

[Shri Shinde]

(2) Notification S.R.O. No. 308/65 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 10th August, 1965, containing the Kerala Pan-chayats (Accounts) Rules, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5151/65].

12.04 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Sardar Swaran Singh on the 15th November 1965, namely:—

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Before the debate is resumed, may I ask whether the time for the debate will be extended—it is ten hours now—beyond ten hours and in that case will the House sit longer today or will it continue tomorrow? Secondly, is the Prime Minister going to reply or intervene, and if he intervenes, when will he do so?

Mr. Speaker: Probably at 4:30 he will intervene and the Minister of External Affairs will reply tomorrow.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I hear my friends talk about the rethinking and the revision of our foreign policy, what they mean is that they want us to drop the policy of non-alignment. It is suggested that rethinking was going on in London, Paris, Moscow and so why not also in Delhi? What is this rethinking in these capitals? France is feeling her new strength, economic and military and is trying to break away from the hold of the United States. England is trying to gate-

crash into the European Economic Community so that she may have a voice in the direction of the third force emerging in Europe. Between Moscow and Peking there are stresses and strains and there also the policy is undergoing some change. All these show that rethinking is in the direction of breaking alignment and not getting more and more aligned. Naturally it is too late in the day to suggest that we should get aligned when the other countries are trying to get non-aligned. Non-alignment has paid sufficient dividends. Now, Pakistan is aligned. Does anyone suggest that we should exchange places with Pakistan? Pakistan of course got Sabre jets and Patton tanks. But what else? Is her position more secure? Does it feel greater confidence in herself than we do? In fact the position of Pakistan is like that of our old Indian States. There are the people groaning under the dictatorship which is there. But somehow it is supposed to exist, as a part of the so called free world. That is but only a glorious form of the Indian States misrule under paramountcy, wine, women and security. That is the sum total of all this alignment. Therefore, I would stress that the policy we have been following has been good and has given us self-confidence and self-reliance, and this should not be changed.

Some say that we have no friends. Shri Masani thinks that we are isolated; Shri Trivedi wants us to test our friends and comes to the conclusion that England and the United States cannot be relied on because of their recent performance; he also says that friendship with the Soviet Union may be suspected because of the attitude she has taken about Pakistan and therefore he advises us that we should go alone. At the same time it is complained that we have no friends.

It has been suggested also that the policy of UAR at the Afro-Asian

Conference shows that she is not friendly and that she is not inclined to be friendly. Should all the countries of the world be regimented to follow a particular line when India takes up a line and should all follow us just to prove that they are our friends? Within the Swatantra party itself, there is a division in respect of Punjabi Suba and Hindi. Shall we come to the conclusion that all those who gather there are not friends? This kind of regimentation with the expectation that all the other countries should follow a particular course is really unthinkable.

Who are friends? May I ask, where were the friends of England when there was the Suez crisis? May I ask, who are the friends of the United States of America in Viet Nam? France has openly opposed it and England is doing it secretly. Therefore, these friends all the time emphasise that every country has to be tested; what she does in a particular case is a proposition that I cannot accept. If we had no friends, how is it that the United Nations resolution went in our favour? Where were the friends of Pakistan? So, friendship depends upon the stand we take and upon what we have got to say and what our position is in the world, and therefore, if we try seeking friends by adopting the policy of alignment, you may find that on the balance we will lose more than what we gain and also lose our soul in the bargain.

I ask, is it not much better for the people opposite to try to see that our country gains a position in the world so that others seek our friendship? Why should we all the time say that we should keep on seeking friendship here and there, Formosa, Israel and so on? Ours is a big country. We have a contribution to make and we have not been in the way of progress of any other country. Why should not other countries seek our friendship? That day will come and that day will come soon.

About Rhodesia, the stand that our Foreign Minister has taken is very, very correct. The support he has promised to the Organisation of African Unity—I also welcome it very much. Mr. Wilson has taken a stand that it is England's responsibility and that she has gone to the United Nations only to seek the support for the sanction which she proposes. I have got some doubt that tomorrow he will come and say that it is only England's internal matter; it is only her domestic matter and other countries should not interfere. About the sanctions, Mr. Wilson himself in reply to a question in the House of Commons said that oil is not included in the sanctions. Further, it was England who gave advance information to Ian Smith that England will not use force if there was a unilateral declaration of independence. This is a new technique. In British Guiana, the Governor warned Dr. Cheddi Jagan that unless he obtains absolute majority, he will not be called even if he is returned to the House with a big party majority. This advance information in a particular direction prepares the people to go in the way in which England wants them to go.

Now, Sir, these sanctions we have seen how they worked in South Africa. We have seen what China, which is a very big mouthed country about anti-colonialism, was doing trade with South Africa. Rhodesia is much better placed. On one side there is South Africa. Then there is Angola and Mozambique on the borders. They can in fact form a South African economic community and trade through South Africa and through Portugal colonies till kingdom come. Therefore, these sanctions are really an eyewash and will not satisfy anybody. When strong steps are taken against Aden, when strong steps are taken against British Guiana, I ask, why should not similar steps be taken against Rhodesia? When Jews from all over the world were brought in ship-loads and dumped in a spot in Palestine thus displacing the people living there for

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

centuries to create a new State of Israel and to plant a cancer in the whole of the Arab world, why should not the small white minority numbering a few thousands be air-lifted from Rhodesia and brought back to their mother country and the people there left to govern themselves? Therefore, we should be very firm in this matter. We want to have Afro-Asian unity on principles, on some ideals, not just getting together and passing some resolutions. It is the minimum that everybody wants. Therefore, I welcome the stand that our Government has taken.

Now, Sir, a few words about our publicity. It is said that our embassies are not active and, therefore, the face of Pakistan in the outside world is more beautiful than that of India. The embassies have got very limited funds.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Give them more money.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: The hon. Member does not understand how much money publicity requires.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I said, give them more money.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: Apart from that, Pakistan has the backing of her allies, especially England and BBC. The support of BBC is not a small thing. Over five continents and in a dozen languages of the world news is broadcast by BBC. People think that it is broad-minded and objective. It is not wholly the case. To meet that support which BBC gives to Pakistan propaganda, I submit, even if you plant so many 'North cliffs' and 'Bever-brookers' in our embassies in different parts of the world we will not be able to meet the propaganda from BBC and the allies of Pakistan. Therefore, let us not come in the way of our embassies. They are doing good work with the limited resources that they have.

What about our radio? We have been stressing and shouting demanding a powerful radio transmitter in this country. But we are charmed with the television. It is only now there is some hope that we will get some more powerful transmitters. Pakistan radio is as strong as India's, while China's is much more stronger and it splits our ears every day. In some parts of India we cannot hear our own transmitter.

The other thing is, it all depends on the stand that you take about a particular question. Take the question of Kashmir.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): What were you doing all these 18 years?

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: We were watching your progress.

I was saying, Sir, it all depends upon the stand we take on a particular question. Take, for example, Kashmir. So long we took an attitude that there was something to be settled and the people were confused. This was the first time that we took a definite, precise, strong and firm stand about Kashmir. The reaction was that people began to understand our stand on the Kashmir question. It is a fact that even the Security Council has changed its posture; so also, United States and England, because of our firm and clear stand.

There were powerful reasons for our previous position. Because, Panditji was devoted to peace. Panditji did not want to humiliate Pakistan, by getting her branded as an aggressor. Panditji wanted to settle the question of Kashmir to build a bridge of peace between India and Pakistan, because he realised that peace was the fundamental need of the hour for the whole of Asia and Africa. I will plead that we should not forget that particular stand. Whatever we do, we should try not

to build up a war psychosis; we must pursue the path of peace. Peace is the thing that Asia needs and Africa needs. America is giving us a lot of aid, about Rs. 400 million crores. But half of it is military aid. What is that for? Is it also providing a target for the use of that aid. Not a single bullet out of that aid has been fired against the Communists. Those armaments have been used for fighting between ourselves.

Shri Bade (Khargone): There cannot be one-sided peace.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: I agree with you. There should be negotiation. Now there is some talk of Pakistan asking for mediation by Russia. I would not like to bang the door. I do not want you to change your stand. Russia has accepted Kashmir as an integral part of India. We have made it clear and even the United Nations has more or less accepted it. So, what harm is there in having peace. The pursuit of war has not helped any country. Even the victors have found that they are also losers. Therefore, I would plead with this House that we should pursue the path of peace. I support the foreign policy of the Government.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate is set in a complex setting. And it is important because of that, despite our legitimate pride in our magnificent army and indeed our civilians, that we do not allow ourselves to be overtaken by any sense of euphoria or of undue complacency. There has been for us a vindication of faith in our magnificent fighting men. Even after the NEFA reverses I had maintained that the image of our fighting men, of our jawans, was a shining and imperishable image inscribed in blood and valour over the battlefields of the world. Yes, that image was somewhat tarnished, but we have to remember this, that those reverses in NEFA were essentially the reverses

of a tragic lack of preparation and, to some extent, undue political interference with the structure of military command. Thank God, that period is now behind us. Then there has also been this glorious fulfilment of the secular ideal, fulfilment both on the battle field and on the home front. On the battle front we saw the young men of every community fighting and indeed dying shoulder to shoulder to repel aggression. On the home front there has been this heart-warming exemplification of unity, of discipline and of complete communal harmony. And it is necessary that we should ensure for the future these qualities that we have displayed so abundantly in this crisis that they should condition our policies in the future.

12.18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

In the past we have tended to be neither practical nor realistic. I believe that first the Chinese aggression and then the successive aggressions by Pakistan have been blessings in disguise. They have helped to shake us out of this world of cloudy idealism, illusions and slogans that took the place of policy, of action. Today what do we face? We face an uneasy cease-fire. I do not wish to encourage any war psychosis but let us realise this that we face an uneasy cease-fire. We are faced with a regime that is hate-filled; we are faced with a regime that has a long record of treachery and aggression.

Internationally, we face all kinds of pressures stimulated by considerations of power politics. In this context we have got to remember one thing. We are a warm-hearted emotional people. We tend to be sensitive, perhaps unduly sensitive; but, however emotional we may be, however legitimately sensitive we may be, we have to try and assess our attitudes in an objective way. There is no point, I feel, in imputing motives. We

[Shri Frank Anthony]

should leave, as the Foreign Minister left, the imputation of motives, uncouth language, uncivilised behaviour to the Chinese and to those who do their barking at Chinese bidding—I refer particularly to the Peking-Pindi axis.

I come now to the question as to what should be our attitude towards Britain and the Commonwealth. However strongly and legitimately we may feel resentment against Britain's continuing Blimpism, her double colonial standards—a hang-over from the colonial past—yet, I feel that here also the imputation of motives will not do. Mr. Masani sought to rationalise the British action; I am euphemizing my condemnation here. I say that no amount of rationalisation of the British action, British attitudes and the attitudes of the press can make it anything less than what it was—undefensible, utterly reprehensible—and I believe that much of Pakistan's intransigence is due directly to a policy of British official encouragement.

Shri Hanumanthaya (Bangalore City): You are telling the truth.

Shri Frank Anthony: He is approving of my condemnation.

The fact is that Britain has adhered to some kind of medieval doctrines for Asia—doctrines that she has thrown over so far as her own society is concerned; there is no doubt that even today there is this obsessive preoccupation by British officialdom with this two-nation theory—this addiction, as I say, to these medieval theocratic concepts, which she has rejected for her own society. Because of that Pakistan has been encouraged in this attitude of intransigence. And it is not going to be easy for us to change encrusted ideas or prejudices of British official policy. I believe that it is human nature for nations as for individuals, when they have lost the substance of glory and power, to cling all the more tenaciously to their illusions and to their faded

memories of the past and Britain, because she has lost the substance of her glory and her empire, clings today all the more tenaciously to those illusions and outmoded memories.

But, I would say, however legitimate our resentment, it would be a mark of lack of statesmanship—let us criticize and condemn the British—almost a mark of lack of maturity if we walked out of the Commonwealth in a mood of pique. What I say is this: It would be reminiscent of the adolescent behaviour of Pakistan in breaking off diplomatic relations with Malaysia; it would be reminiscent of the equally adolescent behaviour of Indonesia in storming out of the United Nations. We have got to remember that India's basic policy must be to play an effective role in every international forum—a role consistent with a position as one of the really great nations of the world, one of the nations in the front rank of the nations of the world in her own right. And, we have got to remember, while dealing with Britain and the Commonwealth, that the Commonwealth is not Britain; it is not even predominantly white. Of the 22 members, 14 are non-white—9 African and 5 Asian. Already, perhaps because of India's example, the physical complexion of the Commonwealth has literally changed. It should be India's purpose now to condition the policies and attitudes of the Commonwealth; it should be India's purpose to ensure that the non-white members of the Commonwealth play, as they should, a dominant role in framing the attitudes and the policies of the Commonwealth and—I am underlying this—without any acceptance of either British hegemony or British paternalism. It is important that these Commonwealth Conferences should be held in different member countries with the non-white countries presiding by rotation. Canada has already suggested it. We have also got to remember that Malaysia that stood out so conspicuously in support of our secularism continues

to be a member of the Commonwealth. Canada, a good friend of ours and a progressive member of the Commonwealth, is not blinkered by the Blimpism of much of British official thinking. I feel that India can play a decisive role in ensuring that the African and the Asian members constitute a solid force in preventing Britain from backsliding with regard to Rhodesia. Britain must be told that no longer will these members of the Commonwealth accept the old colonial double standards, one for the whites and another for the coloured. If force was necessary to be used by Britain when dealing with the duly elected Governments of British Guiana and Aden, then Britain must be told that force should be used, if necessary, in order to bring the white racist rebel minority to its senses.

Through the Commonwealth, Britain talks glibly of self-determination. She plays the role of the devil's advocate to Pakistan in pleading for self-determination, for a medieval dictatorship that does not understand the meaning of self-determination. Britain must be asked in the Commonwealth and through the Commonwealth first to heal herself, to apply the principle of self-determination to Rhodesia and to Aden and to jog her rather convenient conscience into asking that self-determination should be applied—it is long overdue; Britain had promised it—to Pakhtoonistan and that indeed Britain should jog her convenient conscience to ask that the minimum of human rights should be given to the people of Tibet. We should also jog our conscience in this matter.

Then, Britain should be asked to ask Pakistan to give the minimum of human rights to her minorities. Let me give you one example. Before Partition, the members of my community whom I looked after in that area were happy. After Partition, they were largely driven out Pakistan. The person who took my place as the

accredited leader of the Anglo-Indian community in Pakistan was persecuted and driven out. Comparatively a young man, he died recently in exile in Britain, I believe largely of a broken heart.

Towards America, justifiably, we feel resentment, not a little resentment, because of certain of her actions and policies today. I for one have felt it an unspeakable humiliation that food aid should have been rubbed in as an instrument of diplomatic arm-twisting. I have felt it an unspeakable humiliation that we should be made to feel literally like beggars standing in a queue with a beggar's bowl. The fault is partly ours that we have developed this crutch-complex and I join issue with the Food Minister that he helps to continue this crutch-complex. We are like cripples too afraid to surrender our crutches. And yet in food and other matters, it is also important to remember that every developing country needs assistance and indeed the developed countries, including Britain, depend to a large extent on American largesse. But the difference is this, the difference between the attitudes to the coloured and the non-coloured. Largesse to Britain is never rubbed in. They are not made to feel like we are made to feel beggars standing in a queue. However humiliated we may feel, here again it is not advisable for us to impute motives to the Americans. Realities have caught up with us. I believe that realities will catch up with both the democracies and will make them measure developments in the sub-continent, at any rate, in a realistic manner. We know that one of America's dominant occupations is the containing of communism and because of that any one who is prepared to supply bases to America, who is prepared even nominally to join military pacts, qualifies, irrespective of however reactionary their regimes, however committed to the negation of a free society, for unlimited American aid.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

Americans in some respects are even more naive than we are. We were told that this stupendous military aid that they were giving to Pakistan was intended for use to stop communist expansion. But Pakistan had always intended it for use, and indeed used it, against India. And despite all the solemn assurances that we were given in the face of Pakistani treachery, what happened? These assurances by the Americans were not worth the paper they were written on.

Americans must realise this also that because of this desire to contain communism in Asia, they have upset the natural balance in this sub-continent. After all, we have no quarrel with Pakistan. Pakistan is a small country; inherently it is weak militarily and economically; politically it is a monstrosity divided by a sub-continent in two parts. They have to realise this. And may I say this in passing that it was a measure of India's passionate desire for peace that we did not overrun, which we could have done in the space of two days, the other half of this political monstrosity—East Pakistan. We did not do it as a further measure of our passionate desire for peace.

America has yet to learn this: because of this tremendous artificial military inflation of Pakistan, she has made Pakistan the victim of military megalomania; by this artificial inflation, she has made Pakistan the victim of egomania, the victim of religious hatred and fanaticism.

Recently when some of us met an American Senator and some Congressmen, one of them asked—I was able to appreciate his feelings—with a passionate intensity: what can I say—they had visited some of the American hospitals in Vietnam and Phil-

ippines—to the American mothers who ask me why should our sons die and be maimed in the swamps of Vietnam. He said that the only answer he could give was rather an academic one—it was because of America's desire to protect free society in Asia. Can we not legitimately ask, with even more intensity, America this question; what have we to say to the mothers of India—mothers not only of Indian soldiers but also of Indian civilians—when they ask us why should our sons have been killed and maimed by American gifted tanks and guns, by the American gifted planes and bombs. We have no answer that the American Congressman gave. He at least was fighting academically to contain communism, but here our jawans, young men, and civilians were killed by gifted weapons, by the weapons gifted by one democracy to be used against another democracy. There is no answer that we have to make to the Indian mothers.

America has also to learn this that, equally with China, Pakistan desires to weaken and also to subvert our secular base. To both democracy is not only foreign; to both democracy is utterly repugnant. I believe, whatever Britain and America may seek to do, they will not be able to prevent the increasing concert between China and Pakistan. I believe it sadly that, sooner or later, this country must be prepared for a concerted attack by China and by Pakistan. The supreme tragedy of it all is this that here we have the strongest democracy in the world; because of this tragic misappreciation of the basic issues in the sub-continent, tragic misappreciation of Asian psychology, the strongest democracy is pulling the carpet economically and militarily from under the feet of the largest democracy in the world. And without intending it perhaps America today is assisting the forces directed to subverting and weakening democracy in India.

May I say this that so far as the USSR and the East European countries are concerned, I believe that they share with us a common confrontation, a confrontation with expansionist China? I am happy that our relations with the USSR and these Eastern European countries are being strengthened. And it is a matter for gratification and perhaps a little ironical, that these communist countries, although communist, are helping us to strengthen our secular base, while the Western democracies are denying us that help.

In conclusion, I want to condemn this talk of an understanding on Kashmir. Mr. Masani, for whom I have great respect, said that Pakistan because of her aggression has put herself out of court but there must be some kind of understanding with the people of Kashmir. May I say this with great respect to Mr. Masani and those who speak like him that this is not only loose talk but it is dangerously loose talk. Because it gives a stick to those countries that are unfriendly or inimical to India to beat us with especially in international forums, when they think that there is a section, however microscopic, in this country, that can talk of coming to some kind of understanding with the people of Kashmir who are part, after all, of the people of India? Let us remember this. The Americans fought a civil war in order to maintain unity, and in order to maintain the integrity of their country. Has Mr. Masani forgotten the history of India? Has not the history of India been essentially—let us be honest with ourselves—a history of tribalisms? Is Mr. Masani suggesting that in this day and age after we have fought a war to cement our secular base, we are going to open the flood-gates to a resurgence of these tribalisms?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: (Jammu and Kashmir): Never.

Shri Frank Anthony: I say that whatever trouble there has been in

Kashmir—I do not want to point fingers at anybody—has been there because we have kept the Kashmir problem simmering; we have done it because of our confused and muddle-headed policies over the last eighteen years.

After all, I am a lawyer, largely a constitutional lawyer. Constitutionally, legally, who can say that Kashmir did not become a part of India? Even from the purely moral point of view there have been three elections in Kashmir, and none in Pakistan.

Then, we have this plebiscite hurled in our teeth. I do not understand it. Anybody who is not deliberately disingenuous knows that it was an off-the-cuff offer,—as there were so many off-the-cuff offers by the late Prime Minister—of a plebiscite, but it was categorically conditional on Pakistan vacating the monstrosity that they call Azad Kashmir. There must be some finality in human relations.

After two invasions by Pakistan, Kashmir has been sealed by the blood of Indians of every community; it has been sealed not only as a part of India but it has been sealed as a part of the minds and hearts of every section of the Indian people. And I say that Kashmir today—it is not a figure of speech—is a symbol of our secular democracy, and for the minorities, especially, it is a symbol of our secular democracy. I know that China and Pakistan would like to see Kashmir separated from India; they know that it would immediately destroy our secular base. They know that it will make India, like Pakistan, a theocratic state where the minorities are consigned to helotry, fear of death and dishonour.

I say this to the Prime Minister—and perhaps to the Hindus—that the minorities in this country, a hundred million of them, the largest minority being the 60 million Muslims and the smallest minority being the Anglo-Indians, would be the first to resist any semblance of any attempt by

[Shri Frank Anthony]

Government to treat Kashmir as negotiable with anyone.

Pakistan did us this service. By attacking us, it helped us to strengthen the fabric of our nationhood; it helped to cement our secular base, and as I said, it helped us to seal with Indian blood the fact that Kashmir will remain an inseparable part of India.

Shri Mahatab (Angul): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this time also a demand has been made that the foreign policy of India should be reviewed. As far as I remember, on all occasions, whenever the question of foreign policy is discussed on the floor of this House, a demand is always made that there should be a revision of the policy. There is a certain section in the country which wants a revision of the foreign policy from its very inception. Therefore, there is no wonder that this time also some attempt has been made in the same direction.

Since we are in the midst of a serious conflict, we have to find out whether our foreign policy has served us well even in the midst of this conflict. Now is a time when the whole thing can be assessed dispassionately and objectively.

Broadly speaking, our foreign policy is that India should not belong to any power bloc, any of the two power blocs which are competing with each other in the whole world. This implies that India should believe in peaceful co-existence and mutual tolerance. This is the broad policy which we have adopted for the last many years since the independence of India. How has it stood the test of time is the point to be considered.

Take the case of Kashmir. I would briefly trace the history of Kashmir. From the very beginning, Kashmir has been the playground of the conflicting diplomacies of the western countries and USSR. As early as 1920, immediately after the first world war,

the British Government at that time warned the then Kashmir Government that the Bolsheviks should not be allowed to carry on their propaganda in Kashmir. The then Diwan of Kashmir issued a regular circular to that effect. Sometime before independence, Gilgit was taken on lease by the British because that was important to contain Russia. The U.K. was afraid that Russia would expand throughout Asia through Kashmir. That was the fear then. It went to this length that immediately before independence, a British Brigadier who was in charge of Gilgit, announced without reference to anybody that Gilgit belonged to Pakistan. That was immediately contradicted by the British authorities then.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: One day before Pakistan came to be formed.

Shri Mahatab: This is the history. Immediately after independence, I think the British would have been very happy if Kashmir had acceded to Pakistan. That was their desire. But that did not happen; thanks to the diplomacy of India that did not come to be. Ultimately, Kashmir acceded to India. But Pakistan invaded Kashmir, and armed conflict ensued. The whole thing could have been settled then. But it was referred to the UN and it is hanging fire since then.

The USA, so far as Asian policy is concerned, is always led by the UK; they are wrongly led by the UK. When the Korean trouble was going on, the USA was misled by the UK and got into trouble there. The USA depends on UK for framing its policies with regard to Asia because the UK is supposed to be the expert on these Asian matters. So it is guided accordingly by the UK advisers.

Shri Warior (Trichur): Is the USA an innocent child like that?

