That is also necessary so far as the south-eastern countries are concerned. Culturally and otherwise, we have great affinity with those countries. Most of them follow the Buddhist religion and if not for anything else, they have love for India because it is the birth-place of Buddha. Culturally and otherwise also there is a large amount of similarity with India. But I am afraid our propoganda and our diplomatic strength in those countries is not what they should be. Therefore, our Prime Minister should take note of that fact also and try to strengthen the position so that those countries may be prospective customers of various things that our country is producing, both consumer goods and capital goods which our country is producing and which our country is going to produce more and more in the very near future. Therefore, our propoganda has got to be improved.

Sir, so far as China is concerned, I feel that they are out to create trouble for us, and it is necessary that we should be in a position to meet this challenge from them.

Mr. Speaker: Shri J. R. Mehta.

An hon. Member: He has not heard you.

Mr. Speaker: Shri V. B. Gandhi.

Shri J. R. Mehta (Pali): Sir, I am sorry I did not hear when you called my name.

Mr. Speaker: Now I have called Shri Gandhi.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall just say a few words about whether we have lost prestige by accepting the Colombo proposals. I shall, then, also deal with the oft recurring question of whether China will attack us again. I shall also say something about the significance of China's supposed isolation, about the meaning of China's atom bomb and, finally, about the programmes and visions of the present rulers of China.

Sir, it has often been said that we have lost prestige by accepting the Colombo proposals. I do not think so. In fact, we have gained something by our action in promptly accepting the proposals and coming out with grace. We have put ourselves in the right in the eyes of the Colombo powers and in the eyes of a growing number of countries all over the world. I do not see what else we could do.

We have always declared that in international affairs we believe in a peaceful settlement of disputes. Professing that, we could not do anything else, and I am quite sure we have done the right thing in keeping to our path. The Prime Minister has rightly said that we on our part will always keep the door open for settlement. It is now for China to extricate itself, or else to have its sincerity of intentions placed in doubt. We have also evidence coming from all over the world that the position or stand of India is being supported in many ways in many countries. Recently, there was an international

women's conference held in Moscow which gave an overwhelming support to the position of India. Then, recently, only last week, we received news of what happened in Nicosia at the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference. There also India has received overwhelming support in the teeth of Chinese opposition.

Now, my next question will be: will China attack India again? I have no doubt that it will do so. All the indications point to one way, and that is that the attack is bound to come. In what form or in what mode that attack will come, we have to consider, and I shall presently have something to say on that too.

We see that the Chinese have concentrated a large number of troops in Tibet, more especially on the Indian frontiers. We see that they are building roads, constructing barracks, erecting gun emplacements, extending airfields and constructing new airfields and sub-terranean trenches. All these preparations are naturally made with a view to using them. We can, therefore, think of the Chinese intentions only in terms of one conclusion, and that is that they will attack India.

We know well that what China is doing is not an easy thing. It is a very expensive thing. Mass concentration of troops from very long distances over three thousand miles is an expensive proposition by any calculation. Neither is China fabulously rich to undertake these actions lightly. I say this, even though I am aware that China is a dictatorial country; because even dictatorial countries cannot take liberty with economic laws. They have to obey economic laws. If China undertakes these expensive troops movements, what does it mean? It means only one thing. Attack of India is on the cards, is contemplated. We have also to consider the recent Chinese blandishments with Pakistan, which is a rather new development. It is mean-

ingful. Both China and Pakistan have been united with one motive, and that is to continue the conflict and make aggression on India.

Chinese are used to war making. We can even call them professional war-makers. They have some experience in the game. It is not clear as to whether the Chinese will now go in for a massive attack on India or they will resort to their old familiar tactics of harassing the enemy by guerilla warfare or by brush warfare, warfare in which generally they do not confront the enemy, warfare in which they avoid a direct confrontation. Now, what will be the form, the mode of attack, is not possible to say at this time. But there is one thing of which we should be sure and it is that we have to be prepared and we should not be surprised if this aggression, if this conflict, with China is a very prolonged affair. It is something of a war by attrition; it is something that is going to put our endurance to trial and our nerves to test. We have, therefore, to be prepared for all this contingency. We have to be prepared to make all kinds of sacrifices in terms of men, money, material and military preparedness.

