

12.17 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION— contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Swaran Singh on the 23rd November, 1964, namely:—

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

Shri Shinkre may continue his speech.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May we know when the Minister will reply?

Mr. Speaker: Would the Minister be able to reply today?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): I think the understanding was that I will reply tomorrow, so that hon. Members will have a little more time.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): We would like to know whether the Prime Minister is going to intervene and if so, when.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Near about 4:30 he will intervene.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Yesterday I enquired and I was told he was not going to intervene.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister will intervene near about 4:30 P.M. and the Minister of External Affairs will reply tomorrow.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): Sir, I was saying yesterday that I am very much indebted to you for allowing me to participate in this important debate. The House has already heard so many ideologies so much, tall talk and lofty principles about world politics and international affairs. I, as a comparatively new Member of the House, would not claim any special

knowledge or deep study of international affairs. I would try to place before you, Sir, only the point of view of a complete layman, of the average citizen of this country. Obviously, Sir, you should not expect from me anything like a lucid exposition that we had from our hon. friend, Mr. Masani, nor the fiery excitement that we had from my hon. friend, Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad, neither, Sir, the mellifluous sweetness from my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, nor the lofty and ethereal exposition that came on foreign affairs from the main spokesman of the ruling party. But, Sir, certainly, I would attempt at placing before you the viewpoint of the so-called man-in-the-street.

On a clear and dispassionate assessment of our foreign policy, I cannot help stating at the very outset that we have achieved very little all these years ever since the independence of this country through our so-called foreign policy. As the analysis of this statement of mine would take me to the analysis of the so-called policy of non-alignment of this Government, I would beg your indulgence to deal with it a little later, and in the meantime refer to one basic and fundamental point that I think very worthwhile making in this debate.

Although every country has a Foreign Ministry or a Ministry of External Affairs or Foreign Affairs, and a Minister of External Affairs, not all countries have anything called a foreign policy as such. Even if we go and see in today's world, we will have to realise and accept that not even half-a-dozen countries have anything called a foreign policy. Obviously, a Ministry of Foreign or External Affairs is required in every country to deal with so many routine matters like attestation or endorsement of passports, visas and all that, but if we see properly we will find that it is only the United States of America, England, France, the Soviet Union and, comparatively recently, the Communist China that have anything called an established foreign policy.

This means that the foreign policy is a very costly and expensive sport to indulge in and not all countries can afford to have it. Only those countries which are convinced that they have satisfactorily dealt with their own home problems, their own domestic problems, sometimes think of going and worrying themselves about what is happening in other countries and what should be their stand-point towards those other countries. We seem not to have realised this basic and fundamental truth; so much so that immediately after our independence we tried to evolve and build a thing called foreign policy. May be, it was partially due to the great prestige and international standing of the late lamented Prime Minister Nehru. But I am forced and compelled to say that he did not in any manner try to make anything called a self-examination of our own country and her basic needs before launching on a foreign policy, and that landed us into so many troubles.

Sir, immediately when we became independent this country had many difficulties of her own. First of all, there was the problem of clearing this country from so many foreign pockets. Some of these pockets were under the possession or occupation of a very powerful country in the world—France. Had it not been for the fact that at some stage the affairs of France were presided over by a very enlightened personality like Mendez-France, I do not know how many long years it would have taken for the clearance of the French from the soil of this country. Sometimes I shudder to think what would have happened if instead of an enlightened personality like Monsieur Mendez-France, France was headed by some modern version of Napoleon, whom I need not refer by name.

Then, we have the permanent problem of feeding the hungry millions of this country, not to speak of the problem of developing this

country and bringing it on par with at least the half advanced countries.

We cannot deny the fact that one result or effect of our foreign policy has been that we have antagonised most of the powers of the western bloc. If we take into consideration that immediately after the war, that is, at the time when we became independent, the Soviet Union and the East European countries were not in a position to come to the assistance of any other country so much so that they themselves had to receive massive and liberal aid from the United States of America, we will realise that right from the beginning our foreign policy was definitely faulty. The role of this country as the champion of the liberation movement in Africa and Asia has naturally and legitimately antagonised most of the powers of the Western bloc. I do not mean to say that we should keep completely quiet; at the same we need not be so much vocal and vociferous either, because the Western Powers are hurt by our policy of championing the cause of the newly-emerging nations of Asia and Africa. So, they waited for their chance to hit back at us, and that came very soon. We wanted to liberate Goa and there was no other alternative except police action in the face of the arrogant and adamant refusal of Portugal to come to any peaceful settlement. Immediately that opportunity was taken by no less a person than Mr. Adlai Stevenson to raise his voice of protest against us in the United Nations. He went to the extent of saying that we are a country professing something and practising something different. Why did they do so, it is very pertinent to ask. The answer is very simple. Since the achievement of independence we have been stating in public meetings and in interational forums that all international disputes should be settled by negotiation and peaceful means. So, when we resorted to force immediately criticism came against such use of force and naturally we had

[Shri Shinkre]

no reason to give to counteract such criticism.

Then I come to a problem which apparently has exercised the minds of most Members of this House, the problem created by the explosion of a nuclear device by China. Although most of the hon. Members who referred to this subject showed so much concern and excitement over this subject, it is a fact that yesterday the debates on this question had to be adjourned for want of quorum. I do not mean to cast any reflection upon the legitimate sentiments of the hon. Members of this House, but still I feel that there is something wrong with us.

Nobody would dispute the fact that ever since China invaded or attacked this country in the autumn of 1962 in such a treacherous manner, ever since she has remained in illegal possession of a large part of our country, China has become a real menace to this country. But, to say that the explosion of a nuclear device by China has in any manner increased this menace or threat is something that I am yet to believe or convince myself about. I know that several hon. Members will try to jump at me for this statement but I am fully convinced of what I am saying. If only we are a little realistic and positive, I am sure that most of the hon. Members of this House will agree with me when I say that.

In the conditions that obtain today militarily China is a stronger country than India and this country will be living, I do not say, in a fool's paradise but somewhere near that, if ever this country thinks that even in conventional arms this country will be stronger than Communist China because whilst ever since her birth or inception and even before that China has always been militarist and belligerent and has built her people's mind militarily, we have always been a peace-loving country and have not only been pre-

ching peace for others but have also been practising and professing peace for ourselves. Under these circumstances I cannot foresee that any time in the near future this country will ever be stronger than China even in conventional arms. That being so I fail to understand why China should ever think in terms of using any nuclear device or nuclear weapons against this country.

This does not mean that I supporting the views of some people and those of the hon. Prime Minister that this country should not produce a nuclear device. I am definitely for the production of a nuclear device and atomic weapons but for completely different reasons. If this country has an army, if this country has to equip this army with so many sophisticated and modern weapons, when a nuclear device has also become one of those weapons, it is but natural that the armed forces of this country should also possess all the new and modern weapons including nuclear or atomic weapons, because when so many other countries will possess it our not possessing it will definitely keep us lagging behind. Certainly, if we maintain or pretend to maintain a modern army, we cannot afford to keep it unequipped or ill-equipped.

Then, I come to the other pertinent question that may also arise in connection with the same fact, namely, if China has not this country in mind, which other country could China have in her mind? This is a question which does not require a specific or straight answer. China, as it is, right from the beginning, has been facing several enemies in the western world and not in the least the United States are permanently probing there to catch hold of the first chance that they might have to jump over Communist China and do away with the Communist regime in China. Even the problem of Formosa is a permanent threat to the security of the Communist regime in China. So, the

atomic or nuclear device built or developed by China need not necessarily be considered as a fresh threat to this country to my mind. I do not want to suggest in the least bit that we should be anything like complacent. We should be completely alert and should be aware and alive to everything that is happening around us in the field of military experiment or new developments, new techniques or new military weapons. But that does not necessarily mean that this new situation which has arisen from the explosion of China's nuclear device poses to this country a fresh threat.

Then, I come to the most fundamental part that should be discussed elaborately during this debate, namely, the so-called—once again, I say, so-called—non-alignment. In the first stages of this non-alignment it was being said that this country has adopted non-alignment for two reasons—firstly, because this country did not want to commit itself to either of the two power blocs and, secondly, this country wanted to keep unpolluted and completely free the independence of her judgment on every matter in the international situation. I feel that both these propositions are completely faulty and fallacious, if not impracticable and impossible. First of all, it is completely unrealistic to think in terms of being non-aligned in the world as it is impossible for an individual to be non-aligned in society.

Mr. Speaker: We have so many Members in the House who are unaligned.

Shri Shinkre: Starting with myself.

What I say is, it is completely unrealistic and impracticable and if I should require any evidence, I would simply ask these hon. friends of mine who are still propounding this proposition: Are we really non-aligned?

Some Hon. Members: Yes, we are.

Shri Shinkre: Can we, for instance, take a legitimate step like recognising

or extending official recognition to a country like Israel which, notwithstanding everything, has come into being? Can we, for instance, for a while think in terms of sitting over judgment on Malaysia and Indonesia? Can we for that matter indulge in so many sporting pastimes of international politics? Can we say anything or do anything that eventually might damage or hurt the feelings of the United Arab Republic or Yugoslavia or for that matter even Nigeria? I think the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs who is sitting there would indeed be pleased to give some attention to these queries. So, there is no point in calling ourselves something that we cannot be.

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

Shri Shinkre: Is sitting in judgment over international matters at all practicable or acceptable? Which country can allow any other country such a costly and expensive luxury? We have got so many problems of our own. Can we allow other people to sit in judgment over our own affairs in the same manner?

Sir, I am concluding now. I thank you very much for reminding me to conclude. It has always been my feeling that we have laid our foreign policy which we do not have. We will simply be landing ourselves in so many troubles with this unrealistic foreign policy. Before we reach such a stage where we can afford that costly luxury, I think we will be landed in so many other troubles.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): But for that policy, Goa would not have been in our land.

Shri Shinkre: If we had the correct foreign policy, Goa would have been liberated in 1947 or 1948.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार): तुम्हारी तरह नहीं जिन्होंने नागालैंड को भी फारेन इश् बना दिया।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Shri Bagri is supporting you.

Shri Shinkre: Nobody will dispute this statement of mine. Every sensible person in the House will agree with me.

As it is in my substitute motion which I have moved, I want that at least now there should be a reappraisal of our foreign policy. The international figure of great prestige that prompted that policy, is now no more in our midst. I am sorry for that. Let us give strength to our new hon. Prime Minister so that he tackles all the problems of this country instead of getting with so many things that might happen elsewhere. I think that is the only way in which we can really achieve something worthwhile both on the national as well as in the international scene.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Khadilkar.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): May I request that I be allowed to speak now? Otherwise, I would not speak at all.

Mr. Speaker: After Shri Khadilkar finishes, I shall call Shri J. B. Kripalani.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): I shall take only about 15 to 20 minutes and not more.

Since we debated upon the international situation in the last session of Parliament, many changes have taken place in the wide world, changes of great significance and wide import. As some people have already stated, the withdrawal from Soviet leadership of Mr. Khrushchev is a big change in the so-called socialist world. Then, there is the atomic blast by China; whatever the infantile reaction that has been expressed on the floor of the House may be, we must apply our mind to that blast in a political manner and in a mature manner. Then, Mr. Johnson has been elected

as the President of the USA, defeating the brinkmanship of Mr. Goldwater. Mr. Wilson has been elected as the Prime Minister of Great Britain, which means a victory for liberalism and socialism. In the West, President De Gaulle is challenging the NATO, and the Common Market that is coming up is challenging the American (U.S.A.) leadership in the world economy. If I might mention in passing, even the Pope's visit to this country has some significance.

But when we look at the wide world and try to analyse the situation, I would submit that our Government must have a sort of delicate feel of the situation, just like a good physician, who, when he approaches a patient, has a clinical and intuitive feel about the various ailments. At the present juncture, such a delicate feel is called for to understand the implications and to guide the policy of our nation.

What has happened in the Soviet Union is of great significance, namely the withdrawal of Mr. Khrushchev and new leadership coming up there. Though they have assured us that they will abide by the past policies of co-existence, peace and friendship particularly with India, we cannot ignore the background of this change. To my mind, internal situation and external pressures have brought about this change. At the present juncture, as I see things, a settled, stable and long-term policy with internal stability in the party hierarchy which is still being stabilised is yet to emerge. Therefore, I feel that this change has been brought about by the assertions of independence in different socialist countries, which go by the name of polycentrism. A challenge was posed to the socialist world whether the socialist world would at least present an image of unity or allow Mr. Khrushchev to have a sort of permanent rift in the socialist camp. That was the

challenge, and that has to be answered by the new leadership. The Western world was trying to base its diplomacy on this division, but now they will have to apply their minds afresh.

I feel that Soviet policy will remain basically the same, but from all the surrounding utterances that I have found, I feel that it is bound to change to some extent and it may bring Soviet Union closer to China. Of course, ideological polemics would go on. We cannot take it for granted that on every issue *vis-a-vis* China and India, the Soviet Union will stand by us.

So far as Kashmir and Pakistan are concerned, new feelers are going abroad. Only yesterday, I was reading *The Dawn* and there I discovered that a new approach was being made. So, in such a situation, we shall have to apply our minds very carefully and very cautiously to the changes that are taking place in the socialist world, because we do not believe, as the Western statesmen used to believe for so long, that the socialist world could be written off either by force or by division. Men who have given some thought to these problems even in America have called for a fresh approach. For instance, Mr. George Kennan, a great statesman, while addressing the Western world, in the course of his Rootes lectures, pleaded with the Western world and with America in particular, that the challenge of co-existence with all its implications must be met in an enlightened manner; he said that the official thinking in old terms on the problem of West Germany and trying to reverse the process of socialist transformations in the eastern world was a barren policy and that they would have to apply their minds afresh. That was how he was appealing to the Western world.

To put it succinctly, without taking any more time on this issue, I would like to put it this way, as President Johnson has done; depicting the world, in one of his recent

speeches, in very short and pithy terms, he has stated on the 14th October, 1964 that :

"There is no longer one cold war; there are many. They differ in temperature, intensity and danger."

Our Government while shaping their policies will have to reassess the world situation with a fresh outlook, with a new look at the developments in the surrounding countries and bearing in mind the fact that the atmosphere of cold war has different intensities at different levels and between countries and countries. If we bear these things in mind, then in this context we shall have to judge the question of atomic blast by China.

I had expected that some people at least would apply their minds with a little commonsense and not be carried away by either idealist considerations or by emotionalism or sentimentalism while doing so. What is the reaction in the wide world? Do you know that Mr. Tunku Abdul Rahman who is not a friend of China has acclaimed this as a great Asian achievement, a great scientific achievement in Asia? One of the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union while recently in Bangkok has said that it is a great scientific achievement; we must bear this in mind that he has not condemned it, but he has said that it is a great achievement. Nowhere, not even in the Western world has there been even a little flutter, as has been shown there; this kind of being carried away by emotion and some sudden reaction has not been seen anywhere even in the Western world. But unfortunately, when we apply our minds to the atomic blast by China, we find such a reaction. Was it unknown? There are some people who advocate that either we should manufacture atom bombs and use them as a sort of deterrent, or we should take shelter under the atomic umbrella of the West. Yesterday, Shri M. R. Masani with a sharp logic, put the issue on the razor's edge and tried to corner the whole party and

[Shri Khadilkar]

the Government. He posed the question this way: "Look here, you are helpless; the economics of the atom bomb leads me to the conclusion that it would eat up our economy.". To that extent, he was right, and in a subtle manner, by posing all issues, he has cornered you and said: "The only shelter or protection that you have got to draw is from the Western world or the Western alliance", and in his own wisdom, he advocated that we should take that course. There are some people on this side of the House who have said, "What do you mean? Are we not going to manufacture bombs?" Brave words!" I would like to ask them one question. Have they given thought to this matter as to what our basic policy is regarding the atom bomb? Are we going to change our basic policy? While Panditji was there, we had laid down the policy. Besides, even recently, when our new Prime Minister sent a message to the Conference at Geneva on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, in last August, he had said:

"India believes, today, as it has always believed that atomic energy should only be used for peaceful purposes and for the welfare of humanity and resolves to use it in this manner, as far as its own efforts are concerned."

Shri Koya: China does not believe in it.

Shri Khadilkar: It is not a question of China believing or not believing in it. We are supposed to react or think on our own or to take the objective reality into consideration and then formulate our policy. You are just looking to what happens to the world without realising, and without trying to grapple with the reality or the objective situation in this country and in the world. So, do not talk about this question lightly.

Mr. Speaker: The record would not reflect that he was addressing the Chair.

Shri Khadilkar: I am sorry.

Fortunately for me, the nationalist press, with one or two exceptions, in this country has taken a more objective and realistic view. This should be borne in mind. All over the press in this country—I have gone through it very carefully—they have applied their mind in a sort of realistic manner, keeping in view the considerations of defence and our basic policy.

So, the main issue before the Government and the people is: are we going to change the basis of our policy? We have stated in this House that with full understanding we have joined the nuclear test ban treaty. Was it conditional? As if we did not know then that China was advancing so far as atomic development was concerned, reaching even a sophisticated stage of atomic or nuclear capability. As if China with its conventional arms is not capable of invading this country. Let us take a realistic view of the situation. We knew all this and still we are talking as if there is a new danger.

The Americans have not reacted in this way. They have given serious thought to it. I say this bomb blast is not directed towards India. Let us realise it. It is directed at the world powers, the super-powers. China has blasted her way to the United Nations; she has blasted her way to those who were trying to preserve their monopoly of the bomb. China has tried to break it, and has broken it successfully.

Only yesterday China was being sounded by western statesmen as to whether she would join in the talks. To that their reply is: 'Nothing doing; unless equal status is recognised to us in the United Nations, we are not going to join these talks'. This blast has a political fall-out and it is directed towards America and perhaps towards the Soviet Union.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Khadilkar: It is directed against the nuclear monopoly of the western world and not towards India. This must be recognised. From the point of view of defence, anybody in this wide world recognises atomic weapons to be unnecessary... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: When the hon. Member is enunciating a proposition with such authority, he must be listened to by Members.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): He is opening a new line of thinking.

Shri Khadilkar: What I was saying is that this atomic weapon has become a weapon of destruction. This matter is being debated all over the world. The only alternative, as we have stated, is to rouse world conscience, world opinion and then try to see that all atomic weapons are destroyed and no proliferation or spread of atomic weapons takes place. Now we see that the western world is eager to arm West Germany with atomic weapons. In such a predicament, I am very sorry to say that people who are taking interest in international affairs look at this atom bomb explosion in a particular way and react in this manner, leaving commonsense, ignoring reality, divorced from a pragmatic approach to the problem which is called for, and taking an emotional or idealistic stand. I am worried about that. I am taking an idealistic position, a sort of moralist stance or basing my argument on the traditional non-violent approach. That has nothing to do with it. If tomorrow I feel that it is in the interest of India to apply our mind to this problem in a different manner, I shall do so.

Then there is another factor. Our view is coloured by our conflict with China. None in the African or Asiatic world has come forward to condemn China as we have done. Not even Japan has condemned China—as we have seen.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): That shows your isolation.

Shri Khadilkar: Let us apply our mind. What is this conflict with China? In the Cairo conference, the question was posed. Let this House realise that our conflict with China is a very limited conflict. It is not going to lead to a war. This is the assessment of western statesmen, who are more mature.

Therefore, as I pleaded on the last occasion, instead of taking this suicidal course of changing the basis of our national policy so far as atomic weapons are concerned, I would plead that the time has come to restate our basic policy more emphatically. There are the African and Asian nations with whom we have come closer at Cairo. There is a declaration. They do not want us just to stand on the Colombo proposals; they say—make an independent advance, make a direct approach. What harm is there in doing so, without surrendering an inch of territory or in any way belittling or whittling down our sovereignty and prestige? We can go and sit together and find out a solution. We have accepted that there is a conflict. If there is no military way to a solution, negotiation with China is the only alternative. An honourable way of negotiation with China is still open. This is my view. Let Government consider it. Do not take the barren path of this nuclear armament, poverty and destruction and what not. To this, we must apply our mind.

Then there is another question. I want to ask Government why they have changed the policy regarding the human rights resolution regarding Tibet. They have changed the policy which they have been following so far. Why are we supporting it? Just to provoke China? Are we going to help the Tibetans by that? I do not know what is their condition. But are we going to provoke China by supporting this resolution? Is it consistent with our past policy? I would like to appeal to Government to give a second thought to this issue because Tibet

[Shri Khadilkar]

is under China for a long time and so far we have kept quiet . . .