Shri Mahatab: Immediately after independence, the Kashmir trouble went on. It started with the promise that the Kashmir people should have a voice in the matter of accession.

The thing went on for some time. As a result, different countries began to work in Kashmir, on the politics of Kashmir so as to influence the politics of Kashmir. They went on doing that. But now for the first time after independence, Indian Government has made it perfectly clear that the question of Kashmir is not negotiable at any level and that has settled the matter once for all. That is a great achievement of the Government of India. Here the policy of non-alignment has stood the test of time and has paid its dividends, I think, to the fullest extent. After that declaration, the politics of Kashmir has become the politics of India; Kashmir politics is now nothing different from Indian politics. That is the present position.

Of course, I agree with Shri Anthony that we should not attribute motives, but we should know the motives. Let us not attribute motives to anybody, but let us know the motives. Here I do not think the western democracies are, practically, standing on any principle now, because as you will remember, immediately after the first world war under the leadership of President Woodrow Wilson, the then President of the US, a number of doctrines were declared and proclaimed. One of these was that the rights of minorities in every country should be safeguarded. That was one of the major doctrines for which President Woodrow Wilson was hailed as the maker of a new age. Now that doctrine has gone somewhere; democracy is thrown into the background practically. The two power blocs are competing with one another in such a manner that it does not matter whether a country is democratic or not, whether the minorities are well-treated or not; it does not matter anyway. Each is supporting those who are against the other. That is the policy which these people are following.

Take the case of the USA. I would charge USA with the moral responsibility for this war which has taken place between India and Pakistan.

What was the agreement, understanding, after the last war? It was that the balance of power, wherever it existed then, should not be disturbed by any country. The balance of power between India and Pakistan was there after the last war. But that was completely disturbed by the USA's gift to Pakistan. That has happened. There is no explanation as to why this balance was disturbed. What was the motive of the USA and UK for this action? It was to contain Russia and China together, because they were together at that time, to contain communism. They did not trust India; they thought that Pakistan could be prepared not for any immediate conflict but for the third world war. In fact, they built up Pakistan accordingly. If anybody studies the construction of the Sargodha aerodrome, he would know that it has been built not to fight any immediate war but to fight the third world war when atomic weapons would be used. All these modern weapons were supplied to Pakistan in order to enable her to fight the third world war which according to their calculation, would be fought with the communist countries.

So that was done. Protests were made. They knew that these weapons might be used against India. It is not that they did not know it. I cannot imagine that US politicians and statesmen are so foolish or ignorant as to imagine that these could not be misused or abused. They knew these would be misused. In spite of that, they took the risk in order to help themselves against communism. That is the point. They did it. Therefore, the USA cannot escape the moral responsibility for the conflict which took place between the two countries which led to destruction of life and property. The USA cannot escape the moral responsibility for all that has happened in consequence thereof.

Even with regard to Kashmir and the present conflict, the foreign policy which India has adopted for so many

[Shri Mahatab]

years has stood the test of time very well. Any other policy would have been disastrous to India, because on the one hand we cannot trust this bloc as it does not trust us, and on the other hand we cannot go to the other bloc to create trouble for us. The policy has stood the test of time so far as the present conflict goes.

The question arises with regard to China. A suggestion has been made by Shri Masani, who I know is a great scholar and a student of politics and diplomacy, that India should take the lead in forming a defence alliance with some of the neighbouring countries like Japan and Australia. Does he not know that Japan and Australia are not independent of many commitments? Have they not any commitments with any other countries? Can Australia join in a defence alliance without the U.K.? Can it go out of the Commonwealth and do something in order to help India?

Then, what is our common interest? The other day some leaders from Japan came here. I had also been to Japan and had talks with the leaders there. What is the common interest between Japan and India today, between Australia and India today? It is really common interest which should bind countries together, and we should find out that common interest. After all, foreign policy, or, for the matter of that, even home policy is based upon such common interests. It is not idealism or ideology but really common interest which can and should bind us together.

Here I should point out that there should be more talk of our relationship with the neighbouring countries than hitherto. I am very sorry the Foreign Minister did not say a word about our relations with Burma, Ceylon and other neighbouring countries. Nothing has been said as if these countries do not exist for our consideration. That is a wrong attitude in my opinion. We have to build up, I do not know what steps are

being taken, our close relation with Burma, Ceylon and all the neighbouring countries, does not matter which Government comes into existence there. Shri Masani referred to the defeat of one party in Ceylon. We should not take interest in these matters, because that is again the policy of India, namely co-existence. It does not matter which party comes into power there,—we have to build up our relationship with the people as a whole. If we take interest in their internal politics, we will get into trouble. This is a fundamental thing which we must always remember, and that is the first item of Indian foreign policy, that we should not bother about the internal politics of other countries. Whichever Government may exist in Ceylon or Burma and whatever may be the form of government there, we are not concerned with that, but we have to build up our relationship with the neighbouring countries very closely. That should form the major part of our discussion according to me. But we are always so much western-oriented that we never bother to think about our neighbours, what our relationship should be, how it should grow, which way we should proceed.

Following that policy, I think there should be more collaboration with these countries in all matters than hitherto. There should be more economic collaboration with Japan, for instance. Why should we always look to western countries for all kinds of technical advice which we can easily get from Japan? There should be more contact with neighbouring countries than with others. That is the first principle of *swadeshi* which is now being advocated. There is a place for *swadeshi* in foreign policy also. We should not always look to the distant countries, not minding the countries near us. We have to change our outlook a little to that extent.

Shri Priya Gupta: China is nearer to India than Japan.

Shri Mahatab: We should always try to build friendship with any coun-

try. That does not mean that we should yield to them. Pakistan is a neighbouring country. In fact, Pakistan and India are one. Although we are fighting very bitterly now, and we should fight till the end, peace should be in view. We are not fighting for the destruction of Pakistan, but for a certain purpose. That purpose should be kept in view. We should not lose our head in such a manner that we fight aimlessly for the end of any country. We have to keep ultimate peace in view.

As far as I see, the policy which has been followed up till now has paid its full dividend. I do not think any other policy could have served us so well as the present policy has done. We can say so objectively. It is not a question of thinking of anything from the ideal point of view. This is from the practical, pragmatic point of view.

A point was made that India has no friend today. It is true that India has no friend today in the sense in which Pakistan has got Jordan as a friend. . . .

Shri Mauriya (Aligarh): Your policy has been a perfect failure.

Shri Mahatab: or probably some others, I do not know, but so far as India is concerned, what is the meaning of a friend? What do we want? Do we want that everybody should come forward and say "yes" to us? Do we want that our interests should be served by others? How have the interests of Pakistan and India been served on this occasion? Pakistan has not gained anything because of the claim that she has got many friends, and India has not lost anything because she is said to have no friends. It is probably our traditional outlook that if we call one a friend, we expect him to say "yes" always to us. Friendship never means that, that is not possible. We must have countries round about us who should appreciate our position, who should try to help us in their own way, not in our way.

When, for instance, China invaded India, it is not that India did not get any help from any quarter. In fact, India received help from all quarters. Whenever there is any difficulty, help will be available because of this policy. Otherwise, if we are involved in one bloc or the other, it may be that help will not be forthcoming; on the contrary, it is likely we will have to lose some of our rights and privileges also. That is possible, that is happening elsewhere.

It was asked why India does not raise her voice when fighting is going on in Viet Nam. Shri Masari suggested that India should take the lead. I agree with him on one point, and that is that the attitude of self-righteousness should be abandoned by India. We have got plenty of that. Somehow we have inherited that attitude for the last so many ages. We consider ourselves morally superior to every one. That is wrong attitude. We are as good or as bad as any other country. Therefore, to expect us to go on giving advice to everybody is a wrong attitude. The idea of taking a lead always haunts us. That is the usual psychology of a proud nation. Even if that pride is there, it should be concealed in our hearts. We should work in such a manner that that pride will remain hidden. Otherwise, if we go on talking about leadership, ultimately we will not be anywhere.

This is my submission, and I would suggest again that we should build up our close relationship with and talk more about our neighbouring countries than about distant countries.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Bengaluru): In the last two weeks we have heard two pronouncements on foreign policy on behalf of the Government. The first was made by the Prime Minister on the 5th of this month. It was good as far as it went, only it did not go far enough. You might know that some of the Opposition groups wanted to have a debate on the statement of the Prime

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

Minister, but the Government did not agree. They came forward with this motion for discussion of the international situation as a whole.

After that, we had expected that the hon. Foreign Minister would give us at least some indications of the basic guide lines of Government policy so far as the new events, that have come up, are concerned, but, except for referring to Rhodosia and the freedom struggle of the South Arabian region, he chose to remain silent over every other important development since the cease-fire. The world has been changing fast and the international relation and the balance of forces are changing fast not only in other parts of the world but nearer home, in South East Asia too. I refer to the developments in Indonesia. I do hope that the Foreign Minister would give us some indication as to the assessment that they have made of these developments in Indonesia..... (Interruptions). You have your own conclusions. You welcome that.

13 hrs.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Soekarno is no better; he was sending arms to Pakistan.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Anyway, there was no indication of the government's mind with regard to these developments of far-reaching importance. He also did not mention, although he made a statement a few days back, about the collapse of the so-called Afro-Asian concept in Algiers. I cannot but mention in that connection the singular failure of this government to attach much importance to that Algiers conference although we were engaged there in a bitter struggle with China with regard to the holding of the conference according to schedule. No Cabinet rank minister was sent there although the other delegations that had reached Algiers were expecting that India

would send at least somebody who would be competent to speak authoritatively on behalf of the government. We did not do that. In that connection I also want to make a reference to another omission and failure of the government to send a Minister of the Cabinet rank to the Casablanca conference of heads of Arab States in September. That has created a lot of misunderstanding and I understand that President Nasser also had referred to this bitterly in some communication to us. Many hon. Members referred to the attitude of the Arab States towards India-Pakistan conflict. When we see that a group of heads of States of a particular region are meeting, Pakistan is deputing one of its cabinet ministers there to put across Pakistan's case with regard to Kashmir, we simply keep our eyes shut to these developments. I would very much like the government to indicate what would be India's policy with regard to these various developments that have taken place in world politics, particularly in Asian politics since the cease-fire. I find particularly disconcerting that on two major international issues that had come up before the country in the course of the Indo-Pak conflict, government had been simply postponing a decision or did not state clearly its views. Firstly, the question of our relationship with the United Kingdom. Some strong views were expressed in favour of our severance of relations with the Commonwealth of Nations. It is not really so much a question of our connection with the Commonwealth of nations; it is substantially a question of our relationship with the U.K. and by a queer combination of circumstances some of us in this House also combined in a way which would practically about Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad's resolution for severance of relations with Britain. I do not know what the government are going to do about it. It seems they are more or less relieved that it is no longer on the agenda and they will not have to express an opinion clearly thereon.

Secondly there is this hesitation and dillydallying over clearly stating our position with regard to the attitude that the United States has taken in regard to Indo-Pak war. I have no ideological axe to grind, I do not want to look at our relationship with the United States with Russian eyes, neither our relationship with the U.S.S.R. with western eyes or American eyes. But I do definitely want that the government must make its position clear. In the course of the last few weeks different government spokesmen some of them cabinet ministers have made contradictory statements about our relationship with the US and what the posture of relationship should be. This is very confusing state of affairs and government must make it clear what it intends to do so far as our relationship with that country is concerned. The hostility of the USA towards our attitude to Kashmir, to our stand on Kashmir is well-known and it has been stated by no leftist but a conservative western journal, the *Financial Times of London*, that the USA is using economic aid in order to put pressure on India to get its own views accepted by this country. If that is so, I want to know what is the Government's assessment, and if that assessment is correct, then the Government must make it known that, whether we get any food aids or other economic aids from the United States or not, we are not going to submit to that kind of interested pressure politics.

In this connection, I would also like the Government to make its position clear on certain things which concern us very intimately nearer home. The Government has stated its policies over Rhodesia which is across the seas, a far away land. The stand that our Government has taken is quite correct, but it seems strange that nearer home, where a far more intense struggle is being conducted by one of our erstwhile national leaders, attention is not being paid to it. I refer to the struggle that is being waged by the Pakhtoon people

in Pakhtoonistan. Many of us must have read with sorrow and regret the articles written by Shri Pyarelal about the feelings of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Some other Members have also referred to it, but I hope the House will excuse me if I read out something from that article. Shri Pyarelal met Badshah Khan in Kabul where he was living in exile. The Khan Sahab remarked:

"... While he and the Khudai Khidmatgars had for 25 long years stood shoulder to shoulder with the Congress in India's freedom struggle, India on attaining independence had sacrificed them and thrown them to the wolves. But it was never too late for making amends. Could he expect India even at this late hour to make belated amends and redeem her pledge to the Pathans?"

And what was that pledge? That pledge was given by no less a person than Mahatma Gandhi. When partition was decided upon and we agreed to partition, Badshah Khan went to Mahatma Gandhi and asked what had been done. At that time, Mahatma Gandhi gave him an assurance which is repeated in this article from which I now quote:

"At the time of partition Gandhiji had told him that independent India would not fail to come to their help if they were oppressed. That promise had not been kept. Gandhiji would never have let this happen if he had lived. India owed it to them and to Gandhiji to make kaffara (expiation) for it."

At that time, when Gandhiji told him that if the Pakhtoon people were oppressed, then, independent India would make it a *casus belli*, and go to war against Pakistan, Badshah Khan asked him, "what would be the fate of your non-violence?" Gandhiji replied, "Don't you worry about my non-violence. I shall take care of it."

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

At least Gandhiji gave him that promise, that if necessary, we would go to war with Pakistan, if the demand of the Pakhtoon people was not accepted by Pakistan.

Here, Badshah Khan has described the oppression that the Pakhtoons are facing. The Pakhtoons are denied the right of free association and of free speech. The Khudai Khidmatgar Organisation has been outlawed. Pushtu was being suppressed and Urdu was being forcibly imposed upon them. They were not allowed to bring out a Pushtu paper, which even the British had not dared to ban. The Pathans were being crushed and demoralised and corrupted by bribery and repression and assiduous spread of opium and charas smoking among them by the Pakistani Government. The Pakistani authorities had appropriated 26 per cent of the land set apart for the refugees at the Ghulam Mohammad Barrage in Sind and settled Punjabi ex-servicemen there. The same was being done in the Thal area to alter the composition of population in the border areas.

Were the White minority in Rhodesia doing anything worse? So, if you could stand up for the Rhodesian non-whites, why can't you stand up for our brethren who are being led by one of our foremost leaders? In conclusion, I would refer to the state of affairs in East Pakistan. On East Pakistan, the Government have said that because they are following a policy of peace, they do not want to extend the war to East Pakistan. Even accepting that policy, is there nothing that we can do excepting occasional monitoring of the radio broadcasts of East Pakistan revolutionary council? Does not the Government know that even in the initial stages of the war, there were anti-war processions in Dacca and Narayanganj led not by the Hindu minority people they did not dare to do it—but by progressive Muslim young men, Muslim lawyers and Muslim political

parties with a progressive outlook? They shouted slogans for peace with India. Have we no duties towards them? The slogan of an independent East Pakistan has been raised. Have we not any obligation towards those people and towards those developments and the progressive movement?

13.18 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

East Pakistan is on the one side, and Pakhtoonistan is on the other side. Here, the people are fighting with the same ideals and the same secular ideals and the nationalist ideals for which we stand. Can't we do something more than what we have done, namely, expressing only lip sympathy? Can't we do anything more substantial towards meeting their aspirations? That is what I ask, in conclusion.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the foreign policy of every country is not a simple and straightforward affair. It has become a complex thing, mixed up with economic policies and also defence policies. That is what is happening all over the world, and I think my country is not an exception to that rule. When I look at the foreign policy of my country, I want to say only one thing: any economic aid that we get from any country and which jeopardises the freedom of our country must never be taken. I say so because our foreign policy is the foreign policy of a free country which loves freedom not only for itself but also for other countries of the world and we are always represented to be a strong champion of those countries who are fighting against colonialism or neo-colonialism or imperialism. Therefore, anything that curtails our freedom of action, our freedom of choice and our freedom of decision, must be given the go-by by our country.

In this connection, I want to say one thing: recently, United States

paper said that one farmer out of five farmers in the United States is working for India to supply food to India. That is true. Some persons say that out of every four chappatis that we take one chappati is donated to us by the United States of America. I believe that in a matter like this we should not try to have economic aid especially when we find that while bread is given to us, bullets are given to our neighbour, who in spite of our best efforts never tries to be friendly to us. Therefore, I would submit very respectfully that we must give up that economic aid either from the United States of America or even from West Germany, because West Germany has also been supplying arms to Pakistan, and we must not go to all the countries of the world to get economic aid when we find that that economic aid is given to us while military aid is given to others. Military aid is more dangerous than economic aid, and if economic aid gives us some kind of help we must not try to have it at the expense of the freedom of the country I would not mind even if there is a "plan holiday", because I do not think any country should take it into its head to think that our country is subservient because it is getting money from this country or that country. Therefore, we have to safeguard our freedom and we have to see to it that the economic aid that we get is given to us as free and self-respecting citizens and it is not that while we are given some economic aid our neighbour who is trying to fight us all the time is given military aid which, I think, amounts to more than 120 billion dollars at the hands of the United States.

I want to say that our Security Council performance was not very spectacular, not very hysterical like the performance of Mr. Bhutto. But one cannot deny that it was a conclusive performance, and if one studies some of the papers of the world which take an objective view of things one will find that people have said that the discussion about the

political issues involved in Kashmir was fruitless and that if anybody wanted that Pakistan should have a plebiscite in that country it was utterly undemocratic, and if anybody thought that Pakistan must have Kashmir because it was a Muslim majority State, it was a very very futile argument. I want to read out to the House, with your permission, Sir, a few lines from a newspaper which has referred to this. Of course, the Pakistan people are feeling very very high and mighty on account of the collusion with China. It is to this collusion that this Nigerian paper has referred. It has also referred to the Kashmir problem. This is what it has said:

"It is a waste of time for the UN to get involved with seeking means to settle the Kashmir dispute.."

I think that was the stand we also took. It further says:

"...talk about religious difference, warranting a change of frontiers of dictating disintegration had better be left to babbling apes....."

That is to say, people who talk of changing frontiers or doing certain things in that context are not worthy of being the citizens of any country. The paper further says:

"If every dialect, tongue, mode of worship and every other difference a drunkard could essay up in his fuddled brain, had to dictate establishment of a State then even small England would be split into multifarious particles...."

I do not know why they do not take this thing into view, that if colour is going to be the basis of a State—when I went to the United States of America I remember Malcolm-X saying that they want to secede from the United States because of colour barriers—If religion is going to be the basis of a State, if language is to be the basis of a State, this world will be parcelled

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

into not so many countries but into so many sub-countries. Therefore, I believe that this performance was conclusive in this sense that we were able to place the Kashmir issue in a proper focus. That focus was that the Kashmir issue is not an issue which can be negotiated, that the Kashmir issue has been settled once and for all. Now, when some of my own countrymen say that we do not want to discuss the State of Jammu and Kashmir, because it is an integral part of India, but we want only to discuss about Azad Kashmir, I feel very unhappy because I think the whole of that part of the country belongs to us and as we develop strength we shall be able to get hold of Azad Kashmir also. Nothing succeeds like strength and we have to develop all kinds of strength,—economic, political, defence and other kinds of strength.

Our country has always stood by non-alignment. I want to give a warning to my country. The forces of non-alignment are not as strong these days as they were at one time. Who were the leaders of non-alignment? Dr. Sukarno was one of the leading allies of non-alignment. But what has happened to Dr. Sukarno? Dr. Sukarno has not been able to do that kind of political tight-rope-walking which he used to do before having a government consisting of communalists and nationalists. He finds himself confronted by the Communist upsurge in his country and he is hand-tied with that problem. There was our great friend, Col. Nasser who was a leader of non-aligned forces. But Col. Nasser is also tied up with Yemen and he has also internal problems which are very very formidable. There was Ben Bella. Where is Ben Bella now? Ben Bella is somewhere in the Algerian desert and I think he is fighting for his own freedom. His successor, Boumedienne, is also not yet so strong as to be taken an ally of non-aligned forces. The only person who can be of some hope for the non-aligned forces of the world is Marshal Tito.

I think Marshal Tito has been the bulwark of strength to the non-aligned countries. While the non-aligned countries have not been faring so well in the last few years, there is no doubt about the fact that we must strengthen the cause of non-alignment because that way lies the great legacy of our late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We must not give up that legacy, we must try to augment that legacy. So we have to take up some kind of a plan of action, plan of propaganda, plan of publicity, in order to strengthen the forces of non-alignment all over the world. It is by non-alignment that we will succeed and it is for want of non-alignment that we might not be able to succeed and we might fail.

Then there is the question of peaceful co-existence. We have been talking of peaceful co-existence every time. Somebody asked the question about Ceylon. Well, we took so many lakhs of stateless citizens from Ceylon only, I think, as a good-neighbourly country. At the same time we have been receiving so many Indians domiciled in Burma. That is also a step which will show how we want to live in peace with Burma. In the same way, our relations with Nepal are happy and I hope as time passes this relationship will improve more and more. But our relations with China can never improve, at least for some time to come. So, I would say that we must give us the advocacy of China at the United Nations. I think we have overdone it. We must not try to do it again.

डा० राम मोहर लोहिया :
(फहंखाबाद) : बहुत बढ़िया बात बोल रहे हो, शर्मा जी !

Shri D. C. Sharma: When the Cambodian de'legate Liu spoke at the United Nations, about 35 delegations walked out, because he was trying to speak about the inclusion of China in the United Nations. They included Communist representatives, several

African delegates and Pakistani representative. Washington officials are known to believe that Pakistan has moved closer to Peking in recent months while France has been saying since it recognized Peking in January 1964 that it would vote for Communist China in the United Nations. I think this advocacy of China must be given up for two reasons. Firstly, if China is seated in the United Nations it would acquire the right of veto in the Security Council. Therefore, instead of China being restrained by the United Nations, I think it will become more aggressive. So, we must give up this advocacy of China as early as possible. We should not try to make much headway in this matter.

The foreign policy of every country is undergoing reappraisal. There is no country in the world which is not taking a second look at its foreign policy. I do not want to speak about Rhodesia. The UK Government has declared that the declaration of independence by Rhodesia is an act of rebellion. I do not also want to refer to Pakhtoonistan and Baluchistan, to which references have been made by other hon. Members. But I will say this. In order to do something about China, why could we not have a second look at the policy that we have adopted towards Tibet? Perhaps we thought that it was not in line with our thinking, but I think this must be done. We cannot take things lying down at the hands of China. Since today Tibet is subjected to genocide and it is undergoing mass persecutions, we must do something about it.

One more point and I am finished. I am happy that many delegations of Members of Parliament are going abroad. I would only say that these unofficial ambassadors from our country must be given some brief so that they can speak with one voice in the countries where they go.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : महापति महोदय, एक भी नहीं। कल श्री यशवन्त राव 1772 (AI) LSD—7

चत्तान ने पूछे एक सवाल का जवाब देते हुए कहा था कि अब तक एक भी चीनी सिपाही जिन्दा या मुर्दा भारत की पलटन ने नहीं पकड़ा है। इसके विपरीत हजारों हिन्दुस्तानी सिपाही चीनियों ने पकड़े हैं। लेकिन चत्तान साहब का यह जवाब कि एक भी नहीं . . .

