

Mr. Speaker: How long is the Minister of External Affairs going to take for his reply? Shall I call him at 4 o'clock.?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): It would be all right.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Like the anticipatory bail, he has given an anticipatory reply already.

Mr. Speaker: I thought it would be worth while having even that much, because if he had gone to the press conference first, we would have taken exception to that.

Shri Nath Pai: I have to offer a clarification. When Shri Manubhai Shah started this new precedent, in response to your many directions that if any important statement is to be made pertaining to policy, this is the forum where it should come, and I congratulated him. When you asked the Foreign Minister about time, I said he had already taken sufficient time—not that I do not like to hear him—and that he had made an anticipatory reply, anticipating points.

—
MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: Now there would be several points raised by Members, and he has to reply to them. If he does not specifically give a reply, then too they would take objection.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): On the previous day, several hon. Members had requested you to consider extending the time of this debate a little. We started very late today too. You may kindly see to it that he might reply at 5 instead of 4 o'clock. It is already 1 o'clock and there are many people to speak still.

Mr. Speaker: He has also to go away and I must consult his convenience also.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): I am prepared to surrender another 15 minutes.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): I have a serious point. We should put in longer hours of work at least to deserve the increased salary!

Mr. Speaker: This is for hon. Members to decide, not for me alone, as to which precedes the other, whether it is because they were working more, they have got the increased salary, or because they have got increased salary they should put in more work!

I would request hon. Members to condense their remarks within 15 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Would you be so good as to call him at 5 o'clock?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: He is willing.

Mr. Speaker: He says he surrenders 15 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Make it 4-30, a *via media*.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am prepared to start at 4.30, but if it spills over by 15 minutes or so, then the House might show indulgence.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We might push the half-hour discussion to tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, we will not take the half-hour discussion today. Acharya Kripalani. He will take fifteen minutes.

Shri Shinkre: The hon. Minister has covered so many points and it will be difficult for us to cover within fifteen minutes all those points.

13.00 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Every hon. Member should not touch every point that had been mentioned by the Minister. They

[Mr. Speaker]

should take up two or three points. So, that is not a very valid argument. (Interruptions)

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): **Mr. Speaker, Sir,** when I thought that the illusions about Panch sheel were over and nobody today talks of Panch sheel, our Foreign Minister for whom I have very great regard has enunciated another Panch Sheel. These, he considers, are the principles of our foreign policy. The first is that "we shall continue to seek friendship and develop our relations with countries irrespective of their ideology or their political systems." It is a very strange doctrine. If there are countries whose ideology is aggressive and who nibble at our territories, I cannot really understand how we shall seek and continue to seek the friendship of such people. They might follow in their own country whatever ideology they choose for themselves and but that ideology should not be such that it means that they invade other countries, especially our country. How can we be friends with them? Unfortunately in using political language we do not carefully see what we talk about. The beauty of the language covers the defect in thought. I cannot understand how we can cultivate friendly relations, say, with China or with Pakistan, if their ideology is aggressive. And I say that it is inherent in the communist ideology that they should be aggressive because they have taken upon themselves to bring about a communist revolution in the world. Of course that objective has been modified by Russia; but it has not been modified by China.

I have already stated many times that this 'non alignment' has no significance today except that we are not in a military alliance with any country. What does it mean? When we were in trouble, a friend of mine here on the Congress Party just now said that the whole people rose as one man and made contributions. But could we resist the Chinese with these contributions? If at that time

help had not come from western democracies, especially from America, would it have been possible with all the money that we collected—what you collected was absolutely nothing compared to the help that was sent by America—to resist aggression? How are we non-aligned when we are at war and are involved in cold war with our neighbours? I want words in political language to be properly used. How can we be non-aligned, when we are in hot war and cold war with China and Pakistan.

Then he enunciated some other principles also: "we want to help the UNO". Can we help UNO if it is being controlled by power blocs? If power politics are working in the UNO, what is the good of our help? We helped the UNO by taking the Kashmir question to it. What was the result of it?

One may leave aside all these five principles which our Foreign Minister had enunciated. I am afraid he has left one principle according to which the foreign policy is guided and should be guided. That principle is that we shall safeguard our legitimate interests. That is the first and foremost principle. All the other principles are of no value at all; even our working for peace in the world is of no value if we do not take care of our own interests. If we do not take care of our own interests, we cannot even work for world peace. That is the first principle of foreign policy of a country. It is the first principle of diplomacy: that we have to take care of our legitimate interests. It is this principle that we have forgotten and neglected and it has placed us in such an unfavourable position today that we have very few friends left in the world.

I also say this. Not only have we to safeguard our legitimate interests but we have also to make alliances, if necessary. Is it that we are non-aligned eternally? Supposing there is an invasion of India? Before the Chinese invasion in 1962 autumn, we said that any military help from the

power blocs would impair our non-alignment. But when the time came, though it was too late, we called for help from the Americans, after the Emergency was declared. But even then we got that help. Will we say at such a time, as we had said earlier, that if we took military help, we would be involved in the cold war? We got the help. That was one of the causes why Chinese went away. Tomorrow, it may be possible that this help would not be enough and we will want more help and help would come only when we are aligned to some country. What are we going to do then? Are we going to jeopardise the safety of our country and our Independence because we are bound down to the principle of non-alignment which has no meaning at all in the present world? We must recognise from where we shall get help.

It is very well to say that we get help without strings. But is it reasonable to get help without strings? What is the meaning of 'without strings'? Somebody does something for me and I do nothing for him! This is very good! Somebody should oblige me and I do not feel obliged! This is what comes to be the meaning of "without strings." I say when the last war was going on the British Prime Minister was asked, how he could combine with a communist country when he was so anti-communist? He boldly said "I would align myself with the very devil if I have to save my country from Hitler." We cannot make this non-alignment as if it were a moral principle from which we cannot deviate. You may do what you like; you may take the help from America and yet call yourself non-aligned; you may get military help even from Russia and call yourself non-aligned. But I say it is utter nonsense; it makes no sense at all. You may use the same word if you like, but it is a fact that if we are in trouble, we will get help only from the western countries; we may get some from Russia, but I do not know whether Russia sent us arms when

we were in difficulty. It did not. It may send us today, but it cannot send us in quantity for the massive help we shall require, if we are attacked. So, let us realise that massive help in any emergency can come only from America and from the west.

If it were not for America today, the whole of Europe would have been over-run by the communist regime. If it were not for America, there will be no South Korea left; if it were not for America, I have no doubt that there would be no South-East Asia, an independent South-East Asia. There will be little kingdoms; they would just be like the kingdoms in eastern Europe under the control of Bolshevik Russia and they would be behind the iron curtain. No country has ever stood alone when it is in difficulties. So, we must at last say that if there is any attack upon us we will get help from any quarter, alignment or no alignment.

Then there is another thing we must remember. It is a principle of foreign policy; it is a principle of diplomacy that our enemy's enemy is our friend. We have never made our enemy's enemy as our friend. Recently, I read in the papers that the Formosa Government has issued a map which is in no way different from the maps that have been circulated about our borders by China itself. Why did Formosa do it? It is the enemy of communist China. Why did it circulate the very same maps that were circulated by aggressive communist China? Nationalist or communist, that China is nationally aggressive is admitted today even by Russia. Why did Formosa do it? Because we would not talk with Chiang Kai-shek and his government. "We have nothing to do with it." Even the enemy's enemy is not our friend. It is a strange way to carry on diplomacy. What did Pakistan do? "India's enemy is China; therefore, let us make friends with China." And we are now in a quandary. This is the most ancient principle of diplomacy: that the enemy's enemy is our friend.

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

We have people who want to be friends with us, but we will not make friends with them. Take, for instance, Israel. Israel is a fact, and Israel cannot be wiped out as nation unless there is another third world war and that also if the third world war is won by the Arabs. We are friendly with the Arabs. So also, many countries are friendly with the Arabs in Africa, but they are also friendly with Israel. From Israel we can learn very much because they have made a desert into a garden. Our problems are similar. Also, if we want to learn co-operation in agriculture, we can learn it best from Israel. I do not understand why in order to cultivate friendship with Arab countries we should refrain from friendship with Israel, the country is very anxious to have friendship with us. I do not think there is any difficulty in this. If we are so much afraid, then our policy cannot be independent. If we are afraid of the Arab countries, if we are to consult the Arab countries whether we should be friendly with Israel or not, then I say we have no independent foreign policy. Foreign policy is not based upon fear. It is based upon independence. It is based upon our sovereignty. If we find that we can get a good deal of knowledge from Israel, I really do not see why we should not have diplomatic relations with that country.

13.13 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

So, we must remember that there is only one principle in foreign policy, and it is that by all means, by every means, we must protect our vital interests. The five principles do not apply here. I tell the Foreign Minister, we will have to forget them. We violated the principle of non-alignment when we took the massive help from the west.

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

Shri J. B. Kripalani: When did we take this help? We took it after the emergency was declared. If we had been careful, if we had not been caught in this phrase, "non-alignment", we would have got help much earlier and we could have resisted China. I do not want to take more time than the Deputy-Speaker would allow me.

I would request our Government to have only one principle of foreign policy, and it is that we shall take care of our vital interests that are legitimate by all means at our disposal. If it means military alliances, it shall be military alliances. Thank God, nobody wants military alliances with us. For, what can we give in return? We can give nothing. America has said let there be understanding and let there be proper understanding that if South-East Asia has got to be defended it has got to be defended by India and the West. If India is not there, the West alone will not be able to defend South-East Asia. I am sure of that, because they will want our help. If India is indifferent to South-East Asia's independence, then I think sooner or later, and sooner than later, the West will also say, "Let them go to hell if they do not recognise their own interests."

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the opening remarks made by the Foreign Minister were in my opinion a fairly satisfactory exposition of the general principles of foreign policy which this country has been following, and I welcome very much the reiteration and the re-declaration that he has made of those principles. My quarrel with him is not so much on the things he said as on the things which he did not say or omitted to say. As for the other arguments which have been heard in this debate, particularly those which have been made by both the Acharyas, I do not wish to deal with them because I have not got the time. I leave it to the hon. Minister to answer them because we must remember

that this debate is taking place also at a time when two very important elections are taking place abroad, the presidential elections in the United States and another presidential election in Pakistan. The impact of both these electoral campaigns will be, I think, to step up the cold war atmosphere rather than anything else. So, if the sentiments of Mr. Barry Goldwater found an echo in this House through the mouths of certain hon. Members, I am not particularly surprised. I leave it to the Minister to reply to them.

Acharya Ranga and Mr. Kripalani also, who suddenly find the balance of forces in the world changing, have themselves stated that alignment is gradually giving way to non-alignment among the big powers. Just at this moment, they feel India from being non-aligned must become aligned—a curious logic which I was not able to follow. In Pakistan too, I think President Ayub is facing probably the first serious threat to his power. Reports are speaking of massive support which Miss Jinnah is already drawing in her electoral campaign against him. It would not be surprising, therefore, if faced with that situation, the Pakistan dictator sought some means of diversion, which would strengthen his position in the electoral campaign. That diversion may very well be at India's expense in terms of military provocations and such like. Therefore, the cold war atmosphere is likely to increase in the coming weeks and not diminish in South-East Asia and on our borders.

In that situation, I welcome certainly some of the very limited steps, steps nevertheless which should have been taken earlier also, which the new Foreign Minister has taken, such as strengthening our ties with certain neighbouring countries and so on. Of course, we are all very happy that he made a direct contact with Ceylon and that the Ceylon Premier is coming soon to our country. But he might also have paid a little attention to

the fact that on this question of the Indian settlers in Ceylon, I read in the Press that Mrs. Bandaranaike, before she visits this country, as a preparatory step, has held all-party consultations on this issue. She has discussed with the Leader of the Opposition in the Ceylonese Legislature, the Leader of the Tamil Federal Party, the Leader of the Communist Party of Ceylon and various other groups have all been consulted by her in all-parties conference as to what stand they should take in Ceylon's interests, on this issue when she comes to negotiate. I do not find any such parallel move or thinking on the part of our Government. They never bother to consult the opposition parties on this issue. They are only content to answer questions and supplementaries whenever they are put.

Shri Nath Pai: They have a fictitious consultative committee.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: That is not quite the same thing.

He has not told us anything about—I hope he will do so in his reply because it is something which is disturbing the country very much—this apparent impasse into which these cease-fire talks with Naga hostiles seem to have got bogged down. I do not know what the truth of the matter is. But we were led to believe all sorts of optimistic tales and stories a few weeks ago, when we were concerned about the activities of Rev. Michael Scott among other people. But now something seemed to have happened suddenly like an anti-climax. I would like to know what the Government is thinking and on what lines they want to break the deadlock, if it is at all possible.

He has not told us about the renewed outbursts of anti-Indian propaganda by, of all people, Portugal, which now claims to go to the United Nations with a complaint against us for having reduced conditions in Goa, according to them, to a state which

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

is far worse than what prevailed before the liberation, and accusing us of acts of neo-colonialism.....

Shri Shinkre: Only the Government are to blame for it, for their lenient attitude towards the Portuguese nationals still in Goa.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. He is not yielding.

Shri Nath Pai: His voice needs to be heard, Sir, because he represents Goa. We tried to raise this matter of Portuguese complaint to the United Nations....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. He is on his legs.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: We would like to know something about that, because India's voice has to be heard in reply and nothing has been said so far.

On the question of China, we all welcome very much this reaffirmation of the initiative which was taken by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, which I really consider to be a bold initiative in the sense that we made this proposal before the world that in terms of the Colombo Proposals, if China agrees to vacate these seven posts in the demilitarised sector of Ladakh, we would consider sitting down to talk with them and begin negotiations. This is basically a move in the direction of snatching the initiative away from Chinese hands in diplomatic terms. But he has not told us whether we are just going to go on repeating this formula in a lifeless sort of manner or whether in the context of the coming Cairo conference of non-aligned nations next month, any special steps are contemplated by which this initiative, which has been taken very rightly by us, will be utilised to the fullest, so that we can mobilise maximum support behind our stand that these non-aligned nations can give, because many here have mentioned on more than

one occasion that among this non-aligned family of nations, support for us does not come automatically or spontaneously on this India-China border dispute. We have got to win it for ourselves. He has not told us much about that. Anyway, these are some of the points which he omitted to mention.

This, of course, is the first foreign affairs debate in the absence of Pandit Nehru and if we say a few things which seem to some people to be uncharitable sometimes, I do not think we should be blamed, because this Parliament, after all, has to act as a sort of Vigilance Commission of the people too, without any offence being meant to anybody. Some words have been used lately in Parliament and outside about deviation, to which some people have a sort of allergic reaction and they get very annoyed. I do not want to use that word. We can use words like lapses, mistakes, departures, or whatever may be the choice of vocabulary. We must function as a Vigilance Commission, because it is our concern to see that the basic policies which we have followed and which we consider to be correct and admirably suited to the requirements of this country's foreign policy are firmly retained and not cast adrift in this mighty turbulent ocean of international storms in which we are functioning. It is necessary. I personally suggest that it is a distortion, it is a slander, if I may say so, of the late Prime Minister to suggest even indirectly that he was not flexible, he was rigid, he was dogmatic and therefore, in the name of flexibility and pragmatism, what does it matter if we make a little shift here and there to suit changing times. I suggest this is a slander. Pandit Nehru was the most flexible of all world statesmen and flexibility in diplomacy should mean diplomatic tactical skill. It should mean the capacity for initiative combined with firmness in adhering to principles. Flexibility should not become a cover for dilution, for resiling from certain basic principles step by step. It should

not become a cover for yielding to pressures which are manifestly hostile. Non-alignment certainly should not be reduced to isolationism. Does non-alignment mean that we are just passive isolationists, neutral on all issues? That is not the concept of non-alignment as Pandit Nehru taught this country. Therefore, it is only from that viewpoint that we have to make some critical remarks about certain actions or certain statements of the Government in recent days.

I do not wish to cover old ground, because a lot has been said in the country about the Commonwealth Conference in London, rather about one aspect of it, the most regrettable injection into the final communique of that reference to the Indo-Pakistan dispute. Enough has been said on that. All I would like to know is which other country participating in that conference, apart from Pakistan and the U.K., was so insistent that this particular reference must be made in the communique, because certainly I cannot believe that without Mr. Krishnamachari's concurrence, it would have been possible for that reference to be inserted.

Shri Nath Pai: What have you to say about the omission of mention of Chinese aggression in the communique?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: There are other aspects of the conference and the communique, which represents the sum and substance of the discussions there, that have not been taken note of adequately in my opinion.