Finally, I would say, let us remember the old saying: he wins the war who wins the last battle.

Now, one word more about the China's growing isolation. I must begin by saying that the world keeps on changing and it changes for China too. Things do not remain constant for long. We should not lay too much store by China's isolation for countries change their policies, their national policies, to suit their interests. If new interests come up, then new policies will also definitely come in. That also we can, in a sense, see happening today. We see, for instance, that Britain is taking larger and larger interest in trade with China. We have heard about an exhibition that is going to be opened in Peking. We also have read about the sale to

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

China of British aircraft. Of course, we do not complain there. The British are free to sell their aircraft to whomsoever they like. They have been friendly to us and they have been extending aid to us. And I do not want to appear as being mean or ungrateful. I know for a fact that even in America there is a lobby that is gaining prominence more particularly on the West Coast, on the California side, which is interested in opening trade relations with China. California and the West Coast have for a century been having a very lucrative trade with China and they are beginning to feel the loss.

As for Japan, we know that Japan can be a very valuable source of essential and needed materials for China, but Japan is holding back and looking towards America, but if America makes any move or even slackens in her determination, Japan will immediately follow the step and take full advantage of the opportunities.

In short, we have to look at these things in the light of these potential developments that are always possible. Take, for instance, the question of the admission of China to the United Nations. We should all understand that that is a foregone conclusion; some day, today, tomorrow, or years later—it simply cannot be avoided—it has to come. Therefore, naturally, whenever we think of China, we think of China, not only of yesterday and of today, but also of China of tomorrow and the day after.

Then, may I say one word about the Chinese atom bomb?

Mr. Speaker: The atom bomb comes last, I suppose.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: That will be the last point, and I shall conclude after that. About the Chinese atom bomb, I would say that it is something in which we are all interested, and we

naturally note that China has refused to sign the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. That has given rise to alarm in some quarters, but we need not over-rate anything that China can achieve in the direction of producing an atom bomb; neither should we, of course, under-rate their achievement. What competent observers who know something about this business of atom bombs and their production have said is that China first will have to have an industrial base that will be adequate to produce and develop the nuclear capacity, capacity which will be of any practical value as an offensive weapon.

श्री याज्ञिक (अहमदाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने वर्तमान अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति और भारत सरकार पर की नीति पर विचार करने सम्बन्धी जो विचार सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किये हैं उस का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। हमारी नीति का सार यह है कि हम हर एक देश की आजादी चाहते हैं। हमारी नीति साम्राज्यवाद विरोधी है, संस्थानवाद विरोधी है और जातिभेद विरोधी है। हम सहग्रस्तित्व को पसन्द करते हैं और तटस्थता की नीति भी ताईद करते हैं।

इसके बारे में मैं ज्यादा कहने के पहले यह जो लंदन में घटना हुई, जमीर साहब की, जो पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी हैं, प्रधान मंत्री के, उस के बारे में मैं कुछ पूछना चाहता हूँ। मुझे जानकारी हुई कि वह अमरीका जाते थे। चूंकि उन के पास वह लंदन का मनी नहीं था, पैसा नहीं था, तो उन्होंने राजदूत, अपने जो वहां हाई कमिश्नर हैं, उन की कचहरी में तलाश की लेकिन चूंकि उनको वहां से कोई सहायता नहीं मिली इस वजह से मजबूरन उनको फिजो की शरण लेनी पड़ी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी इस बात की जांच करें और अगर हमारे राजदूत के कार्यालय में कोई गलती हुई हो, तो उस के बारे में जो कुछ योग्य लगे, वह करें।

Shri Raghunath Singh: The hon. Member is making very serious allegations.