बैरेंसिक-कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री विनेश सिंह) : अभी माननीय डा० लोहिया ने कहा है कि हजारों हिन्दुस्तानी सिपाही चीनियों ने पकड़े हैं। ऐसी बातें गलतफहमी पैदा कर सकती हैं। यह सच नहीं है।

श्री सुद्धीर सिंह (महेन्द्रगढ़) : नेफा की लड़ाई में क्या नहीं पकड़े थे? इस में गलत क्या बात है?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : माननीय दिनेश सिंह जी की याददास्त बहुत कमजोर है। लेकिन यह वक्त उनके वक्त में से काटा जाये। हजार ब्या, मैं दस हजार कह सकता था। जब से चीनियों से हमारी लड़ाई शुरू हुई है जिन्दा और मुर्दा अब तक कोई घाट दस हजार पकड़े हैं। किस दुनिया में रहते हो? यह हवाई दुनिया नहीं है। यह विदेश मंत्री बने हुए हैं।

श्री विनेश सिंह : मुर्दों को कोई पकड़ता नहीं है। अब कौसे मैं इस बात को समझाऊं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक भी नहीं, यह किन्तु तरह की बेंतुकी बात है। मुझ को टोक रहे हैं। संसार के इतिहास में यह प्रदभुन बात रहेगी। इतने बरस लड़ाई चलती रही, एक तरफ के हजारों घादमी चीनी जिन्दा और मुर्दा पकड़ ले गये और जहां तक हमारा सम्बन्ध है 'एक भी नहीं' जवाब रक्षा मंत्री का है। कहीं कोई खराबी है।

रणनीति की थी तो उस में मकल्प और हरादे की कमी थी। लेकिन इस वक्त मैं

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

आस तोर पर विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में आप का ध्यान दिलाऊंगा। हमारे रहे हैं बोये अर्थात् और प्रति-व्यावहारिकता। इसका नमूना हम को तब मिला जब इस सरकार ने तिब्बत में दलाई लामा को आ तो जाने दिया अपने बोये आदर्शों के कारण लेकिन प्रति-व्यावहारिकता के कारण उस आदर्शों के फायदे का बिल्कुल इस्तेमाल नहीं किया। उनको करीब करीब मुर्दा बना कर छोड़े रखा है। इसलिए हमारी विदेश नीति में सकल की जहां गति होनी चाहिये उसी के साथ साथ कुछ सिद्धान्तिक परिवर्तन होने चाहिये, ठोस आदर्श होने चाहिये और उसी के लायक व्यवहार होना चाहिये। एक कहावत है, वहां अर्थ जहां गम निवास। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां दलाई लामा है वहां उसकी सरकार मानी जानी चाहिये और उसको भारत की सरकार मान्यता दे।

उसी के साथ साथ एक और बात पर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाऊंगा। इस वक्त करीब अस्सी हजार तिब्बती लोग भारत में नेपाल बगैरह में हैं। इन अस्सी हजार में से जितने ज्यादा को तिब्बती आजादी के संग्राम में निकल बनाया जा सके दलाई लामा को उस काम में मदद दी जाये।

हो सकता है कि इससे कुछ लोगों को गलतफर्मी हो जाये और मूल का शायद समझ बैठ कि मैं रूसी या चीनी गुट के खिलाफ हूँ अमरीकी गुट में हूँ। लेकिन मैं पहले से साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि मैं स्वतंत्र पार्टी और मसानी साहब के खिलाफों इजराएल और ताइवान से अकेले खुश नहीं हो जाता। उसी तरह से श्री रेणु चक्रवर्ती का खिलौना पूर्वी जर्मनी है, उसी से नहीं खुश हो जाता हूँ। ये अलग अलग खिलौने हैं। हो सकता है कि आप . . .

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore) What does खिलौना mean?

एक माननीय सदस्य : टय।

श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती : हमने कहा "You should be grateful."

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हम जाते हैं अमरीका। रेणु जी भी वहा जाती हैं। लेकिन पूर्वी जर्मनी और रूस के ऊपर वह ज्यादा मोह करती है। इससे हो सकता है कि कुछ लोग समझ बैठें कि शास्त्री जी और सरकार का खिलौना है न इजरायल का, न उधर का। तो मैं साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि शास्त्री जी का एक तो है बगुला ध्यान और दूसरे हैं वह बिल्कुल शून्य मुस्कान जिस की एक तस्वीर मूल को अभी मिली जब राष्ट्र कुल के प्रधान मंत्रियों का सम्मेलन लन्दन में हुआ। सब प्रधान मंत्री गम्भीर बैठे हुए थे लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर वह सदा मुहागिन मुस्कान थी। इसका नतीजा होता है कि वह ताक में बैठे रहते हैं, कब तो रेणु चक्रवर्ती का खिलौना पूर्व जर्मनी मिल जाये और कब मसानी साहब का खिलौना इजरायल या ताइवान मिल जाये। ऐसे खिलौनों से अर्थ काम नहीं चलेगा। सिद्धान्त के ऊपर जाना पडेगा। सिद्धान्त इस सम्बन्ध में एक है कि जब कोई सरकार जहां कहीं किमी राज्य में देर से हो और वह ताकतवर हो, उसको न सिर्फ मान्यता देनी चाहिये बल्कि उसके साथ राष्ट्रों को राजनीतिक और कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध भी कायम रखने चाहिये और करने चाहिये। यह है सिद्धान्त। इस में अग्रवाद केवल दो हो सकते हैं। एक अग्रवाद तो यह है कि यह राज्य मानवता के खिलाफ हो जैसे दक्षिण अफ्रीका है या रोडेणिया है और दूसरे वह राज्य हम पर हमला कर चुका हो जैसे चीन और पाकिस्तान। इस सिद्धान्त को अगर आप अपना लेंगे तब फिर न आप को मसानी साहब के इजरायल वाले खिलौने की और न ही रेणु चक्रवर्ती साहिबा वाले खिलौने और न शास्त्री साहब के पारा पारी वाले खिलौने की जो ताक में मिस जाए जरूरत

होगी बल्कि सिद्धान्त के अनुसार अपनी विदे नीति को प्राप्त करना सकते हैं। प्रसस में वह रोग कहां होता है। मैं प्रकसर इस लोक सभा में देखता हूं कि भारत और दुनिया के बीच में मसानी साहब तो अमरीका के पुजारी बनाना चाहते हैं और रेणु साहिबा रूस की पुजारी बनाना चाहती हैं। प्राप्त कहेंगे कि शास्त्री जी तो अच्छे हैं।

श्री योगेश्वर झा (मधुबनी) : दोनों को पूजते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : बिल्कुल सही बोले। कांग्रेसी हो न। लेकिन अभी नये कांग्रेसी हो। बिल्कुल सही बोले साहब। दोनों को पारापारी पूजते हैं, लेकिन पूजते अलग हैं। इसलिये जो रोग है इस वक्त हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का वह यह कि मसानी साहब, रेणु साहबा, शास्त्री जी और उधर वह कृष्ण मेनन साहब और इधर पाटिल साहब, इन सब का रोग है कि भारत और दुनिया के बीच में यह कोई न कोई पुजारी रखना चाहते हैं, जिस पुजारी को यह अपने देश से भी ज्यादा महत्व दे डालते हैं और अपने संसार से भी ज्यादा महत्व दे डालते हैं, जो कि पुजारियों के साथ प्रकसर हुआ करता है। और शास्त्री जी चाहते हैं कि कभी किसी पुजारी

श्री शिव नारायण (बामी) : प्राप्त क्या चाहते हैं, यह भी तो बतलाइये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं तो अपना रास्ता सिद्धान्त वाला बताना चुका न। अब एक बात रह जाती है सिर्फ कि इन सब पुजारियों को तुम खत्म करो। दुनिया और देख रखो, तब हम बतलायेंगे कि क्या हो।

अब की दफे प्राप्त के प्रधान मंत्री ने क्या किया। दो बड़े सवाल घाये। एक बियटनाम का सवाल घाया और दूसरा पूर्वी जर्मनी का खवाल घाया। बियट नाम के सम्बन्ध में

उन्होंने गलती कर के ऐसे पुजारी को पकड़ा जिस को नहीं पकड़ना चाहिये था। उन को बियट नाम के सम्बन्ध में कभी भी अमरीका के खिलाफ और रूस के हक में हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिये था।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बिल्कुल सत्य कहते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : पूर्वी जर्मनी के सम्बन्ध में उन को बिना परवाह किये हुए कि अमरीका नाराज होता है मान्यता दे देनी चाहिये थी। अगर मान लो कि सिद्धान्त के ऊपर हिन्दुस्तान की नीति चलती होती तो यह पारापारी पुजारी पकड़ने की कोशिश न होती, बल्कि अपने सिद्धान्त के अनुसार सीधी चाल हम चलते।

इसीलिये इस बहस में एक अजीब बात प्राप्त देखेंगे। जिस के लिये सारा मामला शुरू हुआ, अर्थात् पाकिस्तान के, उस की चर्चा बहुत कम हुई। लोग घबराते हैं। चाहते नहीं कि चीज का सामना किया जाये। ठीक उसी तरह से जिस तरह जब श्री पट्टाण ने कल कहा "एक भी नहीं" तो न सिर्फ इस सोक सभा ने नखर मन्दाब किया और उधे विस्मय और शर्म के साथ नहीं देखा बल्कि इस देश में किसी को पता ही नहीं चला कि कल लोक सभा में प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री ने जवाब दिया कि "एक भी चीनी सिपाही जिन्दा या मर नहीं पकड़ा गया"। इस तरह से आखिरी बन्द कर के काम नहीं चलता। पाकिस्तान के बारे में समझो कि क्या है पाकिस्तान।

पाकिस्तान के आर अर्थ में इस सरकार के सामने रखना चाहता है। कई दफे जब कह दिया जाता है कि पाकिस्तान का नाब हो तो किस अर्थ में और कहाँ और पाकिस्तान से एका हो तो किस अर्थ में और कहाँ। पहला अर्थ है पाकिस्तान का "अयूब साहब और भट्टोसाहब"। शायद यहाँ मैं थोड़ी सी चलती कर गया। कालांतर में इस अर्थ का

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

उप प्रश्न भी हो सकता है "भयूब साहब या भूटो साहब"। "घौर" नहीं, "या"। यह बहला प्रश्न है। इस वक्त जो पलटनी हुकूमत पाकिस्तान में चल रही है। दूसरा प्रश्न है "श्री फातिमा जिन्ना और उनके साथ साथ जो तब रहे पिछले चुनाव में"।

श्री जे० बेंकटासुबय्या : (भड़ोनी) : श्रीमती।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्ररे, प्रब हिन्दी मुझे मत सिखाओ। और तेलगु, कन्नड़ में भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्रीमता कहना बन्द करो। और श्री सब के लिये रखो चाहे मर्द हो चाहे प्रीरत हो, चाहे लड़का हो या लड़की हो। सब के लिये श्री रखो। दुनिया में मर्दों का राज्य कायम रखना चाहते हो इस लिये श्री को रखना चाहते हो। कुछ सीखो प्रब।

Shri Maurya: No discrimination on the basis of sex.

श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती : ठीक।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : रेणु साहबा को उस तरफ नहीं रहना चाहिये, मेरे साथ आकर बैठना चाहिये।

तो दूसरा प्रश्न है श्री फातिमा जिन्ना और उनके साथ रहने वाले जितने लोग पिछले चुनाव में थे, जो कि समय आने पर हो सकता है सही कदम में मदद दें। लेकिन मैं उनके बारे में प्रतिग कुछ नहीं कह सकता। पाकिस्तान का तीसरा प्रश्न है "सरहदी गांधी जो पिछले 18 वर्षों में पन्द्रह या सोलह वर्ष जेल में रहे, बलूचो गांधी, जो पिछले 18 वर्षों में सोलह या छत्रह वर्ष जेल में रहे यानी खान अब्दुस्समद खां। उनके बारे में हम उतना नहीं बोलते हैं जितना खां अब्दुल गफ्फार खां के बारे में। तीसरे शरणार्थी हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : चौथे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नहीं, तीसरे। शरणार्थी भी इसी में सम्मिलित हैं। पाकिस्तान की दस करोड़ जनता में करीब डेढ़ करोड़ शरणार्थी हैं। उनके ऊपर ध्यान देना जरूरी है। सिन्धी, पठान, बलूची और बंगाली। मैं इन लोगों के नाम प्रलग से इसलिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनमें सही या ग़त एक भावना धा गई है कि पंजाबी साम्राज्यशाही उन पर राज्य कर रही है। चौथा प्रश्न है पाकिस्तान का वहाँ के दस करोड़ भ्रादमी। यह चार प्रश्न हैं। जब तक इन चार प्रश्नों को भारत सरकार प्रच्छी तरह से प्रलग प्रलग नहीं समझ लेगी, पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में कोई हमारी नीति प्रच्छी तरह नहीं चलेगी।

सभापति महोदय : प्रब माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो गया।

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : प्रभी तो कुल दस मिनट हुए हैं।

Mr. Chairman: He has exceeded fifteen minutes.

Shri Kishen Pattnayak: No, ten minutes.

Mr. Chairman: That is alright. He can take a few minutes more.

श्री किशन पटनायक : प्राप ने ठीक तरह से बड़ी देखा नहीं।

Mr. Chairman: You will have to withdraw your remarks.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्रभी तो मैं चौथाई भी नहीं बोल पाया।

यह चार प्रश्न प्रलग प्रलग जब प्राप पाकिस्तान के समझेंगे तो बात साफ हो जायेगी कि जिन लोगों ने पाकिस्तान को बनाया था वही लोग आज पाकिस्तान को एक खास स्थिति में खत्म करने में साथ दे सकते हैं। किन लोगों ने पाकिस्तान बनाया था? सिन्धी, पठान,

बिलोचिस्तानी, बंगाली, घोर में कह सकता हूँ कि पंजाब के भी, मुसलमानों में नहीं बल्कि उन मुसलमानों ने जो कि भारत में बसते थे, घोर जिन को डर था कि अगर भारत स्वतन्त्र हो जायेगा तो हिन्दुओं का राज्य हो जायेगा। उस डर का जिन्ना साहब ने बालाकी घोर बेईमानी से इस्तीमाल किया। लेकिन आज वही मुसलमान समझ रहा है कि इस घट्टारह वर्षों के घर्से में मुझ की सांस नहीं ले पाया है बल्कि उसके गले में फांसी का कन्दा पड़ा रहा है। एक बड़ी जबर्दस्त तबदीली हुई है। उसी तबदीली को पकड़ कर हिन्दुस्तान की वैदेशिक नीति को चाहिये कि वह एक डरफ तो महासंघ का प्रादर्श रखे घोर दूसरी तरफ बूँक इतिहास थोड़ा सा रजामन्दी से चलता है घोर थोड़ा सा झगड़े से चलता है मगर ज्यादातर रजामन्दी घोर झगड़े के मेल जोल से चला करता है इसलिये प्रादर्श होना चाहिये "महा संघ अथवा जंग"। जंग अपनी डरफ से नहीं, जंग तब जब पाकिस्तान हमारे ऊपर थोपता है। इन चारों बातों को सामने रख कर अपनी नीति बनाओ तो बिल्कुल साफ बात सामने आ जाती है।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं खाली पूर्वी बंगाल स्वतन्त्रता रेडियो की तरफ के जो दो वाक्य हैं उनको पढ़ कर गुनाहा हूँ। उस रेडियो ने इनको 24 घन्टों के सुनाया था।

"खाली वह प्रस्ताव, लाहौर वाला, जो हमारी स्वतन्त्रता को एक स्वतन्त्र घोर प्रभुसत्तात्मक पूर्वी बंगाल देता है, हमें खूब कर सकता है।"

इसलिये इस वैदेशिक नीति पर ध्यान देते समय मैं थोड़ा सा झूतपूर्व प्रधान मन्त्री घोर वर्तमान प्रधान मन्त्री के बारे में भी कह देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि बात कुछ फँस गई है कि देश का वर्तमान प्रधान मन्त्री कम से कम पक्षे वाले से कुछ माने में तो अच्छा है। मुझे कोई मुकाबला नहीं करना है। लेकिन एक बात में तो पक्षे का प्रधान मन्त्री अच्छा था। लोकसभा को

जरा ज्यादा समय दिया करता था। इसके भलाबा वह बातूनी जरूर थे, डींग भी हाँक करते थे, लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूँ कि पिछले पन्द्रह बीस दिन से डींग मार वर्तमान प्रधान मन्त्री उनके सोलह वर्षों को भी खत्म कर चुका है। इससे नुकसान हो जाया करता है क्योंकि कुछ जरूरी बातों पर हमारा ध्यान नहीं जा रहा है।

मैं इस लोकसभा को बताना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1952-1955 में हिन्दुस्तान के रज विभाग ने अनुमान लगाया था कि अगर पाकिस्तान काश्मीर लेता चाहता तो छम्ब जोरियां धखनूर के इलाके में हमला करेगा, घोर सन् 1955 में नक्शे तैयार हो गए थे कि उस हमले को बिकल करने के लिए लाहौर घोर स्यालकोट की तरफ जाना पड़ेगा।

दूसरी बात उस नक्शे में थी कि मधवापुर की सड़क बननी चाहिए। मैं यह बहुत जोरों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस गारे नक्शे के रहते हुए छम्ब जोरियां की रक्षा करने के लिए मधवापुर की सड़क क्यों नहीं बनायी गयी। घोर लाहौर घोर स्यालकोट के बारे में आप जानते ही हैं कि मेरे विचार क्या हैं।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now. He has already taken 20 minutes.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी शिफ मुझे बोलने हुए 15 मिनट हुए हैं, घोर आप ऐसा करिए कि मुझे को सात घाट मिनट बोलने दीजिए, फिर मामला खत्म हो जाएगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप भी ठी नही मानते।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हाँ मैं बैठा जाता हूँ। (कई सदस्य नहीं, लिये, बोलिये।) मुझे बोलने की ज्यादा इच्छा नहीं है। लेकिन मैं सोचता हूँ कि इससे शायद मन्त्रियों के हाथ में कुछ चीज लग जाए। इसलिए मैं इस लोक

[श० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

सभा से एक बात साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ। कभी मांका मिलेगा तो नेहरू साहब की धीर शास्त्री साहब की इस लड़ाई के सम्बन्ध में तुलना करूंगा, लेकिन आज उस प्रश्न को छोड़े देता हूँ, आज या वह प्रश्न। इतना जरूर बहूंगा कि आपकी कांग्रेस पार्टी में शायद एक भी धादमी नहीं रह गया है जो इस वर्तमाना अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय धीर रण परिस्थिति का मुकाबल कर सके।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप धा जाइए।

श० राम मनोहर लोहिया : बहुत अच्छा कह रहे हो। देखो, इस को याद रखना। जब हालत बिल्कुल खराब हो जाएगी, तब आप लोग मेरे पास आओगे, इसके सिवा धीर कोई रास्ता नहीं है, आप आओगे। मैं 17 साल से किमी प्रधान मंत्री के पास नहीं गया, लेकिन इस बार मैं उनके पास गया धीर प्रधान मंत्री साहब से कहा कि एक मंत्र सीखो, धीर वह मंत्र है, "जो बर जारे आपना"। जिस गद्दी पर आप बैठना चाहते हैं उस गद्दी में आज यह ताकत होनी चाहिए कि अपनी नीति धीर तरीकों के लिए धर एक दफा गद्दी को जला भी देना पड़े तो उसके लिए तैयार रहें। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि जला दो। मैं कहता हूँ कि रास्ता निकालो। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि इस तोता रटन्त विदेश नीति को खत्म करना चाहिए। जब देखो तब "शान्तिपूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व"। विदेश मंत्री साहब कहाँ पाते हैं "शान्तिपूर्ण-सहअस्तित्व"? दुनिया में बहुत चूमते हो। इस वक्त तो सिर्फ गाली पूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व है धमरीका धीर रूस में। उसके साथ एक बात ध्यान में रखना, कि धमी तक दोनों में प्रोस्पेक्ट, जिनको आई० सी० बी० एम० कहते हैं, का इस्तेमाल नहीं किया गया है इतना तो प्रोस्पेक्ट अहअस्तित्व है, लेकिन वह शान्तिपूर्ण-सह-अस्तित्व नहीं। गालीपूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व है।

धर हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति कारगर होती तो वह सचमुच शान्तिपूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व की तरफ जाती।

धीर फिर कहते हो बिना लगाव वाली नीति। मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता। किसी जमाने में हम लोग भी इस बारे में श्री नेहरू की तरह सोचते थे। वह हमारे बोड़े बहुत नेता तो थे ही, धीर नेता धीर अनुयायियों में कुछ लेन देन हुआ करता है। हमने सोचा था एक तीसरी दुनिया के बारे में। लेकिन नेहरू साहब ने अंग्रेजों के वामपन्थियों की मातृही में धाकर उस तीसरी दुनिया को खत्म कर डाला। इसलिए मैं उनकी बात न कह कर, इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ, मैं इस बेलगाव की नीति के बारे में साफ साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसका आज कोई मतलब ही नहीं रह जाता। इसको सही सही धरों में समझो। वह यह है कि हम उन सब लोगों से लगाव रखेंगे जो हमारे रास्ते धीर दुनिया की भलाई के रास्ते पर चलने को तैयार होंगे। सब से लगाव रखेंगे जो हमारे रास्ते पर चलते हैं। धीर इसका क्या मतलब हो जाता है ?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now.

श० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं धमी खत्म किये देता हूँ।

हम उन सब से लगाव रखते हैं जो हमारे साथ हैं गरीबी को मिटाने में, हिन्दुस्तान धीर पाकिस्तान को एक करने में धीर विश्व व्यवस्था को कायम रखने में। इन तीव्र मामलों में। इसलिए रूस धीर धमरीका के मामले में हमको पक्की तरह से हमेशा कोशिश करते रहना चाहिए कि दोनों में के दोनों या एक हमारे साथ हो धीर हम उसके साथ हों।

धीर इसके भलावा जो हमारे नजदीकी पड़ती है जैसे थाई, मलेशिया, लाओ, फिलीपीन, ताइवान, जापान, दक्षिण कोरिया, अफगानिस्तान, नेपाल धीर बाहरी बंगोलिया—जो मैंने नाम गिनाए हैं बहुत सोच समझ कर गिनाए हैं—इनमें घाप लोगों को एक प्रतिनिधि मंडल भेजना चाहिए था, लेकिन घापने नहीं भेजा। यह प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण है कि घापकी विदेश नीति में कहीं कोई सार नहीं है।

धीर इसी तरह से गांधीवाद के सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक तो गांधीवाद की हत्या हो रही थी, लेकिन इस बार गांधीवाद ने भ्रातृ हत्या की है, क्योंकि गांधीवाद के बड़े बड़े लोग जो एक तरफा निःशस्त्रीकरण के सम्मेलन कर चुके हैं, उन्होंने ही इस लड़ाई में अपने पलटनी कूच को धार्मीवाद दिया था। इस तरह से फूटी खोपड़ी से दुनिया नहीं चला करती। मुझे ख़द भ्रफ़सोस है इस बात का, क्योंकि मैं चाहता हूँ कि गांधी के रास्ते पर दुनिया घावे। लेकिन क्या बात है? जो देश हथियार रखते हैं उन्हींके पास चावल है। लोक सभा द्वारा मैं यह सन्देशा श्री बरट्टू रसल को देना चाहता हूँ। वह गलती कर रहे हैं। सारी दुनिया में हमारा मखोल उड़ाया जाता है। मैं उन लोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ जो हम से कहते हैं कि तुम कई पैदा करो, गस्ला पैदा करो, चावल पैदा करो, कि हथियार के बिना हम बैसा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। इसलिए दुनिया में धीर एशिया में निरस्त्रीकरण धीर गांधीवाद होगा धीर हो कर रहेगा, क्योंकि धमरीका धीर रूस ही एक ममले की हल कर सकते हैं।

धम बोड़ा सा सभापति महोदय, घाप मेरे पर रहम करे क्योंकि मैं उस खत के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ जो कि श्री राम छेकक याचक ने प्रधान मंत्री साहब को लिखा था इस मामले को लेकर हिन्दू, मुसलमान

जहाँ हरिजन, चमार, बंगी, ब्राह्मण, ठाकुर सब का सहभोज सरकार की तरफ से कराया जाए। यह खत 13 सितम्बर का है वह याद रखना चाहिये कि यह विदेश नीति से सम्बन्ध रखता है क्योंकि घाप की दुनिया में बराबरी धीर सामीप्य इन दो धादशों की बड़ी आवश्यकता है। जिस देश के पास शक्ति नहीं है वह अपने धादशों से ही दुनिया के मन को जीत सकता है, जैसा कि रूस ने जीता था। धादश के हिराब से श्री राम सेसक याचक ने सुझाव दिया था कि :

48 करोड़ लोग पाकिस्तान से निपटने के लिये तैयार हैं परन्तु हिन्दू-मुस्लिम, छांटी-जाति बड़ी जाति का झलगाव तथा गैर बराबरी देश की शक्ति को कमजोर करती रहती है 4 मैं चाहूंगा कि पूज चलते, हिन्दू-मुस्लिमान, छांटी जाति बड़ी जाति, हजाराओं की संख्या में जगह जगह एकत्र हों, धीर एक साथ भोजन करें धीर हिन्दू-मुस्लिम एक दूसरे को राखी बांधें।

बाकी मैं नहीं पढ़ता। धीर उसका प्रधान मंत्री साहब की तरफ से यह जवाब भया था :

“मैं समझता हूँ कि साम्प्रदायिक एकता को अपने हृदय तथा कार्य दोनों में ही स्थान देना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है।”

इस तरह से राज्य नहीं चला करते। अगर राज्य को चलाना चाहते हो तो बिल्कुल निश्चित रूप से ठोस कामों को पकड़ कर चलना पड़ेगा।

सिबयुनरिज्म के सिद्धान्त की, सभापति महोदय, घाप भी अक्सर चर्चा किया करते हैं। मैं ने खुदा धीर परमात्मा से कभी मुलाकात नहीं की, लेकिन जी खुदा धीर परमात्मा से मुसाफात कर चुके हैं धीर जो पाकिस्तान के हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करने पर पाकिस्तान से लड़ना चाहते हैं, उनसे मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त सिक “हर हर महादेव” के गारों से काम नहीं चलेगा। धमको “धमकी

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

शकबर" भी कहना चाहिये, दोनों का मतलब तो एक ही है। यह है सिक्यूलरिज्म, यह है इन्हें लोकवाद परलोकवाद के मुकाबले।

और अब मैं बिना मतलब बताए आपको एक कविता सुनाना चाहता हूँ, जो शायद हमारे सिद्धान्तों को बता सके। वह कविता इस प्रकार है :

"सगे हूर मगे जानाना
सगे बहिस्त मगे मयखाना"

वह बाबर की भाषा उजबेक में कविता है। इन सिद्धान्तों को पकड़ कर आपको अपनी विदेश नीति को बदलना चाहिये। मैं यह शास्त्री जी से यह कह रहा हूँ, इसका मतलब नहीं बतलाता। मैं उन से कहता हूँ कि अपनी विदेश नीति को बदलो। इस मानी में नहीं कि जो नेहरू जी चला रहे थे वह सिर्फ गन्दी थी उससे वह गन्दी राजनीति चला रहे हैं, यह मैं निश्चित रूप से आपको बता देना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि समय बड़ी बुरी चीज है। समय हर चीज को सड़ाता है। जब तक गद्दी पर बैठने वाले आदमी में जलने की शक्ति नहीं है तब तक वह गद्दी जो इतने वर्ष की हो चुकी है उसको महाकाल सड़ाता चला जाएगा। इसलिए यह परिवर्तन आवश्यक हो जाता है।

14 hrs.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella):
Mr. Chairman, apart from the hon. member who has spoken just before me and who, as is his custom or wont, has resorted to lampoon and distortion to create a dramatic effect in the House, all other members who have taken part in this debate for the last two days have shown how the country stands solidly behind our Government in the attitude that the Government has taken in grappling with the problems that have arisen in the

international field as a result of the crisis that this country has weathered through or is weathering through, and the menace that this country is constantly confronted with as a result of the collusion of two unprincipled and unscrupulous neighbours on our northern frontiers. The debate in this House has shown that, even as our jawans rose to defend the honour of the country in the battlefield, the members of this House and the people whom they represent have expressed their solid support for the stand that the Government has taken in relation to the question of Kashmir. In the debates that have taken place in the Security Council, in thwarting the designs of some imperialist power and their agents to batter us, to bandy us about, to bully us in the meetings of the Security Council, where contrary to the principles and the Charter of the United Nations, an attempt was made to subject our internal matters to discussion and judgement. This House has shown that, by and large, the people of this country are solidly behind the Government in its attitude on the question of Kashmir and the Indo-Pakistan conflict. But it is quite right that, on an occasion like this, we do not content ourselves with singing our praises, but we also try to scrutinise, to evaluate the successes that we have achieved and the goals that are still to be achieved, the failures that have stared us in the face the inadequacies and the shortcomings to which we cannot be oblivious. Therefore, it is necessary on an occasion like this not to be content with patting ourselves on the back; it is necessary to examine how our foreign policy can be made more dynamic, more effective, to cope with the situation in which it has become clear beyond all shadow of doubt that there are at least two powers who are in league with each other to detract from our position and to organize all kinds of activities on the governmental and non-governmental planes calculated to denigrate and dis-

credit our country. In trying to do this, Mr. Masani, the Hon. Member for Rajkot, went so far as to suggest that a radical reappraisal of our policy is necessary. I am one of those who have high respect for Mr. Masani and his views. I know it is very seldom that he takes leave of reason. But it appears to me that sometimes he allows his allergy to the word 'non-alignment' to get the better of his reason. I do not want, at this late hour, to talk of non-alignment. The utility of non-alignment, the way it has served our nation during the last few years, the way it has enabled us to marshal and maximise the support of nations all over the world, are all there for the people who have eyes to see and for people who would like to say what they see. But if Mr. Masani thinks that the only way to win friends and influence people in the world is to join one of the military blocs, he must have the courage to say so in public without mincing words. I am sorry Mr. Masani did not give much evidence of this courage in the course of his speech. He said that we had no friends. Then in a very subtle way he suggested that this was not because of the failure of our diplomacy, not because of failure of our publicity, but because of the failure of our policy,—a failure—which he did not describe as plainly as he should have done. Perhaps he has a high opinion about the intelligence of the members of the House and, therefore, he was sure that they would understand what was in his mind.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): It was indescribable.

Shri Ravindra Varma: It is clear that the policy of non-alignment has served our nation, but that does not mean that we can sit back and say that all that is to be done is to repeat that our policy is "non-alignment and peaceful co-existence." I am completely in agreement with those

who say that the basis of this policy is sound. But one must examine whether it is adequate to say that this is our policy. What is non-alignment? Granted that we believe in non-alignment, that non-alignment is essential, that it is something which we cannot give up without surrendering our sovereignty, that non-alignment is the freedom to judge every issue on its merits. You ask what is the policy. The answer is "non-alignment", that is freedom to have a policy. Again you ask what is this freedom to be used for. The answer is "non-alignment," because it gives you freedom to have a policy. This, I submit, is a very inadequate answer. It is necessary for us to-day to indicate what is it that we want to use this freedom for. Here I must point out to the House that time and again I have spoken in this House and said that no government can afford to be apathetic to or apologetic about national interests. There is no greater criterion, no more paramount concern, than national interest. Our policy, therefore, must be the utilisation of the freedom that we have achieved through non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, to relentlessly pursue the national self-interest of the country. There should be no apology about it.

Sir, we must admit today that, in spite of our efforts to be the good Samaritans of the world, we have enemies. We have Pakistan and China who are our sworn enemies. For 18 years we had tried the policy of unilateral friendship and of good neighbourliness with Pakistan. It is clear today that Pakistan does not understand the language of friendship; she mistakes good faith for gullibility; she mistakes our desire for peace for cowardice. We must, therefore, now discard this unilateralism and resort to bilateralism which Pakistan too understands. We must make it clear to Pakistan that, if we need the friendship of Pakistan, so does Pakistan need India's friendship; if there are internal problems that can

(Shri Ravindra Verma.)

be used by Pakistan in India, there are internal problems in Pakistan which India can make use of; if there are areas which can be strangled because of their vulnerability in India, there are areas in Pakistan which can be strangled because of their vulnerability. Unless, therefore, this country talks the language of bilateralism and follows it up with courage and determination, and the willingness to make the sacrifices necessary to prove that we mean business, we will not be able to deal with Pakistan.

Sir, Mr. Masani said that we must have a short-range policy as well as a long-range policy in regard to Pakistan. I agree with him. The short-range policy is a policy of resistance to which the nation has dedicated itself. The long-range policy cannot be a policy of vague and amorphous "conciliation"; it should be a policy which takes into cognizance "the facts of Pakistan" which my hon. friend, the Member for Farrukhabad, referred to a few minutes ago; he too had lucid moments. We cannot ignore the fact that there are different aspirations in the different areas of Pakistan. If self-determination is something which Pakistan could argue about, self-determination is something which every people can argue for and India cannot, in the long range, ignore the necessity of taking into full cognizance the fact that there are legitimate aspirations for autonomy and self-determination in different areas in Pakistan. I do not want to dwell on this question.

Sir, the conflict with Pakistan has made it necessary for us to review the situation and to find out who are our friends. Mr. Masani went to the extent of saying that we have no friends in the world, that we are isolated, that we are denuded and that we stand in the nude in the world exposed to the cold winds of hostility. It is one thing to say that we are isolated and it is quite a different thing to say that we do not have a number

of vocal friends. If we look at the position today, we have to readily agree that all those who claimed to be our friends have not proved themselves to be our friends. There is no use closing our eyes to this fact. There are many friends of ours for whom we have gone out of our way, to support every demand of theirs without questioning whether it was a legitimate demand or a just demand. All these friends have not stood by us. I submit, Sir, that we can no longer adopt a position in which we equate our friends and our foes. We must adopt a policy which enables us to distinguish, recognise and foster friendship, to distinguish unfriendliness and to combat hostility. We should discreetly but intelligently and intelligibly tell those of our friends whom we regarded as friends but who did not prove to be our friends in our hour of trial, that if the aggressor and the victim of aggression can be equated in one region of the world, and if it can be argued that peace at any cost is the first goal, irrespective of the rights and the wrongs of the situation, then this is a dangerous criterion which will have its application to and repercussions in every part of the world, not only in East Asia but also in West Asia.

Sir, a reference was made to the Afro-Asian Conference at Algiers, and it was said that here again it was proved that we were isolated. I had the privilege of being present at this conference, and I think, therefore, that it is my duty to take a few minutes of the House to inform the House of what the position was at Algiers. It has been said by some, perhaps on the basis of inadequate information, that the postponement of the summit conference at Algiers was a diplomatic victory for China and a diplomatic defeat for India. There is no cure for masochism or for those who feel a sense of elation in flagellation. What was it that led to the postponement of the summit conference in Algiers? What was the Indian interest in the

Conference? India has always stood for Afro-Asian solidarity. India has always believed in the total freedom of the two continents, but we have never sought any narrow or selfish national interest from the movement for Afro-Asian solidarity. We have never wanted to use the legitimate aspirations of the people of these continents and the natural feelings of fraternity for any narrow national interest or selfish purposes. We have had no territorial ambitions, and we have no territorial ambitions, no nostalgia for hegemony, no designs to use economic aid or encourage insurrection to increase the area of influence and amenability on our periphery. But we have stood for the solidarity of these continents in the fight against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, whether it be in the garb of economic aid or in the garb of ideological Messianism. We are aware of our common interests and we believe in co-operation, but we are not oblivious of our differences, differences as far as our ideas about political and economic institutions and the ways of achieving rapid economic progress and social justice are concerned. But our attitude to the conference all along was that we believed that the conference had a useful purpose to serve, but we did not believe that any nation had the right to switch on and off a conference of this kind or to lay down political or ideological pre-conditions which would entitle or disentitle people from attending a conference of this kind. What was the Chinese position? In June, it is well known that China wanted the conference at all costs; it wanted the conference to be held even if the black African countries absented themselves from the Conference. Mr. Chairman, I hope you would permit me to take a few more minutes, because I think that this is a subject about which the House should be fully aware . . .

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon):
But let not my hon. friend forget to say who is our friend at last.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I shall satisfy my hon. friend about who our friends are—anyway, I hope we are all friends here, friendly enough to listen to what one has to say.

As far as the Chinese attitude to the conference was concerned, why was it that China changed her attitude? Why was it that this time China took the position that whatever might happen the conference should not take place? As our distinguished Foreign Minister said the other day, can it be because China felt that her influence was on the increase in the Afro-Asian world, or was it because China suspected that her influence was on the wane? I do not want to go into the details of the decisions which were taken which led to the holding of the Foreign Ministers' Conference. But it is well known that China laid down three conditions, firstly that the conference should dissociate itself from the U.N., secondly that the U.S.S.R. which in China's opinion was neither an African country nor an Asian country, should not be invited, and thirdly that the countries participating in the conference should express their willingness to condemn United States' imperialism. On the basis of this, China held that the time was not propitious and wanted the standing committee to decide to postpone the conference. But the standing committee felt that it did not have the competence to postpone the conference and that the Foreign Ministers alone could decide whether the conference could be postponed or not. China then wrote to every Head of State in the Afro-Asian world saying that this would be an illegal step, that such a Foreign Ministers' Conference should not be held and that the standing committee itself should take the decision, that if a Foreign Ministers' Conference would be held it would be an attempt to wreck Afro-Asian solidarity and that she would desire every country to stay away from such a conference. I have no time, otherwise I could have read out the relevant portions from Mr.

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

Chou En-lai's letter to the Heads of States. In spite of this stand that China took, 45 out of the 61 countries entitled to attend were present at Algiers; their Foreign Ministers or those who were authorised to act on behalf of their Foreign Ministers were there. China said again that no other subject except the postponement of the Summit Conference should be discussed at this conference. Yet the Foreign Ministers' conference discussed the question of the composition of the Conference, and evolved a clear consensus which has been recorded in the report of the Rapporteur as well as in the concluding remarks of the chairman, on the question of the participation of the U.S.S.R., Malaysia and Singapore. If this is to be described as a victory to China, diplomatic or otherwise, it would need some rewriting of the dictionary. I do not want to go further into this question because of lack of time, but I hope, Sir, that you would permit me to deal with one or two other points on which I would not take much time . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member can have a couple of minutes more.

Shri Ravindra Varma: Not in the extended manner in which the hon. Member who spoke before me had, but really two or three minutes.

I would like to refer to the question of the Commonwealth. It was said that no decision should be taken in a hurry, and that we should not walk out of the Commonwealth in a hurry. I am fully in agreement with those who say that no decision should be taken in a hurry. But I really wonder whether eighteen years is a short span of time. We have had the experience of being in the Commonwealth for eighteen years, and we now have enough evidence to evaluate the utility or the futility of being in the Commonwealth. We must realise that this relationship with Britain or the Commonwealth is not something which is sacrosanct, something which

can never be reviewed. If in an unsentimental examination of national interest we find that it is necessary to review and change this relationship we should do so. We should see how far, as my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony who spoke before me indicated, though every member of the Commonwealth is equal, Britain is a little more equal than the rest in the Commonwealth. We should see whether it is common faith in a set of political institutions or identical or common economic interest, that binds us together in the Commonwealth, or whether it is a series of historical accidents which may be a source of pride for one country and shame for many other countries in the Commonwealth. The argument that if we leave the Commonwealth, our bilateral relations with the other members of the Commonwealth will be affected is something which is very tenuous. I do not want to deal with it at greater length.

Sir, concluding, I would like to say one word about Rhodesia,—not precisely one word, but a few words about Rhodesia. The House will completely support the Foreign Minister in the stand of the Government that he has put before the House. But I do feel, as many others will feel, that we have to be a little more forthright in evaluating the role of Great Britain in Rhodesia. It is incredible that this thing has happened in Rhodesia today and that this was allowed to happen. The world cannot absolve Britain of the responsibility for this sordid and shocking drama. We cannot help feeling that Britain could have prevented this, and would have prevented this if it had happened elsewhere in British Guiana or Aden; it is an unmistakable and significant contrast from the alertness, the alacrity and the unflinching thoroughness with which the British Government would have acted to forestall and quell any such move if what was involved was not a White minority; the glittering panoply of the

Crown would then have been very much on parade. This difference, this discrimination, is a shocking feature which we cannot ignore.

To conclude, it is clear to me as it should be to other hon. Members of the House, that we are today in a very critical phase as far as our foreign policy is concerned. On the one hand, in spite of the animosity of China and Pakistan, we see that the influence of China is on the wane in the Afro-Asian world. We see that even Pakistan's friends are having second thoughts about the virtue of loyalty that Pakistan possesses. Indonesia, which was another country inimical and hostile to us, is today passing through a phase which may lead to closer collaboration or at least the end of hostility.

It is, therefore, necessary for us to have a bold, imaginative and dynamic policy. This we will be able to formulate and execute only if we have a machinery that is competent, and commensurate with our objectives and opportunities I would conclude by urging Government to see that the policy they adopt will be one of action, and not reaction; one of forethought, and not afterthought.

Shri Seshiyam (Perambalur): Since the House discussed the international situation last, events of vital importance and far-reaching consequence have taken place to the country. It is heartening to note that by decisive action taken by India during the aggression perpetrated by Pakistan, she has regained to a certain extent the esteem she lost after the Himalayan debacle in 1962.

The attitudes and alignments of various countries during the Indo-Pakistan conflict should offer us a fresh opportunity to review our foreign policy. If there be one as such. We have all along been preaching sermons, chanting certain mantras time and again, about panchsheel, peaceful co-existence, non-alignment, anti-nuclear policy and other things. These are ideals, good ideals, left to

themselves. But the whole problem comes to a head when certain countries, certain neighbouring countries do not believe in such mantras and slogans. What are you going to do with a country that does not believe in co-existence? What are you going to do with a country that does not believe in non-alignment or peaceful existence? For our Big Brother China, peaceful co-existence means thing other than what is normally meant; it means to China something "suppressive" of all freedom; to China co-existence means its own existence and non-existence for any body else.

Therefore, a foreign policy cannot surely be a string of phrases repeated over and over again. It should be a policy meaningful, purposeful and practical taking into consideration all the criss-cross currents and attitude of other countries, specially those who are our neighbours.

14.25 hrs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.

We have been practising this non-alignment and other confused policies which have been drifting us to a blind alley and policies which are not clear. We have been drifting all along and we have not been able to create a good atmosphere and reliable friendship with countries which we have been dealing with.

An analysis undertaken by the PTI of the recent discussion in the UN General Assembly shows clearly how far our foreign policy has been paying dividends for the last 18 years, the delicate foreign policy adopted by our Government. Shri M. R. Masani also referred to this in his speech. Of the 110 members who spoke, only 85 made some reference or other to the Indo-Pakistan conflict. 25 members did not make any comment at all. Of the 85, 63 were careful to adopt a neutral position; 3 members made only passing references while 19 were definitely hostile to us. Our policy has

[Shri Sezhiyan.]

not paid any dividends and no country has been able to support us openly in the General Assembly, as has been brought out by the analysis. Of the 19 countries which opposed us, 11 were Arab countries, then Portugal, Albania, Iran, Turkey, Somalia, Mali, Ruanda and Uganda.

Instead of going further, I want to analyse the situation even so far as the Afro-Asian countries are concerned. As can be seen, with the exception of Portugal and Albania the rest seventeen countries were Afro-Asian countries. This is a thing we have to grapple with. We should probe the causes for this apathy, indifference or even hostile attitude of the Afro-Asian countries towards us, countries with which we have been identifying so long in Afro-Asian conferences for which we have been so enthusiastic, in Bandung ten years ago and in Algiers a decade later. I want the Government to analyse why this has happened. The hon. Member who preceded me referred to the Afro-Asian summit that was to take place in Algiers. There also it seems that China had a bigger say than has been made out before us. Here I want to quote from an AFP report from Algiers dated October 27:

"Diplomats of some influential countries who vigorously opposed the Chinese move to postpone the summit were having second thoughts.

"They said that if China really boycotted the meeting, the Foreign Ministers might do better to postpone the summit rather than cause a virtually unhealable split between the Afro-Asian world and its largest and most powerful member."

This is what the members have been feeling as reported by AFP. The Government of Algeria was very keen on having the conference, but their

position has also been reported by AFP the next day, October 28, thus:

"Algiers was not unilaterally opposed to another postponement of the second Afro-Asian summit conference which without people's China would be 'colourless and of limited significance."

"Algeria made a last-minute appeal to China to attend the conference".

This is the state of affairs. A decade ago we were having a premier position in the Afro-Asian world. But now the thunder has been stolen by China and the Pindi-Peking axis.

It is of relevance to point out here that in 1962 when China committed aggression against India, the only African country which showed some sympathy to India was Ethiopia. This year when there was aggression on us by Pakistan, no country from Africa came out openly to sympathise with us or to condemn the aggression of Pakistan. On the other hand certain countries have been, as I pointed out, openly hostile to the stand taken by India.

Therefore, it is high time we made a reappraisal of the whole foreign policy and reoriented it on practical considerations in terms of existing realities, and not make it a matter of chanting some slogans and mantras as we have been used to do. We should probe the cause of the indifference of the African countries towards us. More than anything else, we should be able to get the democracies and other up-and-coming nations in African countries on our side. What we have been doing all along has been preaching these high ideals and slogans. But by this means we have not got anywhere near these friends. What we indulge in sometimes may only be deemed as tall talk.

When our Prime Minister went to Moscow and made a memorable speech in the Lumumoa Varsity where so many African students were studying it has been reported that the Prime Minister got a very good reception and, that there was a standing ovation and whatever he said was taken in good sense.

The *Indian Express* said on 14th May: "A day to remember for Prime Minister, India." But behind all the smiles and everything, the correspondent who went to Moscow along with the Prime Minister had this much to say, namely, that "from the reactions I could also detect that his claim of Indian leadership in the colonies' freedom struggle was not appreciated" by the African students there. Therefore, such tall claims which we have been making may give some satisfaction to our own country, but in getting friends from other countries they have not been helpful.

Also, we should have an eye on the growing influence exerted by the Pindi-Peking axis on the Afro-Asian countries. The clashes we have had with China and with Pakistan have been more of a fundamental nature. There is an ideological basis for these clashes. We believe in democracy, our government is run on the democratic structure; but these two countries have been obsessed by dictatorship, military or otherwise, and do not like democracy coming up in a neighbouring country. Therefore, we should base our future foreign policy on this basis. If we want to preserve freedom and democracy we should look around and see the other countries which are of a similar structure, with similar political systems. Therefore, instead of keeping ourselves aloof from the general current of the world, we should at least look around to the South-East Asian countries which are opposed to China, which are also menaced by the same Chinese expansionism. Like Malaysia and Singapore and Japan and other countries which have got homogeneity of inter-

ests, and similarity of political structure. We should have closer contacts with those countries. Whenever we have closer contacts, it does not mean that we become a satellite of one bloc or the other. But we should be able to distinguish who are our friends, who are of a democratic nature, because in the end it comes to a question of how we are going to be able to defend freedom and democracy in this country. Democracy, though slow in peace-time, though it presents a disunited front of various parties, becomes strong and united in times of war. History points out that communities based upon self-government and free discussion always survive any attack from autocrats and dictators.