Shri Raghunath Singh: It was never under China.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, I would plead with Government: do not deviate from this path, do not provoke China on this issue and do not support this resolution at this juncture.

Then there is the Naga problem . . .

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): The Chinese Government is speaking through a member of the Congress Party!

Why does my hon. friend make this eloquent plea in support of the Chinese lobby among the communists?

Shri Nambiar: There is no Chinese lobby here.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): He is speaking for the American lobby.

Shri Khadilkar: I am not worried about the communists; they are fighting among themselves.

Mr. Speaker: I am only worried about ringing the bell a second time.

Shri Khadilkar: I am concluding.

Yesterday, so many voices were raised in connection with the Naga problem. The basis of the negotiations was questioned, why we have entered into negotiations. Because we had applied the military method or police method for such a long time..

Shri J. B. Kripalani: This is not a matter concerning foreign policy.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, when we found that by military method we could not win them over....

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): The military method has not been applied.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): It has never been applied.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, we are trying a new method....

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Shri Khadilkar seems like Alice in Wonderland.

Shri Khadilkar: We tried the military method; in that we did not succeed....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Is this a foreign policy matter?

Mr. Speaker: The House took strong exception to this subject being discussed under foreign policy. The House was very much exercised that day also on this matter. That was why the Minister of External Affairs did not touch this point at all in his opening remarks.

Shri Khadilkar: Yesterday, almost every speaker touched on this point.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): I did not touch on this point.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, my plea is this. All this tribal area is a sensitive region. The only method Government have decided to follow they must follow with determination and by persuasion, by argument win them over. That is the only method which is going to succeed in winning over the Nagas; no other method will.

One word and I have finished.

13 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: That is all.

Shri Khadilkar: I was disturbed.

Mr. Speaker: That also is part of the game.

Shri Khadilkar: I will finish with one word.

As I said in the beginning, the challenge of co-existence must be faced by our Government squarely.

While we frame our policy, we have not got to live with our neighbours of the socialist world, whether it is China or Soviet Union, and we have to adjust our policy in such a manner that it is not a question of aligning ourselves with the Western extremists who are trying to create a rift in, or hoping to defeat the, socialist world. The socialist world has come to stay, and China has come to stay as a big nation with new prestige, and we must live with China with honour and prestige of our own. This is the only policy that we should follow.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kripalani. He might sit and speak.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Since we discussed foreign affairs last time, to my mind two important events have taken place. One is the Chinese explosion of the atom bomb, and the other is the sudden and abrupt change in the leadership in Russia. The other two events, about which the Foreign Minister talked, are of no very great international import—they are Mr. Johnson's success as the President of USA and the success of the Labour Party in England.

So far as the Chinese bomb is concerned. I do not understand why people should be surprised, much less shocked. We have known that China was trying to make this experiment, and we knew that one day it would succeed. We also know that China believes in cunning diplomacy and in war. It has made this quite clear. My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai gave quotations from the writings of their leaders, which clearly point to the fact that they do not believe in co-existence or in peaceful methods, that they want to make their military machine as strong as possible, and also that they have aggressive designs. We cannot, therefore, blame China if it has acted according to its communist philosophy and its national interests as it conceives them.

That their national interests have been advanced by exploding this

bomb is very clear from the prestige they have acquired in the international world. Apart from that, it has also terrorised the Asian, especially the South-east Asian, nations into silence, so that nobody dare raise his voice against what has been done.

The third thing is we have been trying to get China into the UNO, but in vain. Whether we ought to have tried or not is another question, but today the UNO will have to consider whether it should not allow China to be a member of that organisation, and sooner than later, this bomb will be of use to China, and it will be admitted into the United Nations Organisation.

13.05 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

It is useless, therefore, to say that the bomb that they have exploded is merely a bomb of mass destruction. It was not a weapon of mass destruction in Japan. People do not use all the nuclear weapons that they have. They use some small bombs in order to terrorise the people, and so far as terrorising of the people is concerned, this bomb is really a military danger. It is not merely meant for mass destruction. I do not think any nuclear powers want mass destruction, but they want to terrorise people into submission. Japan was terrorised into submission by the bomb.

Now, what should be our reaction to this? Let us not delude ourselves with the idea that we do not believe in war, that we believe in following in the footsteps of Gandhiji. Let us not take his name in vain, I am sure, this Government have not understood Gandhiji's policy of non-violence when they talk that India is a peaceful nation and stands for peace. Gandhiji's peace was of a different variety. He did not believe in arms at all. Can this Government say that it does not believe in arms? Is it not trying to make its arms as sharp as possible and as destructive as possible within its

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

means? What is the good of talking in terms of non-violence when we ourselves are sharpening our weapons of war?

We keep an army and we want to make it as efficient as possible. The Government demonstrates an overwhelming desire for arming itself, but it shies at the idea of experimenting with the atom bomb. There seems to be no logic in this.

Moreover, must we say things that we may not be able to act up to? It is quite possible that the present Government may not want to experiment with the bomb, but it must not suppose that it is going to last for ever. It must not bind the future governments. I am afraid that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru did bind his successors when he said that India would never experiment with the bomb. In a democracy it is wrong to say that the country will do this or that or the other thing. The new generation will have as much right to decide for themselves as the present generation has.

The example of the invasion of Goa is before us. We declared before the world that we would not use arms, that we would bring about the liberation of Goa by peaceful means, that we would settle this question by peaceful means. What happened?

We had, for one reason or other, to invade Goa and drive away the Portuguese. What was the effect of that? There was a thorough misunderstanding among other peoples. They thought we had gone back upon our words and our words were of no value.

Shri Shinkre: Not at all; only those who were not sincere in their professions.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I met a very great politician from a country which had nothing to do with Goa or Portugal and yet he told me that he was shocked. I told him we were not shocked. I said he was a politician,

and he could not have been taken in by our words, that we would do this peacefully. It did not mean that we would never use arms.

We used arms in the case of Kashmir. We used arms in the case of Hyderabad. How did he believe that we would not use arms? But he said: "we took you to be honest people and we believed it." We were thus put in a very awkward position. I do not want that we should again be put in an awkward position and people may say that India says one thing and does another and that we are a nation of hypocrites and cheats. I want that nobody should talk whether there should be experiment in the atom bomb or not, whether we shall always remain bound to this idea that we will never experiment with the bomb. My friend, Mr. Khadilkar, said that China had experimented with the bomb and it has advanced science but he does not want that experiment to advance science in India! It is very strange. It can only come from a fellow travelling Congressman.

We must think on this matter absolutely in practical terms: can we make the bomb in the near future? Dr. Bhabha has told us that it can be made with an expenditure of a few lakhs or may be a few crores of rupees. This estimate of his is as correct as that, that the atomic electricity will be manufactured more cheaply than thermal and hydraulic electricity. Let us not think in terms of money. Let us think whether in the near future, in the next three or four years, we can experiment with an atom bomb, we who could not even detect the potency of the bomb that was fired by China and it had to be discovered by Japan and they said it was Uranium 237, which means that the Chinese are in a year or two, in a position to manufacture a hydrogen bomb. If this is the condition of our science and our scientific laboratories, I really cannot see how we can manufacture the bomb. The difficulties are great. We have not the material with which we can make

the bomb. We are thinking of setting up two nuclear power stations with the help of Canada and the United States for peaceful purposes. Can we use them for experiments with atom bomb? Can we do so without breaking our word and losing the help of these two countries? If we cannot put up even these two atomic power stations, I really cannot see how we can try and experiment and manufacture an atom bomb. Then we have to find a place where the bomb will be fired. We have no such place where we can do it. Our country is so populated. What is then our answer to the Chinese threat? It is useless to talk as my Congress friend here talked that the Chinese have peaceful intentions. It will be going against what they have themselves been saying and what they have been fighting for ideologically with Russia. Russia believes in co-existence and China believes in thrusting communism on other peoples by means of arms. He must be an imbecile who thinks that China has peaceful intentions and I am sorry that such people should be found in this House. We have got to think of some other method by which we can meet this threat. Let us see how other nations are meeting such threats. They are not making atomic experiments themselves. They think it is useless to make such experiments. They are relying upon the international situation. They feel that no country can conquer another country today. If the effort is made, somebody or the other would come to their help. But it is always better to think of that help beforehand. When the Chinese attacked us in the autumn of 1962, after the Emergency had been declared, I went to the late Prime Minister, as the country was in a critical situation. I was not used to going to him but I went to him then because of the critical situation. I asked him definitely: have you ordered any arms from other countries? He said: no, as usual from some small countries of Europe arms are coming. Then I asked him definitely: have you put any orders with America? He said: no; we

are thinking of it. As soon as he put those orders, the next day or the third day, help came immediately. But I am sure that if that help had come to us earlier, if we had made arrangements earlier for that help, the Chinese would not have been able to advance as they did. We have to think of these things not at the time when the danger is on us, but before.

We must understand in this connection from where help can come. Can it come from Russia? This brings me to the question of what recently happened in Russia. Yesterday, a man was considered to be like an *Avatar of God*, who had descended in order to carry Russia forward, whose photos and statues were everywhere, who was talked of in every book that was written and read, whose tantrums were tolerated—they tolerated even his thumping the table at the UNO conference with his shoes—today they have turned about in a moment and say that he was not a proper man; he was a buffoon or something like that. If they could treat their people like that, can we rely upon such a Government to help us when the Emergency comes? In Russia there is no democracy. It is a totalitarian Government it is always uncertain and you cannot rely on it. People say that they have said that their policy towards India has not changed. Who has said it? They have not officially said so. It is Mrs. Indira Gandhi who has said it; our ambassador has said it. Their ambassador was clear; he did not talk about military aid; he talked only of economic aid and cultural aid. He never talked of military aid. We cannot rely upon Russia. We have to rely upon the west and we must see that we are assured of their help. If we want to have a deterrent here, it may be necessary for the west to have even bases here, as they have bases in European countries and nobody has lost his sovereignty because America is helping them. Even a country like Pakistan does not care two hoots for the opinion of America who is helping it and Gen. De Gaulle does not care a

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

fig for what Americans think about him. He goes his way; and so does England. We do not bind ourselves; we do not lose our sovereignty; people do not lose their sovereignty like that. It is no use saying that we are a non-aligned country; "Non-aligned" is not a *mantram*; it is not a foreign policy of a country. The foreign policy must be something more positive, more dynamic. We must know who our friends are and who our enemies are. When people do not know who their enemies are, they are doomed to failure and we would be doomed to failure because our Government does not know who our real friends are and who our real enemies are.

This brings me to the question of his blessed conference that took place at—where?

An hon. Member: Cairo.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Cairo. I am sorry, I forget the names. You will excuse me. At this Cairo conference which was held, what did they do? They enunciated all abstract principles. Ever so many concrete questions in the world are waiting for solution. But they did not discuss these. Our Foreign Minister told us what they decided there: all abstract principles; nothing to do with the world in which we are living. These conferences are held for the Governments, to boost their authority in their own countries; they find themselves becoming important by collecting together in conferences which have absolutely no value. It is a waste of money to go to such conferences where only the barest of first principles and abstract principles are enunciated.

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

Shri J. B. Kripalani: One word more and I have done, and that is about Ceylon and the agreement that has been made. I am reminded of the English proverb which says, "give a

dog a bad name and hang it." But our Government does better; it reverses the proverb. It gives the dog a good name and puts it in the nation's lap. This is very strange. This treaty, this settlement, has been absolutely against India. It has also violated the interests of the people who are settled there for centuries. Today in America, there are many nationalities settled there. Supposing America declares that certain nationalities, say, the people of Irish origin, or the people of German or Czechoslovakia origin are non-citizens without any nationality, will Germany or Czechoslovakia or Ireland receive back those people? It is absolutely absurd to think like that. When the Government wanted to negotiate with Ceylon, did they call the representatives of the people who are to be brought to India back again after centuries? They were born there and they have their property there; they have their business there; they get their labour there. They are more virile people and they are stronger people than the native Ceylones. I say they will curse us. Here, they will be stranded. The Government ought to have at least said in this conference that there should be not only India and Ceylon but also the representatives of those people who are to be transferred, who are to lose their home which belongs to them. We have never admitted that these people are Indian citizens.

Now, if we want to go to 'origin' of people, my hon. friend Shri Jaipal Singh, Adivasi friend, will tell us "you are foreigners. You go to Central Asia. You have your origin there." He will go further and say with Tilak. "You go to the Arctic regions from where you came." It is not a question of origin. We take fruits every day; we take vegetables every day. Do you think of their origin? If we were to think of their origin, I think we will starve ourselves. We think of the present state. We do not think of origin. So, in this respect, I am afraid our Government has done a very great wrong to the people there. I do

not think that the people there are happy. If they were coming in small streams you could have allowed them to come. You cannot stop people but on humanitarian grounds. But on grounds, because their origin was in India you cannot say that they are Indian citizens—those who have been born in Ceylon where they have been living for 50 to 100 years. To say that they are our citizens is something which is unheard of in the history of the whole world.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, for 17 years the Ministry of External Affairs was presided over by one of the greatest international figures and all his shortcomings, all his drawbacks, all his weaknesses, were overshadowed by that great personality. At last that personality is no more with us. He was a man with a vision, who rallied friends and foes around this country, but today that task has fallen on the shoulders of smaller men. Therefore, it is necessary that the affairs of the Ministry of External Affairs should be enquired into and should be thoroughly reorganised.

Recently, I had the unique opportunity of going to the non-aligned conference of the Heads of States in Cairo under the leadership of our Prime Minister, and I can say with full authority at my command that our great Prime Minister kept the flag of Jawaharlal Nehru flying. I can say with full authority that he was very ably assisted by our Minister of External Affairs. I found there delegates after delegates from the non-aligned countries, from Afro-Asian countries, getting up and paying their tributes to the memory of that great father of non-alignment. But I could not say the same warmth was found in the lobbies of the conference. It was not the fault of the leader of the delegation; it was not the fault of the Foreign Minister; it was not the fault of the delegation. But this warmth was created by consistent, persistent, long work by

various countries and I can say that there we have not very much succeeded.

Africa is emerging. It is going to be a big factor in the politics of the world international affairs and we in India cannot afford to neglect Africa. Only yesterday, the hon. Minister of External Affairs disclosed in this House that a number of African countries have till today not opened their missions here. There might be their own internal reasons, but I know it very well and in my own knowledge that before freedom Algeria used to have a representative here and an office here to rally support of the Indian people for the freedom of Algeria. I know it very well that before freedom, Tunisia used to have its representative here to rally the support of the Indian people for the freedom of Tunisia. If two countries, when they were slaves, when they were fighting for freedom, could afford to have their office here, to have their representatives here, I fail to understand why they cannot have their Legations here now. It is the task of the Ministry of External Affairs, it is the task of our Missions to cultivate them more intimately, to persuade them to send their representatives here and to have representation here. I hope and trust that our Missions function properly and in a nice way in African countries. There is no reason why the African people cannot be rallied round the Indian people. Perhaps there are some friends who feel that Afro-Asian countries are overawed by the might of China; they fought for centuries the occupation of Britain, of Germany, of Belgium and other countries. They do not want to become the slaves of China. But China has got its own technique of infiltrating into these countries. China often invites their delegations to Peking. The delegations are lavishly entertained by them and taken round the country. China sent some of its important emissaries

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

to some of the African countries. Even the Prime Minister of China spent months and months among the Africans. But the *bara sahebs* of our External Affairs Ministry consider it beneath their dignity to go to one of these Afro-Asian countries. They much prefer to stay in Rome, Paris, London or Washington and if that is not possible, at least at Beirut or Cairo. If that mentality is there on the part of the big bosses of the External Affairs Ministry, our relations with the Afro-Asian countries cannot be improved. That is why in the very beginning, I suggested that the time has come now when a real evaluation, a real appraisal of the working of the External Affairs Ministry, should be made and if the Cabinet thinks it proper—I do not think it would be improper—to appoint a parliamentary committee to go into the working of the various missions and into the working of the External Affairs Ministry, to suggest ways and means for improving their working.

China has been carrying on a campaign against us in Afro-Asian countries that we are British stooges. It is a lie; it is a humbug; it is a canard. But by saying it on the floor of this House, I cannot remove that impression. So long as this country was presided over by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, this lie could not work there very much. But now they say that we are British stooges and when an ordinary student goes to the library and picks up the *Who's Who* of our ambassador, he finds: His Excellency Mr. X graduated in 1928 when Bhagat Singh was being hanged; appeared in ICS and got into the Civil Service; in 1930 he tried the satyagrahis of the civil disobedience movement and sent them to jail; in 1940 and 1942, he suppressed India's movement for national freedom; in 1946 he was taken in the External Affairs Ministry and today he represents the British stooges. Sir, I would like to say that there is no dearth of talent-

ed people either on this side of the House or that side, people much more able than some of the *bara sahebs* who represent us abroad. Therefore, I hope and trust that our new Prime Minister and Foreign Minister will take this point into consideration and will do something about it.

Much has been said about our relations with Pakistan. There are some busy bodies in this country who have been shouting from the tops of the hill about Indo-Pakistan amity. I want this House to understand it very well that even after 18 years of freedom, Pakistan has not achieved nationhood. It is an artificial country, a country divided by 1,300 miles. What is common between East Pakistan and West Pakistan to get them nationhood—Religion? If religion would have been a common bond, certainly Afghanistan would have been the greatest friend of Pakistan, which it is not. The only thing common between East Pakistan and West Pakistan is hatred of India and fear of the Hindu majority here. As long as East and West Pakistan continue, I am sure there cannot be any amity between India and Pakistan. Those people who are talking of Indo-Pakistan amity are talking through their heads.

Therefore, the task of the Indian people is to rally to the support of those freedom-fighters of Pakhtoonistan and those freedom-fighters in East Pakistan who are being suppressed by the military rule of Pakistan, who want to free themselves from the Pindaris of Rawalpindi. It is our task to help them. We should not stand on these finer myths that we could not interfere in their internal affairs. When we could support the national movements of Algeria, Indonesia and Angola, there is no reason why we should not support these people who are being suppressed in East Pakistan by the military regime.

Before I close, I would like to refer to two of our neighbouring countries, namely, Burma and Indonesia. Burma and Indonesia have been traditional friends of India. There is too much of cultural ties between India and Indonesia, but the relations are not so good as they ought to be. It is not due to our policy; it is due to our functioning. At a time when hundreds of people of Indian origin were driven away from Burma to India, we had no ambassador there, because none of the *bara sahebs* of the External Affairs Ministry was prepared to accept the ambassadorial post. Ultimately we had to send a retired navy officer to save the sinking boat of India in Burma.

The same thing happened in Indonesia. For months and months, there has been no ambassador there. All these countries feel very touchy about it. Therefore, I hope and trust that the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister will pay their personal attention to our relations with Indonesia and Burma, for we cannot have a hostile Indonesia and a hostile Burma. People say Indonesia is under the Chinese influence. It is not. They are afraid of the Chinese. If they are sure that India is a great friend of theirs, they can stand up in a better way against China. Therefore, I hope and trust that immediately some of our important people, either the Prime Minister or the Foreign Minister, would visit Jakarta, and patch up our small differences and misunderstandings with President Soekarno.

Sir, I can assure you that we have been left a great legacy and a great heritage by our late Prime Minister. He has left tremendous goodwill in Africa and in Asia, in Europe, in America and everywhere, in every nook and corner of this earth. We should be worthy of that heritage and we should maintain it. We can maintain it only if we can send people with a broad outlook, with dynamism, imbued with patriotism and with great love of this country, to these countries and tell them that India is

to continue the same foreign policy and the same traditions that we have continued in the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

With these words, I conclude.

Shri M. K. Kumaran (Chirayinkil): Sir, yesterday while the Foreign Minister was speaking on this motion, when he was referring to the Ceylon-India agreement on the persons of Indian origin in Ceylon, there were so many interruptions and so many Members were very much exercised over the agreement reached by the Prime Ministers of the two countries. I also, share the feelings of apprehension expressed by some of them.