I wish to say a few words about this. For example, the Commonwealth Conference also discussed the questions of economic development of the Commonwealth countries, particularly the under-developed members of the Commonwealth—trade, mutual assistance and so on. The background of that is provided by the United Nations Conference on trade and development which had taken place in Geneva a short while earlier where our Indian Delegation led by Shri Manubhai Shah did very good and commendable work. In that confer-

ence India had played quite a leading role particularly in the deliberations of the developing countries—there were 75 developing countries—of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They used to sit together and chalk out their line of action. In that United Nations Conference, India, by all accounts, had played a very leading part which was welcomed by all these developing countries. One would have thought that in this field, at any rate, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari would carry forward the good work at London. But the Press reports—they have not been contradicted—say that when this particular issue was discussed at Marlborough House our representative remained silent. The communique talks in general terms of assistance from the United Kingdom, Canada, and so on, to other countries. But we find that, in the report of the discussions, the African countries were disappointed at the fact that India remained silent and, of all people, President Ayub Khan got an opportunity to pose at this conference as though he was the champion of the 'have-not nations' of the Commonwealth as against the 'haves'—it is there all on record, I have no time to quote them.

What could be the possible explanation for this silence, I do not follow, because it runs counter to the stand we took at the United Nations Conference on trade and development where we had very positive things to say? Is it reflection of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari's desire that the assistance that India should give to other under-developed countries should be channelled primarily through the private sector, because we find that in recent days private Indian industrialists have been encouraged by the Government and are being encouraged to establish new industries in many South-Asian countries and East African countries? A high-powered delegation of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce is, perhaps, at the moment touring East Africa, Sudan, Ethiopia, Malawi and Zambia. Mr. Birla and other friends of his are naturally anxious to invest

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

capital in these countries. But, surely, what the under-developed countries of the Commonwealth expect of India is that on a government to government basis we would try to the best of our capacity to render them assistance. Shri Krishnamachari's silence on this point at Marlborough House gives rise to the suspicion that apart from some technical know-how and training schemes which we as a Government may provide for them, we want to leave the rest of this plan of capturing markets abroad, as it were, to the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, may I point out one thing. The hon. Member is very gallant but he is now becoming . . .

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Sir, I refuse to yield. Shri Nath Pai is a very good friend . . .

Shri Nath Pai: I would like to know why when there were three representatives, he mentions only one all the time and not the failure in the other two . . .

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I leave it to him to mention about them. He is also gallant, young and all that. But he has recently acquired the habit of interrupting other Members.

Shri Nath Pai: This is an old habit, not a new one.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A very bad habit.

Shri Nath Pai: That is a very parliamentary one.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: On the question of South Africa the final communique to which we are a signatory says:

"It was recognised however that there was a difference of opinion among Commonwealth countries as to the effectiveness of economic sanctions and as to the

extent to which they regarded it as right or practicable to seek to secure the abandonment of apartheid by coercive sanctions of whatever kind."

This is the communique which we have signed, although the United Nations Resolution, which is at least morally binding on all member States, calls very definitely for economic sanctions and boycott of South Africa by all possible means.

Here, if I may say so. I think the Foreign Minister knows that two distinguished representatives, one of the South African National Congress and one of the South African Indian Congress are at this moment touring this country as guests of India. They have made it clear in numerous statements that the real trouble, the real reason why this white racist regime in South Africa is able to go on is the fact that it is being buttressed by the support particularly of the United Kingdom and the United States of America. It is they who, because of the millions they have invested, the capital they have invested in South Africa, the trade that they carry on, the arms they are supplying to South Africa, are most reluctant to implement the United Nations Resolution.

Now, in view of this, was it not India's duty at Marlborough House—we are supposed to be one of the elder members of this family—to say something? Did we say anything? Did we just try to pass the buck on to someone else or did we boldly state this fact that it is no use passing resolutions about South Africa unless the United Kingdom changes its policy? There is no evidence on record to show that we took a stand of that type.

Shri Swaran Singh: You know fully well that we have enforced all possible sanctions against South Africa.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Of course, we have, and because we have done that . . .

Shri Swaran Singh: Any enforcement is more eloquent than any speech.

Shri Indrjit Gupta: Because we have done that we are in a much stronger position to tell the Government of the United Kingdom that they must fall in line with the United Nations Resolution. I cannot forget that I have to really say a word of praise for Shrimati Lakshmi Menon who is sitting over there, because I find that in her speech that she made on behalf of our country in the Security Council of the United Nations on on 8th June, in the special discussion on South Africa, she minces no matters. I would ask the Foreign Minister to compare it with the tone of the communique passed at Marlborough House. On 8th June the ashes of Pandit Nehru were in the special train going on the way to Triveni Sangham, but I would like to think it was his voice speaking through the mouth of our representative to the Security Council. Just listen to the words:

"Unarmed, exploited, humiliated and tortured people are demanding justice and appealing to the United Nations—the only hope mankind has today. They may be killed by the rashness and madness of the South African Government. This august body may become an object of growing suspicion and scepticism of the smaller nations. The spirit of people struggling for freedom and equality will not yield to pressures and policies of the South African Government, however much they may be supported by external assistance."

Mrs. Menon then went on to refer to South Africa's build-up of her defence forces and the British supply of arms to that country even though the United Nations had imposed an arms embargo, and said: 'These developments are an expression of further defiance of the United Nations and of international opinion. They are a threat to the peace of the world.'

Very good. And, from this United Nations debate to Marlborough House in London, there has been—what polite word shall I use, because if I say 'deviation' some people get annoyed—a dilution. Has there been a dilution or has there been a softening down (*Interruption*).

Sir, in the Kenyan Parliament at Nairobi last week, one of Mr. Kenyatta's Ministers said that if the British Government did not change its policy towards South Africa, African members of the Commonwealth might be compelled to demand Britain's expulsion from the Commonwealth. Quite a refreshing thought, I feel. When we have already accepted this idea that for all time to come the head of the Commonwealth must be the British Sovereign, here is a new African country thinking in terms of expelling Britain from the Commonwealth.

Sir, my time is up but I have a lot of things to say. I will touch just a few more points. On the question of Malaysia, of course, we are all very grateful to the Malaysian Government and Mr. Tunku Abdul Rehman for his statement of support at the time of Chinese aggression. But may I ask whether that is the only criterion by which we are to judge our stand in relation to all other countries? If so, I would like to ask, why do you discriminate between West Germany and East Germany. The Capital of West Germany, Bonn, has strangely enough become one of the main centres in Europe for dissemination of Chinese propaganda, whereas, as everybody knows very well, it was in the German Democratic Republic, in East Germany, where for the first time after the Chinese aggression on India a Chinese delegation who appeared at an international conference there was heckled and howled out. But what do we do? We recognize the West German Government and we refuse to recognize the German Democratic Republic to this day. And I am very sorry to know—I would

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

like confirmation from the hon. Minister—a story is going round the capital that the Deputy Chairman of their Council of Ministers who has recently been here had on behalf of her Government made a new offer of assistance to India of a sum of Rs. 27 crores. They were willing to set up the entire plant and equipment, the payment was to be in rupees, spread over a period of twentyfive years at 2½ per cent interest, but that offer had been turned down by our Government. Because, I am reminded of the echoes of the Belgrade Conference in 1961, the earlier conference of non-aligned nations. I remember on the eve of the Belgrade conference a communique was issued from Bonn by the West German Government addressed to the nations assembled in Belgrade saying that any country which restores diplomatic relations with East German Government will be denied aid by West Germany. This is the famous Hallstein doctrine. Now we are approaching Cairo again, for the second conference, and yet the East German Government, with which we have built quite good trading and commercial relations, is not recognized by us. I do not know what sort of non-alignment is this; in any case, it is beyond me. They come and make us a good offer and we are told that it is being turned down. Has it some bearing, I do not know; I would like to know.

Similarly, with regard to Malaysia, I would only say this. We should not rush in where angels fear to tread. Is it essential that we must take sides in such a way? We may like to support Malaysia but we should not do so in such a way that necessarily Indonesia is angry. At Cairo next week when we are sitting round the table with 50 nations Indonesia will be there but not Malaysia, because Malaysia is very much aligned. She does not come there. She is not there in the list of nations which will be assembled at Cairo. I say that if we respect Tunku Abdul Rahman's concern for the freedom and integrity of

his own country, we should pay equal respect to President Soekarno's statement that he considers Malaysia to be a British pistol pointed at the heart of Indonesia. Why do we not do that? We have to be very diplomatic and tactful in these matters.

I do not know how many members are aware of the fact that when this new confrontation is taking place between Malaysia and Indonesia and we have committed ourselves through some statement, which I consider to be unfortunate, even our Embassy at Jakarta is not manned since March 1964. We have no Ambassador in Indonesia. That post is lying vacant and therefore we are not even in a position to be in proper touch with them. Therefore, I think this kind of methods and practices of ours should be reviewed and corrected if we are not to commit all sorts of diplomatic blunders.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I will take another five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken 23 minutes.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: In that case, I will just conclude with one more point.

We are very disturbed about the reported action at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference for the first time to give an institutional form to this association. Some hon. Member a little while ago referred to the spiritual kinship and ties which have always been the speciality of this Commonwealth. Then why should this spirit be given a sordid Secretariat, I do not understand. Let us stay in the realm of the soul. But here we find we have signed a communique approving of the setting up of a Secretariat. I do not know what that Secretariat is supposed to be, whether it is a new kind of associa-

tion, but the communique mentions nothing about it. I would like to know whether our delegation to London was authorised by our Government to commit themselves for this and to accept it, because I am worried more by the news that there is a parallel move by the British Government, because the British Government is interested in some institutional form being brought into being in place of the spiritual kinship which is starting to disintegrate, there was a parallel move at Camberley where the Joint Chiefs of Staff were meeting, including our military commanders—it was reported in the press, perhaps, it has been shelved for the present—to have joint Commonwealth defence forces for peace keeping operations under the United Nations. That joint Commonwealth force might have been a bit premature and, therefore, people did not fall for it. But these things are not accidents; they are not coincidences. Therefore, we would like to know what is the concept now of this kinship in the Commonwealth. Do we attach more attention and more respect to the precincts of Marlborough House, Buckingham Palace and Chequers, for example, than we do to the meeting halls in Cairo and Belgrade? We have to make the choice, but we cannot go on like this.

Since the time at my disposal is over, I would like to say only this that we should be very vigilant about the developing coldwar atmosphere in this part of the world. There are pressures going on and if Mr. Barry Goldwater is elected in November, the United States Seventh Fleet will go on extending its area of operation in this part of the world. Other smaller nations have protested against the entry of aircraft carriers equipped with missiles, but we are still saying that we do not know of the proposal to set up any base in the Indian Ocean, so why should we protest. But these bases are not regular bases, but floating bases, from which a vessel could pass from one end of the Indian Ocean to the other end come

back because they are equipped for modern warfare. But we do not seem to be concerned about these things.

These are some of the points I would like to indicate briefly. I would like the hon. Minister when he replies to tell us whether on all these matters the Government is prepared to say something definitely because I feel that there is a big opportunity presented to us next week at Cairo where we can once again take the proper dynamic leadership which is expected of us; not that we should assume to ourselves the leadership of all the non-aligned countries of the world, not that, but the role that the other nations expect of us can be played. At Cairo if we prepare properly, whatever misunderstandings or whatever disappointments have been caused by some of our performances at London can be repaired to a large extent, if not wiped out, and therefore, I think we should go to Cairo with that spirit. For that I wish all best luck, all good fortune to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. They will go there with our good wishes. Let us hope that they prove worthy of this country's great traditions.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the basic tenets of our foreign policy were laid in the remote past from the time of Buddha and Asoka. In the immediate past, the Gandhian technique has been the guiding line. But it is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who had been the chief designer and the chief architect for all these seventeen years of the foreign policy of India. It was he who aroused the consciousness of a wider world in India. Even during the freedom struggle it was Pandit Nehru who thought in terms of the world and humanity and that thinking has become the conscious part of Indian thinking today.

Now I am reminded of some words that were told to me some years back, in 1949, by Prof. Harold Laski, when I was on my way to the United Nations as a member of the Indian delegation. He said: India is poor and ignorant

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

and suffers in many ways, but she is the most fortunate country in the world today as she is the only country which has a great leader and not a mere statesman at the helm of her affairs, the only person who could give a lead to the United Nations. And so it was. India's contribution due to Panditji has been of greatest significance. He not only fashioned and tempered the instrument of non-alignment against great criticisms, but later it has become the accepted creed of many nations, particularly those which are newly emerging into freedom. The power-blocs are coming nearer to each other in consequence. I am sure, the new Foreign Minister, who has already a hand in implementing the policies, will do his best. But it is not an easy task.

Perhaps Shri Indrajit Gupta or some other Member said that the policies of Panditji had no flexibility. I do not think such a charge can be made against his policies by anybody. They had flexibility and they used to change in tune with the changing times. Yet, the basic tenets of his policy never changed. I am sure the new Foreign Minister will carry on those policies in the new atmospheres that are bound to arise in future with understanding.

The new Minister has been to some neighbouring countries and I am glad that he is laying the basis of a new understanding again with them. He has told us much about China and has made the position categorically clear. I do not want to dwell on this point any more except to point out at a later stage some of the ways in which we should counteract the lying propaganda that is going on.

Now I turn to Pakistan. I agree with those who believe that there should be bonds of friendship with this country whose people are the flesh of our flesh and the bone of our bone, whose history, tradition and culture are the same as ours. To the extent possible we should go out of our way

to make every move to be on friendly terms with them. We can even put up with insults hurled at us, but we cannot barter away our territory. We should not give any solemn indication or show any kind of hesitation by which anyone can misunderstand our position regarding our territory. We have to give an answer to posterity and we cannot, in this House or in this country, today barter away the territory of India even in order to keep friendly relations with a neighbouring country. That must be very unhesitatingly put. If it is not done, it leads to a lot of misunderstanding.

That brings me to the question of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference about which much has been said. Let me make myself perfectly clear. I do not think for one moment that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari or Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to whom reference has been made indirectly, are in any way responsible for some of the things and the abuses that have been hurled against them are wrong, specially some of the things that have been said even during this debate. But I would like to say that we should remember that the architect again of this particular relationship in the Commonwealth was Panditji who said—I cannot remember the exact language—that this was a tenuous, vague thing which links the member-countries together. It was on that basis that for so long we have continued, but the trend today is an unfortunate trend. There is no doubt about it. It may be true that a mere reference to good wishes regarding disputes between member-nations is innocuous in itself; but it is the thin end of the wedge. It does imply that if you can give good wishes, you can also criticize. Therefore it is a warning not only to India but to all nations of the Commonwealth of what the future might bring.

Then, reference has been made to the Commonwealth Secretariat.

I hear that they are going to lay an agenda for the next Prime Ministers' Conference. These things are dangerous. It is a dangerous trend. It is something which we must try to avoid. It is quite true what Shri Indrajit Gupta has already mentioned that Nigeria has said—and I agree with it—that if it comes to that it is worthwhile that even Britain should leave the Commonwealth.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Not Nigeria; Kenya.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I am sorry. Kenya has said that if it comes to that, the British can leave the Commonwealth but we can carry on. I would rather agree with that point of view. I think, unlike Shri Malaviya and some others who have spoken have said that we should immediately get out of the Commonwealth. I do not agree with that point of view. I do not believe in a policy of receding from positions. This Commonwealth in its tenuous form has given some concrete help in world affairs. It has prevented the position of a cold war turning into a hot war. Is that not something? There are many other things that it has done. Therefore instead of receding from a position, I think, what is necessary for our Government particularly is to be alerted and for member-nations of the Commonwealth to remember that surely they need not submit to these trends that are before them. It is very regrettable and I cannot help saying it that in this Commonwealth Conference reference could be made to China as a country of great significance in the Far East and yet no reference was made to her aggression on India. If any reference was to be made to China, it could not be done surely without that. That, I think, is something personal; but the rest of it does not apply only to India but to all member-nations and they should all be alerted.

Now I turn to something else which happened then and something which would be surprising but probably which has been shown up because a

world leader has been removed from the scene. We have said—and I have said in this House—time and again something about our public relations. The public relations of India, I think hardly exist and we have seen a glaring example of its incompetence during the Prime Ministers' Conference in London. What happened? When Pakistan put out all its false propaganda about Kashmir being on the agenda to the world Press, this was revealed to us in a press despatch from the Correspondent of the *Statesman* first that it took hours before we could contradict it. What was happening to our Foreign Department? The Ministry has been in existence for 17 years. What about the public relations? I think, we have to take drastic steps today. Something has got to be done in order that our foreign policy is implemented the right way. I think, the new Minister must take the aid of a proper secretariat and proper public relations in all the countries of the world. We have to think afresh. I would request the new Minister—he is not here at the moment, but his Minister of State is here and she can pass it on to him—that the entire Foreign Ministry should be overhauled just as Shrimati Indira Gandhi is overhauling the Information and Broadcasting Ministry. A similar thing must be done with the Foreign Ministry. It is absolutely true that time and again, even in Panditji's time, it has let him down. Today when that outstanding figure is removed, it is impossible for us to carry on and to be able to put across our policies to the rest of the world in a proper way. It is really a surprising thing but true.