Therefore, when we make our foreign policy more useful and fruitful, we should make this basic discrimination as to which are the other countries which are for democracy. We have all along been championing the cause of China since its inception, we have been championing its cause in the world forums, and we have taken it as our greatest friend. But what happened to Tibet? Because, we made a small concession to China. In the same way as Chamberlain wanted to appease the aggressiveness of Hitler, India tried that by a small concession it can appease China. But history has shown again and again that small concessions never appease the appetite of aggressive nations; they only whet their appetite and they demand more and more. It is heartening to note that by their note of October 1 to China the Indian Government have shown some concern about the invasion of Tibet by China and the utter oppressive nature of the conditions that are prevailing in Tibet. It is a good sign that at last the Government has woken up. It should have been done some six years ago, in that case it would have been fruitful. At least, at this stage we should be able to take up the question of its freedom.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: Better late than never.

Shri Sezhiyan: My Congress friend is also supporting me on this. Six years ago we should have done this. But we sacrificed the freedom of Tibet to appease the aggressiveness of China. By that act we not only destroyed the freedom of the democratic institution of Tibet but we brought the enemy closer to our doors. That is what happened.

Therefore, whenever our foreign policy is being reviewed, we should bear in mind that we should have a foreign policy that should be capable, purposeful and practical to preserve democracy; and we should be more courageous and with implacable purpose and endless prudence go ahead to face the challenges and the ordeals to come.

One more point and I shall finish. Some friends have been saying that we should be more friendly to this country, or to that country this country is hundred per cent our friend, that country is hundred per cent our enemy and so on. All these things are very good to tell stories to children. But in a mature world when we practise diplomacy we should be somewhat sober. It is not like going to a stall in the railway refreshment room and getting a quick meal. There is no quick love or instant hatred in international diplomacy. It should be sober. Let it not be hundred per cent one way or the other; let not this country be hundred per cent Russian or hundred per cent American; let the foreign policy of India be hundred per cent Indian. Whatever may be the policy that we devise, it should be based on the requirements of India to protect democracy and to preserve freedom. For that, Sir, let us make a re-appraisal.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the armed attack by Pakistan and the very well deserved rebuff it got from the Indian Army, and the aftermath of this clash, need to be viewed in the broad world context. Otherwise we would not be able

to draw proper conclusions for future guidance.

In the wide world a global conflict was going on formerly only between two blocs. But now the socialist bloc is split. And naturally with that split, in spite of all the life-long efforts made by our late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to build up a common platform of all newly-independent nations—for a sort of a new moral strength to be mobilised to face the imperialist world on the one side and at the same time try to reach some understanding, durable understanding, with the rising new world of socialism on the other—unfortunately, this ideological clash which is very deep has broken up that platform.

What happened at Algiers? It is not a question of victory or defeat for one country or the other. I am very happy that our delegation there struggled very hard to preserve that platform in the larger interests, because it was in the interests of the newly-independent countries to face jointly and unitedly all the western machinations in the present context of the world situation. Of course, there was no common basis. And China has realised it.

All the efforts were made by our Delegation, but unfortunately the situation was not such where they could succeed. Therefore there is no discredit in trying to preserve this platform against all odds. Some people say that our delegation there was hoodwinked, that some people played a double game. But I do not believe it. Ultimately we will have to realize that in this global conflict of ideologies, the image of one communist world, of one ideology, has been shattered, and penetration is being made; a severe warfare is going on in every country; allies are being won either to this side or to that side in the Latin American countries, in the African countries and in the Asian world. This is a new situation altogether.

Therefore, when the question of the basis of our foreign policy is debated here, and when men like Shri Masani and others question the very basis of non-alignment or co-existence, they do not realize that non-alignment has a historic and philosophical basis. It is not based on a sandy foundation. A deep understanding was there, and there was a geo-political understanding as well. India is at the crossroads of many forces which are in a way either silent or in open combat; and to face this world Panditji with a far-sighted thinking felt that the requirement of all these newly-independent nations was peace: the urge was to consolidate their freedom and develop in a peaceful way, take aid from wherever possible. Once the late Mr. M. N. Roy described this new urge by saying that this was not communism in that sense nor socialism, it was nationalism, that is painted red, as he put it. This is the picture of all newly independent countries. If we have that understanding, we will have to make up our mind if we are going to get away from this force. Because the unity today is shattered, are we going to join some camp this side or that side, or shall we struggle? The struggle is very hard. When the two giants in the communist world have clashed, it would be extremely difficult for India to get them to come to some common understanding on a common platform. So, this policy that has been laid down should be viewed in this situation, in the changed context of alignments, and it should be reoriented in a practical manner, to avoid the weaknesses that have been discovered in practice in its implementation. This is the only need of the hour.

Shri Masani says, and many others echo him, that we must assume leadership of the South-east Asian countries. But, is Burma prepared to go with you? Is Indonesia in a mood? Indonesia could not conquer anything, but she recently named the Indian Ocean as the Indonesian Ocean. That spirit we must remember. Is Cambodia prepared to go with you? In such a

situation, to imagine a collective leadership, Indian leadership to be accepted by these nations, is just chimerical. It is not going to materialise.

Then he says that we should invite Formosa or Philippines. I think he is not in touch with the reality of the situation, because Formosa particularly is a creation, a transient creation; it is bound to disappear or survive if China agrees to its independent survival.

Today we should not be obsessed in our thinking. I know that between China and Pakistan there is a deep understanding, it is not just apparent or superficial as it looks, and that understanding has been reached with the blessings of Britain throughout, there is evidence, that China and Pakistan should come closer so that it could be used as a lever against India. That was the British game.

Let us understand the character of Pakistan. Pakistan has got to discover her identity as yet. Pakistan today is just like an eighteen year old damsel, getting a lot of suitors round about; they are kept running after her, and she is not making up her mind, nor is she loyal to any one. This is the state of affairs of Pakistan, if I were to describe it in this fashion. But there are nations who are suitors because there is a damsel, though adolescent behaviour is there, all sorts of waywardness is there. But in international politics this sort of behaviour is never respected, nor taken for a responsible attitude by any nation worth the name.

Pakistan today is the most frustrated nation. I pity it. I particularly sympathise with the people of Pakistan, because they are kept in ignorance. A sort of barrier has been created against all intercourse between India and Pakistan. No interchange of music is possible, no interchange of films is possible. The cultural background that was one has been cut off.

Pakistan is the creation, a sort of illegitimate child, of British imperial-

[Shri Khadiilkar.]

ism, and naturally British imperialism or Britishers are showing a little anxiety about the future of Pakistan during all this period. This must be very clearly understood.

But one good thing has happened. Till now in the Security Council the Kashmir issue was a bone of contention, and all the Powers manoeuvred to put India in the dock. For the first time now, after a certain amount of defeat that Pakistan has suffered..

Shri Nath Pai: Why certain amount?

Shri Khadiilkar: Because I am taking a realistic view. We had an impression, a myth was created, that Pakistan had the capacity to beat India; that myth has been shattered, completely exploded.

For the first time, in the U. N. and in the Security Council a sort of compromise between the two Powers, Soviet Union and America, has resulted in the recent resolution. Not only that. Outside the framework of the Security Council, the Soviet Union has extended an invitation to the heads of the two States, the Prime Minister of India and Ayub. Ayub was reluctant to accept it, but I know that now he has accepted it unconditionally, without realising what it is meant for. The Soviet Union today feels that if at all India and Pakistan are to live as good neighbours, bury the hatchet completely and reach some sort of lasting understanding, this issue of Kashmir must be kept in cold storage, it cannot be touched, and if by other means some sort of a friendly atmosphere, forgetting the past, could be created, that would keep China away, because the Soviet Union is equally interested in keeping the Chinese away from this strategic area.

If we understand these moves, we must welcome this new development, because the Security Council will never decide this way or that way.

Shri Masani quoted the voting figures. He seems to be a follower of Dulles, who used to think that if somebody was not with you, he was against you. So, Shri Masani considers that those who did not vote for us, those who were rather lukewarm, are enemies of India. I never expected such a poor understanding of international relations and international behaviour from a senior member of the Swatantra Party.

He referred to the countries of the Arab world. Some of the Arab countries naturally were inclined towards Pakistan because of religious affinity, but he failed to mention the important role, the restraining influence of Nasser, who frustrated them in their effort to condemn India or brand India an aggressor. You cannot ignore this aspect.

What about the future? We must address ourselves to the future taking our stand firmly on our policy of non-alignment and co-existence. It is not a mantra as some people think, they think so because they have lesser understanding of the dynamics of international change that is taking place in the world; therefore, they take a shortsighted view of the matter. My view is that if the forces that are working lead to some sort of collaboration, so far as South-east Asia and Asia are concerned, collaboration and understanding between USA and USSR, where instead of thinking in terms of military blocs, they consider that a situation has arisen where India should be chosen as an ally in building up these countries round about some democratic ideal, it should be welcome. Of course, when the Americans fight, when they are obsessed with anti-communism, they choose all sorts of allies. The American intelligence is not with the State department. If you see the American Press all the time it is attacking the State department and saying that it has no world vision and no understanding. Men like Walter Lippman

have become exasperated at the manner in which these policies are considered. In this country we are not only defending the territorial frontiers. There are many things at stake. Pakistan attacked this country; it is a theocratic, aggressive polity, as against the Indian polity of secularism and democracy. This is what we defend, not only the territorial frontiers. We cannot ignore it. But at the same time in a sort of war hysteria that is generally created, we must not forget the fundamentals. We must ask what we are defending in this country in the long run. (*Interruption*). You were a disciple of Gandhiji but you had forgotten that idealism and you are looking at it in a cynical manner unfortunately....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Me or the Speaker?

Shri Khadihar: In a minute, I will finish, Sir. We want to defend our secularism and democracy. That will give a shining example to those forces which are in chaotic condition today in the Asiatic and African world where a new struggle is in the offing. After the Rhodesian action by Ian Smith, you will find that in 20 year's time a racial struggle of a severe nature, the most brutal and merciless nature against the whites by the blacks will be there because the African continent is very rich and potentially very capable and they will never forget those white people who ruled over them, the imperialists. Ultimately one day they will have to pay for it, unless as the Foreign Minister said the other day very categorically we stand with the African and Asian nations and compel Britain to take action against the Rhodesian rebels and bring them to book. I will conclude with one word, Sir. I fear that in the background a bit of a communal approach gets into the whole problem. I agree with Mr. Masani that we are fighting Pakistan. We have no ill-will against the Muslims of Pakistan. We must make it very clear to the Muslims of Pakistan whether they are on this side or that side and who share

the common idealism but for their present leadership. Therefore, the struggle must be properly spelled out and this danger of creating some sort of a little communal atmosphere giving the slogan of destruction of Pakistan should be avoided. That is not our objective. We want to coexist, and live in peace with our neighbours.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, may I speak sitting? Several speakers from the Congress side have told us that the foreign policy as it was has eminently succeeded. I think they are doing an injustice to themselves and an injustice to our fighting forces. What has succeeded is not the foreign policy which isolated us and kept us alone. What has succeeded is the military machine. What has succeeded are the people of India. It is not the foreign policy. Because, from the very beginning for these 18 years, foreign policy of India has been misconceived, miserably misconceived. The foreign policy of a country depends upon a proper assessment of the situation and anticipation of events. Take Tibet; take China; take Pakistan. Had we understood the situation properly? Take even Goa. Did we understand the situation properly? From housetops we are saying that we would solve every problem through non-violence, as if it was just like the country's zamindari system which was abolished through non-violence. We did not anticipate what China would do in Tibet. If we had only studied the works of Mao, we would not have committed that mistakes. We were crying Bhai-bhai when China had been moving on our borders for years. We did not anticipate the events and we did not know the nature of Chinese communism or earlier the Russian communism. Any nation which misunderstands the situations and consequently fails to anticipate events comes to grief. The English people came to grief in Suez. Why? Because they miscalculated, because they did not anticipate the events. Then again they have failed in Rhodesia today. Why? Because they did not anticipate what their white Englishmen were going to

[Shri J. B. Kripalani.]

do there. So, Sir, it is not the foreign policy of our government that has succeeded; it is our fighting forces that pitched themselves against the machines and displayed suicidal bravery. The people have succeeded. Let therefore no credit be taken for all these for the foreign policy of India.

There is another conditions for the success of the foreign policy, and it is military preparedness. This was very clear in the case of NEFA. What happened? At the first blow of the Chinese, our soldiers fled pell-mell. Why was it? Because there was no military preparedness, because in the ammunition factories what was being manufactured were stoves, percolators, locks and such other things. Today, what do we hear from the former Defence Minister? What does he talk? He says, there should be no universal military training. He also says that there should be no morale boosting as if we are already out of woods. He also says that there is a war psychosis in India. In India, speaker after speaker and on the radio, all responsible persons say that we want to be at peace with not only Pakistan, with whom we have 100 ties, who are the flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, but even with the cursed country, China under the communists. He neglected the defence. Today he wants the Defence of our country to be neglected. And what has been the result? Because our defences were strong, even our enemies have learnt a lesson. Those who said that one Pakistani soldier is equal to three Indian soldiers have to take back and eat their own words, and America and England have to reconsider their foreign policy so far as India is concerned. Why? Because our armies have advanced into Pakistan and we have shown that we could fight. At such a time, for an ex-Defence Minister to talk of military morale or the morale of the people and of no military training

is abused—he seems to have learnt a belated but pervert lesson from Gandhiji.

15 hrs.

Speaker after speaker from Congress benches says that our foreign policy has succeeded and therefore it remains the same. Let us analyse this foreign policy. What is it? Non-alignment: what is the meaning of non-alignment? Can non-alignment be a principle of the foreign policy of any country, I ask. I say it is unmitigated nonsense. Supposing our country were in danger, and supposing that we could not defend it. What would we do? Russia could not defend itself against Hitler during the last world war. Did it call for help from every quarter in the world, from the capitalist and imperialist quarter? Did it do it or not? Were they fools or are we fools? Therefore, I submit that this non-alignment can be only a policy for the time being. It cannot be the policy for ever. It cannot be the principle of our foreign policy. What then should be the basic principles of our foreign policy? One is self-preservation; and the other is the defence of the legitimate interests of the country. These are the principles. I say legitimate because some people even make illegitimate interests to serve their foreign policy. I do not want the illegitimate interests of ours to be defended, but every country has a right,—and that is the only principle,—by all means in its power, by all the legitimate means that are employed throughout the world, to defend its self-interests. Any other principle, I say and I repeat it, is nonsense; it has no meaning. At least one Congress man—Shri Chagla—had the courage to say that our foreign policy must be guided not by non-alignment but by the enlightened self-interest of the country. He said that non-alignment should be reconsidered. This is a Congressman telling us, a new Congress man has come into your

fold; he comes with a fresh brain and your brains are old and mouth-eaten.

Why should this policy be changed? Because there are no more two blocs,—there are many blocs,—though there are several blockheads, who are the foreign ministers of many countries, for instance, Bhutto in Pakistan. So when there are more blocs, what is the point in again repeating the same old slogan?

What else have we done? Not only we have talked about non-alignment, but also we went on preaching to the world that we must be peaceful, that India stands for the peace of the world. Whenever some of us said strong action should be taken against China and against Pakistan, we were dubbed as warmongers. You talked about co-existence, peaceful co-existence. You did not want even defensive war; you said even in regard to that small territory, Goa—you said repeatedly—that we will get Goa without any military action. And thanks to Kripalani fighting in North Bombay we had to take up arms;

I will tell you a very interesting story of how this non-violence worked. There was one embassy of ours, and in that embassy, the ambassador was learned man and he wrote a learned thesis for a college in which he had expatiated on non-violence, on Gandhiji's creed, on India not using force even in Goa. All that he has written, and he got it printed. He sent the bundles of his pamphlets to the university and after two hours, he received a cable gram from here that Goa has been invaded! The man was in jitters. He did not know what to do. He was perspiring. He sent frantic telephone calls and messages, and did this, that and the other. Fortunately, the pamphlet had not been distributed. He said "I want to make some correction; bring them back to me." So the bundles were brought back. That is the story; that is a real, genuine story, of one incident, which should at least make us careful of

what we talk: small mouth, big words.

Gandhiji had found a way of resisting evil and tyranny by non-violence. Have we found a method like that? If we have not found a method like that, if we are incapable of finding a method like that, nobody in the world today is capable of finding a substitute for violence. It is not possible. It is in centuries that one man comes and brings about such a non-violent weapon that can work; we cannot do it. We have to support our foreign policy by the orthodox methods, the time-honoured methods.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Recognised methods.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Now, about publicity. When I was hearing Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, it took my breath away. He said nothing depends upon publicity.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Ja-lore): I thought Menons take your breath away and not Mathurs!

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You are good enough to take anybody's breath away. Sometimes you take away the breath of the Treasury Banches; you do not know; they will therefore call you there one day. I was saying it took my breath away when he said nothing depends upon publicity. All right; nothing depends upon publicity; Shri Mathur was correct; then, why are we sending these peripatetic MPs and missions? These MPs or missions consisting of six, seven or eight people are going, and you put in also one member from the Opposition party as a sop to them also. I ask, can any responsible person in the Government, whether he be the President or the Prime Minister talk the secrets of his diplomacy to five or six people? England sends its special emissaries; America sends its special emissaries. Only one man goes. That one man talks with the Head of the State or the Head of the Government and they can freely talk without anything appearing in the press. These missions are a waste of our very slender foreign resources; they can serve no good. But there is one good that

[Shri J. B. Kripalani.]

they can do. Recently there have been so many people going. Who are they? Excepting Shri Patil; they are those who could not be accommodated on the Treasury Benches, or get a Governorship or something of that sort. They must be kept satisfied. The authorities thought, give them a little *tukara* and let them be rehabilitated.

An hon. Member: Very high thinking.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I could understand that there was defective publicity in the days of our late Prime Minister because for him diplomacy was something personnel. It was a one man's affair. He went to this and that country, he met this man and that man, he attended banquets and issued joint statements and that was sufficient publicity. He also talked of *panchsheel* and other sheels. This was his special publicity. Therefore, in those days there might have been no use our poor ambassadors talking to the people.

What do we do now? What do the Government do? They send parliamentary delegations to countries where there are ambassadors who are of cabinet rank. Either the cabinet rank ministers should be taken away from there or delegations cannot be sent for publicity excepting under their instructions. Even parliamentary delegations must first approach the ambassador in the country concerned and know what the condition of the country is. Nothing of that sort is being done.

See how very clever our diplomacy is. We think that the Arab world does not consist of Arabia, the Arab world has nothing to do with Arabia and it has only to do with Nasser and with Egypt. Where has the United Arab State its existence, has its country, has its force, has its influence? It is in India. We have given to the Arab people the status of an independent country. Such an independent country of United Arab Republic exists nowhere on the map of the whole world. I can say that with confidence and I hope that the Foreign Minister here would also agree with me in this.

Then, for the sake of this, what you call, United Arab Republic, we do not have anything to do with Israel. It is an anathema. None of our important Cabinet Ministers will ever dare to go there. The people who have turned a desert into a garden, they would not like to meet, they would not like to go and see that land. Dr. Zakir Hussain and Shri Menon went to Egypt and they said that Israel had no right to exist in Pakistan, that it must be driven away from there. Humbly, Sir, I will point out to these two great men that those who have turned a desert into a garden cannot be wished away; they will remain there. And, take it from me, they can be taken out only by a third world war in which the Arabs would be the dominant force in the whole world. Unless that takes place, whatever the Arab world may do, whatever the Arab world may think, Israel is going to remain there. It will be able to resist all the Arab forces that the so-called Arab countries can bring together. So we must understand where we stand. We must understand the situation. If this little situation cannot be understood by our foreign experts, I do not know what kind of experts they are.

About Jordan what did they—the Government representative—say? Our Deputy Minister—what is his name?—Shri Ganesh Singh..... (*Interruptions*)—I apologise, Sir, to Shri Dinesh Singh, he is my very good friend and so are they all—said that “naturally we are in favour of Jordan”. What natural affinity we have with Jordan! And, Jordan was the first country to support Pakistan. You give them flowers and they throw stones at you. Let me tell you, lick them and they will kick you, kick them and they will lick you. This is the only way to treat these people, not by flattery, not by going with Nasser or talking to him. We are blaming America for helping a military dictatorship while we are helping a military dictatorship in Egypt. That we do not see. We do not look to ourselves. We do not take away the beam in our eye and we

want to take away the mole in other people's eye. What about Burma, Nepal, even Russia and African countries. They have relations with both, with my dear friend Nasser and also with Israel. Nothing has happened. Heavens have not fallen. Foreign policy does not depend upon these things. There is a saying in Hindi which means that if somebody's lips are burnt by hot milk he will begin to blow upon curd also Foreign policy is a question of strength. How much strength you have? When you have it, all these countries will come round.

What have we done? Our best and foremost ambassadors we have sent to the west and in the east we have sent second-rate, third-rate, fourth-rate and no-rate men. We have sent such people to South-East Asia; even to Japan and to Australia. We do not care for these countries while these countries are very vital to our interests.

I have no doubt that America has blundered grievously in supporting Pakistan and in not denouncing it for using the arms that it had given against us. But may I humbly ask, what did we do? We ought to have understood the situation. This Johnson is not Kennedy. He is a hard-headed politician. We ought to have known that. He had made the incursion in South Vietnam as a question of his personal prestige, and it is in that sensitive point that we attack him. Did any country in South-East Asia attack this incursion? However bad it may be we may not agree with it, I have learnt from Gandhiji that it is not our duty to state facts when we are not called upon to do so. That does not constitute a lie. We could have kept our lips closed. We ought to have known our own interest better than those of others. If there was anything that America was doing in South East Asian countries we must recognise that what it was doing was for saying those countries from Communism. I do not want this country to recognise that we are being saved from Communism by America and but for them China would descend on us from across the Himala-

ys. I do not go so far as that. But let us understand what we have done. I have met many Americans and they have admitted that they committed a mistake. They said that they are not going to give any more arms to Pakistan and what more do we require.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: So far as England is concerned, I may not talk of it. When I was in the PSP we did not like this Commonwealth link. Now it is plain to everybody that England will not be our friend whatever we may do. It is useless to say that England should get out of the Commonwealth. That cannot be. We have to get out of the Commonwealth. Thank God, our present Prime Minister has no "old school" ties. He has also no patrician friends in England. He has only one plebian friend, the Prime Minister of England, whose advice he took in Kutch and separated Kutch from Kashmir. This is how our foreign policy is working. I do not expect this Government to snap its connection with the Commonwealth. They will never do it. They are too good, too gentle to do such a violent thing. But may I request them very humbly to do at least one thing? Our High Commission in England has more than 1,000 employees. In a small island which has shrunk to its smallness very legitimately there is no necessity to have such a big establishment. England has become so poor that none respects England today. For God's sake let this High Commissioner's office consist of only 10 or 12 employees. The money spent on this High Commission is as much as we spend on all other Embassies put together. If the authorities do this, I will say that the Congress Government has some sense about public money.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, the debate that began yesterday has attracted headlines in daily newspapers. It is a very interesting description of the impression these leading dailies have got. *The Hindustan Times* publishes

[Shri Hanumanthaiya.]

the heading "Opposition Demands change in Foreign Policy". The *Times of India* says "MPs Demand Review of Foreign Policy". The *Indian Express* says "No Need for Change in Foreign Policy, says Swaran Singh". The *Statesman* "MPs suggest Change in Foreign Policy"; *Patriot* "No Basic policy Shift". These papers represent trends of public opinion. According to the opinion they represent, they give a biased picture of the debate. At any rate, except for the solitary *Patriot*, which has got its ideology—I have no quarrel with it—the other papers instinctively feel that there must be a change of policy a change of outlook in our foreign policy.