Those people who are going to be repatriated to India under the agreement within the next 15 years are not Indians. They are grandsons and great-grandsons of labourers and other people who went from India to work mostly in the rubber and tea plantations in Ceylon. They worked there and enriched that country. They settled there and they were earning their livelihood from the soil of that country. But they were not accepted as citizens of that country. Some 30 years ago, when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru went on a holiday to Ceylon, he resided in a hill station. He has recorded how the people of Indian origin from the plantations in the neighbourhood came to see him at his residence. These poor people working in the plantations came to see the great leader of India with flowers, vegetables and other presents. They had his *darshan*. He has recorded affectionately in his book that he could not exchange any ideas with them because those poor people could not understand his language or English. Why were these people so much moved by the presence of Jawaharlal Nehru in their midst? It is because they thought that their forefathers also came from India, India was having a great freedom struggle and Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the foremost leaders of that movement. They thought that, when India attained independence, their lot in that country also would be improv-

[Shri M. K. Kumaran.]

ed. That was their hope. When after independence, in 1947, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru became the Prime Minister of this country, these people in Ceylon knew that he was their friend and they hoped that they would get a better deal from their government with the help of the government of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also did his best to get a better deal for those people from the Government of Ceylon. He had talks with the Government and the leaders of that country. He entered into an agreement with Shri Kotlewala, the then Prime Minister of Ceylon. This agreement is known as the Nehru-Kotlewala Agreement. Following this agreement some machinery was set up by the Ceylonese Government to settle this question. They began some registration work and all that, but that also did not work. These people of Indian origin there were treated as stateless persons, and they had to agitate to get a better deal with the Government. We looked on helplessly and things went on dragging for months and years. And a situation came when the relations between the two countries became somewhat bitter because of the differences over this issue.

Now, after Shrimati Sirimavo Bandaranaike became the Prime Minister of Ceylon, she and the Prime Minister of our country gave their thought to this question and they tried to reach some agreement. But during the life time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru the two governments could not agree on this issue. After so many years of this uncertainty the two Prime Ministers of these two countries met in Delhi recently. They had long deliberations and they came to an agreement over this issue.

This agreement, I should say, is somewhat unsatisfactory. There are

defects and shortcomings. It is correct to say that the hopes of the persons of Indian origin in Ceylon were belied to a great extent. Not only that, apart from the agreement, after the Ceylonese Prime Minister went back to her own country there was a declaration in their Parliament that the persons who will be treated as Ceylonese citizens but having Indian origin will not be entered in the general electoral rolls and they will be kept in a separate electoral roll. That means that they are going to be treated as second class citizens in Ceylon. That is a most unsatisfactory development. Yesterday, the hon. Minister told the House that the Prime Minister has written to the Prime Minister of Ceylon to reconsider this position. Anyhow, even though the agreement is not to the satisfaction of this country and this House, an agreement has been reached over an issue which was hanging fire for a very long time and which was leading to embitter the relations between the two countries. Now, that the agreement has been signed by our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Ceylon, we hope that at least the spirit of that agreement would be observed and respected by the Government of Ceylon.

There is another big question. That is, more than five lakhs of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon are going to be repatriated to this country within the next few years. This is a major question. These people are mostly the descendants of the labourers who went from Tamilnad and Kerala. They are very poor labourers. They are not *chettiers*, moneylenders or merchants. They are poor labourers in the plantations. When they are repatriated back to Tamilnad or Kerala, that will raise very great difficulties for those States which are even now overburdened by the intensity of population and economic backwardness. Therefore, this matter should be taken up by the Govern-

ment with its all seriousness and it should see that these repatriates are properly settled in places where they can earn their livelihood and have a better life.

When dealing with this issue, we cannot forget that descendants of persons of Indian origin, persons who have gone from India, are now living all over the world especially in Afro-Asian countries. We have persons of Indian origin in a large number in Africa. Their question also has become a very live issue.

An Hon. Member: Malaysia also.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: They are there in Malaysia, Indonesia, Fiji and all those places.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: In Malaysia they are allowed full rights; do not bother.

Shri M. K. Kumaran: In all these countries we are having persons of Indian origin. In East Africa especially, there were reports that a large percentage of persons of Indian origin there are trying to get passports to England and other countries. This situation has created some misunderstandings in those African countries, because most of them have recently become independent from British and other imperial domination and the natives of those countries feel that Indians cannot accommodate themselves to free States, they want British and other colonial domination to continue and that is why once these imperialist dominations are removed these people of Indian origin want to go away from those countries. It is the duty of the Government of India to advise those people to settle wherever they are. They must take up the citizenship of those countries. They must live as good citizens of those countries accepting the laws and regulations of those States and also accepting the sentiments and feelings of the natives of those countries.

The difficulty is that most of the people settled in African countries are merchants and other kinds of exploiters, so to say. They cannot accommodate themselves to the social life, the body politic of those countries. They did not take part in the freedom movement of those peoples. They were always seeking the shelter of the Western masses. That is why they are finding it difficult to carry on there. So, we must advise those people to learn to live with the local people peacefully and take up the citizenships of those States.

Whenever our labour have gone to other countries, they have not found it difficult to live there. Once they are allowed to live there, they are prepared to live there. Sir, perhaps you know that the Prime Minister of British Guiana, Mr. Cheddi Jagan, is the grandson of a landless labourer, who went from a U.P. village as an indentured labour to that country. He settled there, worked in the sugar plantations there and now the grandson of that indentured labour has become the Prime Minister of that country. That is how our labour, working people, when they go to other countries, do work, take up the citizenship of that country and accommodate themselves to the conditions there and live peacefully with other sections of the local people.

Therefore when we are thinking of sending our private merchants and private capital to foreign countries, especially to underdeveloped countries, we should bear in mind that it will create difficulties in the future. Whenever private capital is sent to underdeveloped countries, it will become a vested interest and will stand in the way of progress of that country. So, Government should ban the export of private capital to underdeveloped countries. The Government of India may have, and in fact should have, economic collaboration with those countries. We should send our experts and give whatever economic and other help that we can for the further development of those countries. But

[Shri M. K. Kumaran]

it should be the duty of the Government of India to see that no private capital is exported to under-developed countries, as that will create so many difficulties for us in the future.

This has happened in Burma. I do not say that all the people sent away from Burma are *chettians* or money-lenders or merchants. But it is a fact that a section of the people of Indian origin in Burma were indulging in money-lending and other means of exploitation. That has created bitter feeling in the minds of the Burmese people. Whenever they were taking up any development work or nationalisation programme, these people were the stumbling block, standing on the path of progress. So, if the Government of India go to the support of such exploiters of Indian origin in other countries, the people of those countries will misunderstand the professions of India. That is why I appeal to the Government that we should prohibit the export of private capital to under-developed countries.

Then, coming to the question of the Chinese atomic blast, I wish to say a few words. Perhaps that was the biggest issue dealt with in this House yesterday and today. So many hon. Members spoke very eloquently on this issue. The spokesman of the Swatantra Party, Shri M. R. Masani, yesterday made a very clever and cunning speech. He did not attack the non-alignment policy of the Government of India, though he was always doing that while Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was alive. At that time he had not a single word of praise to say about Pandit Nehru or his non-alignment policy; he gave him only brickbats. But yesterday he gave him bouquets posthumously and talked very admiringly of the non-alignment policy.

He said that Prime Minister Nehru sought arms aid from America and other countries without giving up the policy of non-alignment. So, he said that without giving up the non-align-

ment policy Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri should seek the protection of the atomic umbrella of the United States. That was a subtle way of crucifying the non-alignment policy of our country. He did not say it straight, he thought that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri could not understand the subtlety of the argument of Shri Masani. So, he said it in a subtle way. He wanted to stab the non-alignment policy from the back; but for some reasons he did not want to give it a straight hit. That is why he said that without giving up the non-alignment policy the Government of India should seek the protection of the umbrella from the United States. I hope this House and the Government will understand the real intentions of Shri Masani and his Party.

If this House accepts the proposal of Shri Masani of course, Shri Masani will like it but it will be liked more by the leaders of Peking. That is the irony of the situation—what is liked by Shri Masani will be liked more by the leaders of Peking. We have seen Mr. Ayub Khan and Mr. Mao Tse-tung have become strange bed-fellows. No wonder Shri Masani's Swatantra Party and the Chinese Communist Party are going to have flirtations first and on a future date they will also become strange bed-fellows. What the Chinese leaders want is that India should go to the Western camp, and must give up her policy of non-alignment. And that is what Shri Masani also wants. This is a strange development. Perhaps, the extremes may meet!

Here we should remember one thing. He is trying to develop a cold feet regarding the atomic blast of the Chinese. Every one is threatening India. Chinese leaders also want to threaten India. They the black-mailing India, Shri Masani said. Shri Masani is also blackmailing the Government of India to go to the Western camp. I am very sorry to say that some leaders of certain political parties in this country have begun to think in such a manner.

China has blasted an atomic bomb, and we are advised by Shri Masani to seek the protection under the American umbrella; In that case, if the Chinese explode a hydrogen bomb what will he advise us? Will he advise us to go and take shelter under the petticoat of Western imperialism? This is not befitting a great country and a great people like us. I would therefore request the Government to hold on to the policy of non-alignment now we are pursuing.

The Prime Minister has declared still, as I have heard many speakers or elsewhere India is not going to give up its policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. I would say to the Prime Minister, that it is not enough that he has declared it in the peace conference or elsewhere. He should come forward and convene a meeting of all political parties which agree with the policy he has enunciated. Let us sit down and work out a programme for propagating these ideals among the people of this country. Otherwise, the Swatantra leaders and the leaders of other political parties will threaten the people and cajole the Government into accepting their policy in foreign affairs. If it so happens it will be a danger to the country. So, I appeal to the Government to be awakened to this danger and see that, whatever may happen elsewhere, we should stick to our basic policy and must see that collective security alone will help India and the world out of this mess.

14 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Kashi Nath Pande.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हाउस में क्वोरम नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The bell is being rung. Now, there is quorum. Shri Pande.

Shri K. N. Pande (Hata): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, although I am not an expert in foreign affairs nor do I

claim that I know much about it, still, as I have heard many speakers here, I want my real feelings to be expressed in respect of some of the points.

Being a trade unionist I have learnt how to negotiate with our opponents or the opposite party. I think, that gives me some light as to how even for a dispute to be settled at the international level we can be guided by the experience gained by being a trade unionist. Take, for example, the question of Ceylon. I know that there is a very strong sentiment in the people who had gone to Ceylon as labourers and had helped the country at a time when they were building up their economic prosperity and put all their strength and energy in order to make the country prosperous. Naturally, something was expected from that country, namely, that they should have at least been provided with citizenship to live in Ceylon. But in spite of this fact the dispute remained and the Ceylon Government was not prepared to accept all the people coming from India as Ceylonese citizens. Therefore, as the dispute was there, being practical men, we had to find out a real solution for the problem. Taking into consideration all these things the Government of India came forward for talks with the Ceylonese Prime Minister. They came for a settlement, and settled the issue. I know that much inconvenience may be caused to those who have to come to this country, but there is no alternative. Being a practical people we have to accept whatever has been done because there was no alternative at all on that issue.

I heard a big leader like Acharyaji say that we never accepted this position that they were not the citizens of Ceylon. It is not that we accept or reject a particular thing it was for the Ceylonese Government to accept them as Ceylonese citizens or to reject their citizenship. Those people were hanging in suspense. There was nothing concrete for them. Therefore this settlement was made and, I think, it

[Shri K. N. Pande]

was a good settlement. I can tell you that so far as any settlement arrived at in a dispute like this is concerned the people repatriating were never allowed to bring their properties with them, but in this case it has been agreed that the people coming to India within 15 years will bring their property also. No doubt, we are already faced with such problems of settling the refugees coming from East Pakistan and this will add to our burden, but as things are before us we have, naturally, to deal with this situation also and have to find out a solution.

I am fully in agreement with Shri Kumaran that the Government of India should be prepared to accommodate them in such a way that dissatisfaction may not spread because our experience has been that among the refugees that have come from East Pakistan in 1947 or just at the moment some dissatisfaction is there due to lack of conveniences provided to them. A person who has to leave his original place and has to go to another place, naturally, has to face a lot of difficulties; similar are the difficulties with these people. But as they are coming to India gradually we have to be prepared to rehabilitate them in a manner that they may be satisfied.

Then, I heard the Prime Minister say that this was, never the understanding that those who were going to be the citizens of Ceylon will be treated as second-class citizens. I think, no mention of it has been made in the agreement too. If that is so, the Government of India should take up this matter with the Ceylonese Government to see that if they are Ceylonese citizens, they should naturally be treated at par with those who are already in Ceylon. If any further talks are required, I think, the Government of India should be prepared to have them with the Ceylonese Government.

About China's blast I want to say a few words. A developing country like India wants to live at peace.

Therefore our policy was that we should take all steps to see that peaceful conditions of a peaceful atmosphere is created in the world and around us so that we may have some progress within the time at our disposal. So, the policy was decided that even if we established an atomic reactor the production of that will not be used for any war purpose but will be used for peaceful purposes. But now the condition is that China does not care for the world. China is not in the UNO also and there is no binding effect of any decision taken by the UNO on China. Therefore we have to be very careful. Moreover, we are fully aware that China is against us. Their policy is that they want to impose Communism by force, by strength. Therefore the manufacture of this nuclear weapon by China is something very dangerous and it is warning to us that it can be used against us and against anybody who is against them.

How to protect ourselves, or how to strengthen our defence position is a matter which has to be considered by us. There was a suggestion made by Shri Masani yesterday that we are not in a position to produce nuclear weapons, or because of so many reasons we should not produce nuclear weapons, but should depend on America. It is true that at the moment we have got the sympathy of Russia also and we will to make all possible efforts to see that that relationship is maintained, but in this changing world nothing is stable. Nobody can say as to what is going to happen tomorrow. Suppose, we take the protection of the atomic umbrella of America. After all, there is no difference of ideology between China and Russia. If Russia sees that her one communist friend is being killed by this protection, naturally she will come to the rescue of China. How will they come to rescue them? They can attack America also. What will happen if America is attacked? Will that country protect itself or will it come

to protect our country? Therefore, my suggestion in this regard is that even if we do not decide to manufacture nuclear weapons just at the moment, we should think over it and take America into confidence about the situation prevailing. If something happens like that, if Russia comes to the rescue of China other countries will also be involved. If Russia and America come to war, will USA be in a position to protect our country? If that is not so, we are exposed to a very dangerous position because the distance between India and China is only 300 miles and not even a jet plane is required for carrying an atom bomb; even an ordinary aircraft can carry a bomb and put it here.

Similarly, I would say China and Russia are also negotiating. There may be difference of ideology for the time being. But nobody can say with certainty whether these conditions will remain for a long period. There may be some understanding between Russia and China and in that case if the differences between India and China remain, will it be possible for Russia to be neutral in respect of us? This is a matter for consideration. My suggestion is that we should take Russia also into confidence and put it before them as to what we should do.

In this respect, I want to say one thing more. I met Mr. Bhabha in Bombay and I saw our atomic reactor and those other plants also. I think China is rich in uranium and similarly India is also rich in uranium. We have already got the atomic reactor. The condition put by some countries is that we cannot manufacture atomic weapons in those plants with the help of certain electric power stations. But there are other electric power stations which could be used for this purpose and this is known even to the hon. Minister. I think we should think over this matter and that we should make a start. The statement of Dr. Bhabha was based on the ground that we have got the plant and also

some potential of electric energy and we can produce an atom bomb.

My another point in this context is that the moment there was a blast in China, all over the world there was a feeling and also there were views expressed in newspapers that now the powers which have got the nuclear weapons should be brought into a club and even the name of China was also mentioned, that China also should be brought into that club. Why was the name of China mentioned? It was because they exploded one bomb. We having got all those things with us, we are capable of producing nuclear weapons and simply because we have not manufactured a bomb so far, there is a possibility that we may not get a place in the said club. My suggestion is that the Government should think over this matter taking into confidence these countries also because we are friendly to them and I hope if we take those countries into confidence and start manufacture of the bomb gradually and continuously. I think, the purpose can be served. By having atom bomb we can save our expenditure on defence because if one bomb is put here, then what is the use of 3 millions of soldiers there where they cannot do anything. One bomb is sufficient to destroy millions of people. Therefore, my suggestion is that in order to avoid such a heavy expenditure on defence, if we spend something on this side, naturally we will strengthen our defence and raise the morale of our defence forces here by simply manufacturing a bomb does not mean that we are going to explode. In order to show that we have also got an atom bomb will serve the desired purpose.

With these suggestions of mine, I conclude

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was very recently reading a book by Maj. Gen. Moulton and his suggestion was that we could save a good deal of money and probably a good deal of wastage if we had better detailed debates in this House on this question of foreign policy or

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

defence policy Unfortunately, we are sitting in a House where we are afraid that here is a man sitting on my left or sitting on my right who will carry tales and I may not be able to expose the whole thing in the same proper manner without fear or favour which I ought to do. Today we had this shameless picture before us that not only this House has got a Chinese lobby but the ruling party has also got a Chinese lobby and it becomes extremely difficult to have a detailed debate. We should shed this fear and have a full and detailed debate on this question. There should be no hypocrisy with us on this matter.

Where do we stand? Ever since the Hindi-Chini bhai bhai sentiment received a jolt, when Longju was attacked by the Chinese in 1959, we ought to have opened our eyes as to what should have been our foreign policy. If we look at the foreign policy, we will find that it is no policy at all. It is entirely a negative approach, a symptomatic treatment. A doctor who carries on merely symptomatic treatment is no doctor if he cannot diagnose the malady that is before him. We are in that unhappy position that we are not able to diagnose the malady that is facing us. Why is this diplomatic hypocrisy surrounding us? Why are not giving up these unimaginative memberships of this Afro-Asian group which is a so-called non-aligned group? How long can we carry on with this non-aligned group business? What type of no-alignment have we?

On 25th August there was a report in the *New China News Agency* that the U.A.R. representative Mr. Tourky was hobnobbing with the Chinese and because he was a Mohammedan, some Mohammedans of Chinese origin were also called in. He was given a big banquet and then all came together and in the same fashion they said, Mishri-Chini bhai bhai, as we had a slogan Hindi-Chini bhai bhai, and they did not like at the bottom of our

heart. We unnecessarily embroiled ourselves in a situation on Israel. Where are we being led by this? What is this Afro-Asian question after all? Who are our friends in the Afro-Asian nations? We committed an initial mistake in not being very strong when the question of Indians in Burma arose. 125 years ago, the Indians had gone there, settled there, established there and had developed that country with their sweat, with their labour, with their blood, and these people were driven out and we kept quiet. I wrote a letter to our present Foreign Minister on this matter. When he went to Burma, he made a statement that we were not discriminated against. I am sorry to tell him that not only have Indians been discriminated against, but I have got figures here with me, and I have personal knowledge of the fact that we have been discriminated against in the treatment meted out to us. When the British companies were nationalised, for instance, the Irrawaddy Flotilla Co., the Rangoon Electric and Tramway Supply Co., the Burma Oil Co., the Indo-Burma Petroleum Co., etc. were all allowed to transfer their compensation in sterling to England. Did the Burmese Government allow us to do that when the Indian companies like Soortee Bara Bazaar Co. Ltd., the Pazaudaung Bazaar Co. Ltd., the Kemmendine Bazaar Co. Ltd., the Bogale Bazaar Co. Ltd., and the Rangoon Iron Bazaar Co. Ltd. etc. were liquidated? Not one paisa has been paid to us. When the whole of the Kyanktaga grant was taken away, when 90 per cent of our people from U.P. who were residing there had been uprooted, was anything paid to us? When the question of compensation arises in regard to them, we are only swallowing the bitter pill. And seeing that we are swallowing the bitter pill, everyone has learnt a lesson from this. Even a small nation like Ceylon has learnt the lesson and has tried to drive out 5:25 lakhs of people of Indian origin from Ceylon. Again, what is our position in Jamaica? What

is the position in British Guiana? And what is our position in Trinidad? Have we studied these problems? Have we sent emissaries to study these problems? Have we done anything to develop cultural relations with these countries? Have we tried to do anything to protect the interests of the people of Indian origin in these countries? No, we have not done anything at all. Why have we not done it? We have not done it because of a weak-kneed policy that we have been following all along. It is time for us to cry a halt to this weak-kneed policy.