Another thing which I would like to mention is that the voice of All India Radio never reaches to other countries at times when people tune in, neither to South East Asia nor to the Middle East and even to our own troops when the aggression was on and even now. Today in spite of the pressure that this House put, we have not yet got a 1000 kilowatt transmitter so that India can be heard.

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

All these things need rectification. These are smaller things, but these are urgent things. They are far more urgent than anything else at the moment. Our foreign policy had been truly laid on basic tenets. Naturally, many of its manifestations must change as times change. There is no question of any rigidity about it, but in spelling it out, in its implementation we must have a strong machinery and that machinery must be built in a proper manner.

In this connection I would like to refer to the visit of our President from which he has just returned to the USSR and to Ireland. The Irish have pointed out that now they have understood the position regarding Kashmir and India's stand. Is it not a reflection on the way these things were put forward in the past? Does it not bring to light that we must have the right type of persons going abroad to put across our policies. This is not something departmental. It cannot be done by persons who have not the right approach. Some of those who represented us in the councils abroad have been very good in the past but there were others who had failed signally. We must be very careful specially about the representatives to other countries. We must see to it that such representatives are persons who understand the underlying approach and the stand of India and who have the capacity and the personality to put these forward.

One more word and I have done. That is about the non-aligned conference to which our Prime Minister is going very soon. Many people have spoken about it before and I will only add one word. I am sure that the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister will make a deep impression there and many of the countries who today are not fully cognisant or who have some kind of

reluctance to support outright the Indian stand in regard to China will be able to understand and appreciate it better. I am sure this whole House wishes them well and that when they come back we hope that we shall be able to feel that even those countries who are not today fully aware of the Indian stand will understand it and appreciate it. I also feel sure in the future our policies will be carried out in the spirit of the past but in tune with the changing times.

14.00 hrs.

Shri Hem Barua: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, true it is that there has been a continued lessening of international tensions particularly between the two major power blocs, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. but then newer frontiers of tensions have opened this time located amongst smaller nations, from Cyprus to Laos and from Cuba to Cambodia and that is why, Sir, I say that foreign affairs responsibility has increased many more times and it is in that context that the shifting of this foreign affairs responsibility to the exclusive charge of a Minister is a most welcome thing. We welcome Mr. Swaran Singh to his new responsibilities and wish him good luck also.

In the recent times, the refugee problem that has been vexing India for long has acquired newer dimensions. The problem has widened its ambit. A fresh problem of refugees has been created for us by Burma and some of the erstwhile Portuguese colonies like Zanzibar besides the one that Ceylon threatens to perpetrate on us. The most disturbing thing is this that the Ceylonese Prime Minister is trying to draw her inspiration from what has happened in Burma in relation to people of Indian origin. This is what the Ceylonese Prime Minister has said:

"Why should India condemn Ceylon expelling domiciled people

from Sri Lanka when Indians are bundled out of Burma without even Rs. 75 per head?"

This is what she has said. True it is that Indians are bundled out of Burma with their property confiscated. True it is that they are reduced to a state of nakedness and all this is done to glorify the new Burmese social order, a social order that has been described by the formulators of the new Burma policy as "neither Marxist, nor anti-Marxist, neither pro-capitalist nor pro-communist." I do not want to criticise this 'neither-nor' new Burmese social order. But then the fact remains that Indians are bundled out of Burma with their property confiscated and our Government looks on this tragic spectacle of ruthlessness with the splendid indifference and unconcern of a dead mummy.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):
Dead Indian mummy.

Shri Hem Barua: Might be. We were told that arrangements were made to receive deposits of gold ornaments and jewellery of the repatriates with the Indian Embassy in Rangoon. Then what happened? The entire Burmese press raised a hue and cry and charged "capitalist" India—this is their word—of trying to sabotage Burmese socialism. And I know that although to receive deposits, no prior sanction is necessary from the host country, our Government has bowed down to the Burmese threat and withdrawn their decision to receive deposits. Those people who voluntarily wanted to leave Burma were huddled back from the airports. And what was their fault? Their fault was that they deposited their gold ornaments and jewellery with the Indian Embassy in Rangoon. Our Foreign Minister goes to Burma, comes back and tells us enthusiastically: "We discussed matters of mutual interest." We know you did that but then we are interested in knowing whether you were able to evolve any measures towards the re-

moval of hardships with which these people of Indian origin are confronted in Burma. To this, there is no reply.

Then, Sir, it pains me to say that things are worsening and with it our international prestige, shattered into shambles by the Chinese aggression of 1962, has also gone down. What prestige do you have in the international world today except the doubtful prestige of a borrower of money and food? We want our external policy to vindicate our national rights. I will say, mere platitudes—we have heard a lot of platitudes here on non-alignment, on this and on that—cannot be substitutes for achievements. I have already said that the Ceylonese Prime Minister is trying to draw her inspiration from what has happened in Burma in relation to the people of Indian origin in that country. May I tell you that the so-called Stateless million in Ceylon are morally and legally Ceylonese citizens and the Ceylonese Prime Minister by her various overtures is simply trying to beguile India into Ceylon's imbroglia? Our Foreign Minister had been to Ceylon also where he discussed matters of mutual interest with the lady. May I know whether he told her or not that the problem of the so-called Stateless million is Ceylon's problem, Ceylon must solve it and Ceylon must not try to draw India into it? Frankly speaking, in the political harem of the world I do not want our Foreign Minister to conduct himself like an eunuch. This problem of national minority has acquired massive dimensions. Colonialism is either dead or dying but then a different type of new colonialism is on the ascendency in the world today. So, if we could be silent spectators when the people of Indian origin are humiliated and oppressed in countries like Burma and Ceylon, may I know why is it that you sent strong notes of protest against the racial policy pursued in South Africa? I do not say that that was a wrong thing to do. But then what follows from that as a natural corollary is this that our Government must not view with indifference and unconcern similar situations emerging elsewhere,

[Shri Hem Barua]

and that too situations in which Indian interests are directly involved, I do not want to say that India should send gun-boats to protect national minorities elsewhere for that would be an utterly foolish thing to say. But why is it that India cannot organise or make efforts towards organising the U.N. as a supreme tribunal in the interest of national minorities? The U.N. can at least formulate a set of rules to be observed by all civilised Governments *vis-a-vis* national minorities in their countries. This supreme tribunal can function as a permanent international commission in the interests of minorities. This might, I know, be interpreted as an interference in the internal affairs of a State. Non-interference in the internal affairs of a state is a sound principle. But then may I ask, when Ngo Dien Diem Government persecuted the Buddhists in South Viet-Nam, why is it that the Afro-Asian nations agitate for a U. N. commission to inquire into or to investigate into the excesses committed in that country? I remember when Mosadegh of Iran confiscated British property in that country, Britain did not abdicate her rights. She went to the International Court at the Hague. My submission is this that when fundamental human rights are so blatantly violated, the question of interference and non-interference by a civilised forum like the U. N. cannot arise.

Now, let me submit a few things about China. Chinese bellicosity and her expansionist ambitions are a potential source of danger for India and for South-East Asia. May I tell you that China is not interested in the Colombo Proposals? And it has now become clear as daylight that the Colombo Proposals are a source of great humiliation for us. China is interested neither in the Colombo Proposals nor in negotiations. What China is interested in is mounting humiliations and insults on India. Without knowing even an iota of the

Chinese mind, Ceylon suggested to us that China was willing to withdraw her seven posts from Ladakh. And what happened? Our Foreign Minister jumped up and hailed the suggestion as a substantial compliance of the Colombo Proposals. And then what happened? Then came the rude rebuff from China. China openly stamped her foot down on the suggestion and characterised it contemptuously as "another pre-condition."

I do not know why our Government should go on making concessions to China. Have they not conceded much to the Chinese already? May I catalogue them one by one? (1) By observing the cease-fire unilaterally imposed on us by China, have not our Government made concessions to the Chinese? (2) By observing the truce-line unilaterally or arbitrarily imposed on us by China, have not our Government made concessions to the Chinese? (3) By agreeing to a parity of posts in Ladakh, have not our Government made concessions to the Chinese? (4) By agreeing to withhold our armed personnel from NEFA under Chinese behest, have not our Government made concessions to the Chinese?

We must not forget that even if China withdraws her seven posts from Ladakh, China remains in illegal occupation of quite a few thousand square miles of our territory. How can you expect China to come to the conference table where the question of illegal occupation of our territory is to figure? How can you expect China to do that? China has grabbed our territory by force of arms and there the matter ends so far as China is concerned. To talk of dislodging China from what she has occupied, through negotiations, is all moonshine. And with the latest rebuff coming from China, the veil of illusion is completely shattered. I would say that it is high time for our Government to announce to the world and to the Colombo Powers that the Colombo Proposals no longer exist for us.

There is a rather very original suggestion made by some apostles of peace that India should lease out Aksai Chin to the Chinese. There is no protest coming from the Government, categorical protest coming from the Government so far. If you lease out Aksai Chin to the Chinese, because the Chinese needs are reckoned more urgent than ours, may I know why did you turn down Mr. Jinnah's proposal for a corridor across northern India connecting East Pakistan with West Pakistan? If you lease out Aksai Chin to the Chinese, how can you say 'No' to Mr. Phizo's demand for a separate independent Nagaland? These so-called peace talks that you are having with the Naga hostiles in Nagaland at present are destined to fail, in spite of the bell, book and the candle with which these talks are started.

I remember that our late Prime Minister Mr. Nehru made an offer to China that India was prepared to hand over Aksai Chin Road to the Chinese for civilian use. What did the Chinese say then? This was what China said, namely 'Why should China need to ask India's permission for using its own road on its own territory? What an absurdity?' This was what China said on 2nd June, 1962.

There are people who say that our economic situation is difficult and, therefore, we should appease the Chinese, our enemy, by delivering a portion of our own territory to them. The economic situation is difficult because of inflation and failure of Plan targets. Instead of trying to tackle the situation so as to improve conditions, to say that we should try to appease the enemy by delivering a portion of our own territory is sheer cowardice. If it is not a policy of weakness and vacillation that our Government are pursuing or following towards the Chinese, what else are they following?

Now, may I say that I am now quite confident that there can be no solution to our border dispute with China except military solution? We

must not forget that all our talks of negotiations with China have proved futile and effete because of Chinese intransigence. I remember what that great American lady Miss Helen Keller, the blind lady, said, namely that one of the greatest calamities that could befall a person is to have eyes and not to see things. Our Government unfortunately have eyes but they do not see things. May I say that our Government's external policy is a policy of weakness and vacillation, a policy of platitudes and pious wishes? Politically speaking, the world is changing rapidly, whereas our external policy is fixed, static and staccato and jettisoned into a set of dogmas.

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

Shri Hem Barua: I shall conclude in another five or six minutes.

Shri Hari Vishva Kamath: He is the only spokesman from our big group.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may take two or three minutes more and finish. There are a large number of Members who are wanting to speak.

Shri Hem Barua: Instead of trying to fit our policy into the changing pattern of the world our Government are trying to put the changing pattern of the world into their set principles, into their fixed dogma-ridden policies. This must stop.

Our Government policy of non-alignment should be really non-alignment and must not suffer from any emotional or psychological bias towards this nation or that nation, not to speak of the classical East or the classical West. But, unfortunately, our foreign policy is not free from such blemishes. We know in that compilation called *Tributes of Homage* on Mr. Nehru's death, the message sent by the President of Israel does not find a place? This is a disrespect shown not only to the President of Israel but also to our own President who received the mes-

[Shri Hem Barua]

sage? Even UNESCO stipendees are denied passports to Israel. I have documentary proof with me of the Government writing to a UNESCO stipendee, herself Jewish, asking her not to visit Israel, in the political interests of our country. What political interests do you have except bias against Israel? And you call this a policy of non-alignment?

That is why I would say that India is today not a major factor in the Middle East. I hope and trust that when Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri visits Cairo in connection with the Non-Aligned Conference, he would try to improve matters. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is not tired of telling the nation that he has not, and he does not propose to deviate from Mr. Nehru's policy. If deviation at least in external affairs means deviation towards a policy of firmness, I would say that let Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri deviate, for non-deviation or refusal to deviate from Mr. Nehru's policy, with all respect to that great man, would mean firstly permanently leasing out 14,500 sq. miles of our precious territory to the Chinese, and secondly allowing Kashmir to hang on eternally on the precipice of a crisis for us.

I want a certain element of firmness to be introduced into our foreign policy so as to preserve and promote our national interest.

South-East Asia cannot be isolated from the Chinese global war strategy. Both Jakarta and Peking are responsible for creating dissensions and disorder in South-East Asia. When South-East Asia is in torment, should our Government follow a policy of Micawberism? The Indian image in South-East Asia is steadily eroded and it is almost destroyed. May I know what steps our Government have taken to rehabilitate the Indian image and create a pro-Indian climate in these strategic areas?

Apart from Laos and South Viet Nam, the cauldron of war is boiling so far as Malaysia and Indonesia are concerned. In this hour of trial for Malaysia, what is our attitude, when Malaysia is invaded by Indonesian paratroops? When Britain sent her troops, to Suez, we protested, and rightly protested. But now, what is our attitude? This attitude is a very helpless attitude to Malaysia in her critical hour of destiny and history.

A map has recently been published by China. In it 12 countries are shown as within the orbit, within the orbit of the Chinese Empire—perhaps as satellites. In this list of twelve, India occupies the 10th place. I am afraid our Government, impervious as they are to the realities of the situation, are banking too much on the present rift between China and Soviet Russia, even to the extent of neglecting relations with nations that matter. This Sino-Soviet rift will continue till one of the two participants in the strife, Mr. Khrushchev or Mao Tse-Tung, is removed by destiny from this mortal scene.

Then what happens? After that, what? It is for that future that I want our Government to formulate their policies and attitudes, organise their politics and psychology and not allow things to drift and drift, as they are doing at present.

Shri Joachim Alva: It is needless to mention about Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, for a foreign affairs debate without him is, in our generation, like Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark. His great and noble policies, which he formulated, will always be remembered after the din and bustle of parliamentary life is over. When the history of non-alignment will have been written, he will have the first and foremost place, in that history of the world. His words of passion and compassion, his declarations on violence and non-violence will always be quoted in every part of the world, wherever foreign policy at its truest

and best will be debated upon. We indeed miss him, those of us who have heard him from time to time for the last 15 years in this House. Whether he spoke about a great foreign personality—I recall especially his speech on Stalin, a ten minute speech, which was one of the best speeches delivered in this House—or other numerous declarations, we shall always remember them with gratitude those who have benefited by his idealism. Some of us had rough ideas, some others displayed violent ideas. But they were polished by his idealism, after our coming from outside and after hearing him within these great walls. It is impossible to start a speech for the first time in this House specially in a foreign affairs debate without mentioning about our great leader who is no more.

We welcome the new Foreign Minister. We welcome him specially because he is a Foreign Minister who is not entrusted with any other Ministry. Sardar Swaran Singh is an impressive, towering personality and I do hope that he will be able to put many things right, many things which the former Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, burdened with affairs of the world and numerous other affairs did not find time to attend to. He did not have the time, spare time to attend to service matters like complaints that a First or Second Secretary or even a chaprasi might have against his superiors. I hope the new Foreign Minister will keep his eyes and ears open, would listen to complaints from anyone so that things may be put right.

We also welcome the declaration of our new Prime Minister in regard to Pakistan and China. As soon as he assumed his new office, he made a very welcome declaration in regard to Pakistan and China. I do not know what Acharya Kripalani meant. He wanted us to walk into the American parlour. He wanted us to be subject to the manipulations of millions of dollars. We all know into what straits Viet Nam has fallen. Every day 3 million dollars are spent there. He

almost suggested that we should walk into the American parlour. We refuse to walk into anybody's parlour. We shall follow the policies laid down by Prime Minister Nehru that we shall be independent, that we shall be self-reliant. We shall of course take aid from other countries especially when we are in distress, but we shall firmly hold on to our own principles and policies; but we shall not give up our independent stand and shall not allow ourselves to be dictated to, by the West or the East.