Very many members, most of the members who have spoken yesterday and today have in one way or the other voiced their sincere feeling that there must be some change. Even the Punjab paper *Tribune* attributes to our Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh the view that he "wants some adjustment in our foreign policy". We have heard on the floor of this very House our pragmatic Prime Minister, as the revered Acharya Kripalani describes him, say that we must have.....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I described the English Prime Minister.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Our Prime Minister said that we must have re-thinking not only on our foreign policy but even on our internal policies, particularly planning. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in some of her speeches has said that the time has come for us to re-think our foreign policy. The Minister of Education, Shri Chagla, who has earned all round approbation for the magnificent performance he staged for India at the Security Council, says unequivocally that our foreign policy must change in order to suit the interests of India and the requirements of the time. This opinion emanating from diverse sources, from almost all parties and individuals, must be given some shape

and I am certain the Government of India is thinking in those terms.

So far as foreign policy is concerned, we have been taught like school children to think only in terms of either alignment or non-alignment. When arguments are reduced to this absurdity of taking one position or the other, conclusions become very difficult, reasoning becomes very difficult. There are ways and ways of giving a new shape to our foreign policy, consistent with the old policy and consistent with the future demands of this country.

However much we may dislike UK or USA or USSR, let us review their foreign policies. These three big powers have, during the last three or four years, so changed their foreign policies that it is very difficult to recognise their old selves. Take, for example, the United States which had led one bloc. Now it has almost become an ally of USSR, the leader of the other bloc, so far as China is concerned. Even in the Security Council when the Indian question came up, whether it is cease-fire or settlement, I am afraid it is tending more towards the American view than towards the Indian view. With due respect to the Foreign Minister and our Ambassador in USSR, I must say that, whenever there is an occasion they issue statements that they met Mr. Kosygin or leaders of the Soviet Union, that they have assured us that their sympathies are with us, and that their support is for us. But these statements are made only by our own people. I am yet to see an authoritative statement by the Prime Minister of USSR or any of the top leaders of USSR to the same effect. Why should our Ambassador or Foreign Minister go on making such statements which Shri Chatterjee, our able advocate, will say are heresay evidence? This is secondhand evidence. In fact, if we have the stamina and the grit, we must ask the Prime Minister and the leaders of USSR, "Friends! do not allow us to make the statement; it is far better that you make the state-

ment and our nation will applaud your support and your sympathy."

During the time of Mr. Khrushchev, he made it abundantly clear to the world and to Pakistan that he was the friend of India. He made a categorical declaration that Kashmir is India's and anybody who meddles with it would do so at his peril. There was that glow in his foreign policy; there was that warmth in that foreign policy. Do we find the same glow and warmth in the foreign policy statements of USSR today?

An. hon. Member: No.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: And we are accused of inconsistencies by some of our leaders on the other side!

It was a very strange spectacle of the SEATO and CENTO puppet, this moustached Ayub Khan, parading before the Kremlin in procession. Such a thing would have been unthinkable in the days of Khrushchev or a few years earlier. What a modification! Today, we continuously say that Russia is helping us in many ways as also militarily. It is true, I admit; but listen to Pakistan Radio. Another delegation of the USSR people has gone there and they are trying to help the building up of the economy of Pakistan in many ways.

An hon. Member: Third Five Year Plan.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I am not blaming the USSR I do not appreciate the trend of taking any country to task if they do not oblige us in the way we want. That is hardly the way of a mature nation. Some of my hon. friends, merely adhere to the path that when they help us we praise them; if they do not help us we abuse them. This is a childish way of speaking on foreign policy. I do not object to the formulation of the foreign policy of the USSR in a way they think best.

USA and UK have a glorious history behind them. We may agree with some chapters and disagree with some chapters; but their history is as bright as any history that has even been written so far as the human race is concerned. The First World War was fought in order to make the world safe for democracy. That was the famous statement made by President Wilson and on that foundation he built the League of Nations. That floundered. The Second World War was fought in order to make the world free from Nazism and Fascism. They made Hitler and Mussolini war criminals. In order to make liberty and freedom safe in this world they fought the Second World War.

Now what are they doing? After the Second World War there are more dictators, military and proletariat, than there have ever been on this globe. It is the UK, which has what is called the mother of Parliaments, and it is the USA, which holds the torch of freedom—these are the two countries that are going directly against the two world war ideals during which millions of their countrymen sacrificed their lives. It is only an appeal that I am making; it is not so much a blame. Is this a stand that is consistent with the history, the ideals, the war aims of the Western powers.

Here is a military dictator on our frontiers. He is not only a military dictator; he is a middle-age dictator! He wants religion to rule. England rebelled against this attitude of the Pope and made England secular several centuries ago. Here are America and UK who want to prop up this military dictatorship, this religious dictatorship in 1965 and establish peace on earth! Is it ever possible? And, then they talk of Kashmir!

I would appeal to the leaders of USA and UK to think that if Germany is partitioned, are we not entitled to say, "You must bring about some set-

[Shri Hanumanthaiya.]

tlement and make Germany one and united"; are we not entitled to say that Viet Nam, North and South, are divided and it must be one; are we not entitled to say so with equal logic so far as Korea is concerned? Therefore they must hesitate a hundred times before they advise us on Kashmir. Kashmir, for some reason or another, is divided today. They want Kashmir to be independent. Attlee, who probably has aged and may not be catching up with the trends of the times, wants Kashmir to be independent. Probably, Attlee, when he declared our independence, wanted that in India there should be 500 independent States. It did not happen nor will it ever happen that Kashmir is going to be independent.

I support the Government and the stand taken by our External Affairs Minister, Swaran Singhji, that we need not be shy about talking. Let us talk on Kashmir and say that Azad Kashmir must be united with Kashmir proper.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: So-called Azad Kashmir.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Azad Kashmir is illegal occupation. Swaran Singhji made a very meticulous legal speech while opening the debate; so must have he done before the Security Council. But the Security Council is not influenced by arguments however logical they may be. The Security Council is not the supreme court of international justice.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): It is a power combination.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It is, in fact, an international stock exchange, not of gilt-edged securities but of self-edged securities. Each country in the

Security Council and in the U.N.O. thinks of its safety, its influence, and its power. They do not sit there to listen to your logic or reason and there is no sense of justice there. This is the preliminary mistake we have made all the time. Whenever we feel frustrated we get into a mood of righteous indignation and blame everybody else in the world.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We walk out.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: What the Security Council understand is not arguments but alliances. If Pakistan today, in spite of the injustice it has done, in spite of all the ante-deluvian ideas it has, still has the support of so many nations, it is not because of reason; it is because of the alliances that it has forged. This hard fact has to be remembered.

Then, you will ask me: With whom have we to be aligned? I am the last man to advise on that subject nor am I competent. As Acharya-ji has said and as many others have said, it is for the Prime Minister to have personal talks with the concerned heads of States and come to some understanding not only to safeguard the frontiers of India and peace in the world but also to ensure justice in the world. Alliances cannot be effected for the asking. But to say all the time that we have done very well for the last 18 years is one extreme stand and to condemn, as Acharya-ji does that we have completely failed, is another extreme stand.

These foreign policies go on changing from time to time as I have illustrated in the case of U. S. A., U. K., and U. S. S. R. Nobody should be blamed. Times change and so do policies. Therefore, in the present context, we must see who are our friends, who are our enemies and who are our possible friends. These things must be very coolly examined.

So far as the Commonwealth is concerned, very mature men, very wise men, like Acharya Kripalani also get into temper and blamed U.K. for something done or not done. This is the reaction we have now. What was the reaction that we had three years ago when China attacked us? I would like to quote from the Hansard, from the debates of those days in the House of Commons but I have no time to do that. If you go through the speeches of the Prime Minister of U. K., the leader of the Opposition and many other Members of the British Parliament, you will find that they were made in favour of India and they will make you feel how grateful we ought to be for the things they did when China attacked us. It is not a question of blaming them. Let us understand them. It is a well-known fact that U. K. has not deceived us and that America has not deceived us. So far as China is concerned, they will fight with us. So far as Pakistan is concerned, they have a soft corner for it. To the very best of their ability they want to bring about an understanding between Pakistan and India. They have not deceived us; they have not cheated us. It is a well-known fact that for the last 18 years they have said so. We have to recognise the fact and adjust our policy.

It is true we have our own views and so has Britain. But in spite of all these differences, our late leader Panditji continued to be in the Commonwealth. It is not that the Commonwealth is a hindrance in any way to the formulation of our foreign policy nor is it a hindrance to the building up of our military strength. The stand taken by the Prime Minister of U. K., the Leader of the Opposition and many Members of the British Parliament during the days of Chinese attack was not that they wanted to defend India as such but that a member of the Commonwealth had been attacked and therefore, they said, "We will stand by that country, we will not only send arms and ammunitions to India but in case of necessity, we ourselves will fight along with other members of

the Commonwealth". That was the stand taken by the British Parliament. To them, the Commonwealth counts. What are they to do when two members of the Commonwealth fight among themselves? Suppose two of our friends fight with each other. Naturally, we have to play the role of making a compromise. That is the role they are playing.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): They could at least be neutral.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Yes, Sir. I quite appreciate the point made by Swaran Singhji. The force with which he has made the point in his speeches in the Security Council has had its effect. Now, the U. K. and the U. S. A. are modifying their stand. They are saying that so far as plebiscite is concerned, it is a dead issue. It may be that your firm stand will ultimately be able to make them agree with you. The United Kingdom ultimately agreed with Mahatma Gandhi, though it opposed the idea of Swaraj for 60 long years. Ultimately they did come to an agreement with the Congress leaders by saying, let there be independence for this country. If we shape our foreign policy with dignity, decorum and understanding, I am certain both Britain and America will come to see that the stand taken by India is right.

Shri Muthyal Rao (Mahbubnagar): It will take a hundred years.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Mr. Bhutto promises to fight for a thousand years. You can wait for a hundred years.

The other day, I read the *London Times* and an issue of *Economist*. They clearly say that if China ever attacks India, they are going all out to fight along with others to teach a lesson to China. So far as Pakistan is concerned, it is a different issue. Let us understand the temper of the times. We have to be realists. I appeal to you now

[Shri Hanumanthaiya.]

that if you want to fight, you must fight like a Punjabi hero and a Punjabi warrior. If you want to come to a compromise, you must come to a compromise with real and sincere friendship.

Now, you yourself advocate, let there be a cease-fire, let both the countries come to some settlement and let there be some cease-fire line or international line. So, you have taken the stand of compromise. War is over, according to you. It may be that, by way of precaution, you may say that we must be ready to face either Pakistan or China if it ever commits again an act of aggression. That is conceded. But as you fought with determination to stem the aggression of Pakistan, you have to pursue with equal zeal and determination the path of compromise. And that must be seen by the whole world. It must be realised by America and U.K. I am not asking you to give up your stand. The stand that has been taken by you is correct and it is in consonance with public opinion. The only thing is that we should not hesitate but we should be firm in our stand.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few suggestions. Firstly, there must be a firm stand that Azad Kashmir must be handed over to India in order to ensure permanent peace between India and Pakistan. Secondly, I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Mathur, on the question of the manufacture of atom bomb, and I suggest that you should not overdo by way of making statements and you should not commit yourself by saying that you do not want to manufacture atom bomb. Our Prime Minister has made a limited statement. I say, please do not go beyond the statement and commit yourself to the principle as a matter of faith. Thirdly, if you pursue the policy of friendship with all the nations irrespective of their ideology or the stand they take in international politics, it is high time that you should recognise Israel and Taiwan. When we

recognise even our so-called enemies, like Pakistan and China and countries like Jordan and others, it does not stand to reason to say that Israel and Taiwan should be the out-castes of international society.

An hon. Member: And East Germany.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: So also East Germany. We must recognise any country that has a Government, unless it is prohibited by the U.N. Resolution as is the case with Rhodesia supported by the majority of the people of that country.

So far as China is concerned, as you know, it is out to have a worldwide revolution, a red revolution, a military revolution, under its leadership. Ultimately its idea is that the whole world should be under communist leadership. Therefore, we must change our attitude towards China on these two subjects. We must join those people who are pleading against admission of China into the U.N.O. I deliberately say so because the very day China is admitted to the U.N.O., it will automatically claim a permanent seat in the Security Council; it will not come there for nothing and you cannot have a troublesome nation of this kind as a permanent member of the Security Council. Here logic as well as national interest compel us to see that we do not agree to the admission of China into the U.N.O. Then comes the issue of Tibet. (*Interruptions*).

So far as Tibet is concerned, it must be raised in the U.N. as a subject. When Tibet was overrun by China, the United States and other countries wanted to make it an issue in the U.N., but our delegate made a contemptuous remark against the U.S. and U.K. delegates by saying that they had no business to interfere in this conflict between India and China. That was a hurting remark which is still rattling in the

minds of western statesmen. Now the time has come; the Dalai Lama has appealed to you and to the Prime Minister. This is the time when we should officially raise this question of Tibet on the floor of the U.N.

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (विजनौर) :

सभापति महोदय, भारत सरकार की दुर्बल प्रचार नीति से भ्रमवा स्वार्थों से पूरी तरह डूबे हुए होने के कारण पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों में एक बड़ी प्रबल भावना काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में यह बन गयी है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के संघर्ष की कड़ी विशेष रूप से काश्मीर है। उनका क्याल है कि अगर काश्मीर की समस्या का समाधान इधर या उधर कुछ हो जाए तो हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान दोनों राज्य शान्ति के साथ पड़ोसी के नाते रहने लगेंगे।

मेरा अपना विचार है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के संघर्ष की कड़ी काश्मीर नहीं है, अपितु काश्मीर उस संघर्ष का केवल एक अंग मात्र है। अगर काश्मीर की समस्या का समाधान हो भी जाए, तो पाकिस्तान जिसकी गाली देते देते जीभ सूख गयी है, वह नपलपाकर फिर बाहर घ्रा जाएगी और कल को फिर उसी प्रकार की समस्या जैसी कि आज उसने लाखों की संख्या में बुसपैठिये धमम में भेज कर या दूसरा जगह भेज कर खड़ी की है, उसी प्रकार की कोई समस्या खड़ी कर देगा। वह इस तरह की भी समस्या खड़ी कर सकता है कि पाकिस्तान के दोनों भागों को मिलाने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान के बीच से कोई रास्ता दिया जाए। पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच में संघर्ष का प्राधार केवल काश्मीर की समस्या ही नहीं है। यह तो उस श्रृंखला की एक छोटी सी कड़ी है।

इसके लिए बड़ा आवश्यक यह है कि हम उस मनोवृत्ति को समझें जो कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के संघर्ष की बुनियाद है।

वह मनोवृत्ति वह ही है जिससे एक देश का विभाजन दो देशों के रूप में हुआ। जब तक उस मनोवृत्ति पर चोट नहीं पहुंचायी जाती, तब तक हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच का यह संपर्प कभी समाप्त नहीं हो सकता।

जहां तक काश्मीर की समस्या के समाधान का सम्बन्ध है, मैं इस बात से पूरी तरह सहमत हूँ, और विश्व के दूसरे कुछ देश भी इससे सहमत हैं कि काश्मीर की समस्या को बहुत लम्बा बना कर न रखें। पिछले 18 वर्षों में इस समस्या को टालते-टालते हम यह सोचने लगे थे कि शायद धीरे-धीरे भारत-वासी इस प्रश्न को भूल जायेंगे और दुनिया के दूसरे देश भी इसे भूल जाएंगे। लेकिन उसका दुष्परिणाम आज सन् 1965 में हमारे सामने घा खड़ा हुआ। अब इस चोट को खाने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को इस विषय में अन्तिम रूप से ही कुछ निर्णय गर लेना चाहिए और काश्मीर समस्या को सदा के लिये समाप्त कर देना चाहिये।

जहां तक संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ या सुरक्षा परिषद् का प्रश्न है, हमें यह उन से स्पष्ट भाषा में कह देना चाहिए कि जो हिस्सा काश्मीर का हमारे पास है, चाहे वह उड़ी-पुंछ का हो या हाजी पीर का हो, उस हिस्से के सम्बन्ध में हमारी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ से या सुरक्षा परिषद् से कोई शिकायत नहीं है। सुरक्षा परिषद् या संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सामने काश्मीर के बारे में हमारा कोई केस है तो केवल यही कि काश्मीर का जितना हिस्सा, तथाकथित आजाद काश्मीर के नाम से, अभी भी पाकिस्तान के हाथ में है, वह पाकिस्तान बिना बून बहाए हमको वापस करता है या उसको भी जनरल चौधरी को ही वापस लेना पड़ेगा। बस केवल इतनी ही शिकायत हमारे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ और सुरक्षा परिषद् के सामने है। हम नहीं चाहते कि कोई अशान्ति हो या कोई अस्थिरता आए। लेकिन अब भारतीय जनता

[श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री]

अपने प्रदेश को देर तक पाकिस्तान के अधिकार में सहन नहीं करेगी।

15.56 hrs.

[DR. SAROJANI MAHIBBI in the Chair]

कुछ लोग हमारे यहां यह भी कहते हैं कि अगर काश्मीर की कुछ घरती पाकिस्तान को दे भी दी जाए तो इसमें भूल क्या है। पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों से प्रभावित कुछ एक दो मस्तिष्क यहां भी हैं जो उसकी व्याख्या सीधे न करके शब्दों के आवरण में ढांक कर उसी बात को कहते हैं। मैं अपने उन मित्रों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सवाल केवल धार्मिक नहीं है। अगर यह प्रश्न केवल धार्मिक होता तो उसका बड़ी धामानी से समाधान किया जा सकता था। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का प्रश्न धार्मिक नहीं है, न ही वह आवादी के बटवारे का प्रश्न है। हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच घरती का बटवारा दुष्प्रा है। हमारा और पाकिस्तान का बटवारा घरती का आधा है, और अगर अमरीका या ब्रिटेन ... कहना है कि काश्मीर की घाटी में किसा विश्व सम्प्रदाय के मानने वाले ज्यादा हैं और उसकी सहानुभूति पाकिस्तान के साथ है, तो वह बड़ी खुशी से कल के बजाय आज ही पाकिस्तान चले जाएं। लेकिन उसका यह अभिप्राय नहीं है कि वह घरती भी पाकिस्तान को दे दी जाए। जबकि घरती का बटवारा हो चुका है, तो अब घरती का पुनः बटवारा दुनिया की किसी अदालत में समझौते का आधार नहीं बन सकता। अगर कभी भारत सरकार ने किसी प्रकार की दुर्बल नीति का आश्रय ले कर यह बात सोची तो हम फिर वही भूल करेंगे जो कि हमने तिब्बत को चीनी राक्षस के मुंह में दे कर की थी और जिस के परिणामस्वरूप दुश्मन आज हमारे तिर पर आ कर खड़ा हो गया।

काश्मीर की भौगोलिक स्थिति को जो लोग जानते हैं, और जिन्होंने काश्मीर

को भूम कर देखा है, वे अच्छी तरह जानते होंगे कि इस घाटी में कुछ इस प्रकार के क्षेत्र हैं जैसे प्रायः पहाड़ी हिस्सों में नहीं होते। काश्मीरी लोग अपनी भाषा में उन्हें "कुरें" कहते हैं। य इस प्रकार के क्षेत्र हैं कि यदि इन पर सीमेन्ट बिछा दिया जाए तो ये बड़ी आसानी से हवाई अड्डे बन सकते हैं। तो क्या आज हम काश्मीर का कुछ हिस्सा पाकिस्तान को देकर या किसी दूसरे को देकर या उसे आजाद करके अपने लिए मुसीबत मोल लेंगे? जैसी कि हमने तिब्बत को चीन के हवाले कर के ली थी। यदि ऐसा नहीं करना है तो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को दम समय बुद्धिमत्तापूर्वक निर्णय लेना चाहिये। आप ने दृढ़ता के साथ सुरक्षा परिषद् में कहा है कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का भाग है, और भी दुनिया में आप ने सिद्ध किया है कि काश्मीर का कोई प्रश्न ही अब नहीं है, और भी भारत सरकार के सब लोग ऐसा कहते हैं। लेकिन आपकी नीति को देख कर सन्देह होता है कि जब तक भारतीय संविधान की धारा 370 कायम है उस समय तक आप दुनिया को यह कैसे समझा सकेंगे कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है। अभी गृह मंत्री ने कहीं एक वक्तव्य दिया है कि हम अपने संविधान की और कुछ धाराएं काश्मीर में लागू करने जा रहे हैं। पर आपको धारा हटाने में दिक्कत क्या है? आज तो इस के लिए सब से अच्छा मौका है जब कि आप संविधान की इस मरी हुई धारा को समाप्त कर दें। अगर काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में आप सन्देह को मिटाना चाहते हैं तो यह आवश्यक है कि आप इस धारा को अपने संविधान से हटा दें।

रही पाकिस्तान की मनोवृत्ति की बात जिस मनोवृत्ति के आधार पर वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ संघर्ष बनाए हुए है मुझे यह बात बफते हुए बड़ी खुशी होती है कि भारत सरकार में कुछ इस प्रकार के लोग हैं जो जनता के हृदय की बात कभी-कभी बोसते हैं और जब कभी वे

निर्णय लेते हैं जो देश की आत्मा को ध्यान में रख कर ही निर्णय लेते हैं। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह बात हमारे विदेश मंत्री या प्रधान मंत्री के मुँह से निकलनी चाहिए। सौभाग्य से इस समय श्री त्यागी जी सदन में मौजूद हैं। उन्होंने एक स्थान पर कहा है कि अगर पद्धतियों की गवर्नेमेंट बनती है या पूर्वी पाकिस्तान की स्वतंत्र सरकार बनती है तो भारत सरकार को उसे मान्यता देने में कोई हिचकिचाहट नहीं होगी। मैं श्री त्यागी को और उनके सहयोगियों को इसके लिए बधाई दूँगा अगर यह उनके मंत्रिमंडल का भी निर्णय है और मंत्रिमंडल के दूसरे सदस्य भी यही अनुभव करते हैं। पर ये शब्द आज विदेश मंत्री श्री स्वर्ण सिंह के मुँह से निकलने चाहिए या प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी के मुँह से निकलने चाहिए।

16 hrs.