People have said that because of the Chinese making a bomb and exploding it, science has advanced. I would submit that science has advanced everywhere; and science will advance everywhere, not because of China making a bomb; the bomb was discovered long ago, and the fact that if hydrogen and oxygen were combined, they would produce water was discovered long ago. What is that has been newly discovered? What is it that has been done by China? The only thing that has happened now is that a weapon of destruction is in the hands of China. A terror that is hanging on our heads is there. The sword of Damocles has been brought over our head. Are we going to meet it? Are we going to do something to meet this menace? When I am saying this, I do not mean thereby that we should destroy all chances of friendship with that country. If at any time China changes her policy and wants to come and shake hands with us, certainly, let us shake hands with them. But let us follow the path of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, namely 'Ahimsa for Ahimsa', that is, *ahimsa* only for those who believe in *ahimsa*, but weapon for weapon; let us believe in and follow this policy 'Weapon for weapon; if you hit me with a weapon, I shall also hit you with a weapon'.

Dr. M. S. Aney: *Shathe Saatyam.*

Shri U. M. Trivedi: How long are we going to tolerate this position?

Our foreign policy must be dictated by this very consideration namely the effect that has been produced on the world by China by this atomic explosion. Let us consider the question in these terms. In Asia there are two giants; one of them is India and the other is China. If one giant grows and the other remains a dwarf, certainly, the dwarf will be killed, and there will be no time for the dwarf to arm himself.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: One is a *sura* and the other is an *asura*.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is not the *sura* who succeeds, but it is always the *asuras* who succeed and the *sura* dies. This is what has happened in the whole world. All barbaric races have destroyed civilised nations. The Romans were killed because they had become civilised.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: It was the *suras* who won ultimately.

The Minister of Transport (Shri Raj Bahadur): Ultimately, it was the *suras* who succeeded.

Shri Bade (Khargone): All the Gods gave weapons to Shakti for killing Ravana and the other demons.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I shall now come to the question before us. We have to consider the question whether in the face of this atomic blast, which has been referred to as the Lop Nor incident, so to say, we should still remain in the same position in which we were. Are we going to sit passive? Are we going to sit idle saying 'Nothing doing; people will come to our rescue.'? Who is going to come to your rescue? Who do you envisage would come to your rescue? Supposing China attacks us, who is going to come to our rescue? Not one country came to the rescue of the Tibetans when they were killed. Did anyone try to come to the rescue of the Tibetans? So, the terror is there, and nobody wants to put himself into this trouble. Again, who ran to the rescue of Hungary when Hungary was raped? Did anyone run to its rescue? No. It is only

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

when a civilised nation does a particular thing that other nations run to its rescue. But when a barbarous nation does it, nobody runs to the rescue of the civilised nation, and nobody wants to give any help also. So, it is for us to study history and learn the lessons. Let us study the history of China, for instance. Let us not go on merely saying 'Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai; we have always lived together for innumerable years'. How have we lived together for innumerable years? We have lived together because the Himalayas had saved us all along. But we feel now that the Himalayas cannot save us any longer. So, we must face the facts. Have we done anything at all even to get back the territory that China has occupied? No, we are just sitting tight. Can this policy help us? Can this weak-kneed policy contain us even where we are?

Again, let us look at Pakistan. What is Pakistan doing? Our Foreign Minister, and a very sweet gentleman at that, talks very nicely. But with all his nice talks, have we progressed? The moment he turns his back, abuses are showered on us. The moment his back turns, our men are killed; our men are kidnapped, and our men are taken away. No reports are available to us even about how many of them have been taken away; even up to date we are only fumbling; we think that nine men have gone away, but we do not know the exact position. The same thing happened when Col. Bhattacharya was taken away. He was seized in our territory and then taken away to Pakistan and imprisoned there, and now he has come back. What have we done to retaliate? We know openly what the Pakistan Government is doing. It is training the Nagas. For whom and against whom? To whom are we giving shelter? We are negotiating with Mr. Phizo, and we are negotiating with Rev. Michael Scott. What for? We are doing it just to show that we are a very pious people. Each one of us is a pious

person; and every religion teaches the same golden rule, namely 'Do unto others what you ought to be done by'. That golden rule prevails in every religion, and that golden rule covers all your Panchsheel and other things.

An Hon. Member: Naheem.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: But are they going to do that to us? They want to do harm to us, and yet we feel that we should sit and talk to them. I would submit that that is not possible; it might be possible between two neighbours behaving in a neighbourly manner, without arms or anything of that kind. Even in ordinary day-to-day life, it is not possible to have talks with one who wants to do us harm; it is not possible to a greater extent where the question of the sovereignty of a country is concerned, where the question of a nation is concerned.

In this world, as it is now shaping, ideological thinking has gone away, and national thinking has reappeared on the scene, that is, the principle of each nation unto itself; just as there is the principle of each man to himself and each family unto itself, likewise, today the theory in the world is that 'each nation unto itself'. And every nation is trying to practise this principle. Russia may not come to the rescue of China. But Russia will certainly not come to our rescue also. So, what are we to do? We should have friendship with those who are prepared to extend their friendship to us, and who are thinking in the same manner as we do. We are living in a particular type of democracy; we have developed a particular type of democracy, and we believe in a particular type of democracy; we do not believe in communism; we do not believe in totalitarianism. When that is the position, who are the people whom we can approach, and who will be of the same feather as we? We have to keep company only with those countries. I do not say that we

should/kow tow before anybody. It is not necessary to do that. But at the same time, we can keep our heads up, and keeping our heads up, we have to keep friends; we cannot have enemies all around. And these enemies have been created of late. They consist of people who are afraid; they may not be actually our enemies, but they are afraid to help, and they are afraid to come to our rescue, and they are afraid even to talk on our side, and, therefore, they are not able to do anything. We find that the UAR is carrying on such friendship with China that it is almost embracing China, so to say. When that is the position, I would like to ask what prevented us from keeping Israel friendly with us. We are friends with Lebanon. We can have friendly ties with Cyprus. These are very small nations. And after all, how much help can they render? And yet we are friends with them. But here is one nation which has got the power of terror; its 20 lakhs of people are keeping 7 crores of these Arabs at bay. Why not have friendly ties with Israel? Why not have America as a friendly nation? Why not have UK as a friendly nation?

I had once a talk with our late Prime Minister and I had asked him how it was that the propaganda in England was going on to such an extent against us. He told me that it was entirely due to the retired ICS officers who were trying to carry on pro-Pakistani propaganda there and against us. What steps have we taken to meet that pro-Pakistani propaganda that is being carried on there? What are the emissaries that we send out from our country doing in this regard? Who are those persons who have gone? Bureaucrats, who do not know how to handle the situation, who do not know how even to tom-tom their own country. We had a very bad lesson in Malaysia. The day the speech of the delegate from Pakistan was made, it was published with headlines all over; and a very fine

speech by Sardar Hukam Singh, our Speaker, cutting at the whole root of the Pakistani speech, was not published at all and did not receive any publicity. Why? Because, whereas the Pakistan Ambassador was awake and alive to the situation, ours was sleeping. The same situation I found of these bureaucratic ambassadors whom you have appointed. And in Thailand the same situation I find.

What happened in British Guiana? Why is it that in British Guiana, with Cheddi Jagan as Prime Minister, Indians are being molested, why is it that Indian women are being molested. Because today Castro's sister says that "if Cheddi Jagan comes out and wins in the election we will not recognise him and we will destroy Cheddi Jagan". Why? Because he is one who is of Indian origin.

The same thing in Jamaica. In Trinidad what have you done? You have not done anything. Therefore it is most necessary, as I said last time, that there should be a new alignment of our policy. And in this respect, because Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru followed a particular thing, you need not become touchy about it, as Acharya Kripalani has said. Policies do change; Ministers do change, ideas do change, Parliaments do change, Lok Sabhas have changed. These changes are there; and with the changing of the world and the changing of the situation we have to meet the situation as it arises. We cannot sit tight over what our forefathers did.

In a progressive country, in a developing country it is essential to assimilate all the ideas that are there. We have to take a look at the whole thing in perspective and formulate the policy that is most necessary to lay down.

Why should we be afraid of making a nuclear weapon? We need not be afraid. We do not want to be destructive. Because I hold a cane it does not mean that I am going to hit

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

anybody. That theory of the British will go. It is the British who had reduced us to this position and deprived us of all our arms. It is the unlicensed burglar and thief and robber who shoots you. He will shoot you notwithstanding that he holds no licence from the Government. And you and I, holding a licence, are not going to shoot anybody. Therefore this mental control our country can exercise and you can exercise. We can have the atomic weapon, not for the purpose of destruction, but for the purpose of terror meeting terror. It is necessary that terror must be there. If the deterrent of the terror was not available to Mr. Kennedy tragedy would have happened in Cuba. Both ways it has served the purpose: America has agreed not to disturb Cuba, and Russia has agreed not to use the missiles there. Therefore, this terror has balanced the power and the situation.

It is necessary that we must have it. I do not want to destroy any Chinaman. I do not have absolutely any such idea, nor do you have any such idea. But yet it is essential that we must have this weapon. And money is no consideration. What consideration is there for money when crores and crores of rupees are swallowed by hundreds and hundreds of engineers in a corrupt manner? It is no use crying over it. We can easily spend money honestly for the purpose of serving our country.

The conduct of our foreign policy must be guided by prudence and great sobriety. Even then it must not be under-guarded. It must be fully girded by maintaining strength. Unless we have strength, nobody is going to accept our friendship and nobody is going to seek our friendship. It is our strength which will dictate, and people are waiting. Foreign countries are waiting for our strength. Our whole prestige has been put down at the lowest ebb on account of this atomic explosion that has taken place. Sir, it

is high time that we rose to the occasion and met this challenge. It is not necessary that we should go on calculating in terms of rupees, annas and pies. It is better for us to say and realize that not one Bhabha will suffice but we would require forty Bhabhas (*An Hon. Member: Experts*) to come in our country and develop this atomic weapon that is necessary.

One last word I will say, Sir, and that is this. Let the country be saved from our independent Chinese lobbies; but let you also be saved from the Chinese lobby that you have.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, almost every speaker who spoke today and yesterday in this House emphasised two recent developments, namely, the Chinese explosion of an atomic bomb and also, secondly, the deposition of Mr. Khrushchev from the office of power in Russia. This morning's newspapers have come out with headlines, saying that the debate in Parliament on international affairs was dominated by the atomic bomb. That is as it should have been, because, after all, this is a very important development, this development of the Chinese bomb.

The deposition of Mr. Khrushchev in Russia a few weeks ago has a very great significance for India. It is also bound to have very grave consequences to India and to other countries in Asia. We can say that one consequence of the deposition of Mr. Khrushchev was that Mr. Chou En-lai was able to go to Moscow to attend the Forty-seventh anniversary celebrations of the communist party. A thing like that—of course Mr. Chou En-lai was invited to the meeting in Moscow—but a development of this kind would have been unthinkable in Mr. Khrushchev's regime. And Mr. Chou En-lai having gone to Moscow and having stayed there for almost a week, it was only to be expected that the

relations between the two countries, Russia and China, would not remain the same that they were before Mr. Chou-En-lai's visit to Moscow. It was only to be expected that something will happen, some change would take place. As a matter of fact, there were several meetings between Mr. Chou En-lai and Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Kosygin.

Now, we know that these two big communist powers have been confronting each other over a number of years and it is only natural to expect that they could not continue to do that indefinitely. They could not do it without the risk of colliding somewhere and somehow. This realisation has come to the Russian hierarchy; they also knew that unless something was done to remove Mr. Khrushchev from his office of power,—Mr. Khrushchev who had some kind of an obsession about Chinese intransigence—no improvement could take place in the relations between the two countries. So Mr. Khrushchev was removed and we find that the new men who took office after him have lost no time in coming to talking terms with the Chinese.

Now it is too much to expect of course that in these talks they would be able to patch up all their differences. Perhaps that might not be possible ever. Some differences are bound to remain because they are of a fundamental character. But what is important is the fact that these two, the Chinese and the Russians, have met and talked. That is something which would not have happened in the Khrushchev era. It is too early to assess the results of the talks. However, one thing is clear, that on both sides there has been a new desire to come closer, a new desire for rapprochement.

We also hear reports that as the result of these meetings in Moscow, the Russians have already resumed some kind of token economic aid. We hear that a hydroelectric power unit of 20,000 kw. which had been built for

the Chinese three years ago, before the feud started, has now been decided to be sent to China.

What we are really concerned with here today is: what shall be our attitude towards these developments? How shall we react to these developments? Shall we welcome them? It is not possible to say off-hand what exactly our attitude and reaction should be, but we can say one thing, that we need not oppose these developments, even if we could oppose them. Our attitude should be one of wait and watch, should be one of trying to understand and making a correct assessment. But certainly we should not oppose these developments, for after all, there is such a thing as a long-term goal in our international policies. And one of those goals will be that some day we hope to bring China into the fold of polite society, society which recognises international responsibilities.

About this Chinese atom bomb, what kind of view shall we take? We in India consider ourselves a mature people, politically mature, and we are not in the habit of succumbing to the instant, momentary reaction that we may have on any particular subject. These are very grave issues and require grave decisions. And these decisions have to be taken deliberately after taking a full and long-term view, lest we are overwhelmed by our own momentary reactions.

Now we can see that after all, there is a process started already between the relations of Russia and China, a process of unfreezing, a process of a certain amount of thawing; but that should not lead us to the other extreme conclusion, that the road to an understanding between these two countries is all smooth and has no impediments. Impediments there certainly are present, and what is going to happen is not exactly a meeting of minds between these two countries or the leaders of these two countries. That would be reading too much into these developments. But as I said,

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

we need not oppose any progressive rapprochement between these two countries.

What shall we think about this nuclear adventure of China by exploding an atom bomb? We need not think much about it. It was really intended to impress. We, of course, are not such novices in this business of atomic power. We know that atomic power to be effective has to have a strong industrial base, a good, well-established economy; it certainly cannot be sustained in an economy, in a country where we have vast numbers of people having a hand-to-mouth existence, such as we know there still are today in China.

We need not change our convictions on this question of the atomic bomb. We still should continue to have our faith in collective security and in such organisations as the United Nations. We know that China will not undertake any rash adventure. We know it from experience. Competent observers, who have studied the international situation, also have supported the idea that China knows too well that any adventure with the atomic bomb will bring swift and instant retaliation. I need not spell out the directions from which such certain retaliation will come. Also, if we study the events of the last few years, we know that China is not really as foolish as sometimes its actions make us believe, or make it appear. China has been cautious. For instance, there are these islands of Quemoy and Matsu; they have been there, and China has not yet dared to take any untoward action. Also, take our own experience of aggression against our borders. China has desisted from pressing its advantage. That only shows that China is not as rash as it is made to appear.

Shri Manoharan (Madras South): I rise to speak on behalf of my party, the DMK. I shall stick to a particu-

lar issue, the problem that has been engaging the attention of the country, i.e., the Indo-Ceylon Agreement.

I think it is an important issue, a problem beyond the horizon of party politics. I request all the Members of this House to carefully consider this issue objectively and come to a conclusion.

Yesterday our External Affairs Minister talked much about the Indo-Ceylon Agreement, or the agreement between the Prime Minister of Ceylon and her counterpart in India. The arguments advanced and the points raised by our External Affairs Minister did not satisfy me. After having heard his speech fully, I think he can be a fitting Minister of External Affairs to the Government of Ceylon rather than to the Government of India. He simply advocated the case of Ceylon and the Ceylonese Government.

This agreement, I want to say at the outset, is not acceptable to the people of this country. This agreement can never be final, and should not be final.

In the past we have had several negotiations and agreements. The first was Sir Girija Shankar Bajpai's delegation; then in 1939, the late Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, visited Ceylon for this purpose; in 1946-47 a lot of correspondence took place between Stephen Senanayake and Mr. Nehru in 1953 he met Dudley Senanayake and talked with him during the Commonwealth Conference; in 1954, two conferences were held in Delhi with Sir John Kotelawala. The conference witnessed the participation of opposition leaders like the late Mr. Bandaranaike and Indian representatives like Mr. Tondaman and Mr. Aziz. Since then, conferences at the official level were also held by the end of 1963. All these conferences did not and could not produce any effect, except the 1954 conference where an agreement was reached and signed by the parties. Why did that agreement fail? Why was

this new agreement reached? That is my question.

I want to know from the External Affairs Minister whether it is a fact that the 1954 agreement failed because not only Ceylon did not follow the spirit of the agreement, but rejected applications indiscriminately. Out of 8-1/2 lakhs applications, only 1,80,000 were given citizenship. The Government of Ceylon evicted people who were registered as Indian citizens, who, according to the agreement, were entitled to employment till 55 years of age.

I want a straight answer from the External Affairs Minister to this question also whether the Indian High Commissioner at that time protested to the Ceylon Government, and there were talks on the subject as a result of which Ceylon agreed not to evict such people; then again, the Ceylon Government broke that agreement, and when the Indian High Commissioner wanted the Ceylon Government to give it in writing that the people registered as Indian nationals in Ceylon would not be thrown out of employment, the Ceylon Government did not do so, and the Indian High Commissioner stopped registering Indian applicants. Let the Prime Minister or the External Affairs Minister reply to this specific question.

14.55 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Further, our External Affairs Minister yesterday, I think, deliberately confused the House, and got himself confused, regarding the Stateless persons and the like. Our late Prime Minister categorically said:

"Our responsibility is in regard to those who were registered as Indian nationals. Regarding the Stateless, it is not our consideration. It is the duty of the Ceylon Government to look after them."

This has been the consistent policy of the Government of India for the past

so many years, of our late Prime Minister till his demise, and the Shastri Government has been saying that they are following closely the policy of the late Prime Minister, but I think it is a clear departure from that stand.

We have reopened this agreement. why? Because Ceylon has been threatening us. Ceylon threatened the Government of India, why?—because the Ceylon Government knows that the Government of India can be easily threatened, because the Burma Government threatened it, with the result that we have three lakhs of repatriates. In the streets of Colombo it is common talk that the Government of India understands only one language, that is the language of the fist. It is a sorrowful state of things that we the people of India have to stomach.

It is well known that when our Foreign Minister visited Ceylon two months ago, the Government of that tiny island told him that if there was no agreement, agreeable to the Government of Ceylon, Ceylon would be compelled to take firm action like Burma, and in the recent talks that were held in Delhi, the very same threat might have been used by the Government of Ceylon.

The new talks were agreed to by the Government of India because the Shastri Government is suffering from a psychosis of fear. I can understand our being anxious to have a settlement, but what is the character of the agreement that has been reached? Does it make any sense if we look at it very sincerely and analytically?

The framework of the 1954 agreement is that both Governments should register applicants for their respective citizenships according to their laws, but now we have accepted the figure of 5,25,000. How are we going to reach that figure? Yesterday, our External Affairs Minister said something in general about the agreement; he refused to enter into the salient

[Shri Manoharan]

features of the agreement, and how we are going to reach the figure. What is the basis on which we are going to register and reach this figure of 5,25,000? What are the principles which will determine whether a man is an Indian citizen or a Ceylon citizen? Should we go on revising our formula to reach this mysterious figure of 5,25,000?

I say the Government of Ceylon is committed openly to sending away all the Indians from the soil of Ceylon, because, I would like to remind the House of what the late Mr. Bandaranaike once said in the Parliament of Ceylon, namely, "I shall die a happy man when the last Indian leaves this shore".

Shri Nambiar: But he died before the last Indian was sent out.

Shri Manoharan: Let us not forget that the present Prime Minister is the wife of the late Prime Minister Bandaranaike.

15 hrs.