श्री याज्ञिक : मैं किसी व्यक्ति पर कोई आक्षेप नहीं कर रहा हूँ। मेरे पास जो जानकारी आई है मैं उस को इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

जहां तक हमारी विदेश-नीति का सम्बन्ध है, सह-अस्तित्व और तटस्थता की हमारी नीति तो अच्छी है, मगर इस नीति के अमल में जो गलतियाँ होती हैं और इस में जो निर्बलता दिखाई देती है, उस की तरफ मैं सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

यहां पर दक्षिणी वियतनाम के बारे में कुछ कहा गया। वहां पर जो इन्टर नेशनल कमीशन है, उस का प्रमुख (चेयरमैन) एक भारतीय है। हम जानते हैं—और प्रधान मंत्री जी भी बराबर जानते हैं—कि दक्षिणी वियतनाम में कई बरसों से क्या हो रहा है। वहाँ पर जो करार हुआ है, उस में साफ लिखा है कि कोई परदेशी सेनायें उस मुल्क में न आने पायें। लेकिन हम जानते हैं कि आज हजारों अमरीकी सैनिक दक्षिणी वियतनाम में कार्यवाही कर रहे हैं, प्लेन उड़ा रहे हैं, गांव के गांव जला रहे हैं, कई अत्याचार कर रहे हैं। इस क बारे में मुझे पता है और शायद प्रधान मंत्री जी को उससे ज्यादा पता होगा। जब वहाँ पर बौद्धों का दमन हुआ जिसके परिणामस्वरूप कई बौद्ध साधुओं ने वहाँ पर अग्नि-स्नान किया, तो मैं सोचता था कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जो इस के बारे में कोई लीड लेंगे, कोई आवाज उठायेंगे—जैसा कि उन्होंने पहले भी कई बार किया है—और सारी दुनिया की जानकारी के लिये किसी अच्छे ढंग से इस खतरनाक दमन का विरोध करेंगे। अगर वह ऐसा करते, तो हम को अच्छा लगता। लेकिन जब यू० एन० ओ० में यह प्रश्न उठाने की बात हुई, तो हमारा प्रतिनिधि पीछे रहा। जब उसने इस बारे में हमसे पूछा, तो शायद हमने उस का ठीक जवाब नहीं दिया और शायद इधर से उस को ठीक सूचना नहीं मिली।

मगर इस का परिणाम यह होगा कि एशियाई-अफ्रीकी देशों में हमारी नीति की टीका होती रहेगी, हम कुछ ठंडे तरीके से और निर्बलता से काम करते हैं, ऐसा खयाल रहेगा। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में अभी जो कार्यवाही करनी है, उस में यू० एन० ओ० में हमारा प्रतिनिधि आग्रह और दिलचस्पी से काम करेगा।

जहां तक कांगों का सम्बन्ध है, वहाँ पर कई साल तक लड़ाई चली। हमने अपने कई सैनिकों को वहाँ पर भेजा। आज सारे अफ्रीका में—और अमरीका में भी—श्याम-वर्ण के लोगों में ह्वशियों में, बड़ी जाग्रति आई है। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि सिर्फ अफ्रीका में ही नहीं बल्कि अमरीका में भी, आज नीयो लोग, एक नया युग बना रहे हैं। कांगों में लुमुम्बा को मारा गया, हैमरशोल्ड को मारा गया। गिजंगा की हालत क्या है, यह हम नहीं जानते। हम इतना जानते हैं कि वह जेल में पड़ा है। कोई कहते हैं कि वह हाउस-एरेस्ट में है। हाउस एरेस्ट कहने के लिये अच्छा लफ्ज है। मगर सचमुच वह जेलखाने में पड़ा है। कांगों की पार्लियामेंट ने बार बार प्रस्ताव मन्जूर किया है कि उस को रिहा किया जाये, मगर फिर भी वह आज तक रिहा नहीं किया गया। क्या यू० एन० ओ० में हमारा प्रतिनिधि यहाँ सवाल न उठाए? गिजंगा की क्या हालत होगी? क्या उस की वही हालत होगी, जो कि लुमुम्बा की हुई है, यहाँ म जानना चाहते हैं।

मलेशिया की बात भी हुई। मैं साफ तौर से समझ नहीं सकता कि हम मलेशिया को किस तरह से समर्थन दे सकते हैं। मलेशिया क्या चीज है? मलाया और एशिया के छोटे छोटे देशों का संगठन हो गया है। जो देश ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य के अधीन थे, जो ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य की पकड़ में थे, अगर उस पकड़ को हटाना है, अगर एशिया के उन देशों को आजाद करना है, तो हम उस को पसन्द करते हैं। लेकिन यह बात साफ मालूम हो गई है कि