Hence Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's declaration that we want to be friendly with Pakistan and with China is a welcome declaration. These two aspects of policy shall remain the corner-stone of our foreign policy for immediate and long-term solutions.

We are also happy that our honourable President has paid a visit to Russia and Ireland and created a tremendous impression there. Ireland is physically a very tiny country. But we have been tremendously inspired by Ireland, by its great President, De Valera. On the other side, both Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Mikoyan, the President of USSR, have made declarations of the warmest friendship for us. It will be a disastrous day when we separate from the Soviet Union. It was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who as early as 1925 paid a visit as an ordinary person to the Soviet Union and came back with a fervour of admiration. I still remember the day when press correspondents and thousands of students before the thirties surrounded him and asked, 'What about the Soviet Union?'

All these are things of the past. If we look ahead, I think my hon. friend is completely wrong in his views. As regards the quarrel between Russia and China, they may make it up; we have nothing to do with other countries' quarrels. They may make them up. But it will be completely disastrous for India, now or in the future, to have any quarrel with the Soviet Union. We should rely on a mighty

[Shri Joachim Alva]

and great power which is our neighbour; we cannot rely on a man 5,000 or 10,000 miles away! When they offer us their unsuited moral, physical and every kind of support, we shall certainly accept it.

Acharya Kripalani never talks of South Viet Nam, how South Viet Nam has been turned into a desert! I wish I had time to quote from the Hindu of the 20th September, 1964 as early as three days ago, where its South East Asia correspondent writes about the people of South Viet Nam, how they are distressed, how they are in sore straits. They say they are not communist or anti-communist, but they want to be friendly with everybody. We see how therein Geneva Convention has been violated.

Some are always talking that we must take the protection of the U.S. We are grateful to the U.S.A. for the help she gave us. We admire the idealism of America, we admire her democracy. Their presidential election, which I witnessed the last time it was held in 1960 is one of the great feats of democracy. But all the same we shall hug to our own principles. We shall stand by our own principles. We are an ancient country, an Asian country. We have our quarrel with China, but we are strong enough and shall expel China from our territory when the time comes, when we have developed our self-reliance and strength.

I would suggest that the nomenclature of the External Affairs Ministry should be changed. We gave a lead to other Commonwealth countries in the matter of pioneering a Republic within the Commonwealth. Now we shall change the description of the External Affairs Ministry to 'Foreign Ministry'.

Secondly, we are happy that the post of Secretary-General is going to be abolished. It was only a decorative post. Now we know it is going to be abolished—it has been announced in the papers.

Thirdly, there should be a person of a Cabinet Minister's rank to represent us at the UN, a man or woman who can deliver the goods on our behalf. We want a front-rank man or woman of Cabinet Minister status there. Mr. Harold Wilson, the Labour leader, has declared that the UK will be represented at the UN by a person of Cabinet Minister rank if his party comes to power. It is time that we did not put a third class or ordinary person of the foreign service to represent us when crucial issues come up for discussion and decision, sitting by the side of people like U.K.'s Sir Pearson Dixon or U.S.A.'s Mr. Adlai Stevenson or Soviet Union's Mr. Dobryn. We want a man or woman of stature to represent our country at the UN. I hope this will be done now that this new Government has been ushered in.

I would like to say a word about another matter. It is for the first time that we have heard about a foreign Government inquiring about a speech by our foremost VIPs. I do not know if this has happened in the last 16-17 years. I am not a big man; I am not a high-up; so I do not know. But since it has come in the papers, I think it behoves us to tell those concerned that we are an independent nation. The U.S.A. ambassador is welcome to have the texts of the speeches of our VIPs through the ordinary press channels. But I think it was not quite correct to ask what was the speech made by our President, specially when he had delivered it in the proper tone, representing our policy.

We also know that the leading journals of the world like *Time* and *Life*, great magazines with large circulations in their own country, and also in our country, never put a word about the last visit of our hon. President to the United States of America. One small paragraph was put in and that when he was awarded a doctorate. Otherwise, his visit was not mentioned in these two papers.

I am mentioning this, because they are world papers, great papers, organs of public opinion; we are fascinated by them and are enamoured of them. And the visit of the honourable President of our country there was not mentioned.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not great, big.

Shri Nath Pai: Big papers, not great papers.

Shri Joachim Alva: I did not interrupt Mr. Nath Pai. I do not wish to be interrupted. These are great papers of the world, great papers of the United States of America.

I am mentioning these small facts to show how the wind blows in the great seats of democracy and how the people are impressed by these things.

In regard to China, China does not mean business. China does not want to vacate the seven posts in Ladakh. It wants to go around the world with the halo of a peace-maker. Three years ago, on my return from Africa, I said that China is going over our heads and will build up a strong position in Africa. Today that has become more than true. From Zanzibar, from Dar-es-Salaam the Chinese are operating. In Tanganyika just eleven Chinese families are training up girls in the militia with even wooden rifles! And today in Africa neither perhaps the influence of Russia nor the influence of the United States or the United Kingdom or even of India substantially counts. But the influence of the Chinese counts, because the Chinese are determined, they are unscrupulous in their methods, they are strong, and they are going to create trouble. And we, who had a place there where Mahatma Gandhi made his great name with his campaign on behalf of the coloured people, we have no place therein; because many of our countrymen who are there still want to hug to their own privileged positions without becoming Africans. And, as our former

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, said, not once but several times, that if we settle down in a country we must become a part of that country. Unless we understand this basic problem that wherever we go we have to become a part of that country, we shall always be in trouble, expecting that our country will run to their rescue on their cries: "please take us out of this trouble".

China is today forging with a great pace in Africa, and I would like the House to note that China in Africa will be a more determined enemy and in a more dangerous position against us—will be a greater adversary of India or of the freedom-loving countries than China on our borders, just coming across NEFA. In the Chinese aggression against us 2,300 were killed 3,942 were taken prisoners, but we have still not heard of 770 who are still missing. What has happened to them? Even seven can be a danger in the hands of the Chinese on the Chinese radio I would like to know from the hon. Minister what has happened to these 770 men who were listed as missing.

China has violated four Conventions of Geneva. It has signed the Geneva Conventions but it has also violated those conventions. Here is the testimony of Capt. Sood of the Indian Army. He says: "Immediately after we were captured, I saw the Chinese shoot dead our regimental cook who was wounded, although I had requested them to bring the cook along with us." And there are so many other statements in the brochure. I want you to understand how China has broken the conventions and yet can get away with it. We refuse to make use of such propaganda. Yet I do not know what happens to our machinery of propaganda. I do not know where we are and what we are. Everybody gets away making some false and coloured statement. But when we have a first-class case to present morally, physically and in every sense justly, yet we do not seem to get along well indeed.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

I want lastly to speak about the treatment of South Africa. South Africa has been neglected. The people of South Africa are in a terrible position. There are four million whites in the whole of Africa of which three million are in South Africa. The resolution last year in the General Assembly of the United Nations, condemning South Africa was passed by 106 votes against one. 106 votes went against South Africa and only one was in its favour. And yet we are not able to move an inch because of the terrific investment by the United Kingdom totalling 1,000 million pounds. And half of that amount is the investment by the United States. Money is more important; money talks, money acts, and money moves even mountains. And we are unable to move with all our moral power and the 106 votes against South Africa in the U.N.! The English-speaking whites control 99 per cent of the mining capital in South Africa, 94 per cent of the industrial capital and 88 per cent of the finance capital and 75 per cent of the commercial capital. What happens? It is a strange spectacle of a few white people controlling the destinies of Africa. They live in a beautiful country, fabulously rich in natural resources and surroundings, with a glorious climate with economy fed by the British and American investment, and practising violence to a degree not surpassed of the most extreme dictatorships of the left or the right. Such is the fate of the coloured South Africans, the original inhabitants.

When we lose our dynamic leadership for idealism—when we are not after power, when we are not after mere positions when we do not want the first place in any assembly—then we shall not lose our idealism, we shall not lose our dynamic ways. That is what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, following in the footsteps of Mahatma Gandhi, taught us. The day we lose our dynamic leadership, the day we water down our idealism, we shall take a back place and nobody will

look towards us for inspiration and we will be thrown in the dust-bin of history.

I do hope the new Foreign Minister and the new Government will remember that our idealism has to be kept at its finest and zenith point. If we lose that idealism for the underdog, for the exploited, for the black man, we shall have lost our place in history; and even a tiny little country like Pakistan, finding that there is a vacuum as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is no more, will try to take that place. But I want you to understand that this idealism we shall have to retain in the treasury of our collective wisdom, that the opposition this way or that way shall not create trouble but that we shall always stand by our idealism, come what may? And then only shall we be able to operate in a big way and retain our leadership.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we heard from the hon. Minister for External Affairs a re-assertion of the policy of non-alignment, world peace, anti-colonialism, etc. Before examining the working of this policy I shall first deal with the total opposition to it by Prof. Ranga. Rangaji drew up a picture of South-East Asia being gobbled up by communist aggression and that of defence of South-East Asia becoming a strategic objective, to fulfil which we are asked to give up non-alignment and become part of a grand South-East Asian alliance against communism with United States assistance.

Rangaji cannot take credit for the originality of this idea. It is a borrowed idea. The correspondent of the *Hindu* dated 5th September 1964 reported a gentleman as saying:

"He believes that in the long run there is no real defence against Communist aggression in South East Asia 'unless you view it as a much larger region than

the Indo-China peninsula'. He feels that the only counter-balance against Chinese power is a coalition of powers with India as its main force."

Is it not clear, Sir, that Rangaji echoed just this sentiment of the person referred to above? And who is that person? None other than Mr. Humphrey, Democratic Party's candidate for Vice-Presidency in the United States.

I do not blame our Professor for this borrowed stuff. Perhaps it stems from the extra-territorial faith of the Swatantra Party.

Coming to the application of the non-alignment policy by our Government, the hon. Minister said, the test of its success lay in the aid that we got from both the United States and USSR. If this is the test of true implementation of non-alignment, then what about Pakistan? Pakistan is getting help from the United States and it is being offered aid from the Soviet Union also, and an additional third help is from China. Does it mean that Pakistan is following a policy of non-alignment with success? Indonesia and Ceylon have renounced United States assistance of late. Does it mean that Indonesia and Ceylon have ceased to be non-aligned? That is not the real test. The real test is what impact our policy has made among the Afro-Asian nations which cover millions of people in the world.

And what is the impact? Shri K. P. Karunakaran, a reader in the Indian School of International Studies, the only institute specialising in foreign affairs and which is conferred the status of a University by the UGC, writes in the May 1963 issue of the Seminar:

"Many observers in Asia and Africa felt that India was behaving like the big brother, prepared to give patronising support to them, but not willing to court the intense displeasure of the big powers, against whom they were engaged in a bitter struggle."

This is the impact of the working of our policy. Oftentimes it is said that it is due to the inadequacy of our publicity abroad. No, Sir. We are not in publicity; but in policy.

Take our attitude towards the latest Tonkin Gulf incidents. On August 5th, the USA warships and bombers attacked North Viet Nam. Describing the internal situation in South Viet Nam on the eve of these incidents, the *New York Herald Tribune* wrote on August 3rd:

"In late winter and early spring, the Government analysts began to say with increasing emphasis, that the War in Viet Nam was going very badly indeed, and that it would end in defeat, unless severe, corrective measures were soon taken."

Referring to the state of internal administration in South Viet Nam, the *London Times* wrote on August 13:—

"With each shift of power in Saigon, control gets weaker, purpose is dissipated, and the enlarging prospect of total collapse comes nearer. A collapse in morale, once it affects the Generals and Civil Servants, it will be beyond the power of the Americans to stop."

Is it now clear, Sir, that the attack on North Viet Nam in Tongkin Gulf was to be a calculated morale booster, and to carry the war into North Viet Nam, to avoid defeat in South Viet Nam?

In this bargain, the United States was pushing the world to the brink of disaster. We, who unhesitatingly came out against Britain and France when Egypt was attacked, are now hesitating to come out against these provocations of the United States. There cannot be non-alignment between forces of war and forces of peace.

Or, take again our attitude to opposition to foreign bases, which constitutes another crucial test of a policy of non-alignment. United States and Britain are exploring the Indian Ocean to locate a base. The imperialists say that it is meant to

[Shri Umanath]

be just a radio link. But what is the truth? I am giving it straight from the Lion's mouth. The *Hindu* dated 31-8-1964 quoted a British spokesman as saying:

"The new American bases being sought there are purely and simply to provide radio communication links, but, of course, they could be extremely useful for forwarding staging points for troops. If we find one big enough, and if we could lay down a runway without spending millions on it, we could have a first class base for troops staging."

And what is the strategy these new bases are supposed to serve? I am again giving a quotation from the *London Economist* dated 5th September, 1964. It says:

"When the winds of change have pulled the last Union Jack from the last colonial flagpole, it looks as if there are still going to be Western interests and obligations which will keep Britain active in the vast semi-circle of territory round the Indian Ocean and which will probably call for a continued British military presence there, as part of a joint Anglo-American strategy."

Is it not clear that the plea of its serving as a radio communications link, is meant to hoodwink the people? Is it not surprising that our Government, on such a crucial issue of the policy of non-alignment, should project the imperialist alibi in this respect?

All these are proofs of the fact that of late the sharp edge of our non-alignment policy against imperialist war provocations, foreign bases and colonialism, is getting blunted.

I agree with Shri K. D. Malaviya when he said that our foreign policy is the projection of our home policy. And our home policy has, of late, come to lean heavily on foreign aid, for the purpose of industrialisation, foreign exchange, food and defence. This explains the soft-peddling of anti-imperialism in our foreign policy.

But let us not forget the adverse impact this policy is making on the Afro-Asian nations. Shri Karunakaran, discussing the various consequences of this increasing reliance on foreign aid, writes:

"One of such consequences is that in the eyes of many non-aligned nations, India, far from being taken as a leading member of the under-privileged, is considered as one moving towards the privileged."

I hope the Government will take note of this serious development.

Let us see how we are faring in the matter of bettering our economic relations with Afro-Asian countries. In this we have to contend with Chinese competition in the field. And what do the Chinese Government do? Shri Rashiduddin Khan, writing in the issue of *Seminar* of October, 1964 says:

"China has been giving lavish aid to many Asian and African countries since 1956, spectacular among which are:

N. Korea & N. Vietnam	.. 1956—61	4,000 million dollars
Cambodia	.. 1956	22.4 million dollars
Cambodia	.. 1960	26.5 million dollars
Nepal	.. 1956	12.6 million dollars
Egypt	.. 1956	4.7 million dollars
Ceylon	.. 1957	27.5 million dollars
Indonesia	.. 1957	11.2 million dollars
Indonesia	.. 1958	14.3 million Sterling
Burma	.. 1957	4.0 million dollars
Burma	.. 1961	8.4 million dollars
Algeria	.. —	10.0 million dollars
Guinea	.. —	25.0 million dollars
Ghana	.. —	19.6 million dollars

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): You are doing propaganda for Peking.

Shri Umanath: I am giving a quotation from *Seminar*, published in our country. This is to show to our country what we have to contend against. Unless we realise this, the question of facing Chinese competition in Afro-Asian countries is meaningless. That is why I am quoting that.

Most of these are interest-free loans, and their timing is also very important. When Egypt's foreign exchange was blocked by the Western imperialists, this loan was given to Egypt. Similarly, the loans to the various other countries were given when they were battling with imperialism for freedom. When we were not prepared to recognise the Algerian Government, this loan was given to them. I am saying about the timing, and how they are canvassing in the Afro-Asian countries.

Against this background, what do we offer to these countries? We offer our private industrialists as our Messiahs. Shri D. S. Joshi had gone to the African countries. Another mission of the FICCI has gone with official blessings. They advertise for collaboration agreements in these countries. Even in this respect, how do they behave? The *Hindu* correspondent writes from Nairobi on 29-8-1964:

"Since Kenya became independent, nearly half a dozen Indian trade and export promotion delegations have visited East African countries and all of them have been talking joint Indo-Kenyan projects with major Indian technical and financial collaboration without a single project materialising so far."

Why is it so? Because friends of Indian big business are busy exploring prospects of higher profitability through these ventures, than better economic relations with these countries. The image of India, projected by

these men, is one of a big brother who has come to exploit them. We cannot face Chinese competition, nor better our relationship with these countries, by a policy of reliance on Indian big business.