It is true that we have accepted 5,25,000, it is equally true that they have accepted to take 3 lakhs of people, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. It is going to take Ceylon 15 years more to take these people as Ceylon citizens. Are all these years they are already in Ceylon not enough to get citizenship rights? Ceylon can implement this agreement in such a way that these figures can become a mockery. For instance, it can include among the 5.25 lakhs those who want to stay in Ceylon and include among the three lakhs those who do not wish to stay in Ceylon. The result will be that 5.25 lakhs will come away under pressure and the bulk of the three lakhs will come away voluntarily. What is the meaning of this 5.25 lakhs and 3 lakhs. I know the Government has a ready-made answer: the agreement is going to be implemented by a joint committee. I

want to tell the House that soon after the Indian and Pakistani citizenship Act was signed in 1949, our High Commissioner in Ceylon, Mr. V. V. Giri offered to help the people of Indian origin to fill in applications for Ceylon citizenship. I saw Mr. Giri sitting in the Central Hall yesterday and if Mr. Shastri or our Foreign Minister likes, they can consult him. Then the Ceylon Government sent a diplomatic protest to New Delhi saying that the High Commissioner was interfering with the internal affairs of Ceylon. Does our Foreign Minister think that our members in the joint committee will be able to do anything which does not please the Ceylon Government? Let us see how the Ceylon Government implemented the spirit of the agreement signed just a month ago. Employees who are of Indian origin working in firms were asked to quit service. An announcement has been made about the creation of a separate electorate for the Indian citizens. Is this the way to honour the agreement signed in good faith? The ink has not dried before Ceylon has started to show what a rotten paper it is. Let us see the psychology behind this proposal. A Ceylon Indian leader when he was in Madras recently told me that even now there are small numbers of Indian voters in the estate areas in some constituencies. They can tilt the balance with their marginal votes in favour of one candidate or another. The Ceylon Government has discovered a device for this: put them in separate electoral registers: the problem is solved. Their cry will be a cry in the wilderness. The Apartheid policy is formulated and the policy of segregation is finalised. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that we are completely fooled to go into this agreement and we have proved ourselves to be little children in diplomacy. I take my hat off—to use an English expression—to the Prime Minister of Ceylon for her diplomatic skill. She is the victor and Shastri is the vanquished. Mr. Shastri himself has confessed that she is a tough lady to deal with and she has proved herself to be a tough

lady. After this agreement, she was given an enthusiastic welcome at the Ceylon airport; she is the hero, successful hero or the drama. . . . (*An Hon. Member: Heroine*). In a statement issued on her arrival at Colombo, Mrs. Bandaranaike said this much:

"The Indian Government has for the first time recognised its obligations to this category of persons irrespective of their wishes."

Mr. Speaker, I request you to note: "irrespective of their wishes". We have undertaken this responsibility, irrespective of the wishes of the people in Ceylon, which the late Prime Minister refused to undertake. I want to ask you, Sir, whether these wisemen sitting here are wiser than the late Prime Minister. I say "shame" to those people for their failure not to understand the implications of the agreement they have signed: Permit me to offer my strong condemnation to these chicken-hearted men. Excuse me for saying so. Did the Government of India do anything to ascertain the wishes of hundreds of thousands of innocent people who had known no other place except their tea estate? Torn from their roots, their language, culture, climate and food they are going to be thrown into Dandakaranya, Rajasthan and other places. I want to ask you, Sir, in all humility: what harm these people have done to merit this punishment at the hands of this Government? And to the eternal shame of Tamilnad, I regret to say, one of my countrymen, the Minister of the Madras Government, Mr. Ramaiah, was a signatory to this agreement or a party to this criminal document. The Government had no right to do this. I was told in the morning that Mr. Ramaiah has given a note of dissent to this particular document that has not been made public so far. If it is so, it is the duty of the Government of India to circulate that note to the people of this country and I hope the hon. Minister will clarify this.

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no note of dissent by Mr. Ramaiah.

Shri Nambiar: No protest?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no note of protest either.

Shri Manoharan: Thank you. The Government of India has no right, legal or moral, to do anything except as a friendly mediating country to help the two parties in Ceylon to reach a peaceful settlement. Forget not, Sir, the bungling of the Government of India in regard to settlers in Burma has strengthened the hands of Mrs. Bandaranaike. In conclusion, I request the Government to consider this and see that justice is done. My only request to the Government is to scrap the document because the Ceylon Government has already treacherously repudiated it. If the Government of India feels it is impossible to do so, I request them to leave this matter to the people of Indian origin in Ceylon. Let them not forget that the people of Indian origin in Ceylon are not cowards as these people here are; in no time they can paralyse the economy of the Government of Ceylon. Therefore, leave it to the people to decide or scrap the document in view of the fact that the Government of Ceylon had already repudiated the agreement. You should try to give life to the Nehru-Kotelawala pact reached in 1954. I wish that the External Affairs Minister and the Prime Minister should consider over this matter and give those people their fundamental rights. Failing this, time will give correct punishment to the people who have simply killed and slain the rights of the people of Indian origin in a country where they are expecting some help from their country of origin.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Mr. Speaker, there have been great changes in recent times and our Foreign Minister had already indicated all those things; he referred to our approach and the loss of a great man at home. Through all these

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

changes, our foreign policy has continued to be the same. It is not because of its rigidity, because non-alignment stresses that every problem that faces the country is decided on merits. So, rigidity is not in its character. It has succeeded because of its flexibility, because of the correctness of the Nehru line.

Some people quoted Izrael and asked, "Is that non-alignment? Why Izrael is treated in one way and other countries in another way." May I ask them, do they consider the United States of America aligned or non-aligned? Surely, they are aligned. In the Geneva agreement over Laos, was not China a signatory along with the United States of America? Was that not a recognition, *de jure* and *de facto*, of the Chinese Government. I ask, is that alignment? Sir, when you test a policy, you do not take little cases here or there, which for special reasons are treated differently. It is the broad approach which we have to take into account and the broad approach is right, because in spite of our non-alignment we have received economic aid and military aid from all parts of the world. That itself is its success.

Of all the recent changes, the one that has had a great impact on the minds of the people in this country and especially of this House, is the explosion of the atom bomb by China. Those who advocate that we should do the same stress that after all it is a weapon of war and if you are preparing for war, it is good that you choose the most efficient weapon, and that atom bomb is one of the best weapons of the world. That is an argument. About the deterrents, unless you are prepared to strike back, deterrent does not serve as a deterrent. Anyway, I am not going into that now. My point is, that in this approach there is something to be said about it.

Others ask, what about the cost. The cost varies from Dr. Bhaba's

Rs. 30 lakhs to something like Rs. 50 crores which perhaps was mentioned somewhere by Shri Krishna Menon.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):
Dr. Bhaba mentioned Rs. 3 lakhs.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: We are not going into the mathematics of it. Roughly it is between these two extremes. Even if it is Rs. 30 lakhs or Rs. 5 lakhs when we decided to reject the bomb, were we considering the cost of it? Was it the reason why we said we would not go in for atom bombs? When we are going to spend thousands of crores of rupees on defence, we can spend as well some money on the atom bomb. There was a time when we were capable of having an Indian atom bomb but we rejected the idea.

I ask, what about the test ban treaty. They say of course the conditions have changed and China has dropped the atom bomb and so we should also change and be prepared to meet that situation. I say that approach is not correct. In 1958 China got the first reactor from Soviet Russia, and there was a group of people—the General Electric Corporation—who made a study in 1959. In 1960 their report was published in which they said that China was capable of and would explode a bomb in 1963 and was capable of and could have a stockpile by 1966. There were other American experts on Chinese affairs, who gave a different date, and every chancery in the world knew that China was preparing and would explode a bomb. So, we also knew. I think the Prime Minister himself said once or twice that China might have an atom bomb. Knowing that, we came to an agreement which is known as the test ban treaty. Surely, if this thing was known, if these gentlemen who want us to have the atom bomb now, should have advised us then, that we should not sign the test ban treaty and that we should go ahead with the manufacture of the bomb. This reflex action

philosophy will lead us nowhere. The grasshopper mind is never fruitful. That is the consideration.

But there is one thing that I would say about this treaty. Treaty is the first step in the process of complete disarmament. If that first step is not followed by other steps, then this treaty has no value. For that I would like to stress that a time will come when these signatories themselves, apart from China having a bomb or not, will begin to say that we are only ensuring the capacity for the nuclear powers to destroy the world and at the same time ensuring our own vulnerability to this attack. That is an untenable position. So, these signatories should bring about collective pressure on the nuclear powers that if this treaty is to stand, they must also stop producing nuclear armaments. On the other hand, there have been underground tests. Why should the rest of the world follow a particular course, while the others who have got the power and also the advantage should continue without any hindrance or without any comment or without any criticism? This is also not right.

Shri Nath Pai and I think Shri Frank Anthony said that China did not care for world opinion and did not listen to the Cairo Conference's advice and is not reliable; that you cannot trust her and her actions and so on. Was world opinion in favour of the test by the United States of America and the Soviet Union? The world opinion was against that also. To be fair to China, China never accepted this theory: Mao Tse-tung's belief and philosophy is that power comes from the mouth of the gun. He has also always declared that war is a policy, and he was surely preparing. You cannot blame him for that.

The other argument is that China is not reliable and it may attack India and other countries and make them communist and conquer and expand and all that. I would like to bring to the notice of this House a historical fact. When France, because of Viet Nam was in difficulties, asked for aid

from the United States of America, the late John Foster Dulles offered twice, atom bombs to George Bidault, but the former French Foreign Minister refused to use them in Viet Nam. I ask my friend in the American lobby, is that an act with which you can say that it is not the exact parallel with what you are expecting from China. If you have got any doubt, you can refer to the *Life of Dulles* by Drummond and Coblenz. This is a fact. France did not accept it, though she was in great difficulty. It preferred to give Viet Nam to the Viet Nameese rather than have it with the use of atomic bombs. Why? because France knew, as the whole world knows, that one atomic bomb dropped anywhere in the world will lead to a major world war. For, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States of America or any country in the world can tolerate the use of bomb by any one because of the doctrine of self-preservation.

After saying that, I would also tell this House that after all, the atom bomb is not an unmixed evil. Historians say that there would have been no French Revolution or American Revolution or Russian Revolution if there was no gun powder. It is not only an instrument of destruction, but it has also widened in its own way the boundaries of human liberty and progress. We are too near the event of the atom bomb to realise its effects, the political impact it will have on the minds of the people of the world. Some things are already evident. It has not only made possible the control of outer space, but apart from that, the world has come to realise that and physical force is a thing which can be a solvent for international problems. It has proved the inefficacy of physical force.

What gain has any country in the world got from the atom bomb? Has it helped France in Viet-Nam or Algiers? Has it helped Great Britain in Suez or Cyprus? Has it helped the USA anywhere in this wide world? This is only a terror. China said that it is a paper tiger. Because China has exploded one atom bomb, we are

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

making a paper tiger a real tiger. That is not the correct approach. This atom bomb has become the Achilles heel of big powers. If there was no atom bomb the USA and Soviet Union would have had a greater control of the world than they have with the possession of the atom bomb.

What was the secret of the success of the small countries? They had no arms. My friends on the other side mock at ethical considerations. Was it not the followers of one born in the cloister who shook the Roman Empire? Was it not the followers of 'the naked fakir' who shook another empire? All those countries had no arms, no strength, no organisation, but still it was the ideal, the spirit, that moved them, that made powerful arms absolutely useless.

We have already demonstrated that in India, with our faith in democracy, we have been able to stem the tide of communism. We have kept all the frontiers free to political thought. Compare that with what physical force has done. What has America done? 38th Parallel, 17th Parallel, Berlin Wall—these are the achievements of physical force of a country which has got a whole atomic arsenal that too on military lines, politically unstable. We, without any arms, have been able to stem the tide of communism, because we have belief in a certain ideal and if we want to check communism, we have to do that by another bigger ideal.

I appeal to this House: Do not mock at ethical considerations. They are more potent than we are ready to grant. What we require is the national will. Are we creating out nation in that manner? Have we created a nation so that if one is hurt in Himalayas, another feels the pain in Cape Comorin? Look at our villages with people having less than one acre each and facing the cities for employment and the upper few having an easy life in big cities. Do you require a hydrogen bomb to demolish that? You have to build a fortress so that when any aggressive power in the world comes, it meets 450 million guerillas.

So, I believe Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was right in discarding the bomb. I do not want to lean on him, because that is dangerous, because once you do that, you have dogmas deviationism, revisionism, etc. Shastriji is right when he says that he will have to make a decision himself and rely on his own brain power. There is a Russian proverb that you cannot fix one man's head on another man's shoulders. We have to take decisions ourselves and that should be a national decision. I personally believe it would be a great mistake if we make the atom bomb. Before we take the decision, we must be honest to ourselves, and will say that even if a country like Pakistan gets a bomb either by manufacture or by borrowing, we will not change our policy. Otherwise, it is better to have your bomb straightway and not wait even for this to happen and then to react. No such step should be taken because it is a weapon which absolutely cannot be used and will not be used. Today the whole of Asia and Africa are a dumping ground for all the junks from the armament manufacturers of the world. When we require machines for production, you are importing a machine of destruction. This is a road which will lead you nowhere even if you succeed. Therefore, I plead with the House to discard this bomb.

Shastriji has taken the road of peace. He is creating conditions to extend the area of peace. If you keep that in mind you understand his approach all the problems of Nagaland, Ceylon, Stateless people, Pakistan and China. If you extend the area of peace, that itself is a great service. Today what Asia and Africa need is not atom bomb or military power. They want peace to build themselves up. If for 20 or 25 years there is peace and the Afro-Asian powers come to an understanding that they will freeze all the frontiers, they will build themselves up. India is a very big country with a big voice. It has got a moral, social and ethical approach. I think if we move in that

direction, we will make an impact on world opinion.

Shri Karni Sinhji (Bikaner): Sir, I have just returned from a trip of the Far East on my way back from Tokyo and I stopped over at Burma for 3 days and saw the difficult conditions in which our Indian people are living there. Because of that, I will confine my speech very briefly to the problems of Indians in Burma. I returned home a very unhappy man because in the three days I spent in Rangoon I had the opportunity of meeting quite a few thousand Indian citizens who placed their problems before me in the hope that I will be able to raise them before the Parliament of our country. I gave them my assurance that I would do everything possible to acquaint the hon. Minister opposite and my brother Members here with the problems and difficulties of Indian citizens in Burma.

I would like to say publicly that I was told by our brethren in Burma that the Indian ambassador there, Adm. Katari, was an excellent choice and that he is doing a wonderful job there trying to promote Indo-Burmese friendship. There has been a slight misconception both in Burma and in our own country that a large number of Indians who have gone across to Burma have at some stage or other exploited the country they visited. During my brief stay, I had occasion to visit many institutions like schools and hospitals and I was very happy to see that a large number of buildings were put up by Indians and presented to the institutions in Burma. Therefore it would not be correct to say that Indians have exploited the Burmese.

One of the most important points that not only the Indian Ambassador but also, I am sure, the Government here and all of us feel, is to prevent the panic in the minds of the Indian people there. As you are no doubt aware, nationalisation and what is now termed as the Burmese way of socialism has created a very difficult

situation for our Indians, particularly those, about four lakhs, who remain now in Burma and who wish to migrate to India. They are in a very difficult predicament. I feel that some sort of assurance has to be given to them to prevent the panic that has been caused in their minds.

While I was there, a number of institutions run by Indians presented their problems to me in the hope that I would place them before Parliament. I shall read out their problems so that I can place them correctly. The first one is:

“Facilities for those Indians wishing to return to India by providing adequate shipping space and publicising dates of sailings necessary to prevent panic.”

I believe that the last ship is going to sail around the first week of December and there are no further sailings to help the migration of Indians from Burma to India. I feel that the Government of India should definitely make arrangements for more shipping space for at least the next twelve months so that there will be no panic and the people there can migrate in a steady way.

Secondly, they want:

“People of Indian origin with Burmese naturalisation wishing to visit India should be granted visas more easily by India.”

The third thing that they have said is that fate of the people of Indian origin and who elected Burmese citizenship and whose husbands or wives are still Indian citizens is extremely pitiable. Many of them have sent their wives and children to India for educational and other reasons. They have lost their jobs and even trade and are unable to send any money to their dependents or to come to India. Under prevailing immigration laws their wives and children are not allowed entry into Burma. If they renounced Burmese citizenship they would be allowed to come away to India but they are facing difficulties in getting Indian passports from the Indian Embassy. A

[Shri Karni Singhji]

solution to this problem calls for a higher priority on humanitarian grounds and visas should be issued to them as heretofore.

The next point they have mentioned is that measures to rehabilitated the emigrating Indians must be taken simultaneously. Resettlement aid should be given to those Indians who wish to return to India. They have said that this may be done by the Centre and the respective States from where these people originally hailed.

Fifthly, they said, a certain amount of priority to returning Indians in trade, agriculture and other vocations should be given. For example, in Rajasthan a good number of the trading community could be absorbed for the developing industrial complex of the State and similarly a good number of cultivators can find occupation in agricultural pursuits in the Rajasthan Canal area etc. Every State may create venues for their quick and easy resettlement.

These, Sir, are briefly the points that were raised and I place them before the House. Both India and Burma are ancient countries, both sovereign countries, who have had in the past very close cultural ties, and I am sure all of us in India are keen to see that the friendship that has existed over the last few generations will continue to exist between the people of Burma and India so that the citizens of our country and, for that matter, their country can live in peace.

I do feel that of late, due to foreign exchange problems that exist in our country, not enough Indian people or delegations or Members of Parliament in a deputation form have been able to go across to the countries in the far east. I would request the hon. Minister to see that there is greater movement of delegations and cultural delegations between India and Burma and, for that matter, between other far eastern countries also.

I think it would be a good idea if sports teams from India, say, for ins-

tance, in Hockey or Football, are allowed to tour the far eastern countries. As you know, sports is one of the biggest ways by which people can be bound together in different parts of the world. Admittedly, foreign exchange restrictions do come in the way of sports teams moving round, but I think in the far east they should be permitted to tour for creating greater goodwill between our countries.

Mr. Speaker, while I was in the far east—that means, Cambodia and Burma—I did notice that there was a great deal of misunderstanding about our country and about our foreign policy. I feel that there has to be a greater effort towards bringing about greater friendship between these countries. I am sure the hon. Minister across there is conscious of this and everything possible will be done.

Before I conclude, Sir, I would like to just mention one thing for the sake of my hon. friends who perhaps have not visited these far east countries of late. One of the greatest virtues that we have in our country is the fact that we are a free country. We have learnt to live as free people, but few people realise the virtues of a free country. One or two days in the far east will convince you that we are lucky to have got independence, that at least we are free and we can live like free human beings in a free country. I hope more Indians will get an opportunity to visit the far eastern countries so that when they come back they will realise that they can count on our blessings as citizens of a free country, and India still remains the bulwark of freedom against countries who do not believe in our way of thinking.

Sir, in the end, I would request the hon. Minister, if he would be kind enough, to tell us as to what policy he wishes to follow with regard to the Indians who wish to leave Burma now and come back to India so that, I am sure, the panic that is prevailing in Burma will be alleviated to some extent.

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in a few days from now our Prime Minister will be able to take up the visit to London and to have conversations with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. Almost at the same time, I suppose, our Minister of External Affairs will be leading the delegation to the United Nations. I am sure—speaking for myself and on behalf of the Members of this House—all of us would want our best wishes to go with them in the most emphatic way, namely, that they carry the support of this House and of the country in regard to the declared policies of our nation. I say advisedly “our nation” because while, as should be expected from a democratic assembly, there will be voices of dissent, whatever is our foreign policy it has had the endorsement of this House time after time, three times each year for the last so many years, and we cannot easily go back upon it without violating principles as well as large number of international commitments.

Having said that—I do not say this by way of criticism—I must express my regret that the Minister of External Affairs has not been able to tell us about the situation that he would be facing at the United Nations. I want to say in all conscience, and I feel very much concerned about it, that in a sense it is more proximate than even the menace of the atom bomb—I say proximate, I do not say serious—because the United Nations faces a crisis today, and unless the countries, whether committed or not either way, act with wisdom, act with tact and, what is more, with initiative, it is likely that the United Nations may face probably the most serious crisis in its history during the last twenty years and it may lead to a break-up.