[श्री याज्ञिक]

एक ाय से उन देशों को आजाद किया जा रहा है और दूसरे ाय से उन को मलाया के साथ जोड़ कर अपने साम्राज्यवाद के पंजे के नीचे डाला जा रहा है। यह संगठन करने के लिये कौन आगे बढ़ा है? इसके लिये किसने ज्यादा परिश्रम किया है? क्या मलाया के प्रधान मंत्री, टेंकु, ने इस के लिये ज्यादा परिश्रम नहीं किया है? य जो मिलन हुआ है, मेल-जोल हुआ है, जो एक तर की शादी हुई है, उस में आचार्य पुरोहित कौन है? इस शादी का आचार्य, पुरोहित, अंग्रेजी मंत्री हैं। उन्होंने ने क्यों यह शादी करवाई है? ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य का झंडा एशियाई देशों में फहराता रहे, इसलिये य शादी करवाई गई है।

इसलिये मैं मलेशिया की तार्ईद नहीं कर सकता। हमारी जो सह-अस्तित्व, आजादी और तटस्थता की जो नीति है, उस के मुताबिक ाम को यह सोचना चाहिये था कि बनने दो मलेशिया। मलेशिया बनने के बाद यह देखना चाहिये था कि ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य का पंजा उस पर रहा है या नहीं, उस की फौज-खुशकी फौज, नौका फौज और विमानों—की क्या स्थिति है, उस की परदेश-नीति किस तरह चलती है और तब ाम को निर्णय करना चाहिये था कि मलेशिया संघ ठीक है या नहीं और ाम को उस का समर्थन करना चाहिये या नहीं। पहले से ही उस को आशीर्वाद का सन्देश भेज देना और वहां पर अपने मंत्री को भेज देना मुझे अच्छा नहीं मालूम होता है।

आज हम को बड़ी से बड़ी तकलीफ पाकिस्तान और चीन की तरफ से है। पाकिस्तान के बारे में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो साफ घोषणा कर दी है, मैं समझता हूँ कि उससे सारी दुनिया में ामारा दृष्टि-बिन्दु स्पष्ट हो गया है। बहुत बातें हुईं। बहुत महीनों तक हुईं। साफ बात है कि जो पाकिस्तान चाहता है, वह हम नहीं दे

सकते। पाकिस्तान चाहता है कि हम काश्मीर की रियासत सोने की थाली में उस के सामने रखें। वह ाम नहीं रख सकते हैं, यह बात साफ है। इसके बारे में कोई सोच भी नहीं सकता है। हमारे बुजुर्ग नेता, राजाजी, ने इस बारे में जो कुछ कहा है, उस से हमारे दिल में कुछ दर्द होता है। पाकिस्तान दुश्मनी करता है, चीन दुश्मनी करता है, और इन दोनों मारे दुश्मनों के बीच भी कोई समझौता हो गया है। एक बात मुझे कहनी पड़ेगी चीन और पाकिस्तान के हमले का मुकाबला करने के लिये हम अच्छी तैयारी कर रहे हैं, यह बात ठीक है। लेकिन कभी हमला होता है, कभी गैर कानूनी कार्यवाही होती है, तो उस के बारे में हम जो कार्यवाही करते हैं, वह ठीक नहीं करते हैं। पाकिस्तान के विमानों ने हमारी धरती पर पांच सौ फीट की ऊंचाई पर उड़ान की, लेकिन इस तरह की घटना की जब हमें खबर मिलती है तो हम चिट्ठी लिख देते हैं, विरोध प्रकट कर देते हैं। हमें देखना चाहिये कि क्यों न हम इन विमानों को उड़ा दें। उड़ाने का इन को हम ने हुकम दिया है या नहीं दिया है, मुझे मालूम नहीं है। पाकिस्तान ने हमारे एयरोप्लेन के बारे में क्या किया था? हमारा एयरोप्लेन किसी की भी गलती से पाकिस्तान पर एक बार उड़ा था। शायद उड़ा भी था या नहीं, मैं नहीं कह सकता हूँ। पाकिस्तान ने समझा कि उस की धरती पर उड़ा था। उन्होंने उस को गोली से साफ कर दिया। इस के विपरीत उस का प्लेन हमारी धरती पर पांच सौ फीट की ऊंचाई पर उड़ा, सब ने देखा लेकिन कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हो सकी। आप कुछ कार्यवाही जरूर कर सकते थे, उस को खत्म करने की। आप एक चिट्ठी लिखते हैं, अमन से आप समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं। अमन हम जरूर चाहते हैं लेकिन उस के साथ साथ हम अपनी रक्षा भी चाहते हैं। उन की तरफ से बार बार एक तरह से हम पर हमला हो और हम दूसरी तरह से चिट्ठियां ही भेजते जायें और हमारी तरफ से इसके