With regard to our neighbours, I welcome the initiative taken by our Minister of External Affairs in visiting some of our neighbouring countries like Afghanistan, Nepal, Burma and Ceylon. With regard to the problems of Indians in Burma and Ceylon, I welcome the approach that has been brought to bear, viz., one of trying to understand the policies that these Governments are pursuing in their own countries, and of not seeking to interfere in these policies in any way whatsoever. But, as far as the human aspect of the problems of Indians in Burma and Ceylon is concerned, it is as much the responsibility of the Government of India as it is the responsibility of the other Governments. And therefore, only to the extent to which we come forward to discharge our responsibilities, shall we be able to insist on the other Governments to discharge theirs. I want that the initiative taken in this respect must be continuously kept up with vigour. I hope no efforts will be spared to settle the problems of Indians in Ceylon successfully when the Prime Minister of Ceylon will be visiting our country.

Coming to the crucial question of our settling the border disputes with China, it is an admitted fact that there can never be a military solution to this problem. After all, some time or other, either today, tomorrow, ten years or 50 years hence, a solution to this problem has got to be found on a political basis.

It is in this context that the question of withdrawal of seven Chinese posts has come up. Referring to the Government of India's stand with regard to this proposal, our late Prime Minister Nehru said on the floor of this House, on the 13th April, 1964?

"I had clearly stated to Lord Russel's representatives and later

[Shri Umanath]

on to Mrs. Bandarnayka, that this could be considered if a proper approach was made to us by China. No such approach has been made and therefore, the position remains the same as before."

Even without the Chinese Government approaching us, our Government have considered this proposal and declared their stand that an act of withdrawal of the seven Chinese posts would be considered as fulfilling the obligations under the Colombo proposals and that we would be prepared to start direct negotiations.

What that would mean is clarified by Mr. Felix Bandaranaike, representing the Ceylon Government, in his statement to the Ceylon House of Representatives on 19th August, when he said:

"I think perhaps it is fair to say that the most important question on which the two sides can meet and discuss matters round a table, would be the establishment of the basic principles of what they are to discuss. At the time the Colombo proposals were being formulated as long ago as December, 1962, and January, 1963 the problem was one of consolidating a cease-fire. The cease-fire is now well and truly consolidated, and the tension has eased. The Colombo proposals have prevented an immediate outbreak of conflict again. To that extent they have made a contribution, and what remains is the ultimate negotiations of a boundary."

In so far as our Government considered the proposal for the withdrawal of the seven Chinese Posts without waiting for the proposal to come from the Chinese Government it certainly amounts to our Government taking some initiative for the purpose of breaking the stale-

mate. Having done that, I only submit that this initiative must be vigorously pursued by all channels including the diplomatic channel. Certainly, no one can say that resort to diplomatic machinery is derogatory to our national honour.

I wish to state that my submission is in keeping with a growing trend of thought among various cross sections of our people. For instance, † *Times of India* dated 24th August, 1964 echoes that trend thus:

"A failure to press ahead on the substantive issue after the purpose of the Colombo proposals has been fulfilled, will be most damaging and may indeed, remove all possibility of any fruitful negotiations in the future."

Capital dated 23rd July, 1964, writes:

"I am not suggesting that the affair with China can be settled in a couple of days, or even months or years. What I am wary about is the vested interests that may grow over prolonging the affair both in New Delhi and Peking. Years ago, I had to negotiate with a landlord for the present offices of *Capital*. This was first done through two firms of solicitors and the correspondence went on and on. I then spoke to the landlord direct and exchanged a couple of simple letters with no legal jargon at all..... This is where Mr. Swaran Singh can apply himself with vigour. If with Mr. Bhutto his brief was to make the talks yield nothing, with China he can take new initiatives..... The Colombo proposals were never promising. Other ways remain."

As early as 12th June 1964, when Vinobhaji advocated the acceptance

of the seven posts withdrawal proposal, he did not want our Government to stay where it was after acceptance. He said:

"India should accept it, take further steps and go ahead."

And further, he advocated unilateral steps by India.

This growing trend within the country for our taking the initiative to break the deadlock arises out of a serious rethinking relating to the harmful effects of the present deadlock to our country.

Even as early as May 27, 1963. Mr. Namporia reflected it sharply when he wrote:

"Washington would prefer a sort of permanent *status quo* as the most convenient solution of awkward problem. China will agree to this for other obvious reasons, which means that the weight of opinion will be in favour of no one breaking the present deadlock...."

"And if the deadlock is not broken at some time in some way, New Delhi will be reduced to drifting from one point of helplessness to another."

And at another place he says:

"Peking is under no obligation to take the initiative since it already has what it wanted."

Sir, this Government must take serious note of this trend of thought and firmly go ahead. This trend was only in dribbles in 1963. Today in 1964 it has grown into streams. Since it is in full conformity with our country's genuine interests, it is bound to grow into torrents in the future.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the answer to the question whether we should come to terms or not with China and Pakistan depends upon a

correct evaluation of the nature and scope of the Sino-Pakistan Pact. China and Pakistan are in league with England, France, West Germany, Turkey and Iran. The aim of England, France and West Germany is to drive out the United States of America from Western Europe but this cannot be done unless Russia is driven out from South Eastern Europe. But Russia cannot be driven out of Southern Eastern Europe unless it is driven out of the Heartland. But it does not lie in the power of England, France and West Germany to drive out Russia from the heartland. Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and China surround the Heartland. The last attempt to integrate Central Asia with Turkey was made by Anwar Pasha. Turkey, Iran and Pakistan are to drive out Russia from the Caucasus and Central Asia. China is to drive out Russia from Siberia. Central Asia has been the home of Pan Islamism since time immemorial. The Arabs were the hewers of wood and drawers of water in the Ottoman Empire. The aim of the foreign policy of Pakistan is to resurrect the Ottoman Empire with Islamabad as its capital. The establishment of a confederation between Turkey, Iran and Pakistan would constitute a threat to the territorial integrity of Russia in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Siberia is the only region where China can expand. India and South-East Asia are overpopulated. The condition precedent to the maintenance of the American power in the rimland and of the freedom and territorial integrity of all the countries of Asia, Africa and Europe is the maintenance of the territorial integrity of Russia in Asia.

The emergence of China as a yellow peril and the coming together of England, France, West Germany, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and China as a result of the establishment of the thermonuclear stalemate have placed Russia, America, India and the Arab world in one camp. The goal of world disarmament would have been achieved by now if the Afro-Asian

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

sector of the rimland in general and China in particular had been divided after the close of the Second World War like Europe in General and Germany in particular into two spheres of influence—Russian and American. What United Germany was to Europe, probably that or more is China to the Afro-Asian sector of the rimland. What Latin America in general and Cuba in particular are to United States of America in the New World, probably that or more, are South China and the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean to the United States of America in the Asian Sector of the rimland. What the States of South-Eastern Europe are to Russia in Europe probably that or more are Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Tibet, Sinkiang, Inner-Mongolia, Manchuria and North China to Russia in Asia.

The division of Europe into two spheres of influence has proved beneficial to humanity in general and to the peoples of Europe in particular. The multipolar world has been replaced by a bipolar world and Europe has been enjoying peace and prosperity which cannot be interrupted by any political cataclysm. The Second World War broke out because the *status quo* had become obsolete in Europe. The conflict between Russia, America, the Arab World and India on the one side and England, France, West Germany, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and China on the other is due to the fact that the *status quo* on the stage of international politics in general and in the Afro-Asian sector of the rimland in particular has become obsolete. British, French and German hegemony may be established over Eastern Europe and Russia within the framework of a United States of Europe and over large parts of Asia, Africa and the United States of America; Pan-Islamic hegemony may be established not only over the Caucasus, Central Asia and large parts of India but over the whole region extending from Morocco to Indonesia

and Chinese hegemony may be established over Siberia, the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean and over large parts of India, Africa and the United States of America if a political settlement is not arrived at between Russia and America on the basis of the division of the Afro-Asian sector of the rimland into two spheres of influence—Russian and American. The heartland has been the home of invaders since time immemorial. The rimland has suffered much as a result of these invasions. The days of Chengiz Khan, Timur, Nadir Shah and Ahmedshah Abdali may come back once again if Russia . . . (*Interruptions.*)

15.00 hrs.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): The hon. Member is making an original contribution but the other Members are laughing. I do not know what is there to be laughed at.

Shri Swaran Singh: The hon. Member also is smiling.

Shri Koya: Everybody may not believe in astrology. (*Interruption.*)

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am not indulging in astrology. This is my estimate of the situation. The days of Chengiz Khan, Timur, Ahmed Shah and Nadir Shah may come back and if Russia is driven out of the heartland . . .

Shri Swaran Singh: They will not come back.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I do not say that those days will come back. Please listen to what I say. If Russia is driven out of the heartland, and if China and the Pan-Islamic States fail to establish law and order over this region India would flourish in a Russo-American world for the does not cut across the path of Russia and America in Asia. India would perish in a world of Pan-Islamism and

Chinese hegemony for she cuts across the path of China as well as the Pan-Islamic States.

The champions of the multi-polar world—England, France, West Germany, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and China—are bound to be routed because the bipolar world cannot be broken up into a multi-polar one. The world will be destroyed and not transformed into a multi-polar one if all States become thermo-nuclear powers. It lies within the power of Russia and America to destroy not only China but the whole world within the twinkling of a moment.

The conflicts between India on the one side and China and Pakistan on the other can be resolved only by the induction of Russian troops into the Aksai Chin. The Chinese invasion of India has rendered null and void the offer that China might use the Aksai Chin road for civil purposes if both Indian and Chinese troops withdrew from that region. The Government of India cannot be a party to the concentration of the Chinese troops on the Sino-Indian and the Sino-Soviet frontiers. At the back of the minds of those who want the Government of India to lease the Aksai Chin to China, or to give up the lien over the Aksai Chin area, is the idea that Russia is the common enemy of both India and China, and therefore, the Government of India should permit the concentration of Chinese troops on the Sino-Soviet frontier.

An Hon. Member: How can she prevent it?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: China needs Aksai Chin to keep Tibet and Sinkiang under bondage. Sinkiang is directly connected with China. East Pakistan has no connection with West Pakistan. The Aksai Chin road is a corridor connecting Tibet with Sinkiang. By suggesting to the Government of India that the claim over the Aksai Chin should be waived, the ground is being paved for the

construction of a corridor connecting East Pakistan and West Pakistan.

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

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am the only Member of this House who speaks only on this subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are others also. He has taken more than 15 minutes.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Two minutes more, Sir. The continuance of the deadlock would lead to the liberation of the Aksai Chin and facilitate the passage of Russian troops into Tibet. Russia took back Sakhalin from Japan after a lapse of 40 years. If we give up our lien over the Aksai Chin either the Sino-Soviet Pact may be resurrected or a Sino-American entente may be formed or both Russia and America may come to terms with China or both Russia and America may be driven out of the Heartland and the Rimland.

The aim of China is to establish hegemony not merely over the NEFA and the Aksai Chin but over large parts of the world. Com. Tito has compared Com. Mao with Chengiz Khan and not with Hitler. There was an element of saving grace in Hitler. Chengiz Khan on the other hand was a purely destructive force.

To expect that China which has conquered Tibet will solve differences with India through mutual adjustment is sheer fantasy. England, France and Russia tried their level best from 1870 to 1939 to solve their differences with Germany through mutual adjustment. Two world wars and a few European wars had to be fought in order to liquidate the German menace. In the Aksai Chin no mutual adjustment is possible because the whole defence system of India and the Heartland and all hopes of independence for Tibet and Sinkiang would be shattered to pieces if the Chinese are allowed to build a missile base in that region where

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

the best missile base in the world can be built. The dismemberment of China as the result of either a Sino-American war or a Russo-American political settlement on the basis of the establishment of Russian hegemony over Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Tibet, Sinkiang, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria and North China, and of American hegemony over South China and the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean is inevitable if the achievement of the goal of general and complete disarmament is the next step in political evolution and if the threat of the Yellow peril is to be combated by Russia and America. No honourable settlement with China and Pakistan on the basis of vacation of aggression is possible. If negotiation was not a condition precedent to aggression, how can it be a condition precedent to the vacation of aggression?

The reason why many countries are not sure that the Chinese action in the Aksai Chin amounted to aggression is that all States are enemies of one another by virtue of the imperatives of power politics in a world of anarchy. Hitler was labelled an aggressor only after he had invaded Poland and not when he took over the Rhineland, Austria and Czechoslovakia. The many countries which are not sure that the Chinese action in the Aksai Chin amounted to aggression are those which want to capture the Chinese market. Some of them are happy that India has been thrashed by China. The widening rift between Russia and China has brightened the prospects of a Sino-American entente. This consideration impels some states to pretend that they are not sure that the Chinese action in the Aksai Chin amounted to aggression. There are some states which do not want to support India unless she joins the American block. The fear of China prevents others from characterising her as an aggressor. In any case, outsiders are not competent to pass any judgment on the question of our frontier with China which ex-

tends over a distance of nearly 2,600 miles.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am overwhelmed to the extent of being floored and I am unable to compose my thoughts after hearing such profundities propounded by my learned predecessor. We are glad that the hon. Minister of External Affairs has taken the earliest opportunity to give us a review of the international situation and to share with us his thoughts. If I may be permitted to personify the tasks of foreign policy in our contemporary world, I would describe the task of the present Foreign Minister as representing the fullness and meaning of ages past on his face and on his back the burden of the world. We wish him strength in order that he may be able to carry his burden, which is a national task, with his accustomed competence.

Before I return to the review of international affairs put before us by the Foreign Minister, I would also like to tender, in all humility, my felicitations and articulate the nation's gratitude on the return of the President of our Republic who has explained India's foreign policy so ably and so well while he was abroad.

I must confess that I for one and I hope the whole House today misses the spiritual eloquence and the refreshing presence of the late Prime Minister even though many of us had on various occasions differed from him. We are duty bound to harken to the memory of the man who was the principal architect of these foreign policies, such as they are. I should therefore first of all like to remind hon. Members on both sides of the House that the architect of these foreign policies was not a dogmatic man, he was neither hide-bound man nor orthodox. He had a lively abhorrence for orthodoxy and for rigidity of approach.

In saying so, I should like to quote a portion of his speech, which perhaps

was his last speech in this House on the subject of foreign affairs: While dealing with Acharya Kripalani's proposal to do away with non-alignment, he had this to say:

"Non-alignment is not a basic policy of ours or of any country. It is our reaction to events, and more particularly, our desire to maintain our independence of thought and action. It arose chiefly because of the two power blocs headed by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and our desire not to get entangled with them. To some extent it continues, but many changes have taken place in these alignments. The USA and the Soviet Union are not so bitterly opposed to each other as they were, and they are growing closer to each other. Among the power blocs, internal differences have arisen, and in some cases, they amount almost to a split. Thus, the Soviet Union and China, the two communist powers, have practically separated from each other and are bitterly opposed to each other. In the western bloc, some differences have also arisen. Meanwhile a large number of newly independent countries have come into existence and most of them adhere to the policy of non-alignment."

I am not quoting our late Prime Minister to demonstrate that in the last days of his life, he had grown to question the foundations of the policies which he had formulated. I am quoting him to show that he kept alive in him a questioning open-mindedness about the realism and the practical value of the underlying ideas of the policies which the Government, in his opinion, should be following.

Therefore, I should like first of all to say that we should not extol or place on a pedestal our policy of non-alignment as if it were a veritable deity. We should not play this up as a permanent principle, for in international affairs, it would be unwitting innocence on our part to do so. It

would, in my opinion, sap the vitality of our foreign policies and may undo the promise of our tomorrow in foreign affairs.

15.12 hrs.

[MR. KHANDILKAR in the Chair]

Non-alignment is not to be viewed as a mere inaction or inertia, prompted by fear that if we act, we might commit sin. It was the positive content that was given to the policy of non-alignment by the late Prime Minister which I think did do a great deal of good, to this country's national interests in the international context. To the extent that neutrality or non-alignment is negative, to the extent that it represents inertia and inaction, it is to be eschewed by a virile nation. I should like to say that it is not my purpose here to say that non-alignment is sanctioned by a moral evaluation of the world, nor would I like that our country should look with contempt and judge other countries in a denigrating way. For, in my opinion, the global aspects of international affairs should bring upon us more of a sense of cosmic humility rather than an attitude of presumption.

We find that in the non-alignment as it has been pursued by our country for sometime past, there has come to enter a certain listlessness, a certain flagging of the human spirit, a certain weakness, if I may say so. This, if allowed to continue in the foreign policies of our country, would efface the very idea of non-alignment and would undo the conception of non-alignment, as a positive force in international affairs. I submit that the time has come when the policies exemplifying non-alignment should be reviewed realistically, with a view to impart to them a forward-looking content, a certain programmatic vision, a certain hope for the under-privileged nations of the world, to impart to these policies the promise that we shall redeem the freedom of the rest of the world. At least we shall strive towards that end. Whenever we fail

[Shri A. N. Raina]

or flag in this effort, we would be pursuing a policy, by whatever name it may be called, which would be calculated to undo our national interest and which would take us away from playing the role that we should be playing in international affairs.