I have no desire to go into the merits of this question called the “United Nations Levy”. But both sides, whatever the rights or wrongs are, are too heavily committed, for each one of them has brought a conflict and it is quite unlikely and in fact it is impossible, whether they

would resile. Therefore, as have been the traditions of the Assembly in the past, we have to find a way—I do not say this nation alone—where this conflict does not take place. In this only hope for the sustenance of such counsels of peace as they may exist. We take it for granted that in the last 20 years many calamities have been averted and as someone said, it is far better for people to talk at each other rather than shoot at each other. Therefore, I do hope that this country will not in any way become involved, on one side, in this controversy against its own principles, against its own history, or be dragged into precipitating a situation. In that connection, I think it is necessary for us to understand as legislators that a great deal of the so-called information has been out around which is totally incorrect. It has been said that the World Court, which is the highest legal authority, not authority but a legal tribunal, the highest legal body in this world, has pronounced on this question and said that the moneys that are owing to the United Nations ought to be paid, shall we say, by France, the Soviet Union, and various Latin American countries and so on, that is, those who have not paid. I want to say have for the purpose of record, if for nothing else, that no such pronouncement has been made by the World Court. All that the World Court has said is that what has been incurred by the United Nations is an “expense”, that is to say, it was not anything else, it was an expense of the United Nations. How that expense is to be met, that is a matter for the charter of the United Nations. Article 43 of the charter does not provide for a levy upon anybody and, what is more, the basis of all this, what is called uniting for a peaceful Resolution, which is Resolution No. 777 of the United Nations General Assembly, at its fifth session that did not provide at all, it did not contemplate in fact, that they should make a levy. In the Korean war the States who participated paid for it. The principle of no taxation without representation was applied there as well.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

But, apart from all these legalities, it is a political issue and as a result of our lack of appreciation of the gravity of this, if a crisis were to arise it would be a serious matter. Even when some years ago on account of the Algerian difficulty France walked out of the Assembly great nations and small felt that the Assembly was weakened thereby and our government, this country, assisted that body in bringing France back. It is not a question of whether we like a country or not. In 1921 when the Japanese walked out of the League of Nations, it was on grounds which would have been approved, that is to say, they walked out because the League of Nations would not approve of racial equality. But the effect of that walk out was the break-up of the League of Nations. So, I hope such a situation would be avoided. Our permanent delegate at the United Nations has also pointed out that at no time has this matter been seriously discussed by those who are competent to do so, namely, by various committees and so on. There have been from the Fifth Assembly onwards a Collective Measures Committee to which this matter has probably never been referred. The United Nations carries considerable debt, but that is no reason to tear the charter to pieces.

What is more, if we subscribe to a position whereby by a majority votes questions of war and peace can be decided, then the world will be in a very bad way indeed. I have no desire to name countries, but I am quite certain that the feeling of importance of certain nations of the United Nations has changed in the last few years. With the coming in of many emerging nations it is no longer possible to obtain votes as before and so their influence has been less than before. It is for these reasons that I want to lay stress on this particular factor, that our government does not involve us in something that looks like a departure

from the principles, and the principal provisions of the charter by making us aligned in any way.

The only solution in this matter would be to obtain time, play for time and obtain postponement of the meeting of the United Nations; when you play for time in the United Nations, always something happens; so, we have to play for time with such skill as we may possess, with such ability as we may have, by working with other people to obtain a postponement of the whole question. It would not be obtained by direct negotiations by either of the parties concerned.

Much of the time of this debate has been taken, particularly the Minister's speech, on two parts of the world, one, a part of our country and, another, outside our country—Nagaland and Pakistan. Speaking for myself, I decline to debate Nagaland in a foreign affairs debate. It is part of this country and I think it would be very wrong for us to debate Nagaland on Foreign Affairs debate. Queerly we have got this peculiar situation—we look upon Pakistan as an internal question and Nagaland as an external question. Pakistan is always dealt with by the Home Ministers and Commerce Ministers and various other people. Pakistan is an external question. Pakistan is a country that has committed aggression upon us for the last seventeen years and everything she has done is with the object of blackening the image of India in the world and at no time has she given us any peace on the 2,300 miles of our border. She has been aligned with the Western Powers on the one hand and China on the other in the hope of harassing us one way or the other.

Therefore, my submission with regard to Pakistan will be that while negotiations are enjoined upon us under the provisions of the United Nations charter, those negotiations cannot be on the basis of the surrender of sovereignty, whether it be to China, Pakistan or anybody else. I

believe, therefore, that while aggression is going on, while in the month of October our cease-fire line was violated more than 190 times and by almost small-scale battles have taken place, I think it is entirely inappropriate that we sit round the table and talk to them until they publish the terms of their agreement with China in regard to the surrender of our territories. That is to say, if we negotiate without taking up this matter, without entering a caveat about it, then to a certain extent we condone it and our condonement would be very bad from our point of view. These are the main matters that one has in mind on this subject.

Then, with regard to our general relations abroad, a great deal is said in this House about relations with African countries. This is not the first time that I am saying this, Mr. Speaker, that our relations with other countries, either today, tomorrow or the day after, have to be governed by the principle of reciprocity and mutual interest. Our interests are best served by reciprocal treatment, but reciprocity does not mean reprisals. Yet, that has been the tone of some of the observations in regard to some countries. We cannot lay down the law for other people and when I come to speak of changes in the governments of the world I shall refer to it. It is governed by reciprocity. And having regard to the backward state of development of some of the emergent countries all these years and the fact that the Africans have as much desire and the Latin Americans have as much desire to cultivate our friendship as we have to cultivate theirs, it is a great mistake to think that they are always at the receiving end and not at the giving end. And in this connection I may say that it is not the amount of propaganda leaflets or papers or the gloss or glaze of the paper on which it is printed but the character of the individuals that counts, and I have no doubt that the Minister has this in mind. Nothing is more harmful to our position in regard to

African countries than the wrong person in the place. And it is not merely a political question, it is largely a psychological question. That is to say, there are some individuals with whom the unfamiliarity of previous political relations or racial practices unconsciously project themselves. There are some persons, whose names may not be mentioned, who have a bad record in this matter and I think it would pay the Government to clean themselves of this past history, not to penalise those people but in order that the interests of this country may be well served.

Then, references have been made to changes in government in other countries. I think it is a truism to say that a change of government in any country is an internal matter. That is quite true, but when they are countries like the United States, the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom, whatever happens there, economical, political or whatever it may be, it has an effect upon other countries on account of the place they occupy in this world. But, at the same time, our judgments about them have to be discreet on the one hand and limited by such knowledge as we have on the other.

I will now first take up the Soviet Union. It is interesting that the people who are shedding most tears about Mr. Khrushchev are the people who did not want to hear the sound of his name when he was the head of the government. It is surprising how he has suddenly become popular. He was a good friend of this country, a nice person to talk to and so on and so forth. If the Soviet people found that they had to make other arrangements, that is their business. Now the question is whether it affects the policies, and the main aspect of policy that would be affected according to newspapers, not so much today but thirty days ago, is Sino-Soviet relations. I think you would be displaying if I may say so with respect, lack of degree of historical perspective in thinking that because of these changes there will be changes in Sino-Soviet

[Shri Krishna Menon]

relations because, if anything, the Soviet Government would be the last government in the world to adopt Munichism as a policy, to sacrifice one of their individuals in order to appease China.

Moreover, the trouble with China results from China's expansionism. The fact that China claims nearly 300,000 square miles of Russian territory is not washed out by the speeches made nor do the large number of skirmishes—I will not go into the numbers of them; they are going into well over four figures in the last two years. Their claims in regard to other matters are far more important than the much-advertised ideological conflicts.

Therefore, we do not have to wait for their assurance; or otherwise. In fact, it is undignified for us to wait for their assurances. Our relations will, again, be governed by reciprocity, that is to say, if Soviet relations towards us change to our disadvantage, naturally, to the best of our ability, we will react in that way. That is how an independent nation behaves. But purely from the point of view of historic circumstances there is no likelihood and indication whatsoever of any basic change in the policy of the Soviet Union.

This morning it was said by someone as to how it was that a man, who was worshipped, idolised and spoken of so much, this way or the other, was turned out overnight. That, it is argued, was because of the autocratic, autalitic or monorehthic character of the Soviet system or whatever it is. I have recollection of a gentleman, called Mr. now Sir. Winston Churchill. He was considered to be the hero of the war irrespective of party ideologies and worshipped by everybody. The war was won, he came back and he was turned down by his people at the polls by a tremendous majority against him.

Shri Ranga: But he remained there in the House as Leader of the Opposition.

Shri Krishna Menon: These changes take place. Many changes take place. That is their system of government.

Shri Ranga: That is exactly the point.

Shri Krishna Menon: The Leader the Opposition in that House does not constantly interrupt in this way.

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend has no chance of coming over here.

Shri Krishna Menon: All I was trying to prove was that it is possible that changes take place. I am not for a moment saying that the British people should have turned out Mr. Churchill or that it was expected or it was not expected, and, therefore, he has gone down in their own estimation or otherwise. I have no knowledge or means of knowing in what estimation Mr. Khrushchev is held by the Russian people. I am more concerned in considering, what the hon. gentleman is also concerned about, whether it will add to our difficulties.

Shri Ranga: Quite right.

Shri Krishna Menon: I say that it will not add to our difficulties not because I have any prophetic knowledge but merely from assessment of the historic circumstances of this case. The Soviet Union has not taken on our quarrels. They difficulties with China are Sino-Soviet difficulties. It so happens that there are parallels between the Sino-Soviet position and the Sino-Indian portion. To that extent they are similar and that is all there is to it.

We have also had a change of government in the United States in the normal way and we are glad to think that the forces of reaction have had no triumph whatsoever; on the other hand, Mr. Lyndon Johnson had a landslide victory. Both the Soviet Union and the United States seem to have exchanged messages saying that their policies do not change. But that also applies to their positions in the United Nations. I believe, they propose to hold on to stubbornness in this way.

But the change which one is more familiar with is the change in the United Kingdom. After 12 years or so the Labour Party has won a victory. That again is a domestic matter, however close they may be to us or we may be to them as individuals. But, at the same time, it is a matter of some relief to us, if I may put it that way. It is something we have to congratulate ourselves about. Most of the members of this Government are people who have been for the last 30 years, in one way or another, identifying themselves with Indian freedom. A good few of them have gone about speaking or writing things of that character and as Member of Parliament put down all the questions against the Empire in those days. That is to say, they have adopted as a common territory with its frontiers, the frontiers of liberty. That does not mean that what they do would always be approved by us any more than what we did is what they expected in many cases when our campaigns for liberty were going on.

We have also reason to congratulate ourselves for the attitude that has been taken with by Wesminister regard to Southern Rhodesia which, by no means, was an easy matter. People might have warned them about the precipitation of another Boer War or whatever it was, but the Government has acted with great courage. We are not here discussing British politics, but the lesson for us and for the whole of the democratic world, the world with a parliamentary system of government, is that they have to the letter and spirit carried out what was put down in the election manifesto. There would be difficulties in regard to South Africa on account of the impacts and the pressures of their Defence Mandarins.

Now we come to one of the more difficult parts on which one may speak that is, this atomic explosion by China. There is little doubt that the test explosion carried out by China adds to the menace to India, but it

should be said at the same time that it adds to the menace to the world and adds to the menace to China; that is to say, it is not a question of a Chinese explosion only, but the proliferation of these weapons whereby what was called the fourth power problem was made into the fifth power problem by France when France exploded this device and now China has done so. So, this goes on.

I think, it is necessary for us, on the one hand, not to influence people's minds or browbeat them by merely speaking in terms of the horrors of the bomb. I think, it is necessary for us to understand what an atomic weapon means. Here, I regret to say,—I think, it is a bad day for a parliamentary government—when permanent officials are allowed to make speeches on matters which go very near policy. Policy is a matter for Government and not for anyone else. I have said it at another place also and I still appeal to the Prime Minister to restrain his officials, whether people go to Nagaland or to the Atomic Energy Commission, and tell them that whatever information they have is not their private property. It is not even the property of this Parliament. It is the property of the Government. The reason is a very simple one. If a civil servant makes a speech, we cannot attack him. He is not answerable to this House, he is only answerable to his minister. Therefore if they must have protection, if they want to have the advantages of remaining in the purdah, they must accept the responsibilities also.

This is not a technological question as it specially abounds in inaccuracies and has affected an unnecessary controversy.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): To what speech is the hon. Member referring? Is it to Shri Bhabha's observation? It is not Shri Bhabha who has said this. It is a paper which was read at Geneva and which was prepared by the U.S.A. Shri Bhabha has not said a word about it.

Shri Krishna Menon: I have said what I have to say.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: But he can also correct himself sometimes.

Shri Krishna Menon: I have said what I have to say that people, particularly in an organisation in regard to which a degree of secrecy, a degree of reticence in debate has been accepted by this House....

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Where is the secrecy? He is creating a misunderstanding. There is no secrecy which Shri Bhaba has given out.

Shri Krishna Menon: The hon. Member has had an opportunity of having is say.

With regard to the recent nuclear test explosion the general reaction in certain parts of the world is that a non-European, non-white nation has exploded a bomb and has, therefore, broken the monopoly. I submit that this is rather not a very realistic or a very highly intelligent way of looking at it. Why not break the monopoly of burglary, crime and things of that kind? China has committed one explosion—committed is the right word because it is a crime against humanity—France five, the United Kingdom 24, the Soviet Union 126 and the United States of America 330 since the time of the atomic test explosion in the April of 1945.

On the 2nd December, 1942, when for the first time on the campus of the University of Chicago the results of fusion were harnessed, there was a block in the University at that time, I believe, which had created a deal of consternation in the minds of people, latterly having brought a simple woman's reaction to this in what a sister wrote to her brother at that time.

She wrote:—

"Everybody is talking about the atomic bomb, of course; Everybody wants to have his say, and we hear the biggest nonsense."

It is not very unusual. It goes on:—

"People of good judgement abstain from any technical comment, and realise that it would be vain to seek who is the first author in a work which is the result of a vast collaboration."

It is all right. She then goes on to say:—

"All, however, are perplexed and appalled by its dreadful effects.... For my part I recommended you to God, Who alone can judge you morally."

16 hrs.

I believe, Earl Attlee has recently given out the facts that when the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on behalf of the allied armies, neither Mr. Truman nor Mr. Attlee, nor the other allied leaders knew anything about it, that is to say, anything about the radiation consequences. The atomic bomb kills merely by the expansion of air with such speed and such dimensions that it can literally be said that people are blown off to pieces in that way. Secondly, it kills by the tremendous heat that it generates. The work that the sun does in a billion years is condensed into the fission or fusion of all processes in a very short period. Thirdly, the worst effect of atomic explosion whether in war or by test explosions is radiation. It is said that a war is between nations, between soldiers or even between the people of nations. But now the atomic war becomes the extermination of the population as a whole, the mass extermination. And then it ceases to have any meaning. Over and above that, we have come to the position where even without war, future generations have been affected by these test explosions. It is estimated that with the test explosions that have already taken place, the results of ionization and radiation is such that there have been at least 4 to 5 million

children who are already born deformed. Over and above that, when you realise that this deformity is not in one generation—that is passed on—then you get the situation as it is.

Now, I come to the dimensions of it. We do not know what the power of this Chinese bomb is. As Mr. Kripalani said, our people have not been able to tell us. But on the whole, it may be a small device. Some people have called it a crude device, whatever it is. But assuming that it was the size of the Hiroshima bomb which had an explosive power of 20,000 tons T.N.T. that bomb is now used in order to create heat that is required for the fusion of the hydrogen bomb, that is to say, it is a trigger bomb and the average bomb today is 15 M. tons which has got an explosive power of 15 million tons of T.N.T. That is the average bomb. The biggest bomb was one which was exploded by the Russians in 1961, the 50 M. tons bomb. It is calculated by scientists, taking the population of the United States at 177 millions which it was in 1959—it is more now—on the first day of an atomic conflict, they will lose 42 million people and before the end of the few days, they will lose another 42 million people and still another 25 million people will be irradiated. Now I am making an allowance for a large number of shelters which would be built assuming that those shelters would be effective—nobody believes—and assuming that those shelters would be effective, they will probably be safe from radiation. It is also estimated that the number of bombs that the United States has—it is differently calculated—is probably 550 to 818 or something of that kind and, no doubt, the Russians have got an equal number of bombs, not including what is on the submarine *Polaris*, under the water. So, there is already in the world, what is called, the power to overkill, that is to annihilate the world more than once, not only just once.

That we come to the test explosion question. The main consideration in

people's mind is that if a neighbour has got a strong weapon, then it is only cautious to be armed with a similar weapon. That would be so if the weapon were either a weapon of war or a weapon of defence. There is no defence against the atomic bomb on a large scale. It is then said that it could be a deterrent. Now, the deterrent power of the atomic bomb comes from two considerations. Firstly if it has to be a deterrent, it must have the capacity of mass annihilation. That is to say, one little bomb would do nothing of the kind; it may create panic but it can't do anything more. It must have the capacity to destroy a country. That is to say, this country must have enough atomic bombs to destroy whatever country it wants to destroy. That is not enough. The atomic bomb is not potent unless you use it first. That is to say, we have to adopt the doctrine of preventive war and civilised nations would find it difficult to adopt that. But its more immediate troubles for us are as to what would be the reaction upon other countries. Say, for example, what would be the reaction of Ceylon—I am not referring to the immigration question? Then, what will be the reaction of small countries, the neighbours of ours? What will be the effect in regard to Pakistan? She has now two sources of supply. She can get bombs from China if China makes the bomb—or she can get bombs from the United States of America as she has a military alliance with that country. So, there will be another nuclear armed country.

The second main difficulty is this that we have now come to a state of affairs in technological developments in the atomic weapons where it is possible to produce atomic weapons of much smaller dimensions with the result that—people have spoken about it—it might become from the point of view of portability a conventional weapon. And that means, two small countries acquiring them can have an atomic border war. It looks like a border war but in no time it

[Shri Krishna Menon]

becomes a war of radiation throughout the world. That is to say, the whole world becomes irradiated in this way. When we consider that the effects are also of it from the fallout material, like carbon 14 or iodine 137, or something of that kind, all these materials have a half life. The scientists have calculated that half the life is supposed to go off quickly and the remaining half extends from anything like 30 to 8000 years. They have got this much capacity of irradiating the whole world. I do not want to go into details. But I may say this much that when one substance drops on the crop, we directly consume it; another substance goes into the soil and comes up to the tuber or the plant itself and irradiates the plant in that way. Even if anybody survives under atomic destruction—we need not go into the atomic destruction at the present time—no one can escape from the effects of radiation. It is not my submission to leave it like that.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, various methods have been suggested. My submission is this that if the Chinese explosion has proved anything, has made any demands upon others, it is this that this country and other countries must now enormously increase their energies and everything else to have the atomic weapon completely abolished. That is to say, unless there is a prohibitive policy of this country against the manufacture, the stock-piling, the utilisation or the traffic in atomic weapons, the world will not be safe for anybody to live in. There are other countries—one may not give their names—which are capable of doing it. The United States and the Soviet Union are two big countries with great responsibilities irrespective of what we think of them. They are not likely to use them in a big way. I am quite sure that . . .

Mr. Speaker: Now the hon. Member might conclude.

Shri Krishna Menon: I want two minutes more.

Mr. Lyndon Johnson has spoken about this. There is no doubt that

everybody feels that we are up against a very serious difficulty. Any amount of speaking, any amount of our expression of opinion or excitement, would not add very much to it. It may well be for other reasons that some people have mentioned that we may not have to make a bomb at all or we may fail in doing so. But by giving vent to all this feeling, that we are inclined that way or doing that way we are breaking the promise that we have made to the world for the last 15 years. For the last 15 years, you have said this—that is another matter—but we signed the Moscow Ban Treaty only some months ago and only three months ago our Government asked our representative at Geneva to proclaim to the world that we shall not use nuclear power for destructive purposes. This is what Mr. Lyndon Johnson said in the middle of the election campaign:

“Before I start dropping bombs around . . . I would want to think about the consequences of getting American boys into a war with 700 million Chinese.”

“In a world such as this—a nuclear world—there is no room for bluster and bluff and belligerence. There is room only for courage, intelligence and reason.”

“The world's hopes for peace cannot be left with those who have no faith in the possibility of lasting agreements and who really predict war.”

We have made international commitments. Not only has this Parliament passed resolutions but we have signed the Moscow Ban Treaty—we have affixed our signature to it—and what is more even in Cairo we invited all other people to sign it. Now, if we are going to tell the world, having affixed our signature to the Moscow Ban Treaty six months ago, proclaimed our unqualified support for it afterwards and say, “We are going to break it”, what will be our capacity to bring down the atomic weapon?

Finally, I would submit that the possession of one of these small bombs or nuclear devices is a danger to us, for if China takes it into her head to drop a bomb on us in order to create panic, then she can easily tell the world that we dropped it on them, just as Pakistan does things to us and then says that we attacked her.

Therefore, the whole philosophy of this nuclear-free zone is partly based upon this. So, in no circumstances is either the interest or the security or the economy or prestige or morality or anything else of this country served by our entering the atomic race.