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां ने क्या कहा। संसद के कुछ साथी काबुल में उनसे मिलने गए थे। उस समय उन्होंने उनसे कहा कि आप दिल्ली आइएँ। खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां ने कहा कि क्या दिल्ली वासों में इतनी जूरत है कि मुझे दिल्ली बुलावें? आपके साथियों ने उनसे कहा कि आप दिल्ली आइएँ, दिल्ली आपके रास्ते में आखें बिठावेंगी। आपने देश के स्वतंत्रता संग्राम में भाग्य बड़ कर कंधा लगाया था। इस पर खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां ने कहा कि जब आपको राष्ट्रीय मुसलमानों की जरूरत थी तब आपको पठान और लालबुर्ती दल याद आता है, लेकिन जिस समय आपको देश के विभाजन की जरूरत हुई तो आपको जिन्ना और लियाकत खली याद आए। हमें इन भेड़ियों के हवाले छोड़ कर चले आये। 18 साल से किस हालत के अन्दर हम यहाँ हैं किसी ने धाकर कर्मा पूछा? हम अगर दिल्ली आ सकते हैं तो उसी हालत में आ सकते हैं कि दिल्ली की हकूमत यह बंदे कि

कार्बल में बैठकर यदि मैं पठानों की आजादी का आन्दोलन चला सकता हूँ तो दिल्ली में भी मुझे यह अधिकार प्राप्त रहेगा। विदेश मंत्रों आज इस बात की दृढ़ता के साथ घोषणा करे। दुनिया में शान्ति की स्थापना के लिए, इंसानियत की रक्षा के लिए अगर दलाई लामा को हम यहाँ बैठा कर तिब्बतियों की मुक्ति का आन्दोलन चलाने के लिए राजत दे सकते हैं या इस प्रकार का वातावरण निर्माण करने का अवसर दे सकते हैं तो कोई गलती इस बान में नहीं है कि पठान जिन्होंने हमारे देश की आजादी में इस तरह कंधा से कंधा लगा कर उसी तरह काम किया है जिस तरह हिन्दुओं ने काम किया है तो आज खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां को खूली छूट होनी चाहिये कि वह दिल्ली में बैठ कर पठानों की मुक्ति का आन्दोलन चला सकें। यहाँ हर प्रकार की सुविधा खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां को मिलनी चाहिए। इसी प्रकार पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के बह सांग जो कि बर्तिस दाता के बीच जीभ की तरह से है उन को हमारा समर्थन मिलना चाहिए। उमरकोट और थरपरकर के लोगों को भी समर्थन मिलना चाहिए। जिस दिन यह बात हो जायगी उस दिन पाकिस्तानी साप के दात टूट जायगे और यह साप किसी को काट नहीं सकेगा। दूसरा तरीका यह पाकिस्तान की मनोवृत्ति से निबटने का है कि साप की कमर तोड़ी जाए। कमर तोड़ने का तरीका है कि हम अपने रक्षा मंत्री श्री चव्हाण को कहें कि अब की बार जो हमने भूल की और दुनिया हमारी जिस भूल का उपहास करती है और हमें खुद अपनी जिस भूल का अब अहसास होता है कि हम ने इतना क्या प्रोपेगंडा किया कि हम लाहौर की ओर जा रहे हैं और अगर किया था तो हमको लाहौर लेटना चाहिए था। लेकिन हो सकता है कि कुछ इस प्रकार का कारण हो जिसकी कि वजह से उस समय उसे नहीं ले सके हैं? लेकिन अब वह कारण भी तो समाप्त हो गया। अब वह कारण समाप्त होने

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

के बाद हमारे गृह मंत्री श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा ने जैसा कि अभी तीन दिन पहले प्रमृतसर में कहा कि पाकिस्तान के साथ अग्रर दुबारा छेड़छाड़ हुई तो वह अंतिम होगी। और निर्णायक होगी। बीच में रुकने का सवाल नहीं होगा। इस प्रकार की बात है। लेकिन मैं उसके लिए एक बात और भी चाहता हूँ कि यह जो रोज रोज की पाकिस्तान की ओर से छेड़छाड़ होती रहती है, आज डोगराई में, फिर बरकी में हो गयी, फिर सियालकोट में हो गयी और फिर राजस्थान क्षेत्र में छेड़छाड़ हो गयी तो उसके लिए हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर या डिफेंस मिनिस्टर को एक बात कहनी चाहिये जैसे कि भगवान श्रीकृष्ण ने शिशुपाल से यह कहा था कि यदि तुम 100 गाली तक दोगे तो मैं तुम्हें क्षमा कर सकता हूँ लेकिन 101वीं गाली जिस समय तेरे मुँह से निकली तो याद रखना तेरी गर्दन पर मुद्राशन चक्र चलता हुआ दिखाई देगा। भारतीय नेताओं को देश के स्वाभिमान को ध्यान में रखते हुए स्पष्ट भाषा में सुरक्षा परिषद् के सेक्रेटरी ऊ दान्ट और पाकिस्तान के नेताओं को कह देना चाहिए कि भ्रमुक तारीख तक यह नालाकियां बरित की जा सकती हैं। लेकिन उस तारीख के बाद भी अग्रर भारत की शान्ति को इसी प्रकार छोड़ा जाता रहा और इसी प्रकार स्थान-स्थान पर यह बराबर छेड़छाड़ चलती रही और हमारे मेजस और सिपाहियों के खून में इस गलत तरीके से पाकिस्तानी हाथ रंगते रहे तो हम मजबूर हो जायेंगे। दुनियां उस समय भारत को अपराधी न कहें कि हम ने एक देश के अस्तित्व को समाप्त किया। अग्रर कभी ऐसी स्थिति बनी या वातावरण जम गया तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह देश श्रीराम की उस परम्परा का मानने वाला है जिसने लंका को विजय तो किया लेकिन लंका को विजय करने के पश्चात् अयोध्या का झंडा लंका की गद्दी पर नहीं लगाया। लंका को विजय किया

लेकिन रावण के छोटे भाई विभीषण को गद्दी पर बिठा कर चले आये। लंका से अन्त्याय व अत्याचार का अंत किया लेकिन लंका की गद्दी पर राम ने अयोध्या का झंडा नहीं लहराया। अग्रर पाकिस्तान इसी प्रकार के पागलपन में चलता है तो जनरल चौधरी और एयर मार्शल प्रजून सिंह को यह कहा जाय कि अब फिर लाहौर, सियालकोट तक ही नहीं रुकना चाहिए अपितु रावलपिंडी और कराची तक हमारे कदम बढ़ने चाहिए। फिर दोनों को जीतने के बाद खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खान को रावलपिंडी और कराची सौंप दिया जाय और उन से यह कहा जाय कि इन स्थानों को शान्ति के साथ तुम रक्खो। हमारे सोचने के ढंग में और निर्णय लेने के ढंग में कुछ परिवर्तन होना चाहिए। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर कहते हैं संघर्ष जरा लम्बा चलेगा। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि इस बात को कहने वाले प्रधान मंत्री इस बात को क्यों सोचते हैं? लम्बा संघर्ष कम-जोरों का चला करता है, बहादुरों का संघर्ष कभी लम्बा नहीं चल सकता है। हम संघर्ष के मैदान में या तो उतरें नहीं लेकिन अग्रर अब यदि उतरें हैं तो इस संघर्ष का अंतिम अन्त्याय लिख कर हटेंगे। बीच में इस संघर्ष को समाप्त नहीं कर सकते। इस के लिये मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरीके से चीन के भारत की रीठ में छुरा घोंपने व उस के द्वारा हम पर आक्रमण करने के बाद 1962 में हमारी आंख खुली और हमने इन तीन वर्षों में देश के स्वाभिमान को सुरक्षित करने के लिये अच्छी तैयारियां कीं। वहां पाकिस्तान के साथ संघर्ष में भी अब यह हमें अनुभव मिला कि दुनियां में कौन हमारा दोस्त है, और कौन हमारा दुश्मन है? हमें अपनी सेना की संख्या की दृष्टि से, शस्त्रों की दृष्टि से और शस्त्रों का उत्पादन करने की दृष्टि से भी यह पता चला। लेकिन मैं विदेश मंत्री के द्वारा भारत सरकार को यह कहना चाहता

हूँ कि अब हमारे पास इतना लम्बा समय नहीं है कि हम दो, तीन वर्ष तक प्रतीक्षा करते रह सकेंगे। रक्षा मामंत्री उत्पादन करने वाली सरकार के कारखाने बड़ा प्रच्छा कार्य कर रहे हैं। बड़ा शुभ निर्णय लिया गया तब जब बंगलीर के प्रन्दर हम ने हवाई जहाज बनाने के कारखाने का निर्माण किया। श्रीर जर्मनी से एक कुशल इंजीनियर को बुला कर लाये। लेकिन प्राज इन चीजों को धीरे-धीरे बढ़ाने का समय नहीं है। सरकार के साधनों का श्रीर उनकी क्षमता का पूरा उपयोग किया जाय। लेकिन इस के प्रतिरिक्त भी जो निजी उद्योगपति हमारे देश के प्रन्दर है श्रीर जो ऐसे कार्य में प्रच्छा सहयोग दे सकते हैं श्रीर जिनके कि प्रौद्योगिक कारखानों का हम इस दिशा में पूरा उपयोग कर सकते हैं उन की सेवाएं भी हमें लेनी चाहिये श्रीर उनकी सेवाएं लेकर देश को जल्दी में जल्दी प्रारम्भिक करना चाहिये।

एक बात में विदेश नीति के इस खोखले-पत पर जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ। जहां मैं सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह को इस बात के लिये बधाई देना चाहूंगा। उन्होंने विदेश मंत्री काल में एक ऐसा निर्णय लिया कि जिस पर सारा देश ही उनको बधाई देगा श्रीर वह तब उन्होंने किया जब मूट्टों ने सुरक्षा परिषद् में बैठ कर अपनी प्रसभ्यता का परिचय दिया तो उस समय भारतीय विदेश मंत्री व उनके साथी वहां से उठकर चले प्राये - जहां देश ने इस बात पर झुक रूप में अपने विदेश मंत्री को बधाई दी श्रीर कहा कि उन्होंने एक किया वहा साथ ही साथ हमें एक बात का कष्ट भी है। कष्ट हमें इस बात का है कि प्राज हमारे संबंध में जब भी कोई चर्चा वहा पर चलती है जैसे मूट्टों साथ यह गालियां बहा दे रहे थे श्रीर विदेश मंत्री हमारे बहिष्कार करके बाहर जा रहे थे तो क्या सुरक्षा परिषद् में कोई एक देश भी ऐसा नहीं था कि जो हमारी बात कहता श्रीर मनापति को कहना

कि कम से कम इस प्रकार सुरक्षा परिषद् के स्तर को तो न गिराया जाय। जो एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय न्याय देने वाली प्रदायन है उसकी प्रतिष्ठा पर तो चांट न पहुंचायी जाये। विदेश नीति के खोखलेपन पर प्राप के साथी संबल इतनी बात कह कर चुप रह जाते हैं कि विदेश नीति में परिवर्तन होना चाहिए। लेकिन जमा कीजिए, विदेश नीति कोई जड़ चीज नहीं है। विदेश नीति कोई ऐसी गठरी नहीं है कि यहां से उठा कर वहां रख दी जाय। विदेश नीति तो अखिरकार किन्हीं जिम्मेवार मस्तिष्कों से पैदा बनती है। विदेश नीति का निर्माण करने वाले भी तो अखिर कुछ व्यक्ति ही होते हैं। स्पष्ट भाषा में मैं इस को कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश नीति में परिवर्तन करने के बजाय प्राप विदेश मंत्रालय में परिवर्तन कीजिए। प्राप विदेश मंत्रालय में क्यों परिवर्तन नहीं करते 'एक श्रीर नया प्रध्याय प्राप दुनियां के प्रन्दर दिग्गज करने के लिये यहां से शिष्टमंडल भेज रहे हैं। दो प्रकार के शिष्टमंडल यहां भारत से बाहर जा रहे हैं। एक शिष्टमंडल वह जोकि सुरक्षा परिषद् में भेजा जा रहा है। सुरक्षा परिषद् में जो शिष्टमंडल भेजा जा रहा है तो क्या भूल श्रीर छागला ने की जिनको वहां से प्रापने बुला लिया श्रीर क्या विशेषता थी श्रीर रफीक जकारिया श्रीर मीर कासिम में जिनको कि वहां पर भेजा गया? क्या प्राज हम भी दुनियां में प्रापने इस उल्टे स्वरूप को गमत प्रोपेगंडा में प्राकर पेश करना चाहते हैं। जिनके पास प्रच्छा मस्तिष्क हो, वह चाहे मुसलमान हो, हिन्दू हो, ईसाई हो या पागमी हो कोई भी क्यों न हो, वह वहां जाकर हमारा प्रतिनिधित्व करे। हमारे सोचने के ढंग में अब बड़ा परिवर्तन प्राना चाहिए।

दूसरी सब से बड़ी चीज यह है कि यह जो विदेशों को शिष्टमंडल प्राप भेज रहे हैं इन शिष्टमंडलों में जो मददगार जा रहे हैं मैं उन की योग्यता के सम्बन्ध में उनकी देशप्रतिनिधि श्रीर उन की निष्ठा के सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार की कोई प्रापति नहीं करूंगा

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

लेकिन एक निवेदन अवश्य करूंगा कि क्या आपको पूर्ण विश्वास है कि जिस प्रश्न के समाधान के लिये इन को आप जिन देशों में चुन कर भेज रहे हैं वह उन समस्याओं से पूरी तरह परिचित भी हैं ? कश्मीर का प्रश्न किस प्रकार से उठा है और कश्मीर के प्रश्न में पिछले 18 सालों में क्या उतार-चढ़ाव आये हैं ? उतार-चढ़ावों के बाद आज वह कहा जाकर खड़ी है, कभी आपने जाते समय उनको ब्रीफिंग किया है या ब्रीफिंग करने से पहले आपने स्वयं उनकी परीक्षा ली थी कि वह इस प्रश्न से पूरी तरह परिचित भी हैं ? या ऐसी ही चाल चला रहे हैं जैसे अंधा बांटे सीरनी, फिर फिर आपने कां दे ? आप एक ओर तो विदेशी मुद्रा का रोना रोते हैं दूसरी ओर विदेशी मुद्रा का इस प्रकार अपव्यय होने देते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस के स्थान पर एक दूसरी बात करें। दूसरी बात यह कि भारतीय पार्लियामेंट के लोक सभा के और राज्य सभा के 750 सदस्य आप के सामने हैं आप उनसे यह देखिये कि कौन व्यक्ति ऐसे हैं और जो विदेशों की समस्याओं के अन्दर निकट से रुचि लेते हैं आप उन को कहें कि वे केवल उन्हीं देशों की समस्याओं का अध्ययन करें, उन्हीं देशों के वे विशेषज्ञ बनें। एक बार नहीं बल्कि कई बार जाय और उन देशों के साथ, उन देशों के सरकारों के साथ और उनके सामाजिक संगठनों के साथ अपना सम्पर्क जोड़ें और सम्पर्क जोड़ने के बाद समय-समय पर भारत सरकार जब उन देशों के सम्बन्ध में कोई निर्णय लेता उन देशों के विशेषज्ञ जो प्रतिनिधि हैं उनको भी आमंत्रित किया जाय। यह नहीं कि सात दिन के लिए शिष्टमंडल चला गया जिसने कभी रुस नहीं देखा जो कि पहले इसके कभी वहाँ पर पहुँचा नहीं वह सात दिन में आकर क्या राय देगा ? और कश्मीर को क्या समझायेगा ? वह क्या बतला सकेगा कि उसकी पृष्ठ भूमि क्या है। अब घर में

ही यह मानना कि दुनिया में हमारा पक्ष अच्छा समझा जाता है तो इसका क्या प्रमाण यह है कि जब आपका पक्ष कहीं भी आता है तो कोई भी समर्थन में खड़े नहीं रहते। सचार्इ यह है आप का पक्ष दुनिया में किसी को पता नहीं। प्रचार की दृष्टि से हम इतने दुर्बल हैं कि प्रचार का अभाव हमारे देश के स्वाभिमान को गिरा रहा है। आज हम को सोचना चाहिए कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति को थोड़ा आकाश से उतार कर धरती पर लायें। मैं पूर्णतया सहमत हूँ आचार्य कृपालानी से जब उन्होंने यह कहा कि हम अपने पड़ोसी देशों की उपेक्षा न करें। कुछ अन्य मित्रों ने भी यही कहा कि अपने पड़ोसी देशों की उपेक्षा न करें। मैं नाम नहीं लूँगा लेकिन मैं यह अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी विदेश नीति देशों से हट कर व्यक्तियों पर सीमित हो जाती है और जब कोई और दूसरा व्यक्ति उस देश का शासक हो जाता है तो देश को कितना नुकसान उठाना होता है और कितनी महंगी कीमत देनी पड़ती है ? कितना प्रयास करना पड़ता है फिर उस पुरानी स्थिति को वापिस लाने के लिये।

हमने अब कंट्रीब को अपने निकट लाने का बड़ा प्रयास किया है। आज भी मैं यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि आप अपने प्रयामों में कितनी प्रकार की दुर्बलता लायें। दुनिया में हम मित्रता की स्थिति बनाये और हमारे जितने अधिक से अधिक मित्र हो सके हों। लेकिन क्या कसूर किया था थाईलैंड ने, क्या अपराध किया था जापान ने, क्या अपराध किया था श्रीलंका ने, जिन देशों के साथ राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों के प्रतिरिक्त हमारे सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध भी हो सकते हैं ? हम उनके साथ न केवल राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध ही बढ़ायें बल्कि सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध भी बढ़ायें। सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध थोड़े टिकाऊ

होते हैं, सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्धों के पीछे एक पृष्ठभूमि होती है ।

अपने वक्तव्य को उपसंहार की ओर से जाते हुए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी विदेश नीति जिस दिन आकाश में चलना छोड़कर धरती पर चलने लगेगी और हमारी सैनिक शक्ति थोड़ी बढ़ जायेगी, हमारे निर्णय लेने के ढंग में व्यावहारिकता आयेगी, हमारे सोचने के ढंग में व्यावहारिकता आयेगी तो एक दिन यह भी आ सकता है कि जैसे आज के संघर्ष में, जिस प्रकार पड़ा लिये, अन्नपड़, गांव का, शहर का, हर घादमी यह पूछना या कि यह तो बताओ कि इस लड़ाई में अमरीका किस के साथ था, रूस लड़ाई में रूस किसके साथ था, अमुक राष्ट्र किस के साथ था, और इस स्थिति को आज हम छठाह साल में पैदा कर सके हैं, तो चाहें जहां कहीं संघर्ष हो, रूस का और अमरीका का बच्चा यह पूछे—कि यह तो बताओ कि भारत किस के साथ है । ऐसी स्थिति आपको पैदा करनी चाहिए थी । लेकिन ऐसा आप आज तक नहीं कर सके हैं । सुवह का भूला हुआ शम को घर आ जाए तो उसको भूला नहीं कहा जा सकता है । अब भी समय है कि आप ऐसी स्थिति का करे । अगर आप ऐसा करने है तो मेरा अनुमान है कि देश पर आप एक बहुत बड़ा उपकार करेगे ।

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinh (Barh): Madam Chairman, there is a little advantage as well as a disadvantage when one has to speak at the fag end of the debate. The advantage is that one can get a lot of knowledge and ideas from the discussion and the disadvantage is that a person like me has to speak after a very revered member of the House, Shri Kripalani, and I am forced to differ from him.

We have been talking about alignment and non-alignment. About that peculiar concept,—the very

existence of which is in question to-day, I find the same Members making the same mistake of thinking that there is any alignment or non-alignment in this world. It is very easy for them to seek an alignment, as if by their choice, desire and free will, the other countries will align with them! this is something that we have to take out from our system. This over-simplification of the foreign policy, this over-simplification of the situation prevailing in this world and this over-simplification of the attitude that we are in need of friends and the moment we start searching for friends, we will get friends—this attitude is something very mistaken and the moment it goes out we would be the wiser for it. It is a peculiar psychological complex which shows over-confidence: a kind of superiority complex which is really an inferiority complex and it should not be allowed to be generated in this country.

It is a very surprising thing for us to imagine today that we should make friends and we shall be able to make friends the moment we try. We do not realise, and we forget, that every country's interest in foreign policy is its own interest first and foremost. Every country's primary interest is to seek its self-interest not only for the present but also for the future and every country has to condition its policies with due regard to this situation. Not one country in the world has gone about with its foreign policy without seeking its self-interest, not only for the present situation but also for the future environments, necessities and needs.

We think here that because China has deceived us, we should immediately fall into the lap of America or other countries, as if they are very anxious to accept us in their lap. This is a very mistaken idea. I would like to quote from what is written by a very leading American journalist, Selig S. Harrison, who is supposed to be a very strong spokesman of

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

public opinion in America. It really indicates the view of the American Government and the American people It says:

"It should be a cause for alarm rather than satisfaction"—

mark the words—

"when national leaders in India throw their arms very enthusiastically around our neck".

This is the situation that members of opposition are creating in the other countries of the world, as if we are extending our arms to them and it is to our satisfaction that they should become our friends and shake hands with us.

This is the reaction of the people with whom we seek friendship so blatantly, without any dignity for ourselves. It is high time the Government made it clear that friendship will come to this country when the true interests of two nations are allied together. It is always a question of allies in a particular situation. There are no permanent enemies, there are no permanent allies. I remember the famous words of Mr. Kennedy who said that in politics there were no friends, there were only allies. It is true in individual politics, it is true in national politics, and it is very much more true in international politics.

And we have today friends. We are not so isolated, I do not accept that. If China is contained a large number of countries will be very happy, if its expansionist ambitions are contained, but that does not mean that we should assume that the moment we want to contain China, the other countries will come to rescue our operation. This is not a correct attitude. It is also a wrong attitude, that if we want to retaliate if some country misbehaves towards us, we should expect other countries to come to our

help immediately with arms and ammunition the moment we fight our battles, as if it is our accepted right and the international code of conduct that other countries should come to our help. This kind of attitude is causing loss of prestige to our country.

We should stick to non-alignment, but non-alignment is not a military celebrity, a concept of *brahmacharya* that we would not take up arms. Non-alignment is a policy in a particular perspective, with reference to a given situation. I remember that the previous High Commissioner of Canada in India, while praising India's policy, was also critical because we were not following in the footsteps of USA or Canada, we were following an independent policy, but when he went back to his own country, he submitted a report to his Government vindicating the policy followed by India at that time. So, the foreign policy of every country is primarily conditioned by the situation and the climate prevailing in the international horizon, with, of course, a little anticipation of the future.

At that time, what was the foreign policy of this country? After the second world war, the situation changed, and wars were no longer world wars but localised wars. Who were responsible for that? We were one of the nations who could hold the balance.

16.18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I do not want to feel very proud of our performance at that time, it is also not necessary to indulge in self-appreciation and praise, but India did certainly make a modest contribution at that time, to turn world wars into local wars.

Take Formosa: It was India which could persuade the Chinese leaders to see that there was no war between

China and Formosa and stop the involvement of America versus China and Russia in a third world war. Then came Korea. We did not stop that war, I do not take credit by saying that we stopped that war, but we certainly contained that war and converted it into a local war, we helped to see that such situation come into existence. I have no inhibition in saying that our foreign policy succeeded very greatly then, because it had a sense of perspective.

But if something happens which goes against our policy a little bit, we create a furore. But do we realise that the very basis of foreign policy in the whole world has undergone a change? There was a time when some countries of the world thought that the biggest danger in the world was international communism. Then came the time when America and Britain, the Western Powers, thought that it was not international communism which was a danger to the world, but it was Chinese-Russian expansionism. The alliance with Pakistan came at that time. But that phase has also changed now and now nationalism prevails. Even in the communist world, nationalism prevails as the primary ambition of the country. Happiness and prosperity and a way of life which is quite different to the international communism concept has developed and evolved itself and so the foreign policy of those countries has also undergone a change. No country in the world is standing today in the same situation and following the same policy and in India also today it should change according to the new situation, new environment and climate that is prevailing here. That does not deny the importance and the significance and the morality and the truthfulness of the earlier foreign policy. The same gentleman who is quite critical so far as the analysis of this country is concerned. I was very happy to learn from his report when he said that so far as our foreign policy is concern-

ed, the foreign policy was a primary factor, which did not allow India to divide. A sense of prestige was inculcated in this country, the prestige of the nation that they also have a foot in the world; this policy has created a country for us and has created a nation for us and has created a unified and dignified spirit of nationhood for us. We cannot forget that. It is rather unchivalrous for the people to the ungrateful for what Mr. Nehru did. Things that he did will remain and remain in this world whether we live or do not live. Members will not live here; they are not immortals; I may not live here, I am not immortal but those policies because they cover the basic truth of humanity will live for ever. Tomorrow and the day after if the world realises these are the policies which have to be sustained then Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's voice will come from the grave to speak to the world in that language, but then these Members will not be there to speak and cherish those policies, which they criticise today.

An hon. Member: Not Mahatma Gandhi?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Mahatma Gandhi also followed a policy of non-alignment. From the very existence, it was non-alignment but it was not non-alignment of the defeatist people; it was not non-alignment if the demoralised people but of dignified people who understand responsibility and dignity.