सिवाय कोई भी कायवाही न हो, य ठीक मालूम नहीं देता । वे सामने से गोली चलायें और हक चिट्ठी भेजते रहें यह शानदार मालूम नहीं होता ।

चीन के बारे में भी ऐसा ही चलता है । : मारे कई सिपाही लोग कई जगहों पर गए हैं, जहां तक हमारी सरहद है जहां तक हमारी सीमा है, वहां तक गए हैं, हम जानते हैं कि जहां तक वे गए हैं, वह हमारी सीमा के भीतर है । उन पर गोली चलाई गई ।

प्रधान मंत्री कई बार कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तानी सिपाही हमारी सीमाओं में घुस आए, और फिर वापिस चले गए । आप क्या भजन करते हैं, आप क्या उन का स्वागत करते हैं, क्या आप करते हैं ? हमारी तरफ से क्या कार्यवाही हुई है ? क्या हमारे सिपाही वहां थे या नहीं थे ? उन्होंने उन का मुकाबला किया या नहीं किया ? इस को हम जानना चाहते हैं । जिस तर से वे हमारा स्वागत करते हैं, उसी तरह से हम भी उन का स्वागत करें । अगर वे अमन से करते हैं तो हम भी अमन से करें । लेकिन जब वे गोली से हमारा स्वागत करते हैं और हम चिट्ठी ही लिख देते हैं तो य ठीक मालूम नहीं होता है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य पांच मिनट में खत्म कर लेंगे ?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : कल जारी रखें ।

श्री याज्ञिक : जी हां, पांच मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा । मैं आज ही खत्म कर देना चाहता हूँ ।

पाकिस्तान और चीन के बीच समझौता हुआ है । यह एक अजीब बात है । अमरीकी प्रतिनिधि राबलपिंडी पूछने के लिये, तलाश करने के लिये कि क्या समझौता हुआ है, आते हैं, किस ढंग से किया है, इसे जानने के लिए आते हैं । वे क ते हैं कि बातचीत से हम

को सन्तोष हो गया है । क्या सन्तोष हो गया है, पता नहीं । हमारी समझ में तो आया नहीं है । पाकिस्तान के पास इतनी ताकत नहीं है । अपनी ताकत नहीं है जिससे वे व चीन के साथ समझौता करे । किस की ताकत से करता है, हमें देखना चाहिये । अमरीका की ताकत नहीं है, अमरीका समर्थन नहीं देता है । तब कौन समर्थन देता है ? सोचने की बात है पाकिस्तान के पास विमान नहीं हैं लेकिन वह कहता है कि हमने चीन के साथ हवाई समझौता कर लिया है । यह हवाई समझौता क्या हवा में रहेगा या ये जो विमान हैं, ये जमीन पर भी आयेंगे ? विमानों के बिना कैसे समझौता हो सकता है ? आज सुबह का अखबार देखा उस से पता चला कि ब्रिटेन से, इंग्लैंड से चीन को विमान मिलेंगे । सुनो भाई यह जो ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद है, यह क्या कर रहा है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हिन्दी में आज आप ने शुरू किया . . .