Shri Kolla Venkaiah (Tenali): At the outset, I would like to say that the problem of the overseas Indians, and the problem of people of Indian origin living in different countries is assuming serious proportions, and day by day it is assuming greater importance.

Last time, we had discussed the question of the Burmese Indians, and that issue has come up before the House several times. But their difficulties did not end there. My hon. friend Shri Karni Singhji has given some information regarding the difficulties faced by our people in Burma. I have got some other information with me that our Embassy is not at all paying proper attention to the people there. About 25,000 applications for emergency certificates are pending with the staff of our Embassy. Only about 360 applications are processed in a week by our Embassy staff. At this rate, if they continue to work the processing itself will take about one and a half years, and in any case not less than that. In addition to that, these people are asked to enclose their household certificates and discharge certificates also along with their application forms. These certificates are kept in the offices and those people are forced to starve and depend on friends for a number of days for their living. I

have got here a letter before me published in the working people's daily published in Burma, where they have explained the difficulties experienced by them in Burma. They are facing very serious difficulties there. People from our State, namely, Andhra Pradesh, are there, and scavengers or some menial workers there are attending to such work, but they are not given proper facilities and they are facing a very serious and critical position.

At this critical moment, we are failing these people. We are failing these overseas Indians not only in Burma, but in Ceylon in East Africa and everywhere else. This problem is cropping up again and again, but our Government are just not prepared to handle this problem, in fact, they are unprepared. In spite of the fact that every party including the ruling party, during the days of our national movement, and during the days of our struggle for Independence, gave lavish promises to the overseas Indians, they are being overlooked now, and they are not being given proper treatment. There is no mechanism or machinery to keep in touch with our people in different countries, whose number runs to several lakhs. There is no mechanism to keep in close contact with them and also to negotiate on the problem facing them.

All these people were taken away from our country during the British rule. At that time, they went and settled there. As to what their troubles are, how their mind is working, what their sentiments are, our Government does not know. Yesterday the Indo-Ceylon agreement was attacked and so many adverse comments were made from different sides of the House. Why? Are we against any agreement or any approach of give and take on such questions with neighbouring countries? No. We are for such an approach. We welcome it. Not only that. We are not at all against the

[Shri Kolla Venkaiah]

Prime Minister of Ceylon. We have the highest respect for her. She is the first woman Prime Minister in the whole world. She has bravely faced problems in developing her country. She nationalised all the foreign industries. She has taken bold steps in that direction and she deserves our respect. But the question is: did our Government take care to be in contact with the people there, to understand their sentiments and difficulties and did they try to evolve the necessary machinery to tackle those problems? They did not. Because of that, those people are facing rough weather. Tomorrow we may face a similar problem with regard to East Africa-Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar and so any other countries where people of Indian origin are suffering and are in a critical condition.

I would appeal to Government to be seized of this matter and treat it very seriously. They should prepare themselves to tackle it. They should have a separate organisation or department, if necessary, to look after the interests of overseas Indians.

It is true that all these people are living in countries which have become newly independent. Those countries are trying to build up their economy and in pursuance of that are undertaking very important and progressive reforms. But we must explain to them; we must say that we are not at all against those progressive reforms. We must be in support of those reforms also. But the point is that the legitimate interests of our Indian people, people of Indian origin, must be safeguarded. For that, proper arrangements must be made by Government. As regards difficulties faced by people of Indian origin in Burma, I can, if the External Affairs Minister wants, pass on the paper which I referred to.

Coming to the Cairo Conference, I have to state that our delegation, the External Affairs Minister and all of them, are out of tune with the situ-

ation. This ruling party has come to power because of the struggle of the Indian people against British imperialism. Our people carried on a bitter struggle against the British during the early forties and because of that, this Government came to power. But did they reflect those sentiments at the Cairo Conference of non-aligned nations? I do not think they have correctly reflected it.

Again the Tshombe incident did not bring credit to our Government or to the people of India. Our delegation abstained from voting against the presence of Tshombe in the Cairo Conference. That gentleman was responsible for the murder of a great patriot, Lumumba, but our Government has not the courtesy and the capacity to state it on the floor of the conference and oppose his inclusion or presence at that conference.

Not only that. I have seen many items of news in the press that our delegation repeatedly attempted to introduce amendments against the spirit of anti-imperialism reflected in the conference. If that is their understanding and policy of non-alignment, I think the Government is going far away from the spirit of the Cairo Conference. Even the statement of our Foreign Minister did not reflect the correct spirit of the Cairo Conference.

In the introduction to the Cairo declaration, it is said:

"Heads of States of Governments of non-aligned countries are well aware, however, that despite the present improvement in international relations, and notwithstanding the conclusion and signing of the Treaty of Moscow, sources of tension still exist in many parts of the world."

Which are the sources of this tension? Then the introduction to the declaration continues:

"This situation shows that the forces of imperialism are still powerful, and that they do not

hesitate to resort to the use of force to defend their interests and maintain their privileges."

This is the understanding of Cairo. Does the statement of our Foreign Minister reflect that idea?

The introduction to the declaration further states:

"The movements of national liberation, the heroic struggle against neo-colonialism, forms part of the common fighting towards freedom, justice and peace."

So, this declaration starts with the spirit of anti-imperialism. Not only that. It states:

"The heads of States of Governments of the non-aligned countries declare that lasting world peace cannot be realised so long as unjust conditions prevail, and people under foreign domination continue to be deprived of the fundamental right of freedom, independence and self-determination. Imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism constitute a basic source of international tension and conflict because they endanger world peace and security."

The declaration commences with these two paragraphs. It also states that imperialism uses many devices to impose its will on independent nations. It adds:

"The process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible. Colonial people may legitimately resort to arms to secure the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence if the colonial Powers persist in opposing their natural aspirations . . . The participants in the conference undertake to work unremittingly to eradicate all vestiges of colonialism and to combine all their efforts to render all necessary aid and support against colonialism and neo-colonialism."

Did the statement of our Foreign Minister reflect these sentiments? I do not think so. It is far away from the spirit of this declaration.

What does the conference say about peaceful co-existence. They say that they are convinced that peaceful co-existence cannot be fully achieved throughout the world without the "abolition of imperialism, colonialism and new colonialism". What is it? It is not just a compromise: they say that it is a fight against imperialism. In addition to that, I have to quote one more part:

"The Conference condemns the expressed intention of imperialist powers to establish bases in the Indian Ocean as a calculated attempt to intimidate the emerging countries of Asia and Africa."

If it were not for the extension of the policy of neo-colonialism and imperialism, what are these bases for in the eyes of our Government and our Foreign Minister? I do not see anything in this statement about the bases in the Indian Ocean.

The Seventh Fleet question came up in the House previously. To understand the proper intentions of the American Imperialism I will quote a statement from their Vice Admiral MacCairne. He put the American designs bluntly when he said:

"The new naval striking force should be concentrated on the Indian Ocean in order to retain for the free world . . ."

It is not for the defence of our country against China but for the free world:

"... to retain for the free world its advantages among the new States of the area."

They want to curb the newly independent nations. That is the intention of the American Imperialism. I wonder if the Government takes note of these.

About our relations with African countries, one of our friends had spoken, they are very weak. About

[Shri Kolla Venkaiah]

fifty newly emerging and independent countries participated in the Cairo Conference and most of them were freed after a bitter struggle against imperialism. Our attitude in that conference was to compromise between imperialism and its activities and the different States that are struggling against them. That attitude will not do; it will not be helpful to cultivate proper relations with the African countries.

Now, Sir, the Second Bandung Conference is before the world and our Government should have taken the initiative in making preparations and tried to impress on the other countries the necessity of preparation. I feel that the Government did not take proper interest in the issue.

Mr. Speaker: His throat is not helping him.

Shri Kolla Venkaiah: About the atom bomb I want to say a few words. Some of our friends say that we have to think in the direction of the Chinese atom blast. We have, however, to understand and properly analyse the events that have taken place. They did not start their preparations for the manufacture of this atom bomb or for the explosion of the atom bomb immediately after 1958 or 1962. They were making preparations from 1950 and in 1956-57 they had entered into an agreement with the Soviet Union. All this shows we should not fail in properly assessing the direction.

My hon. friends Shri M. R. Masani and Shri Frank Anthony wanted to highlight the dangers of this atom bomb to India and just guide us under the shelter of the American atomic umbrella. This is very dangerous. If you think that the manufacture of the atom bomb is necessary in the interests of defence of our country, try to depend on it, but do not depend on American imperialism, American imperialism or America, so to say, is the first country, the first

government, that has produced this atom bomb and used it against the Asian people. They manufactured it not as a deterrent but as a weapon to terrorise the world. So, other countries have come forward, and the Soviet Union has surpassed the American imperialism, and it has developed a strong deterrent and a protection for the socialist countries and the countries that have newly got independence. They are now for the proliferation of the atomic weapons.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. He should finish with the atom bomb!

Shri Kolla Venkaiah: In conclusion, I want to say one word regarding the developments, the intensive efforts of American imperialism, in the south-east Asian countries. America is intensifying its activities and our friends, Shri Masani especially, have said that because China is there, we must fight against them. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अणु शक्ति मंत्री (श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री) : स्पीकर महोदय, कल से इस एटम बम और चाइना विस्फोट के सम्बन्ध में यहां बहस चल रही है। मैं फारेन एफेयर्स के और विषयों पर या दूसरे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सावलों पर कुछ ज्यादा कहना नहीं चाहता हूं। मेरे साथी सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी, जब कल जवाब देंगे, तो वह उन बातों पर कहना पसन्द करेंगे। मैं कुछ बातें इस एटम बम के सम्बन्ध में आप के और सदन के सामने रखना चाहूंगा।

यह ठीक है, यह स्वाभाविक बात है कि जब चाइना ने एटम बम बनाया और एक्सप्लोड किया, तो हमारा दिल या दिमाग यह कहे कि हमें भी चट-पट एटम बनाना चाहिए और एटम बम का जवाब एटम

बम से देना चाहिए। मैं इसे अच्छी तरह समझ सकता हूँ। जो चिन्ता या जो परेशानी देश को हो, या पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को हो, उसे भी मैं अच्छी तरह समझ सकता हूँ। लेकिन हमारे लिए यह सोचने की बात है कि हम इस सम्बन्ध में अपना फैसला कैसे करें। और क्या इस बात की जरूरत नहीं है कि हम उसके सब पहलुओं पर, सब एस्पैक्ट्स पर, सब बातों पर अच्छी तरह से विचार कर के ही कोई निर्णय करें, या कुछ सदस्यों ने जो नीति को बदलने के बारे में कहा है, पूरी तरह विचार कर के ही हम उस पर कोई फैसला करें ?

मैं आदर्शवादिता के नाम पर, आइ-डियलिज्म के नाम पर, कोई बात यहां रखना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं श्री नाथपाई को यह विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि कोई गांधी नहीं है इस वक्त यहां, जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को चलाने की बात सोच सकता है। गांधी कोई एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के समीप नहीं आता है। यह तो हमारे जैसे कमजोर लोग हैं, जो इसे मंजूर करते हैं और अपनी कमजोरी में बड़े आदमियों का भी नाम ले लेते हैं और उनका सहारा हासिल करने की कोशिश करते हैं।

मैं इस सिलसिले में गांधी जी का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ और न गांधी जी के नान-वायलेंस के सिद्धान्त के अनुसार यह अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि साहब, हमें अहिंसा का रास्ता अद्यतयार करना चाहिए और उस वजह से हमें कोई एटम बम बगैरह बनाने की बात नहीं सोचनी चाहिए। मैं वह बात नहीं लाता। मैं मारल एस्पैक्ट को भी इस में नहीं लाना चाहूंगा, गौकि यह बात नहीं है कि मैं मारल एस्पैक्ट को कुछ कम महत्व देता हूँ, उसकी वैल्यू या कीमत कम करता हूँ। हम अपने जीवन में अपने को मजबूत न पाय, वह दूसरी बात है लेकिन कोशिश इस बात की करनी चाहिए कि हम उन वैल्यूज

को अपने सामने रखें, जिन की हम कद्र करते हैं।

अगर उस सवाल को भी हम कुछ देर के लिए हटा दें और मारल एस्पैक्ट और मारल पहलू की चर्चा न करें, फिर भी हमें सोचना चाहिए बिल्कुल एक प्रैक्टिकल, व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से कि हम एटम बम को बना कर क्या नतीजा, क्या परिणाम, हासिल करेंगे, कहां तक हम अपनी शक्ति और ताकत को बढ़ा सकेंगे, क्या हम बहुत हद तक—पूरी हद तक न सही—न्यूक्लियर पावर्ज की बराबरी में आ सकेंगे और उसका कितना बड़ा बोझा अपने देश पर पड़ेगा। इस के साथ ही साथ ऐसा कर के हम पीस के लिए ज्यादा कोशिश कर सकते हैं, क्या हम न्यूक्लियर वार-फ्रेयर या न्यूक्लियर वैंपन्ज के खिलाफ और ज्यादा मजबूती से आवाज उठा सकते हैं ? भारत अब तक यह करता रहा है। जवा-हरलाल जी की लीडरशिप में उसने दुनिया में शान्ति बनाए रखने में कुछ काम किया। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि पीस, शान्ति सुलाह, को-एक्सिसटेंस और डिस-आर्ममेंट के सम्बन्ध में जवाहरलाल जी ने देश को जो लीडरशिप दी, वह प्रैक्टिकल दृष्टि से दी। इसके साथ ही उन्होंने दुनिया में इस बात को फैलाया और वह एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर और प्राइम मिनिस्टर की हैसियत से फैलाया और उसकी वजह से उन्होंने दुनिया को कई बार लड़ाई के खतरे से बचाया। यह भी हमें ध्यान में रखना है कि जो पालिसी, जो नीति हमने आज तक बरती है आजादी के आने के बाद, वह पालिसी और वह नीति हम को कायम रखनी है। ताकि आज एक जो खतरा है दुनिया में अगर उसके खिलाफ हम कुछ कर सकें, उसका मुकाबला कर सकें, उसका विरोध कर सकें तो हम करने की कोशिश करें। मैं कास्ट और खर्च और इन सारी बातों पर नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि मुझे उसका ठीक अन्दाजा नहीं है। मसानी साहब ने जब बात

[श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री]

कही थी तो मैंने यह नहीं कहा कि वह गलत बात कह रहे हैं। मैंने यह कहा कि इस पर अलग अलग रायें हैं। कोई कहता है 21 करोड़, कोई कहता है 14 करोड़, कोई कहता है 30 करोड़, कोई कहता है 40 करोड़, कोई कहता है 50 करोड़। मैंने इस तरह से यह कहा है कि इसके बारे में अभी तक कोई साफ राय मिलना मुश्किल है। मैंने डा० भाभा से इस बारे में पूछा है जो एटोमिक एनर्जी कमीशन के हेड हैं। उन्होंने भी कहा कि कोई फिगर या कोई आंकड़े आज वह इसके बारे में नहीं दे सकते हैं। उनका यह कहना ठीक है कि हम इसका पता लगाते। उन्होंने कुछ कैलकुलेशन यू० एस० में जो न्यूकलियर वहां बन रहा है, लगाया है। उन्होंने लफ्ज़ न्यूकलियर डिवाइसिस इस्तेमाल किया था। मैं नहीं जानता हूँ कि इसका पूरा पूरा इम्प्लिकेशन क्या है। इस वक्त यू० एस० ए० में लेटेस्ट तरीके पर जो बन रहा है, उसके बारे में उन्होंने कहा है कि उसकी कास्ट बहुत ऊंची नहीं है। लेकिन एक मिनट के लिए भी आप इसको न भूलें कि यू० एस० ए० में तो कितना सारा डिवेलपमेंट हो चुका है। कुल सारा जो प्लांट है, जितनी उसकी मशीनरी है जो भी सारा उसका मैटीरियल है, सब यू० एस० ए० में एक हाइएस्ट लेबल पर है, सबसे ऊंचे दर्जे पर है। इसलिए अगर सारी उस चीज़ को छोड़ कर कास्ट को कैलकुलेट करें तो वह बहुत कम पड़ेगी। लेकिन जिन नेशनल को, जिन राष्ट्रों को अभी बनाना है और डिवेलप करना है तो कभी उस कैटेगरी में आ ही नहीं सकते हैं। जो मसानी साहब ने सारी दलीलें दीं एटम बम न बनाने के पक्ष में, यानी एटम बम बनाने के खिलाफ, तथा उसके इकोनॉमिक एसपेक्ट को बताया, उससे मैं जनरली सहमत हूँ, मैं एग्री करता हूँ। मैं उनसे इतिफाक करता हूँ कि एक बहुत बड़ा ब्रोझा इस देश पर और इस देश के रहने वालों पर पड़ेगा और वह ब्रोझा इतना बड़ा है जैसा उन्होंने कहा और जैसा आम आप सब मानेंगे कि सारा हमारे देश का जो डिवेलपमेंट है

उसमें एक बड़ी रुकावट और बाधा पैदा हो सकती है।

मैं एक आर्टिकल मेल में अभी हाल के, 20 नवम्बर के पढ़ रहा था। वह आर्टिकल विलियम लारेंस का लिखा हुआ है। इसके बारे में विलियम लारेंस लिखते हैं :

“William L. Laurence knows more about the atom bomb than any reporter in the world. Until a few months ago he was Science Editor of the “New York Times”. He has won the Pulitzer Prize twice, and was the only reporter to witness the test bomb dropped in Alamogordo. He also was the only reporter to witness an atom bomb dropped in war, on Nagasaki, and the only reporter to witness the hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific, in 1956.”

वह काफी एक जानकार आदमी हैं। वैसे भी वह लायक हैं और व्यक्तिगत तरीके पर उनको जानकारी है। उन्होंने इसको देखा है। अभी हाल में बीस नवम्बर को उन्होंने मेल में यह भी लिखा है :

“The truth is that China has no qualification whatsoever to be classified as a member of the Nuclear Club, or even as a potential candidate for membership”.

यह मैं उनकी राय पढ़ रहा हूँ। मैं इस पर कोई कमेंट नहीं करता कि चीन मੈम्बर हो सकता है या नहीं हो सकता है। क्या उसकी कैंपेस्टी है, मैं उसमें जाना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन जो उनकी राय है वह मैंने आपके सामने पढ़ी। आग फिर उन्होंने लिखा है :—

“The fact is that as of now, and for the foreseeable future, there are only two full-fledged members of the Nuclear Club—ourselves” (that is, United States

of America and Russia). Not France nor even Britain can be regarded as having met the requirements for full-fledged membership. Their accumulated stock-piles are very small compared with our and Russia's and their production capacity is similarly relatively minute."

यह यू० के० और फ्रांस के सिलसिले में उन्होंने लिखा है। उनकी भी आज हैसियत यह है कि रूस और यू० एस० से उनका कोई मुकाबला नहीं है और उनकी प्रोडक्शन वगैरह कम है।

"And though we had magnificent production plants at Oak Ridge and Hanford, built at a cost of nearly \$2,000,000,000" (I think the Finance Minister would be able to say how much it will come to in crores of rupees) "with the aid of our entire industrial plant" (he is talking of the United States) "and the full utilisation of our resources, the production capacity at the end of the war was at the rate of one bomb per week."

यह यू० एस० के बारे में है। यह कास्ट है जो कि वहां लगी है। उनकी प्रोडक्शन कंपैसेटी एक हफ्ते में एक एटम बम बनाने की थी। मैं ज्यादा नहीं पढ़ूंगा।

उन्होंने उसके बाद यह कहा है कि एक एटम बम जब उन्होंने वहां गिरा दिया तो करीब करीब उसके बाद वे एटम बम लैस हो गये। उसके बाद उनके पास और नहीं रह गया है।

थोड़ा बहुत कास्ट का अन्दाजा देने के बाद वह लेख में कहते हैं, जिस तरफ मैं इशारा कर रहा था कि महज, खाली एक एटम बम हमने बना लिया तो भी हम रहते कहां हैं, हमारी पोजीशन और हैसियत कहां रहती है, इसको भी हमें देखना चाहिये। उस सिलसिले में लारेंस ने जो कुछ लिखा है इसमें से

उतना और मैं आपकी इजाजत से आपके सामने पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ :—

"France does not as yet possess even a crude model of the hydrogen bomb, while Britain's stock-pile of ultra-modern hydrogen warheads is very small in comparison with that of the two senior members of the 'club' " (that is USA and USSR). "Moreover, neither France nor Britain have developed the capacity to produce a missile system, one of the vital elements necessary to make a nuclear stock-pile effective and meaningful. To be more specific: the United States now has a nuclear stock-pile in excess of 50,000 nuclear bombs of all types, each tailor-made to meet a specific situation."