There is another thing. Our foreign policy does not require a revolutionary change. It requires evolution. I agree with some of the Members who have said that so far as evolution is concerned, it should be a sensitive evolution and painless and intelligent evolution. What we are lacking is not dearth of a foreign policy, not an idea to be propounded in the world, but a switch-over, an evolutionary process which should have been very sensitive, which should have been smooth. We have not been able to

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

hold it up. For that I have to put the blame not on the policy as Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri said—I agree with him—the blame has to be thrown on the administrative responsibilities, administrative organisation which has remained static from years together. This evolution should not come into the foreign policy with stops and jerks. It should be smooth evolution. But what is there that we have, for really moulding a good foreign policy. In other countries of the world they have detailed research and detailed studies not only of the present situation but of the historical antecedents and also the future climate that will come into existence. In America, Britain, Germany, France and Soviet Union, a big research unit is there which goes on consistently pursuing various researches and studies in various policies operating in the world today. They come to their own intelligent conclusion by proper studies, that today's policy may give way to another policy or may shape into another policy. Have we got any research section here? In America a big department is there which goes on studying the Chinese problem, the Russian problem, the antecedents of various countries continuously in a very very objective and calm atmosphere. We have absolutely no research here. In the Ministry of External Affairs there are various directorates; various directorates have been created, directorate for Africa, directorate for Central Asia, directorate for Middle-east, for America, for Africa, and for Latin American countries. May I have an idea of the work they have done, so far as the research is concerned, of the formula that they have devised that ten years hence such and such policy will be the foreign policy followed in most parts of the world? Have they any formula about this? Have they studied and made any research, showing that today our foreign policy is this, or that the world is following this policy, that

Russia is following this policy or China is following this policy and so on? And have they studied that today and the day after tomorrow, what will be the policy of China and of Russia? We have to live today and tomorrow and if we cannot come to an agreeable situation, can we start condemning each other, that everything is wrong about it? This aspect of the matter requires improvement.

16.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then about publicity, it also requires much improvement. In spite of whatever has been said in the House, is it not an irony of fate that the very existence of Pakistan is on account of the two-nation theory? I am reminded of the speech of Mr. Jinnah in which he very loudly pronounced this: that two nations confronting each other in every province, every town, every village, that is the only solution. That is the terrible solution, he agreed. But he said that this is the only solution. What happened to that? What happened to those words of Mr. Jinnah? Have we ever tried to make these words reach the world? Have we ever propagated that Mr. Jinnah, the creator of Pakistan and almost all the leaders who have followed Mr. Jinnah, and who also have created this situation all along, have been continuously propagating this kind of two-nation theory? Here is our country which does not believe in the two-nation theory. Here is a country which is secular in its approach and spirit, and yet, when American journalists write about us, when British journalists write about us, they write "Hindu India." Where has the Hindu India come from? Who has created that Hindu India? I do not understand. If we have not been able to make the world aware of this aspect, namely,

that here is a country which has got the biggest Muslim population in the world next only to Pakistan herself; it is our fault; and it is not their fault. We can condemn, and we can have the privilege of condemning everybody: we can condemn newspapermen and condemn their writings. But the very basis which provokes them to write these things has not been cleared up. I do not believe that everybody has become partial or everybody has become bad or perverse, or that they have an attitude of always condemning us. I do not believe that. If there is some wrong attitude created against us, the fault is ours, because, we have not from the very beginning, attended to it. It is also true as some Members have said that this parliamentary delegation is going to meet the situation today. I do not think that they will be able to meet the situation. It is much better for our delegations to go, when some of the problems of those countries arise, and to explain our view, our consideration, our understanding and sympathy, rather than to sponsor our own case in this way. But then, this kind of goodwill mission, this kind of propaganda and publicity should have been started from the very beginning. When the situation grew worse, when we knew about the distorted image Pakistan had created and it was based upon this two-nation theory, and it was they who had created this campaign of hatred, we should have started the propaganda then; it is not now that we should have tried to meet the situation, but it should have been done already.

Then, it is very funny that in some people's minds,—some American journalists and some British journalists and some other people—we stand condemned as a country which does not have faith in the principles of the United Nations. There is not one person in this country who has denounced the United Nations forum ever in its existence. There is not one responsible public opinion in this

country which has ever created an undignified approach towards the United Nations. When we have always considered the United Nations as a very dignified body, and it is the great hope for the future of the world. And if we really succumbed to committing some mistake about Kashmir, it was with that great hope that we considered the United Nations as the last word in human hopes and human peace. And this has been our attitude towards the United Nations, ever since.

But what has been the attitude of Pakistan towards the United Nations? The people who are now members of the United Nations—most of them—have failed to analyse and realise and understand that it is Pakistan which has been condemning the United Nations from the very day it was born. I am here reminded of one sentence which was spoken by Mr. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, who was then the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and who represented Pakistan at the United Nations. He said that "Pakistan is under no obligation, international or otherwise, that prevents her from sending her troops to Kashmir." The United Nations from housetops was calling for the troops not to enter the Kashmir territory and to withdraw the troops. But then, Mr. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan; who was at that time representing Pakistan at the United Nations, had the audacity and the cheekiness to say that "Pakistan is under no obligation. . . ." Why is it that those countries—United States of America, Britain and other countries—have forgotten that Pakistan from the very beginning had no obligation towards the United Nations and therefore the United Nations should have no obligation towards Pakistan?

Then, I come to another statement which is much worse and which abused the United Nations so clumsily and savagely that no decent, responsible person could think of. Who has said

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

so? It was Mr. Mir Mumtaz Daulatana, the Chief Minister of West Punjab, who said about the United Nations—mark his words which I am quoting “If the United Nations proves to be a band of thieves....”—I do not know why we have not been able to propagate these things to the entire world—“If the United Nations proves to be a band of thieves, we will have nothing to do with it.”

He said that the United Nations has become a band of thieves, and yet the United States of America, Britain and other countries take pride in supporting Pakistan which has branded them as thieves they being members of the United Nations. This is our mistake that we have not had enough publicity to take these things to the world forum and make Pakistan appear as she is, in her true perspective. That has been a mistake on our part. I am sure it is now time to realise that publicity is not that publicity where we can have a frontal attack in anything and get our things done; publicity should be intelligent, publicity should be continuing and publicity should be sensitive. Then only we can reach our goal.

Once again, Sir, I would like to congratulate Sardar Swaran Singh. Really his performance has been very good. I think his performance has been very good. He has made the other countries of the world realise that they cannot get away with any situation as they like. Let us make it clear that they cannot get away with any situation as they like, at any time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

श्री शीर्य : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस घदला बदली में हम लोगों का समय चला जाता है। इम तरह की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए कि हमको पता चल सके कि इस बोलेंगे या नहीं। हम तैयारी कर के आते हैं और समय नहीं मिलता।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मरी सुनें या नहीं—

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I have moved a substitute motion. I want to know whether I will be allowed to have my say on that or not.

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear the Prime Minister first. Then I will see whether I can accommodate some more hon. Members. If the House decides to sit for some more time, then certainly I can give them a chance.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Then it will not be possible to give them a chance.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened to many of the speeches made in the House. I do not propose to cover all the points, but I shall refer to some of them only. My colleague, the Foreign Minister, while replying to the debate, might be able to cover the rest of the points.

Sir, in the very beginning, I would like to say that when I took over this office my first attention was drawn towards our neighbouring countries and it was my feeling that we had many problems to face in this country, tremendous problems, and they had to be faced and they had to be tackled. I wanted that there should be peace in India and, as far as possible, we should build up better relationships with the neighbouring States.

The Ceylon Prime Minister came here in the very beginning, about a year before, almost when this new government came into office. There was a problem hanging for a long time between Ceylon and India. I do not say that whatever we agreed to between Ceylon and India, the agreement entered into, was wholly satisfactory or it satisfied all the people concerned.

Shri Ranga: It was very unsatisfactory.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I myself have said it. Yet, our effort was that, if possible, we should try to tackle it and resolve it. We had a long discussion here in Delhi for about a week or perhaps a little more than that, and ultimately we entered into an agreement. That agreement is yet to be implemented, and I am glad that the new Prime Minister of Ceylon is rather keen to implement it. He is, if I might say so, taking a very wholesome view, a liberal view in regard to this agreement. I greatly welcome it. In any case, the relations between Indian and Ceylon had improved and we do have friendly relations between the two countries.

There were difficulties in Burma and our people were coming away from Burma. That was a situation which created a good deal of suffering amongst our people. I requested our Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, to visit Burma. He went there and had talks with the Burmese Government. Though I do not say that all the problems have been solved yet some improvements were made. Previously our people were coming from Burma after completely leaving their assets behind. Some change took place in that position and, at least for the time being, the tension that was prevalent at that time was considerably reduced. Soon after that the President of Burma, Gen. Ne Win visited India. He came to Delhi and we had useful talks. I have no doubt that it has definitely improved our relations; while there may be some hitches, our relationship with Burma is exceedingly good at the present moment.

I went to Kathmandu in Nepal myself and I had talks there. I would not like to go into that matter further. I would merely like to say

that the relationship between Nepal and India is very good.

Of course, the relationship has always to be improved upon and we have to do as much as we can in that direction. I may say that we did try to tackle these three important neighbouring countries in the beginning and, on the whole, some good effects were produced.

I might also add that in the beginning it was my desire that we should have better relations with Pakistan also. I felt that it would be good for India if Pakistan and India lived peacefully and in a friendly way. It is for this reason that I decided to visit Karachi. While returning from Cairo I went to Karachi and I had talks with President Ayub. I must say that it did create some impression on me. Because, when we talked amongst ourselves we felt that some of the burning problems between India and Pakistan should be resolved and should be settled. For example, we felt that the skirmishes that were occurring frequently on the borders should come to an end. Then there was the question of refugees. I said that millions of refugees have come from East Pakistan to India. He also referred to some of the Muslims who are being sent out of India. He said that Indian Muslims are being sent out. I said that we are prepared to look into that matter. He suggested that there should be a meeting for discussing this matter. He was very particular that the conflicts or skirmishes which occur on the border should be stopped. So, he himself suggested that the military authorities of the two countries might meet, discuss and evolve a formula. Similarly, he suggested that there should be a meeting of the Home Ministers of both the countries to discuss the question of refugees and evictees as he described it. I said that these proposals are most welcome to me and that we will be only too glad to have talks with them.

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

On my return here we sent up proposals to Pakistan. We said that a meeting of the Home Ministers might be fixed. A date was actually fixed. It was later on postponed by Pakistan. Then, another date was fixed and even that was also postponed. Ultimately nothing happened. When we reminded the Pakistan Government that the meeting did not materialise and what they proposed to do, of course, then they said, "Conditions are rather at the present moment difficult" or there were elections etc. and, therefore, they said, this meeting could not be held. This happened in the case of Pakistan.

As I said, our desire was to live peacefully amongst ourselves. Between ourselves we wanted that we should develop better relationship. Of course, it was far from my imagination that Pakistan was preparing entirely for something else. On the one hand, President Ayub talked of these things and talked of having mutual talks and discussions; on the other, it seems that Pakistan was making preparations for forcing our hands to concede certain matters to them, to surrender on certain points—whether it was in regard to the Rann of Kutch or it was in regard to Jammu and Kashmir.

After a while—I need not go into that again; but, as the House is aware—Pakistan made an aggression on the Rann of Kutch and it was a sudden attack; it was an attack made with full strength. Even then we felt that in case this matter could be settled peacefully we should try to do so. We had said that in case Pakistan would vacate the Rann of Kutch, we would be prepared to meet and discuss. But Pakistan took some time. Ultimately, we came to an agreement. However, even with this agreement Pakistan, it is clear, was not satisfied. They felt that this was a means to achieve something. Even this agreement on the Rann of Kutch

provoked them to further aggression. They thought that they could compel us or force us to agree either to the separation of Jammu and Kashmir or to the merger of Jammu and Kashmir with Pakistan or whatever they may have had in their mind. However, they felt that through force they could compel us to agree to their demands and, therefore, even of course before the ink was dry, as it is said, on the Rann of Kutch agreement, Pakistan made a further attack on Kashmir and this time first it was through infiltrators. As the House is aware, thousands of infiltrators came into Jammu and Kashmir territory with deadly arms and weapons. There is—I would not deny—fairly dangerous potential; there are enough of mischievous people in Jammu and Kashmir and it was expected, perhaps by Pakistan, that they would be helpful to these infiltrators who had come into the territory in large numbers. Of course, these infiltrators tried their level best to create some kind of disorder and chaos in Jammu and Kashmir. It has been the practice and habit of Pakistan to create such situations, specially when a meeting of the United Nations or of the Security Council is held. They had been doing it for the last two years. This year also this was one of their plans to show to the world that Jammu and Kashmir is in chaos, there is complete confusion and disorder, and that India had practically no control over Jammu and Kashmir. Of course, they did not succeed in it.

Again, they made an aggression on the Chhamb area. Of course, this was a regular attack. Formerly, whereas it was a disguised attack, the attack on Chhamb was a regular attack with the full strength of their armour and weapons—they had come there—and there was, of course, a regular fight. When Pakistan sent infiltrators, we raised our voice of protest. We did say that a large number of infiltrators were coming into Jammu and Kashmir and that it was an attack from

Pakistan. When they made an attack on Chhamb, we again made it clear that they had not only crossed the cease-fire line but they had also crossed the international border. Even then, no country in the world, practically no one, said anything about it. They all kept quiet. But as soon as we moved towards Lahore, there were statements made and there were writings in the newspapers and the press that India had made an aggression on Pakistan. I would not like to say much on this. I would only say that this was the most unfortunate and the most unfair and unjust attitude taken by some of the countries with which we are friendly.

However, this matter was ultimately referred to the Security Council and the Security Council considered this. We said that it was necessary that the aggressor should be identified first. Although it was said as I have said just now, that India had aggressed or made an aggression on Pakistan, I think, now perhaps the whole world fully realises or knows the fact as to who the real aggressor was. We said in the very beginning that the Security Council should first identify the aggressor. I am exceedingly sorry to say that the Security Council did not do so. If the Security Council had done it, some of the problem would have been solved automatically. They had done it earlier in the case of some countries. They had done so in the case of Korea. In two or three cases definitely the Security Council had identified the aggressor. We said so because we felt that in case you do not identify the aggressor, you give encouragement to the aggressor to make further attacks and commit further aggression.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This is the second aggression.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Therefore, it was important that the Security Council should have considered over this matter carefully and seriously. But it seems that the Secu-

rity council is not willing to do so. However, the result is obvious. The result now is that Pakistan is committing violations of cease-fire almost everyday. There are serious incidents there are minor incidents and more than a thousand incidents have taken place so far. This is so, as I said, because of the attitude adopted by the Security Council. Pakistan, if I might say so, feels encouraged to indulge in these things.

I do not know what their intentions are. But on the one hand it seems that they want to show to their people that Pakistan is still fighting. To create a wrong impression they have set their people in a particular way. In fact, they have fed them with the news or reports that they have driven away India. India has been defeated and something of that kind. But I need not go into that at all. I think at least the intelligentsia of Pakistan know well as to what is the position and what happened during this conflict between India and Pakistan. A large tract of Pakistan is under the occupation of our Army. This question of cease-fire violations might continue still it has been suggested that we should consider the proposal of withdrawals. I had written to the Secretary-General that it would be advisable that the question of cease-fire is settled first, or if the cease-fire stabilises, then perhaps it might be better to proceed further to consider the next step of withdrawals. But anyhow the Security Council has decided and they have laid the utmost stress on cease-fire and withdrawals to be considered more or less simultaneously. We are prepared to consider it; we are prepared to discuss it, but I would like to make two things clear: one is that, in so far as cease-fire violations are concerned, if Pakistan infiltrates into our territory now, we cannot afford to tolerate it, we will never tolerate it and we will hit them back. (*Interruptions.*)

Secondly, it is true that, in Rajasthan areas, they are there; we have

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

taken some action; we have made them vacate some posts and it will be..... (Interruptions).

श्री रामलक्ष्मण यादव (बाराबंकी) :
राजस्थान में कितनी भूमि पर निका
कब्जा है ?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Please listen to me. After all, when a discussion is going on, you must allow the speaker to have his say and Parliament is meant for that. It should not be that only if I entirely agree with you, you will listen to me or hear me; that is not the correct convention. The hon. members might say many things with which I may not agree, but I would listen to them most carefully. After all, this House must be used for that purpose, for having a free exchange of views and for having free discussions.

Secondly, about the withdrawal, as I said, I have made our position categorically clear. In fact, in the very first letter to the Secretary-General, when he was here, I had said:

"Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective, further details, are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place. I would also like to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will deflect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu & Kashmir is an integral part."

This was what I had said in the very beginning, and I had made it clear to the Secretary-General. I had laid this letter on the Table of the House and I had made a statement also then, and, therefore, I can only assure

the House that we cannot deviate from this position and we will never do so.

There has been some talk about my meeting with President Ayub. As the House is aware, this suggestion was made in the very beginning by the Soviet Government. I do not know what the attitude of Pakistan would be. In any case, we had agreed that we would be prepared to accept the good offices of Mr. Kosygin in this matter. But there is one thing that I would like to make clear. If this talk is going to be held with a view to discuss only Kashmir and settle Kashmir, this talk will never bear any fruit; nor will it bear any fruit if it is just about the present position of Jammu and Kashmir. As I have said, I am not going to deviate from that position at all. But one thing is clear. If it is suggested—of course, there should be an appropriate time for it, but still even if it is suggested—that we should have some talks on the total relationship between India and Pakistan, that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours and there are many points on which we could discuss between ourselves, then, of course, as I have said, although I do not think that this is the right or the appropriate time, yet I will not like to say 'No' to it. Of course, we cannot ignore the history and the geography of Pakistan as it is placed and as it has developed. We have to live as neighbours. If we can live peacefully, so much the better for us, and for both the countries. If they want to discuss the border skirmishes, if they want to discuss about the better utilisation of river waters, if they want to discuss about the refugees, if they want to discuss other matters, well, certainly, we would be prepared to discuss these with them. But, as far as I am aware, President Ayub or at least his Foreign Minister has only one thing in mind and he thinks that the real solution of amity and of better relationship between India and Pakistan is for India to discuss

Kashmir, in fact, not discuss but perhaps part with it and hand it over to Pakistan, a proposition which is wholly impossible and absolutely unacceptable to us.

I have nothing much to say about China, but I must say that what had happened the other day was not a good omen. It is difficult to say what China and Pakistan are preparing for. But if there is a joint attack on us later on, sooner or later, of course, we would be faced with a serious situation. It would be wrong to think that we can just throw them out. It is always difficult to fight on two fronts. So we have to realise the difficulties and the gravity of the situation. As I said, it would mean a lot for us; it would be a heavy burden, a heavy cost both in life and in arms, ammunitions, in every thing.

17 hrs.

Therefore, we will have to face a difficult situation. But I know that the country will have to steel itself to fight that might with all its strength, with all the strength that it commands. In fact, the real strength is our own strength, the strength of the country; and we get the help of other countries also when we are really strong.

Therefore, it is most important that we build up our strength, our defence strength, our economic strength, our industrial strength. All that is essential if we have to face the challenge of these two countries if they come up with a joint purpose and a joint effort.

On the question of non-alignment, I would not like to say much. But I am glad that Shri Masani has at least somewhat subscribed to it for the first time, because I have never heard him before saying that we should have the best of relationship with the USSR. This time at least he said that India should build up good relationship with the Soviet

Republic. So to that extent, I think the principle of non-alignment does not require my putting forward any other argument. Shri Masani is there and no better argument is required than that he agrees with this proposition. I think it is essential and good that we have the best of relationship with the Soviet Republic. I need not add that it would be impossible for us to forget the way they have helped us during a difficult period. We have good relationship and we will build it up, and I have no doubt that our bonds of friendship, will further get stronger day by day.

I might also say that we know that the United States does not see eye to eye with us on the Indo-Pakistan issue. We have our differences with them, but it would not be advisable for us not to have good relationship with the United States also. We have many things in common with the United States. We have also our differences with them. It is these two powers, the USA and the USSR, which to a very large extent can maintain peace in this world. It will be good if these two countries, holding entirely different ideologies and having different patterns of government altogether, live in peace so that the world lives in peace. After all, it is peace that the world is ultimately thirsting for. Every man in the world at least desires it barring governments' attitudes—governments' attitudes are different. But the people as such are tired of wars and they know the sufferings they have to undergo. Therefore, it is good—I do not say that India can play a very important role in that, but if we can do a bit, we will be most happy—it is good that these two countries live in peaceful co-existence—there is co-existence between them—so that all the developing countries could get help and assistance from them, and the world lives in happiness and peace.

I would only like to say one thing more, that it is true that we have friends as such who will come out

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

and openly support us. It is true that there are not many. Some Member had said that even Pakistan had not many friends, but I do not want to compete with them in this matter. The point is that whenever there is a conflict, most of the countries do not want to take sides, do not want to express themselves openly and frankly. These days, whenever there is a conflict, every one tries to bring about peace, to bring about a settlement, and all the statements are made more or less in the same direction. We have also done it, and we also do it. Whenever there is a conflict, India has always tried that should be settled peacefully. Therefore, there is nothing new. We should not feel that there is something absolutely new happening in which we do not get direct support from different countries.

There are certain countries in the Middle East, among the Arab countries also, which were wholly opposed to us, and yet it must be admitted, at least it gives me some satisfaction to say, that the Arab summit, when it met, did not take sides at all, and they appealed for peace.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Except Jordan.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: The Arab summit unanimously passed a resolution, and Jordan, of course, said something in the Security Council which was wholly opposed to us. Therefore, I said it gives us some satisfaction at least that the Arab summit did not take sides, and they expressed the view that the matter should be settled peacefully.

Of course, our attitude against colonialism has been there from the very beginning, from Gandhiji's time. In fact, he was the man who took the leadership and fought the first battle against colonialism, and when he fought it, of course, India became free, and after that most of the Asian countries also got their freedom. And

something unique has happened in the history of the world that in the last few years almost the whole of the African continent is free and has become independent. It is unfortunate that there are still some countries left which are under colonial rule—whether it is Angola or Mozambique, and now has come Rhodesia.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Tibet also. I am glad to see him smile. He smilingly agrees.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I must say that I am extremely sorry about what is happening in Tibet.

As I said, Southern Rhodesia has declared independence unilaterally which is something monstrous. We have always said that we believe in the rule of the majority, we believe in the one-man one-vote principle, and therefore we do not recognise Rhodesia's action at all. We would very much like to give our full support to the African majority living in Rhodesia. They should get the earliest opportunity to rule over their own country.

I am sorry I have taken more of your time. I would only like to say a word about my visit to the United States of America. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty and Shri Mukerjee had said something. He compared me to some kind of shy maiden or whatever it was.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Coy maiden.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: That he is outside always. If you meet Shri Mukerjee in the lobby, you will find him behaving just like a coy maiden! Here of course in the House, it is entirely different. Well, I had never said that I shall not visit the United States of America. Even at that time, even in the beginning when this was cancelled, even then I had said, and the Foreign Minister had replied that it will depend on the convenience of the Prime Minister—he had said—"to

visit America.' Therefore, I would like to make it clear that there is no such refusal as such on my part. And I might also add and say to Mrs. Renu Chakravartty that it is not necessary to wrangle for any invitation. Mr. Patil did not go there for that purpose at all. The invitation is very much there, and if necessary, of course, it can come again. But that is not a matter for which a particular person has to be sent to wrangle about it. But the timing of it, when I should go, it is entirely for me to decide, of course, subject to the convenience of the President also. But it is entirely for me to decide when I should go and when I should not.

There is one thing I would like to make clear. There are some doubts

perhaps in the minds of Mrs. Renu Chakravartty and someone else about that. I cannot be pressurised into accepting anything which would go against the stand we have taken in this House and outside.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know from the House whether we can sit for half an hour more.

Several hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Then the House stands adjourned.

17.12 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, November, 17 1965/Kartika 26, 1887 (Saka).