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : हिन्दी बहुत अच्छी बोल रहे हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हिन्दी तो बहुत अच्छी बोलते हैं, यह तो ठीक है । कम से कम मुझसे तो बहुत अधिक अच्छी बोलते हैं । लेकिन "सुनो भाई" ऐसा नहीं कहना चाहिये ।

श्री याज्ञिक : इन दोनों देशों का जो समझौता हुआ है, उस में ताकत किस की है, य सोचना चाहिये । ब्रिटेन आज चीन को विमान देता है, साफ बात है । अमरीका नहीं देगा । अमरीका इस का विरोध करता है । लेकिन ब्रिटेन देता है । हम जानते हैं कि ब्रिटेन आज चीन के साथ अपने व्यापार में वृद्धि कर रहा है । चीन का प्रतिनिधि मंडल भी लंदन गया था । वहां पर कोई समझौता हुआ है, ब्रिटेन सोचता है कि यूरोपियन कामन मार्केट का कुछ पता नहीं चलता है इसलिये अभी चीन के साथ थोड़ा अपने व्यापार को आगे

[श्री याज्ञिक]

बढ़ाओ। एशिया बनाया है लेकिन चीन के साथ समझौता करता है, उसके साथ व्यापार बढ़ाता है। साथ ही चीन और पाकिस्तान के बीच में समझौता होता है। मुझ शुबहा है कि उसमें इंग्लैंड शामिल है इंग्लैंड की कोई ताकत इस समझौते में लगी है।

काश्मीर में जो कुछ होता है, वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय हो जाता है। काश्मीर का प्रश्न अभी भी चल रहा है। शेख अब्दुल्ला के खिलाफ दस बरस से एक केस चल रहा है। वह दस बरस से जेल में पड़ा है। कब तक उस के खिलाफ मुकदमा चलता रहेगा, पता नहीं। दस साल तो चलते हुए हो गये हैं और हो सकता है कि, दस साल और चलता रहे। इस तरह से उम्र कैंद सारी गुजर जायेगी बिना कोई जजमेंट के, बिना किसी फैसले के। हमारे दिल में एक शुबहा जरूर है कि अगर उन को रिहा कर दिया जाए तो शायद वह ऐसी वैसी बातें करनी शुरू कर दें, जैसी राजाजी कर रहे हैं, वैसी करनी शुरू कर दें। लेकिन राजाजी से ज्यादा कोई कहने वाला नहीं है। मैंने कई बातें सुनी हैं जो शेख अब्दुल्ला ने की थीं जब उन को कुछ महीनों के लिये रिहा किया गया था। कई बातें पेपर्स में पढ़ीं भी थीं। उन्होंने नहीं कहा कि पाकिस्तान के साथ काश्मीर को जोड़ा जाए। उन्होंने यह भी नहीं कहा कि . . .

श्री इय्याम लाल सराफ : क्या उन्होंने कहा है यह तो जरा बतायें। जब फसाद हुए थे तो वह क्या कर रहे थे ?

श्री याज्ञिक : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो बात वह कहते हैं, वैसी बात कई और भी हमारे लोग कहते हैं। हमें ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि काश्मीर के प्रधान मंत्री ने इस्तीफा दे दिया है और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जो ने उसे अपनी स्वीकृति भी प्रदान कर दी है और वहां के प्रधान मंत्री के पद में कोई तबदीली होने वाली है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री यह सोचें कि क्या यह मौका है या नहीं है जब कि काश्मीर के सवाल का फैसला करने का दरवाजा खोला जाए? इतना मुकदमे में दो तीन कोर्टि रुपया शायद खर्च हुआ है और यह दस साल से चला आ रहा है और शायद अभी और दस साल चलेगा। इस से हमारी हंसी भी होती है दुनिया में। उसको क्या खत्म नहीं किया जाना चाहिये और क्या शेख अब्दुल्ला को रिहा नहीं किया जाना चाहिये? मैं समझता हूँ कि जो मुकदमा है, जो चार्जिज हैं, जो कार्यवाही है, उसको खत्म करने का हुकम दिया जाए सरकार की तरफ से। इस में सब-जडिस की बात पैदा नहीं होती है। मैं अबद से अर्ज करता हूँ कि शेख अब्दुल्ला को रिहा करने का अब मौका है। इससे एक नया युग काश्मीर में खुलेगा, वहां पर एक नए युग का आरम्भ और उस से जो शान्ति और अमन हम चाहते हैं, उस का श्रोगेश हो जायेगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब सदन कल ११ बजे मिलेगा।

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 17th September, 1963|Bhadra 26, 1885 (Saka).