The late Prime Minister had said in his last speech on foreign affairs in this House to which I referred that by and large, the content of non-alignment today was psychological. It appears to me that it is being further diluted today and I would not pass any judgment on this, but it does appear that non-alignment is perhaps being redefined today, either because non-alignment as it was known earlier has lost meaning in the world of ours or because it does not have the kind of validity or force it used to have before. It appears to me that this is represented by the composition of the forthcoming conference at Cairo. One would be hard put to define that concept of non-alignment which combines these motley nations together to a common approach to foreign policy and yet I would like to say that this association is useful not only to us, not only to the various small nations which belong to this association, but also to a progressive growth of international society on sound principles of human rights and anti-colonialism.

I would like to submit that unless non-alignment is made more dynamic, unless we strive together to give it content and meaning, unless non-alignment comes to have an entirely different aspect than it had hitherto, namely, a force for a war against poverty, a force for emancipating the under-privileged nations from the shackles of economic backwardness, we would not be able to claim the leadership which has been given to us by the nations which look to India as one of the fore-runners of freedom. This is because I think in the world of today, the emergence of polycentrism or the emergence of many centres of power, is necessary in order not only to relieve the rigours of cold

war, but also to spell out the phase of creative development of international society.

Mr. Chairman, the communique at the Commonwealth Conference was not so objectionable or exceptionable because it contained a somewhat innocuous reference to an effort being made to compromise our differences with Pakistan, but it was highly objectionable inasmuch as it refrained to take note of the menace which China represents today in Asia, it was highly objectionable because it did not articulate a categorical reaction to the Chinese aggression on India. Sir, the Chinese are carrying on today an incidious, frenzied, crusading propaganda against us, and our response to this, our answer to this really is anaemic, it is ineffectual. It is an apology for an answer. Unless we are able to meet this threat of psychological warfare initiated by China we will not be able to project India in the proper perspective in the international world. This is happening both in Africa and in Asia where Asians look to the two examples of India and China with anxiety.

In this context, I should briefly like to refer to the question of admission of China. Time has come when the Government should review its approach to this whole question. The United Nation's Charter clearly says that it would admit to the United Nations those countries which are ready and willing to carry out the obligations under the Charter, which are willing to keep peace. Our sponsorship of the Chinese admission to the United Nations does us no credit and it is wholly contradictory, inconsistent, improper and even illegal. I would submit, at a time when we were asking for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations for violating certain dictates of the Charter, it is entirely incomprehensible why we should be sponsoring the cause of Communist China's admission to the United Nations.

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

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Sir, allow me five more minutes. I am the only speaker from my group.

Mr. Chairman: He has taken already 20 minutes.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Sir, I have hardly taken 15 minutes. Anyway, other speakers before me were given 20 minutes and 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: He has already taken 20 minutes. He may have two more minutes.

Shri Kapur Singh: Sir, he is such a learned speaker... (*Interruption*).

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Sir, if your record shows that I have taken 20 minutes, I have nothing to say. But I think I have only taken 12 to 15 minutes.

I want to say a word about the plight of persons of Indian origin abroad. This unfortunate class is tortured, it is in difficulty, the Indian has had a raw deal and, what is more, the agony and pain end of this all is that he has been disowned by his own Government in a certain way, not openly but in a way which is painfully evident. I had occasions to witness this. I hope Indian diplomacy will show more resourcefulness to come to the rescue of the unfortunate, embittered Indians abroad.

Sir, before I conclude I should like to emphasise that the time has come when we should try to secure a seat for ourselves on the Security Council and, perhaps, a rational and realistic revision of the United Nations Charter at an early date.

In concluding, I should like to quote from the Vedas which say: शान्तिरेव शान्ति that we must establish peace which will give birth to peace and which will be based on a proper combination of our peaceful intentions and the capacity for righteous indignation.

This is the invocation which is held for us as a beacon light by Yajur Veda which I have translated in these words:

"Luckless and in error was I, while I was incapable of just indignation, I invoke you Oh just indignation, Fortify me with your strength."

Shri Osman Ali Khan (Anantapur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, since this House met last discussed the international situation, the cause of world peace and international goodwill has suffered a loss in the passing away of our beloved leader Jawaharlalji. Our great esteem for him. Our respect and regard for him is manifest in our adhering to his policies and in our carrying out the tasks for which he ceaselessly strived during his life time.

Our Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, has made it clear and has reiterated more than once the continuance of our foreign policy. The policy of non-alignment and the policy of working for world peace and the principles of co-existence will form the basis of our foreign policy.

The hon. Member opposite, Shri Ranga, and also Acharya Kripalani, referred to the policy of non-alignment at length in their speeches. Shri Ranga said: "It is most unfortunate that we stick to dogmas long after their use is over. My fear is that it has no positive role to play". Shri Ranga is a senior politician and hails from my State of Andhra Pradesh. I have great respect for him, but politically we differ. I am unable to understand when he calls this policy of non-alignment a dogma. Does he call it a dogma because we have said our foreign policy is the natural result of our rich heritage of the ages? Sir, I will have to assert that this policy of non-alignment is not merely not a dogma, it is the only rational, realistic policy the country could have pursued in the present day world.

The world today is threatened to extinction by stock-piles of nuclear

[Shri Osman Ali Khan]

and thermo-nuclear weapons. The thought uppermost in the minds of people all over the world is to save this world from destruction. Small nations and big nations are all concerned because they have realised the implications of a nuclear war if ever it happens in the present day world. In these circumstances, efforts for peace and policies of peace are the crying need of mankind, and our policy of world peace is directed to meet this essential objective, this essential need of humanity.

The hon. Member, Shri Ranga may agree—he actually agrees—with this policy of peace, but, at the same time, he questions the usefulness of the policy of non-alignment. The answer to this is not far to seek. The policy of non-alignment is the natural corollary to the policy of peace. I may illustrate this by a common place example. Let us assume that there are two persons who are engaged in a quarrel or in a fight and there a third and fourth persons arrive. If the third and fourth persons join the persons who are quarreling or engaged in a fight the quarrel is intensified. If, on the other hand, those two persons stand aside, they remain non-aligned, and they help in solving their dispute they would be helping in establishing peace between those first two persons.

15.29 hrs.

[MR. KHADILKAR in the Chair]

Sir, our policy of non-alignment has so far helped in preventing conflicts and in reducing tension in the world. Our role in Korea and Congo and our part in Vietnam, in addition to our contribution in the United Nations and to the cause of disarmament, are illustrations of our policy of peace and non-alignment. The policy of non-alignment has served not only its basic ethical objective of promoting world peace but it has also paid us dividends on the home front. We had been able to maintain the most cordial

relations not only with the United States, West Germany, United Kingdom and the other Western bloc countries but we have also been able to maintain the most cordial relations, the friendliest relations with the Soviet Union. This has been rendered possible because of our policy of non-alignment. If we had been able to secure massive economic aid from both the power blocs, it is due to this policy. We have been able to get economic aid not only from the United States and the Soviet Union but we have been able to obtain moral support as well as help to build up our defences from other countries too to meet the challenge of the Chinese aggression. As a result of our securing the help of the Soviet Union, as well as the Western bloc countries, China today stands isolated in the world. This is entirely due to our policy of non-alignment.

Professor Ranga and some other hon. Members have said that non-alignment is not a positive policy. I may say that it is not a passive policy either. It is different from neutralism. A neutral country remains aloof from the world issues. According to our policy of non-alignment, we do not pre-judge issues; we judge each issue on merit and take our decision. Having taken that decision, we act upon that decision. Shri Ranga during the course of his speech asked: "non-alignment against whom? Not against Russia, because it is not necessary; nor is it against the United States, because it is not necessary." Then he goes on to say that this policy does no longer serve any purpose because Russia and the United States are coming together. I do not understand him when he asks against whom this policy is directed. It is evident that this policy of non-alignment is not directed against anybody. If at all, it is a policy directed towards promoting goodwill and friendship between the nations of the world.

It is true that there has been lessening of tension and there has been

better understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States. But to what extent has there been improvement is a point to be noted. While it is true that there has been better, understanding, all the same, it is most inadequate. The progress at the disarmament conference is still very slow. The stockpiling of nuclear weapons by either side is continuing still, threatening world to extinction. Unless and until we succeed in disarming these two great countries, unless and until we make progress at the disarmament conference, we cannot say that the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union have improved. Many sparks of conflicts appear on the international scene off and on and we cannot say that these two countries have come together, justifying an alteration of our policy of non-alignment. Even assuming these two countries have come together, I still feel there is no reason for us to give up our policy of non-alignment and align ourselves with the Soviet Union and the United States against China, as has been pointed out by Shri Ranga.

There has been some criticism both in this House and outside about the communique issued at the end of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference. In a short passage in the communique:

"The Prime Ministers have noted with satisfaction the public statements of the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan and have expressed hope that the problems between them would be solved in the same friendly spirit."

There has been much hair-splitting about the consequences and implications of this communique. We have to read the words in the communique in their proper perspective. The reference is not to any discussion of what has taken place in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference. There is no reference in the communique to Kashmir. No harm

could possibly be done by such a reference to our cause. As far as the reference in the communique to conciliation is concerned, it is conditional on two parties agreeing to mediation.

If anybody has reason to feel disappointed about this communique, it is President Ayub Khan of Pakistan. He has not succeeded to include even many attempts that he made at the Conference to have included in the communique a reference to Kashmir. He has not succeeded to include even a reference to the proceedings of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in the communique. It appears there was a discussion for two hours in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and at the end of the two hours the Commonwealth Prime Ministers agreed not to refer to any discussion in the communique; they also agreed not to refer to Kashmir in the communique. All that they have done is to refer to the public statements of the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan.

It may be asked why there should be even that reference in the communique. For an answer I can do no better than quote the hon. Finance Minister on the subject. He has replied to it in a short sentence. He said "it was unnecessary but hardly objectionable". Many an unnecessary thing has gone into this communique. It has been done to please several Prime Ministers who were present at the Conference.

The publicity advisers of Pakistan have tried to make it as if they have gained some victory in this Conference by this mere reference in the communique. I will say that they have done this as a face-saving device; they have done this to cover up their miserable failure in their attempt to have in the communique a reference to Kashmir or even to the proceedings of the Conference in spite of all that President Ayub Khan has said in the Conference about Kashmir and the dispute between

[Shri Osman Ali Khan]

India and Pakistan. Having failed in their attempt, they want to make their people believe that they have succeeded in their attempts in having included in the communique a reference to Indo-Pakistan relations.

It will ill-serve the presentation of our case if we ourselves protest against the working of the communique, thereby endorsing the claims of Pakistan. We will be playing into the hands of the propagandists of Pakistan by doing so. But I must admit that there is justifiable apprehension in the minds of some people in this country that this reference, harmless though it may be, still has its implications. It may be that the first reference is harmless. Next year they may go a step further and they may refer more directly to the dispute between two Commonwealth countries. So, there is some apprehension, justifiable apprehension if I may say so. I am sure, Government will resist any such attempt as and when it arises.

Mr. Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Osman Ali Khan: Could I have five more minutes?

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Shri Swell.

Shri Bade (Khargone): As Shri U. M. Trivedi is not here, I may be given a chance.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, all groups cannot be accommodated. Shri Swell will have ten minutes.

Shri Bade: If Shri Swell could be given an opportunity, why not I?

Mr. Speaker: They should not compete with each other. I will see if I can give him an opportunity.

Shri Swell (Assam—Autonomous Districts): Mr. Speaker, I will try to confine to ten minutes, although it is rather somewhat disappointing.

Mr. Speaker: Quite right. I share his disappointment.

Shri Swell: Mr. Speaker, following the sad demise of our late Prime Minister, who for seventeen long years was the soul and substance of our foreign policy, and preceding the conference of non-aligned nations in Cairo just by a few days, this discussion appears to have an importance of its own and has not come a day too soon.

During the very limited time that you have been pleased to give me, I will only draw attention of the House to a number of developments in the international world which appear to me to be of special significance and I shall conclude by urging on the Government to adopt a more politically dynamic approach towards the solution of our problems.

Firstly, the death of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru by itself was the most portentous event for us. Not only have we lost the man who with both his hands lifted India to an honourable position in the comity of nations but also his death has excited the world's curiosity about us and our future.

Secondly, our inglorious performance in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London in July last has filled many people with misgivings not only in this country but also abroad as to whether we have the capacity to maintain the position that we have been holding so far.

Thirdly, our Prime Minister, who has not been anywhere outside India beyond Nepal, will make his debut in an international meet in Cairo. He has an onerous duty on his shoulders not only in filling the place, a big place, occupied by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru so far but also he will have to retrieve somewhat the position that we lost in the London Conference.

Fourthly, for the first time in the history of our country we have a Minister who is solely in charge of external affairs and if grievous mistakes in the working of the External

Affairs Secretariat or in our missions abroad were detected in the past because of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's preoccupations with his duties as Prime Minister, those mistakes cannot be excused now.

Fifthly, the prospects of peace in Nagaland which were raised in our hearts by the current peace talks seem now to be dimmed and I am filled with misgivings and forebodings that if these talks should fail and another bloodbath should take place in Nagaland, the intervention of the Chinese Army or the Chinese volunteers in that part of our country cannot altogether be ruled out.

Sixthly, our disputes with Pakistan and China remain where they were before. We have a tremendous legacy and it is for this Government to prove whether they are worthy of this legacy, whether they can maintain it.

The Minister of External Affairs in the speech that he read out to the House last Friday has reiterated that this Government will abide by the policy enunciated and built up over the years by the late Prime Minister. He has also reiterated the two basic tenets of that policy, namely, non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. May I submit, Sir, that I do not think that there are many people in this country who will seriously and basically differ from that policy except in the implementation of it, in the nuances given to it, in the emphasis placed on it from time to time on different issues? There cannot be a departure from that policy because the only alternative to that is confrontation and the risk of global annihilation. I agree with what the External Affairs Minister said the other day that this policy has earned for us rich dividends; but I would not go into that because the time in my hands is limited. I would, however, take this opportunity of congratulating the Minister of External Affairs for having taken the earliest opportunity, soon after assuming res-

ponsibility, to visit our neighbouring countries, Nepal, Burma, Afghanistan and Ceylon. It was altogether a step in the right direction, for if we are to exist as a nation, we have to exist together and get along with our neighbours. We have problems with these neighbours of ours and these problems have got to be solved sooner or later in a friendly and a co-operative spirit. I note that the Minister of External Affairs has also agreed to accept the invitation of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to visit that country in the near future. I wish him godspeed in this venture also.

That, Sir, will leave out only one more immediate neighbour of ours but which is the most portentous as far as we are concerned, China. With regard to China we have been repeating that we stand for a peaceful solution of our dispute with her. We have accepted the Colombo Proposals and we have gone even a little beyond that. We have said that if China would withdraw the seven posts in the demilitarised zone in Ladakh, we shall consider that a substantial fulfilment of her acceptance of the Colombo proposals and that we are prepared to sit on the negotiating table with her thereafter. But notwithstanding the rather optimistic statement of Mr. Felix Bandarnaike in the Ceylon's House of Representatives to this effect, China has so far prevaricated. But, may I submit, that there is no reason to be pessimistic; there is no reason for us yet to lose our balance and to cry a wolf. There is no doubt that we have got to safeguard our territorial integrity, that we have got to strengthen our defences. In this regard the statement made by the Defence Minister on the defence aid from the USA and the USSR the other day has been encouraging. But let us not lose the larger world perspective and that if we are to solve this problem with China, we can solve it not in the military way but in the political way.