मैं और नहीं पढ़ना चाहता।

आज यू० के० इतने दिनों से इसमें लगा हुआ है, जैसा मैंने कहा उसके पास मिसाइल्स हैं और उस तरह का डिवैलैण्ड वह नहीं है : फ्रांस का उन्होंने कहा है कि वह बहुत ही कम-जोर हालत में है। यू० एस० की हालत यह है कि करीब पचास हजार अलग अलग तरह के एटम बम स्टॉक-पाइल करके उसने रख छोड़े हैं। एशिया की भी पोजीशन बहुत मजबूत है और वह भी आगे इसमें बढ़ा हुआ है, ठीक नम्बर इसमें नहीं लिखा हुआ है। इस सारी बैक ग्राउण्ड, इस सारी तस्वीर को अपने सामने रख कर हम को सोचना चाहिये। शटपट में, जल्दी में हमें कोई फैसला नहीं करना चाहिये कि हम भी अगर एटम बम बनायेंगे तो हम चीन का मुकाबला कर सकेंगे। चीन का मुकाबला भी हो सके और शक्ति भी हमारी बढ़े, इन दोनों बातों का हमें ध्यान रखना है। मैं यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि हमारी नालिज बहुत कम है। हमारे देश में एटमिक इनरजी प्रोजेक्ट्स ने काफी तरक्की की है और

[श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री]

उन का ज्ञान इस सिलसिले में बहुत ज्यादा है, इधर वह बहुत बड़ा है, बनाने की हमारी शक्ति है। इसको बनाना असम्भव बात नहीं है, हम इसको कर सकते हैं। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि इसके कितने इम्प्लीकेशन्स हैं, इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रखने के बाद एक एक्सपर्ट जो कि बड़ा साइंटिस्ट है, जो प्राइज़ पा चुका है, वह ये चीजें हमारे सामने रखता है। हम को सोचना चाहिए कि अगर आज हम इस थोड़ी सी बात के कारण परेशान हो कर ऐसा कदम उठा लें तो इस से हमारे विकास के काम में बाधा पड़ेगी। उम्मीद हम और रेमेडीज़ कर सकते हैं, उन के बारे में हम सोच सकते हैं। मैं इससे भी इन्कार नहीं करता कि इस को हमें स्टडी करना चाहिए, हमें उसके बारे में सब कुछ जानना चाहिए, चाहे वह कास्ट का सवाल हो या मैन्यूफैक्चर का सवाल हो। उसकी जानकारी करने में तो हमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिए और उसकी हम जानकारी करेंगे। लेकिन मैं इतना आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह फँसला पार्लियामेंट को बहुत सोच कर करना चाहिए। पार्लियामेंट सावरिन हे, मालिक है, जिस तरह से चाहे अपनी राय बनावे, लेकिन उसकी जिम्मेदारी भी उतनी ही बड़ी है और इस वजह से उसको बहुत ही शान्ति के साथ फँसला करना चाहिए।

यह कोई पोलिटिकल लड़ाई नहीं है कि आप जोश में कह दें कि एटम बम बनाओ और हथकड़े कि नहीं हम नहीं बना सकते और फिर आप उसको एक्सप्लाइट करें और कहें कि यह कमजोर हैं। यह चीज नहीं चलनी चाहिए। चाहे कोई कुछ कहे मगर हम इस चीज को नहीं आने देना चाहते।

मेरी यह भी दरखवास्त है कि यह सवाल केवल हिन्दुस्तान का ही नहीं है, यह मानवता का सवाल है, और इसमें हमको तमाम चीजों में जाना चाहिए और उनके बारे में सोचना और गौर करना चाहिए कि किस तरह अपने ऊपर मूसीबत भी न आने दें, हमारे देश पर आंच भी न आवे, हमारी सोवियोरिटी को भी खतरा न हो, और साथ साथ दुनिया में जो हम अब तक थोड़ी बहुत शान्ति और सुलह के लिए सेवा करते रहे हैं उसको भी जारी रखें। इस तरह का बैलस स्ट्राइक करना मामूली बात नहीं है। मैं यह कह नहीं सकता कि यह पालिसी जो आज है यह जकड़ गयी है, यह जमीन में घुस गयी है, यह हट नहीं सकती, यह कभी बदल नहीं सकती। यह ठीक है कि एक इंडीविजुअल की एक पालिसी हो सकती है और उसका कनक्वेशन हो सकता है, जिस पर वह जिन्दा रह सकता है और मर सकता है। लेकिन पोलिटिकल फील्ड में हम ऐसा नहीं कर सकते। यहाँ हालात बदलते रहते हैं, परिवर्तन होते रहते हैं, उनके ही अनुसार हमें अपनी नीति बनानी पड़ती है। हम ने जो आज कहा है उसमें अगर कुछ सूधार करने की जरूरत हो तो हम कह देंगे कि ठीक है, उसे किया जाए। जैसे कि फ्रेंक एन्थानी साहब ने कहा कि अब तो कनवेंशनल वैनिस में भी एटमिक इनर्जी का इस्तेमाल किया जाने लगा है विनाश के लिए, तो यह दूसरा सवाल पैदा हुआ। एक तरफ एटम बम बनाया जा रहा है, दूसरी तरफ कनवेंशनल हथियारों में भी उसका इस्तेमाल शुरू हो रहा है। तो जैसा उन्होंने कहा, हमारे लिए यह भी होचने की बात है कि कहीं हमारे कनवेंशनल वैनिस कमजोर तो नहीं पड़ रहे हैं। तो हालात के साथ हमारी नीति भी बदलेगी : अगर कोई कह दे कि हमारी नीति स्टेटिक है, रिजिड है, तो हम इस को प्योरली इंटेलिक्चुअल लेविल पर तो समझ सकते हैं, लेकिन हम ऐसा रवैया नहीं अपना सकते। जैसा मैंने कहा इसके हर पहलू पर विचार करना चाहिए और विचार

करके ही हमको अपना फैसला लेना चाहिए । मेरा अपना खयाल तो यह है ।

अखबारों में छपता रहता है कि आज इंडोनेशिया एटम बम बनाने वाला है, कभी छपता है कि दूसरा देश बनाने वाला है । इसको आप इम्पारटेंस दें तो यह खिलवाड़ ही जाएगी । और ये जो देश एटम बम बनाएंगे ये टाय एटामिक पावर बनेंगे । किसी के पास दो चार दस बम होंगे, किसी के पास दस बीस होंगे । यह चीज बड़े खतरे की चीज होगी और उस हालत में दुनिया में शान्ति कायम नहीं रह सकेगी । अगर एक देश न्यूकलियर हथियार दूसरे देश को दे तो ऐसा हो सकता है कि थोड़ा सा मतभेद होने पर—जैसा कि आज इंडोनेशिया और मलेशिया का हो रहा है—हम कन्वेंशनल वैपन्स की जगह एटम बम इस्तेमाल करने लगे । इस खतरे की ओर यूनाइटेड नेशन्स आरगेनाइजेशन को ध्यान देना चाहिए क्योंकि उसमें दुनिया के सारे देशों का—चीन को छोड़ कर—प्रतिनिधित्व है । आज एक बहुत बड़ा संकट दुनिया के सामने है और अगर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ इस सवाल को गम्भीरता से नहीं उठाता और उस पर विचार नहीं करता तो उसका एक जरूरी काम खत्म हो जाता है ।

आखिर खास तौर पर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ शान्ति के लिए बनाया गया है और उसका काम दुनिया में शान्ति रखना है । जहां अशान्ति हो वहां उसको उसे खत्म करना है । दुनिया में कोएग्जिस्टेंस के लिए उससे मदद मिलनी चाहिए । इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान तो इस सवाल को उठाए ही पर अफ्रीका और एशिया के दूसरे देश भी—यूरोप के देशों को छोड़ दीजिए—जो कि आज विकसित नहीं हैं, जो आज मुसीबत में हैं अगर वह इस सवाल पर गम्भीरता से नहीं सोचते और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में इस पर गौर नहीं करते, तो मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया की शान्ति खतरे

में है और हम नहीं जानते कि उसका क्या परिणाम होगा । लेकिन मुझे विश्वास है कि इस सवाल के महत्व को, इसकी कठिनाइयों को और दिक्कतों को समझा जाएगा क्योंकि आज यह सवाल अकेले हिन्दुस्तान का ही नहीं है । मैं कहता हूँ कि तमाम अफ्रीका के देश और तमाम एशिया के देश जो डेवेलपिंग कंट्रीज हैं, जो अपनी थोड़ी बहुत आर्थिक उन्नति करने की कोशिश में हैं, जो एक नया सोशल आर्डर बनाना चाहते हैं, आज उन सब के लिए यह एक टैरिबल सवाल है । अगर आज हम अपनी शक्ति को एटम बम आदि में लगाने लगे तो हमको अपने देशवासियों के हितों को छोड़ देना पड़ेगा ।

जब हम सख्त मुसीबत के बीच में थे उस वक्त भी जवाहरलाल जी ने कोएग्जिस्टेंस की बात उठायी थी । तो आज हमको एक जरा सी बात से घबरा कर उस चीज को नहीं छोड़ देना चाहिये । ऐसे मौके आते हैं जब नेशन्स की मुल्कों की परीक्षा होती है । हमको उन परिस्थितियों का धीरज से सामना करना चाहिये ।

जैसा कि मसानी साहब ने कहा, मैं मानता हूँ कि हम आदमी हैं और डर जाते हैं । मैं भी डर जाता हूँ । मगर जब पहला मोमेंट इम्पैक्ट का और घबराहट का बीत जाता है, तो इन्सान अपने दिमाग की शान्ति को इकट्ठा करता है और सोचता है कि हमारे ऊपर थोड़ा सा खतरा आया है, अगर हम उस खतरे से डर जाते हैं और गलत कदम उठा लेते हैं तो जो अच्छा नाम हमने दुनिया में पैदा किया है और जो हमने थोड़ा बहुत असर डाला है — वह बहुत ज्यादा तो नहीं है—वह खत्म हो जाएगा । काहिरा में जो हमारा असर पड़ा, वह मेरा व्यक्तिगत हैसियत का असर नहीं था । अगर वह असर था तो हिन्दुस्तान का और उसके पीछे जो इतिहास है उसका, वह असर था जवाहरलाल जी की लीडरशिप का, उनका जो इंटरनेशनल

[श्री लाल बहादुर शांसी]

एफेयर्स में असर था उसका वह प्रभाव था ।

तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे कुछ समय के लिए कुछ लोग हमसे नाराज हों या हम पर बिगड़े, लेकिन लोगों के दिलों में आज भी इस बात की इज्जत है और दुनिया के देश इस बात को महसूस करते हैं कि हम जो बात सही समझें उसको निडर होकर कह सकेंगे । इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर इस मौके पर हमने यह फैसला कर लिया कि हम एटम बम बनायेंगे, तो मेरे अपने खयाल में हम दुनिया में कोई असर पैदा नहीं कर पायेंगे, और हम ऐसा करके इस खतरे का मुकाबला कर सकेंगे इसकी आशा मुझे कम लगती है । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह फैसला करके हम एक हद तक अपने को कमजोर बना देंगे ।

तो इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि जो हमारी नीति और पालिसी इस सम्बन्ध में रही है उसी को मैं इस वक्त दुहरा रहा हूँ और हमारी पूरी गवर्नमेंट इसके साथ है । और मेरा अपना विश्वास है कि कुछ मतभेदों को छोड़ कर आम तौर पर यह नीति इस देश के लिए लाभदायक है, फायदेमन्द है ऐसा सब समझते हैं । इससे हमारा भी भला होगा और मेरा खयाल है कि दुनिया का भी भला होगा ।

17 hrs

अब मेरा समय खत्म हो गया है, मैं और किसी चीज पर ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता । एक दो अल्फाज में आपकी इजाजत से नागालैंड के बारे में कह दूँ । नागालैंड के मामले को मैं इस एक्सटरनल एफेयर्स की बहस के दौरान नहीं लाना चाहता । यह दूसरी बात है कि नागालैंड किस मिनिस्ट्री के अधीन है । एक्सटरनल एफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री के अधीन होने से वह मामला एक्सटरनल

एफेयर्स में नहीं आ सकता । नागालैंड को इस मिनिस्ट्री के अधीन रखने का कारण यह था कि वहाँ के लोगों को नेहरू जी की लीडरशिप में विश्वास था और वहाँ के लोग चाहते थे कि उनके अधीन इस क्षेत्र का काम चले । मैं भी इसके पक्ष में नहीं हूँ कि नागालैंड इस मिनिस्ट्री के अधीन रहे, लेकिन उसको आज यकायक बदल देना ठीक नहीं है । इस वक्त कुछ बातें हो रही हैं, इस बीच अगर मैं इसको चटपट बदल दूँ तो ऐसा करना न अक्लमन्दी होगी और न ऐसा करना मुनासिब होगा, और न इससे कोई फायदा होगा । मैं इस चीज के मैरिट्स में नहीं जाना चाहता । इतना ही मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम काफी सावधान हैं, गवर्नमेंट का दिमाग साफ है, हमने अपनी नीति और पालिसी बता दी है । किसी एक आदमी के इधर या उधर कुछ कह देने से गवर्नमेंट दब जायेगी उसका कोई अन्देशा और खतरा नहीं होना चाहिए । मेरा निवेदन है कि इस नागालैंड के सवाल को आप इस समय छोड़ दें ।

मैं इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता था ।

जयप्रकाश जी का अपना मत है । गवर्नमेंट का भी अपना मत साफ है । हम ने अपने मत को दुनिया के सामने साफ कर दिया है और दुनिया को वह मालूम है । हमारी राय अलग है । इस सिलसिले में जयप्रकाश जी अपनी जो भी राय जाहिर करें, हम उस को रोक नहीं सकते । आप कहते हैं कि इस के लिए हम उन को गिरफ्तार करें । मैं गिरफ्तार करने के पक्ष में नहीं हूँ । चाहे एक जयप्रकाश जी नहीं दस जयप्रकाश जी अपनी राय जाहिर करें तब भी हम उनको गिरफ्तार नहीं कर सकते । अगर जयप्रकाश जी कोई गलत काम करेंगे, अगर कानन को भंग करेंगे तो मजबूरन

हम को उन्हें रोकना होगा। फिर भी हम उन को दस दिन छोड़े रखेंगे, फिर पकड़ेंगे। आप को याद होगा कि सन् 1920-21 में जब गांधी जी ने नान-कोआपरेशन मूवमेंट चलाया था, तो वह जबरदस्त मूवमेंट था। उस वक्त के वाइस राय ने कहा था कि मैं परप्लेग्ज्ड हूँ परटवर्ड हूँ कि क्या करूँ समझ में नहीं आता। और उन्होंने उस वक्त भी गांधी जी को केवल एक बरस के लिए जेल में रखा था। एक फारिन गवर्नमेंट भी एक रिबेल लीडर को जेल में ज्यादा समय के लिए बन्द नहीं रखना चाहती थी।

और जयप्रकाश जी नई दिल्ली आए हुए हैं, वह हमारे सामने अपना मत रखेंगे हम उन के सामने अपना मत रखेंगे। मैं आप से नम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी अपनी कुछ नीति है और उस को हम कायम रखना चाहते हैं। हम को सब बातों को देखना पड़ता है। आखिर हमारी एक डिमाण्डेसी है।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : जयप्रकाश नारायण जी ने एक बयान नहीं दिया है उन्होंने ने अनेक देशद्रोह पूर्ण बयान दिए हैं। उन को आप इस तरह क्षमा न कीजिए।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : जयप्रकाश जी एक बयान नहीं सौ बयान दें। मगर मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि जयप्रकाश जी मुझ से मिलेंगे, वह अपनी राय मेरे सामने रखेंगे, मैं अपनी राय उन को बतलाऊंगा।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : माइकल स्काट से आप की मुलाकात हुई है ? क्या बात हुई ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : अभी नहीं हुई है। आप चाहेंगे तो जो बात होगी वह बता दूंगा। हमारे कुछ आइडियाज हैं। मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि न

जयप्रकाश नारायण जी कानून से बाहर हैं और मैं भी कानून से बाहर नहीं हूँ। हम जो करते हैं कानून के अनुसार करते हैं। वह कानून बड़े से बड़े आदमी और छोटे से छोटे आदमी के लिए एक सा है और सब के लिए इस्तेमाल हो सकता है।

मैं ने आप का ज्यादा वक्त ले लिया। मैं आखिर में फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप जानते हैं कि हमारी नीति और पालिसी दोस्ती और मित्रता की है, हम इस बात को मानते हैं कि जवाहरलाल जी ने जो को-एग्जिस्टेंस, नान-एलाइनमेंट और डिसआरमा-मेंट की नीति और विचारधारा दुनिया में फैलायी है, वह हमारे देश के लिए अच्छी है, दुनिया के लिए अच्छी है, हम सब से अपनी दोस्ती और मैत्री रखना चाहते हैं। हम सब के साथ रहना चाहते हैं, लेकिन अगर कोई हम से दुश्मनी करेगा तो मजबूरी है। लेकिन दोस्ती हर एक के साथ रखनी चाहने के बावजूद हम कोई इस में पार्टिजन ऐटीच्यूड, कोई ऐसा मिला जुला, ऐसा कोई बात हम करने के पक्ष में नहीं हैं।

थोड़े दिन पहले मुझे प्रेसीडेंट जानसन, जब वह चुने गये तो उन्होंने एक पत्र भेजा था और एक पत्र मैं ने भी साधारण वधाई का उन्हें भेजा था और उन्होंने जो पत्र भेजा था, जो लैटर लिखा था, मुझे काफी अच्छा पत्र लिखा था। एक जनरल मारी अपनी बात इस चीज पर वह पीस के बारे में और और चीजों की तरफ उन्होंने ने बहुत इस में जोर दिया था कि हम उन को चाहते हैं। उस में उन्होंने कहा था कि हमें आशा है कि हिन्दुस्तान भी उस में मदद करेगा।

कल रात मुझे प्राइम मिनिस्टर सोवियट यूनियन का लैटर मिला, बहुत ही अच्छा और बहुत ही फ्रैंडली लैटर है। फ्रैंडली मेसैजेज और सन्देश उन के पहले भी आये हैं लेकिन अब यह जो कल पत्र आया, खूब

[श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री]

आया, उस को जब मैं ने पढ़ा तो स्वभावतः एक बड़ा सन्तोष हुआ। अपनी पालिसी और अपनी नीति के बारे में भी उन्होंने कहा है। मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि उस का हमें स्वागत करना चाहिए कि आज अगर हम अपनी पालिसीज की वजह से नहीं चल सकते हैं तो दुनिया के बड़े बड़े देशों के साथ वह हमें भी ले चल सकते हैं। वह भी हमारे लिए बड़ी ताकत की बात है। मैं इसलिए चाहता हूँ कि हम एक ऐसी पालिसी और नीति बर्तें जिस में फ्रेंडशिप और मित्रता हम दुनिया में बढ़ा सकें और हम भी दुनिया में कुछ क्लेशेज और कौनफलिक्ट्स को बनाने में मददगार हो सकें। अगर दुनिया में इस तरह से पीस और शांति कायम रखने में हम भी कुछ मददगार साबित हो सकें तो हमें उस का स्वागत करना चाहिए और में आशा करता हूँ कि आप सभी लोग मुझे उस में सहयोग देंगे।

Shri Hem Barua: On a clarification.....

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से केवल एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ . .

Mr. Speaker: Final reply has not been given. He has only intervened.

Now I would ask whether it is the pleasure of the House to sit late. There are about half a dozen hon. Members who are very eager to speak. Tomorrow only the Minister will reply. So if the House desires to listen to those Members, we might sit late. If it does not, we can adjourn.... (Interruption). First, I should know the pleasure of the House, whether it wants to sit.

Some hon. Members: We are not prepared to sit.

Mr. Speaker: Then, the House stands adjourned.

17.11 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday November 25, 1964|Agrahayana 4, 1886 (Saka).