We have taken a certain stand with regard to China. It will be useless to

[Shri Swell]

expect—it will be foolish to expect—that China, a great and proud nation, to come round meekly to our terms, specially so after the debacle that we suffered at her hands. But we have also to remember that China bears a chip on her shoulder because she has been denied a place in the United Nations Organisation which she thinks is her due, because rightly or wrongly she feels that she has not been dealt with properly by Soviet Russia which she considers as a sister Communist country. But things are piling up for China too. Under the impact of these developments there are signs that China has been forced to rethink about her entire approach and attitude to world problems. There is the Gulf of Tongking episode the other day when next door to China the American Fleet pounded away at bases and vessels of North Viet Nam and China did nothing more than indulge in futilmination. Then, there is her quarrel with Soviet Russia which has escalated from an ideological difference into a bitter territorial and national rivalry. Premier Khrushchev's pronouncement, the other day to a Japanese Parliamentary Delegation that met him that China was laying claim to 580,000 square miles of Soviet territory and that the Chinese emperors had conquered Manchuria, Mongolia, Tibet and Sinkiang, that Sinkiang was not a part of China and today's reports in the newspapers that China had accused Soviet Russia of trying to dismember her territorial integrity—all these are signs that things are piling up against China. It is no wonder that we hear rumours and rumblings of a kind of political purge in China today. It must have dawned even on China that she cannot continue to be a bad boy of the international world with impunity, that she cannot take on America and Russia at the same time and continue her aggression on her neighbours. In this context, the statement of Mrs. Bandranaikē seems to have more to it than can be lightly dismissed and it is for us to take the advantage of the situation. I wonder if the time

has not come for this country to take the initiative of trying to promote some kind of an organisation that would promote Asian unity. You may say that we have the non-aligned nations conference and we have the Afro-Asian Bandung Conference. There is no need to talk of avoiding China. We cannot avoid China. In any case, we are going to meet China in the next Afro-Asian Conference whenever that is to be held.

May I, Sir, submit that these conferences are too broad, too comprehensive, that it would not be possible to discuss the realities of the situation as it obtains between one nation and another there. That would be possible only if that is done within a more closely-knit organisation like an All-Asian organisation. May I submit to the Minister of External Affairs to kindly think about this and see if he can take steps in this direction.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Yudhvīr Singh Chaudhary's name was sent to me. He was not here. No other name was sent to me.

Shri Bādē: I may speak, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: That cannot be substituted like this. If you had conveyed it to me earlier, I would have proceeded in that manner. No other name was sent to me.

Shri Bādē: I sent my name. Unfortunately, he is sick.

Mr. Speaker: I am glad that Mr. Bādē is well. Then, he might have 7 or 8 minutes.

श्री बड़े : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेशी नीति पर बोलते हुए मैं सर्वप्रथम विदेश मंत्री का अभिनंदन करता हूँ। यह मंत्रालय उनके हाथ में आते ही उन्होंने पड़ोसी देशों का दौरा किया। इस बारे में दो घोषीनियन्त्र हैं कि इन देशों के दौरे में उनको कहीं तक सफलता मिली है। कुछ लोग कहते

हैं कि विदेश मंत्री वहाँ से खाली हाथ लौटे हैं और कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि उन के दौरे से उन देशों के साथ हमारे अच्छे सम्बन्ध कायम हो गये हैं । कुछ भी हो, इन देशों का दौरा कर के उन्होंने ठोक कदम उठाया है ।

ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि स्वर्गीय पंडित जी ने जो विदेश नीति अपनाई थी, वह दूर-दर्शिता पर आधारित थी । उस समय पूरा जगत दो गुटों में विभक्त हो गया था—एक तो सोवियट ग्रुप और दूसरा पश्चिमी देशों का ग्रुप । उस विदेश-नीति के अन्तर्गत यह निश्चय किया गया था कि हम इन दोनों ग्रुप्स में से किसी में नहीं मिलेंगे । लेकिन बाद में उन दोनों गुटों में दरार पड़ गई । एक ओर रशा और चाइना में दरार पड़ गई । विदेश मंत्री को इस तथ्य का ध्यान रखना चाहिए और इस दरार का फायदा उठाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए । यह ठीक है कि ऐसी कोशिश की जा रही है । दूसरी ओर हम देखते हैं कि पश्चिमी देशों में फ्रांस ने अपनी एक अलग नीति अपनाई है, जब कि ब्रिटेन, आस्ट्रेलिया, कॅनेडा और वैस्ट जर्मनी ने चाइना को मदद देने की शुरुआत कर दी है । इस से यह प्रतीत होता है कि पश्चिमी ग्रुप में भी चाइना के बारे में एकमत नहीं है ।

पहले पश्चिमी जगत ने यह नीति अपनाई थी कि चाइना को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ से एक्स्क्लूड किया जाये और उस को सैब्रीगेट किया जाये । इस के विपरीत हम ने यह नीति अपनाई थी कि चाइना को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में मान्यता दी जाये और हम ने वहाँ पर इस की बकालत भी की । लेकिन चाइना ने इस बात का ध्यान न रखा और सह-अस्तित्व तथा "हिन्दी-चीनी भाई भाई" का नारा लगाते हुए भी हम पर आक्रमण कर दिया । तब स्वर्गीय पंडित जी के मत में परिवर्तन हुआ और उन्होंने कहा कि नान-एलाइनमेंट का अर्थ यह है कि हम किसी के साथ एलाइन नहीं करेंगे, लेकिन अपने डिफेंस के लिए जहाँ से भी शस्त्र मिलेंगे, हम लेंगे । मैं

कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह उस वक्त डेविएशन नहीं था । वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री, श्री शास्त्री, ने कहा है कि जब जब परिस्थिति बदलेगी, तब तब परिस्थिति के अनुसार हम भी बदलेंगे, लेकिन हम स्वर्गीय पंडित जी की नीति पर चलेंगे ।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पालिटिक्स में हमेशा आवश्यकता के अनुसार परिवर्तन करना चाहिए और परिवर्तन करना पड़ता है । इसीलिए पालिटिक्स के सम्बन्ध में "व.रांग-नैव" शब्द का प्रयोग किया जाता है, क्योंकि पालिटिक्स में हमेशा परिवर्तन और बदलने की गुंजायश रखी जाती है ।

इस समय चाइना और रशा का आपस में झगडा चल रहा है । आज चाइना दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया में अपने पांव फैला रहा है । इस लिए उस क्षेत्र में चाइना के विस्तार को रोकने के लिए हमें उचित कदम उठाने चाहिए । और इस विषय में सतर्क रहना चाहिए । प्रश्न यह है कि इस सम्बन्ध में हमें क्या करना चाहिए । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब एक नई नीति अपनानी चाहिए और वह नीति दिल्ली से चलाई जानी चाहिए । हमें चाइना के खिलाफ एक मोर्चा तैयार करना चाहिए । जो जो राष्ट्र चाइना के खिलाफ हों, फिर चाहे वह रशा हो, ईस्ट जर्मनी हो या ब्रिटेन या अमरीका हो, उनको एकत्रित करके एक संयुक्त नीति अपनाई जानी चाहिए और वह नीति दिल्ली में बनाई जानी चाहिए । इसमें नान-एलाइनमेंट इतना है कि जब अमरीका ने हम को शस्त्र दिये, तो हमने अमरीका से शस्त्र लिये, लेकिन चूँकि अमरीका ने हम को केवल जमीन के शस्त्र दिये और वह हवाई शस्त्र देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हुआ, इसलिए हम रशा की ओर दौड़े । इस सम्बन्ध में हमारे राष्ट्रपति, डा० राधाकृष्णन्, और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर रशा गए थे । जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, चाइना के खिलाफ जितने देश हैं, उनको एकत्रित किया जाना चाहिए ।

[श्री बड़े]

लेकिन इस बारे में हम को यह ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि हमारे निकट ही पाकिस्तान है और पाकिस्तान तथा चाइना ने हाथ मिलाया है। हम को यह बात भी समझनी चाहिए कि जब पाकिस्तान ने चाइना से हाथ मिलाया, तो अमरीका ने जरूर पाकिस्तान को अपनी सहमति दी होगी और अगर सहमति प्रकट नहीं की होगी, तो कम से कम यह प्रसंदिग्ध है कि उसने पाकिस्तान को रोका नहीं होगा। अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को यह जरूर कहा होगा कि वह काश्मीर को लेने के लिए चाइना से हाथ मिला सकता है और इस प्रकार उसने इस गठबन्धन के लिए अपनी अनुमति दी होगी।

काश्मीर और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में हम को यह देखना चाहिए कि हमारे यहां के बहुत से शान्तिप्रिय लोग पाकिस्तान जाते हैं और दिन-रात उसके साथ शान्ति और समझौते के नारे लगाते हैं और शासन भी उसमें उनको अपना सहमति देता है। यह अनुचित है। शासन को स्पष्ट कहना चाहिए कि फूल्ज पंराडाइज में रहने वाले जो लोग शान्तिदूत बन कर पाकिस्तान जाते हैं, उनसे हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

पाकिस्तान कहता है कि काश्मीर के लोगों को सैल्फ-डेटरमिनेशन का अधिकार देना चाहिए। तो फिर पाकिस्तान पख्तून-स्तान के सम्बन्ध में पठानों को सैल्फ डेटरमिनेशन का अधिकार क्यों नहीं देता है? यह अच्छी बात है कि विदेश मंत्री अफगानिस्तान गए थे। पाकिस्तान और अमरीका जिस नीति पर चल रहे हैं, वह यह है कि कांटा से ही कांटा निकल सकता है। वही नीति हम को भी अपनानी चाहिए। जो उसके शत्रु हैं, वे हमारे मित्र होने चाहिए। यह मालूम नहीं है कि अफगानिस्तान में विदेश मंत्री को वहां के नेताओं के साथ क्या बातचीत हुई। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हम को पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ

पख्तूनस्तान का प्रश्न उठाना चाहिए। तब पाकिस्तान को मालूम हो जायेगा कि सैल्फ-डेटरमिनेशन का अर्थ क्या होता है।

जहां तक नागालैण्ड का सम्बन्ध है, मुझे वहां के कुछ लोगों से मालूम हुआ है कि वहां पर दस आदमियों में एक आदमी ऐसा है,—जिस को पाकिस्तान में ट्रेनिंग दी जाती है। इस प्रकार लगभग चार पांच सौ आदमी पाकिस्तान में जाकर ट्रेनिंग प्राप्त करते हैं। इसके प्रतिरिक्त होस्टाइल नागाज की तरफ से एक एक फ़ैमिली को सात सात रुपये दिये जाते हैं। इस प्रकार नागालैण्ड की समस्या में चाइना और पाकिस्तान दोनों का हाथ है। पाकिस्तान तो हमारा इम्पीडिएंट शत्रु है और चाइना भी हमारे विरुद्ध है। इन दोनों के खिलाफ हमें अपनी सुरक्षा को दृष्टि में रख कर नीति अपनानी चाहिए। जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, विदेश मन्त्री को उन देशों को एकत्रित करना चाहिए, जो कि चाइना के खिलाफ हैं और उनका सहयोग प्राप्त करना चाहिए।

हमारे मित्र ने शान्ति की नीति अपनाने की बात कही। द्रौपदी ने कहा था कि नपुंसकों की शान्ति नहीं हो सकती है, शान्ति उनकी हो सकती है, जो पुंसक हैं, जो पराक्रमी हैं।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा डिफ़ेन्स और विदेश नीति साथ साथ चलने चाहिए। मुझे यह सुन कर आनन्द हुआ, जब डिफ़ेन्स मिनिस्टर ने यह कहा कि हमने और तैयारी की है और कर रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान सबल हो कर ऐसी विदेश नीति अपनाए, जिससे चाइना को दबाया जा सके और जहां तक हो सके, हो सके, पाकिस्तान से मित्रता की जाये, लेकिन नाट एट दि कास्ट आफ काश्मीर।

16.00 hrs.

श्री० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फरेंखाबाव).
अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय विदेश मंत्री ने

अलग अलग पेड़ों की निगरानी की लेकिन जंगल का अवलोकन नहीं किया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि अमल और सिद्धान्त दोनों की परीक्षा कुछ अधूरी रह गई। जब मैं सिद्धान्त की चर्चा करता हूँ तो कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ पर एक ही बात ज्यादा उठती है कि किस गुट में जायें और किस में न जायें, रूस के गुट में या अमरीका के गुट में। अगर इन्हीं दो गुटों से मतलब है तो मैं, अध्यक्ष महादय, अपने अनुभव से आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि अभी कुछ दिनों पहले संयुक्त राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा परिषद की बैठक मैंने देखी जिस में अमरीका और रूस, दोनों के प्रतिनिधियों ने कम्बोडिया के बारे में अपनी अपनी रायें बतलाईं। मुझे ऐसा लगा कि वे मिली जुली कुपती कर रहे हैं। नोक झोंक है लेकिन एक दूसरे के दांत नहीं गड़ा रहे हैं। अभी भी सम्भव है कि रूस और अमरीका का मामला बहुत बिगड़ जायें लेकिन उसके साथ साथ इस बात की भी सम्भावना है कि वे एक दूसरे के नजदीक आते चले जायें। इसलिए भी इस बहस को ज्यादा चलाना कि हम इस गुट में जायें या उस गुट में जायें, जायें या न जायें, कोई विशेष अर्थ नहीं रखता है।

पहले भी जब सह-अस्तित्व के सिद्धान्त की चर्चा होती थी तो मैं कहा करता था आज से ही नहीं बल्कि आज से कोई दस बारह बरस पहले भी कि सह-अस्तित्व के साथ साथ सामीप्य के सिद्धान्त को भी जोड़ी, यानी रूस और अमरीका को नजदीक लाने की कोशिश करो ताकि वे एक दूसरे के गुण सीखें और एक दूसरे के साथ दुनिया को सुधारने में सहकार करें।

आज उस सिद्धान्त की ओर ज्यादा जरूरत हो गई है। मैं अमल के लिए एक बात माननीय विदेश मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री जी की खिदमत में पेश करना चाहता हूँ कि अब जब कभी वे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलनों में जायें तो कोशिश करें कि रूस और अमरीका का शिखर सम्मेलन हो दुनिया से गरीबी मिटाने के लिए। यह

एक बात हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति का मुख्य उद्देश्य बन जानी चाहिये। जब मैं इसकी चर्चा करता हूँ तो इसको मैं खास तौर से एक मिसाल देकर बतलाना चाहता हूँ। आज दो चार पांच दस अरब रुपये इधर या उधर किसी देश में डाल देते हैं रूस और अमरीका वाले लेकिन उससे कामकाज नहीं चलेगा। काम तो तब चल सकता है जब मिसाल के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की खेती को पानी देने के लिए रूस और अमरीका संकल्प कर लें। तब यह बात न रहे कि कौन किसान नहर के पानी का पैसा देता है और कौन नहीं देता है। कोई पैसा दे या न दे, जिस तरह से हवा मनुष्य को मिलती है उसी तरह से खेती का पानी भी हिन्दुस्तानी को मिल जाए। मैंने यह मिसाल हिन्दुस्तान की दी है। लेकिन मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी तथा विदेश मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि वे मिसालें लैटिन अमरीका की दें और अफ्रीका की दें ताकि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलनों में गरीबी को मिटाने के लिए यह शिखर सम्मेलन वाली बात और कार्यक्रम वाली बात अच्छी तरह से आ जाये। मैं लैटिन अमरीका और अफ्रीका की मिसालें यहाँ दे कर आपका वक्त बरबाद नहीं करना चाहता, लेकिन ऐसी बहुत सी मिसालें हैं।

अब मैं इस सम्बन्ध में थोड़ा सा राष्ट्रपति जानसन की गरीबी मिटाने वाली अमरीकी योजना, अमरीकी कार्यक्रम के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ एक क्षेत्र है जिसका नाम अपालाकिया है। वह तुलनात्मक दृष्टि से गरीब है। कई मानों में पिछड़ा हुआ है। जैसे मैं कहा करता हूँ कि यहाँ 25-30 करोड़ आदमी तीन आने रोज पर जिन्दा रहते हैं, वहाँ पर आप समझिये डढ़ दो करोड़ आदमी अमरीका के करीब तीन रुपये रोज पर जिन्दा रहते हैं। यह है अमरीका की गरीबी की मिसाल। राष्ट्रपति जानसन ने संकल्प किया है कि अपालाकिया से गरीबी मिटा दी जाए। मैंने वहाँ अमरीका में एक विलक्षण परिणाम देखा है। वहाँ लोगों में भी इस बात की चर्चा

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

है कि अगर हमारे यहां अमरीका में ऐसे गरीब हैं तो हम अपना रुपया दुनिया के दूसरे देशों से गरीबी मिटाने के लिए क्यों बरबाद करते चले जायें। मैं मानता हूँ कि राष्ट्रीयता का सिद्धान्त भी बड़ा जबर्दस्त है। दुनिया में है, रूस और अमरीका में है। इसलिए मेरी बात कोई आसानी से ये लोग नहीं मानेंगे। फिर भी मैं कहूंगा कि लैटिन अमरीका में जिस तरह से उन्नति का एलाएंस, उन्नति के संगठन की जो बात राष्ट्रपति कैनेडी ने रखी थी और उसका जो बेहाल हुआ है, उसको देखते हुए ये दोनों देश इस पर सोच विचार करें कि क्यों यह दुनिया बिगड़ी जा रही है। ऐसा न समझो कि चीन वाले कमजोर पड़ते जा रहे हैं। मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि चीन आज संसार की आवादी में चाहे डर के कारण और चाहे प्रेम के कारण ज्यादा आदर पा रहा है बनिस्वत हिन्दुस्तान के। इससे आखें बन्द करना बिल्कुल बेवकूफी होगी। यह आदर बढ़ता चला जाएगा। इसके बुनियादी कारण हैं। एक कारण यह है कि संसार में उत्पत्ति की साम्राज्यशाही है। एक तरफ हम रंगीन लोग हैं जिन की आमदनी मुश्किल से रोड आठ दस अने अमतिन है और दूसरी तरफ गौरे लोग हैं। फिर जमीन की साम्राज्यशाही है। हम लोग एक दो चार मील में करीब 6 सौ रहते हैं, वहां पर बे कम रहते हैं। ऐसी बातों का चीन फायदा उठाता है। इतना ही नहीं, उसको अब बड़े गहकारी मिलने लगे गये हैं, उसको बड़ा गहकार मिलने लग गया है। यूरोप के बड़े भारी हिस्से में आज दिगाल और माओ-त्से-तुंग में एक तरह से दिमागी और कार्य के क्षेत्र में भी समझौता होता चला जा रहा है। एक बात दोनों देश कह रहे हैं कि अणु हथियारों का जिनका खाली अमरीका और रूस के पास एकत्रीकरण हो गया है बन्द होना चाहिये, सभी देशों में अणु हथियार होने चाहियें। और सभी देश में नहीं तो कम से कम उनके देशों के पास तो होने ही चाहियें। अब

यह बात सुन कर जो लोग खाली अमरीका और रूस की दुनिया को नहीं देखना चाहते हैं, वे कुछ खुश होते हैं।

उसी तरह से दूसरा सवाल राष्ट्रीयता और सम्मान का है। गरीबी भी उसके साथ जुड़ी हुई है। लैटिन अमरीका, अफ्रीका, एशिया के काफी बड़े हिस्से इस बात को पसन्द नहीं करते हैं कि आज रूस और अमरीका दुनिया के घना सेठ बनते चले जायें। यह गलत हो या सही, इस विचार के खिलाफ वे खड़े रहते हैं, सामने आते हैं।

उसी के साथ साथ स्वार्थ की तरफ निगाह जरूर रखी जानी चाहिये। वैसे जापान और चीन के बीच जबर्दस्त दुश्मनी होनी चाहिये। लेकिन मैं लोक सभा को चेता देना चाहता हूँ कि चीन और जापान के बीच दोस्ती के भी काफी बीज बोये जा चुके हैं। जापान में एक तो ओकीनावा द्वीप है और एक कुरील द्वीप है। माओत्से तुंग ने बहुत जोर के साथ कहा है कि रूसियों को कुरील से निकाल दो और अमरीकियों को ओकीनावा से निकालो। जापान के अन्दर न जाने कितनी राष्ट्रीय शक्तियां हैं जिन्होंने इस बात को पसन्द किया है। उसी तरह से कई तरह के स्वार्थ के मामले उठा करके चीन और फ्रांस वाले अपनी तरफ दुनिया को खींच रहे हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में थोड़ा सा मैं जिक्र कर देना चाहता हूँ खाली इसलिये नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान को मदद दिलवानी है बल्कि वे सवाल सिद्धान्त के भी हैं कि तिब्बत है, सिक्किम है, मंगोलिया है जिनके सवाल रूसने उठाये हैं चाहे उसने अपनी संकुचित राष्ट्रीयता के कारण उठाये हों। लेकिन मेरा यह पक्का विश्वास है कि वे सवाल न सिर्फ राष्ट्रीयता की भावना से उठने चाहियें बल्कि दुनिया में शान्ति के सिद्धान्त के आधार पर भी उठाने चाहिए और इन सवालों को सामने लाना चाहिये।

यह सही है कि श्री.नावा और कुयिल का सवाल ज्यादा ताकत के साथ आ जाता है क्योंकि उसके साथ जापान जैसा शक्तिशाली देश जुड़ा हुआ है और तिब्बत का सवाल नहीं आ पाता क्योंकि कोई शक्तिशाली देश उसके साथ जुड़ा हुआ नहीं है। खाली रूस और अमरीका से मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि उन सवालों को भी वे उठाएँ जिन के साथ कोई शक्ति जुड़ी हुई नहीं है।

आप यह भी देखें कि माओ-त्से-तुंग साहब ने आजकल एक सिद्धान्त मध्य क्षेत्र का भी कहना शुरू किया है। उनका कहना है कि रूस और अमरीका के बीच में एक मध्य क्षेत्र है जिसमें वह यूरोप को गिन लेते हैं, यूरोप के पूँजीपतियों को गिनते हैं, जापान के पूँजीपतियों को गिनते हैं। लैटिन अमरीका, एशिया इत्यादि को उन्होंने जबर्दस्त अपील कर रखी है कि इस मध्य क्षेत्र का संगठन करो। दिगल और माओ-त्से-तुंग में जैसा मैंने कहा दोस्तो चल रही है। मैं खुद उसको अपनी आँखों से देख कर आया हूँ। बेल्जियम जैसे छोटे देश में भी चीनी रेस्तोरां की तादाद बढ़ती जा रही है। मैं मानता हूँ कि चीनी खाना कुछ अच्छा होता है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि चीनी और फ्रांसीसी खाने, दुनिया के अच्छे खाने हैं। चीन के सौ से ज्यादा रेस्तोरां बेल्जियम में खुल गये हैं। वे रेस्तोरां खाली यों ही नहीं खुला करते हैं। उसके साथ दिमागी बात भी चलती है और चीन काफी आगे बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। कांगो में मुलेल नाम के एक बड़े नेता के साथ चीन जुड़ा हुआ है। अगर कांगो की वर्तमान सरकार किसी तरह से हिली तो जो गिजेंगा, मुलेल वगैरह आयेंगे वे चीन के दोस्त होंगे स्वार्थ के कारण। पाकिस्तान के अयूब साहब चीन के साथ आ रहे हैं। लैटिन अमरीका की बात मैं कह चुका हूँ। ये दिमाग के भाई हैं। हिन्दुस्तान को भी दिमाग के भाइयों को ढूँढना चाहिये। पहले की बात तो मैं नहीं कहता हूँ लेकिन आगे के लिये कहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान को

चाहिये कि दिमाग के भाई ढूँढे।

मैं नेपाल का खास तौर से जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर क्या हो रहा है। राजा और वहाँ के प्रधान मंत्री के बीच में क्या होना चाहिये? इसके बारे में मैं कोई सुझाव नहीं देना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन इतना मैं अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि नेपाल में उत्तरदायी शासन को खत्म करके और वहाँ के प्रधान मंत्री और दूसरे मंत्रियों को लगातार गिरफ्तारों में रख कर एक ऐसी स्थिति पैदा होती चली जा रही है जो न जाने कब खतरनाक सिद्ध हो सकती है।

इसी तरह से जब मैं दिमाग के भाइयों की बात करता हूँ तो आपसे मैं अर्ज करूँ कि इतने समय से गांधीवाद की गद्दी पर बैठ कर जो भी आगे आई थी, वह आगे कुछ बुझ सी गई है। मार्क्सवाद का ऐसा हाल नहीं है। और विदेश नीति में हमेशा अपने सिद्धान्तों के परिणाम की तरफ देखना चाहिये। मार्क्सवाद है चीन का, रूस का। सही गलत, टेढ़ा, मेढ़ा, कई एक रूप का, लेकिन उसमें एक क्रांतिकारिता है। उसने सम्पत्ति के कानूनों को बदला, मालिकों को बदला, लोगों में एक विचार पैदा किया और शायद समता वाले सावधान हो गये। लेकिन गांधीवाद जो पन्द्रह सत्तर साल पहले हिन्दुस्तान की गद्दी पर बैठा वह इस तरह से कोई क्रांतिकारी कदम उठा नहीं पाया। वह बधिया हो गया और इसलिए दुनिया के लोगों ने उसकी तरफ देखना बन्द कर दिया है। जब तक आप कोई क्रांतिकारी कदम नहीं उठाएँगे तब तक आप कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं। जो कुछ मेरा मतलब समता का है, मैं उसकी एक मिसाल आपको दूँ। अभी स्विटजरलैंड में एक किताब निकली राल्फ बिगलर की। अगर आप इजाजत दें तो उसके बारे में खाली कुछ शब्द बतला दूँ :

“Bigler Schlagt auch Vor die uniformen und das Essen für alle Angehörigen der Armee gleich zu gestalten”.

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

बिगलर ने यह राय दी है कि सेना के सभी सिपाही, सिपाही और भ्रफसर, सब के कपड़े और वर्दी तथा खाना बिल्कुल बराबर होने चाहिये। अब यह दुनिया किस तरफ चली जा रही है। सेना का इतना बड़ा पंडित समता के बारे में लिख रहा है कि हर सिपाही और हर भ्रफसर की वर्दी और खाना बिल्कुल समान होना चाहिये। लेकिन हमारे यहां एक तरफ तो समता की बात है, गांधीवाद की बात है, और दूसरी तरफ खड़गवासला जैसी चीज चलती है जहां पर मैं नहीं जानता कितना रुपया एक विद्यार्थी पर खर्च होता है। मैं अधिक न कहता हुआ इतना ही बतलाऊं कि खड़गवासला में जो भ्रफसर लोग तैयार हो रहे हैं या हैदराबाद के स्टाफ कालेज में जो कलेक्टर और कमिश्नर तैयार हो रहे हैं उनमें से एक एक के ऊपर साढ़े तीन या चार हजार रुपये महीने खर्च हो रहे हैं। वह कौन लोग तैयार होते हैं। वे लोग समता की निशानी नहीं रखते देश के सामने या दुनिया के सामने। मैं एक ही बात का खतरा बतला देता हूँ कि अभी यह लोग आप को मजबूत चखायेंगे। अगर कहीं हम लोगों के "भारतबन्ध" जैसे कार्यक्रम बढ़ते चले गये तो यह लोग मैदान में आयेंगे। मुझे इस बात का भ्रफसोस रहेगा लेकिन हम लोग अपने कार्यक्रम चलाते रहेंगे। तो अगर आप चाहते हैं कि समता की तरफ जायें तो एक तरफ ही गांधीवाद, या समझो हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर की समता—मैं उसको आध्यात्मिकता की जगह देता हूँ, दुनिया चाहती है कि हिन्दुस्तान आध्यात्मिकता की कोई नजर पेश करे, लेकिन आध्यात्मिकता खाली कागज पर चलने से नहीं होगी, उसे अमल में उतारो—दूसरी तरफ सन्तोष की भावना।

और जब इन बातों की तरफ खयाल करते हो तो मैं थोड़ा सा फीजी के बारे में कह दूँ। अभी मैं वहां से होकर आया। वहां पर हिन्दुस्तानी पुरखों, यानी पैदाइश के लोगों की

संख्या ज्यादा है। वहां पर करीब 52 या 53 सैकड़ आबादी का हिस्सा हिन्दुस्तानी पैदाइश का है। वह अब हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं हैं, सारे फीजी वाले हैं, लेकिन अंग्रेजों की नौकर शाही और आस्ट्रेलिया के पूंजीवाद ने उन लोगों की ताकत को खत्म कर रखा है और फीजी में लोगों को उत्तरदायी शासन नहीं मिल रहा है।

इसके अलावा एक चीज मैं हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति के बारे में अर्ज कर दूँ कि जो उभारते हैं उन को पूरा करने के लिये भी रास्ता पहले से समझ लेना चाहिये। मिसाल के लिये जैसे काश्मीर के मामले में हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति ने कुछ चीजों को उभार दिया है पिछले महीने दो महीने में। मैं नहीं जानता कि अब क्या होने वाला है, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा खतरा लगता है कि वह इस काम को पूरा नहीं कर पायेंगे, और यह एक बड़ी खतरनाक चीज है। कभी किसी चीज को छोड़ो मत। बरं का छत्ता है। उसे छोड़ते हो तो फिर वह काट कर छोड़ेंगी। कभी उसे मत छोड़ो। जब तक अगला रास्ता न समझ लो कि किस तरह से इस चीज को पूरा करना है।

अब मैं एक चीज थोड़ी सी अर्ज कर दूँ कि अमरीका और रूस वालों को जरा सावधान रहना चाहिये विदेश नीति के मामलों में। वे इन मामलों को ऐसे चलायें कि हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल न दें। अभी चेस्टर बोल्स साहब हैं, उन्होंने न जाने कितनी बातें कही हैं जिससे हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दरूनी मामलों उनकी राय आ जाया करती है। मिसाल के लिये उनकी एक राय अभी कुछ दिनों पहले छपी थी कि अगर यह मौजूदा सरकार न रही होती तो पन्द्रह, सत्तरह साल पहले हिन्दुस्तान में खाली चीन वाला रास्ता था। ऐसी बात कभी किसी राजदूत को नहीं कहनी चाहिये। वाउल्स साहब इस्तीफा दें, और एक अमरीकी की हैसियत से आकर एसा कहें तो ठीक है।

इसी तरह से मैं रूसियों के बारे में भी कहना चाहूंगा कि वह लोग भी सावधानी से काम करें। उनका व्यापार रुपये में हमारे साथ चलता है, लेकिन जो उनका रुपया इकट्ठा होता है या पर उससे वह खुद हिन्दुस्तान के साथ व्यापार नहीं करते, बल्कि उस रुपये को वे पश्चिमी योरप के देशों में नीलाम कर देते हैं 6 प्रतिशत बट्टा लगा कर और जो रुपया, जो सारा फण्ड चला हुआ है उसमें से न जाने हिन्दुस्तान की राजनैतिक पार्टियों के लिये क्या रहता है। अमरीका का भी।

आखीर में मैं एक मलयाली लोगों की बात कहता हूँ। उनका कहना है "वल्लभे पल्लामायुधम्"। इसका अर्थ पूरा मैं नहीं बतलाऊंगा, लेकिन विदेश मन्त्री जी और प्रधान मन्त्री जी से खाली यह कह देता हूँ कि इतना ख्याल रखो कि घास हथियार बन जाये, ऐसा न करो कि हथियार घास बन जाये।

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): I yield to none in joining with those who have spoken before me in my felicitations to our Minister of External Affairs.

He and the Prime Minister will be in Cairo in a few days to join and participate in a conference of what are known as the non-aligned countries.

Within the time that is available to me, it is not possible to go into the details of this, or to cover the whole field of world affairs which the Foreign Minister has been good enough to cover and place before the House.

I would like to say this, that from the very fact that, in spite of his pre-occupations, the Prime Minister is going, and that, in spite of his fresh entry into the Foreign Office, our Minister of External Affairs is going to this conference, is an emphatic proclamation and a reiteration of the non-aligned policy of this country.

Being a democratic country, we hear differing kinds of expression about this, and sometimes there is al-

most the shedding of tears, over the wasted years, of non-alignment or whatever it may be called. I have repeatedly said in this House that it is merely an expression of our independent nationalism in the context of external affairs.

It is not possible here to cover the whole field, but only consider foreign policy, in general terms, or wide terms. It is concerned with world peace and the menace to it, and the configurations of world political groupings that are concerned with that matter and, immediately to ourselves, our relations, or lack of them, with Pakistan and China and our neighbouring countries. So, I will take these one by one and as rapidly as possible.

It was said this morning—may I say I mentioned this matter to the Defence Minister before he went away—that there was comparatively active fighting along or across our cease-fire line on the Pakistan-Kashmir frontier. I want to say that it is not only on the cease-fire line, but on the international frontier between Jammu and Pakistan, that armed action has been going on for a long time, but the most important things at the present moment to remember are two or three.

In his answer, the Defence Minister said that a new proposal had been made by the United Nations Observers in regard to a 500 yards corridor on the cease-fire line. I think this is one of those things where the U.N. Observers and all those others who agree with them, try to lead us up the garden path. This is part of the Karachi Agreement, that is to say, the armed troops armed forces, on either side are not to be allowed into this corridor; this has been the agreement for a long time, but Pakistan has always violated it, and the United Nations Observers themselves have said: "These are not Pakistani soldiers, these are civilians of Pakistan or Indian-occupied Kashmir who are dissatisfied with their Government, and they are shooting everybody around, therefore we cannot do anything about it." I think it would be a political and diplomatic

[Shri Krishna Menon]

mistake to be drawn into this controversy and listen to Pakistan, and say "we will consider it" in a very patronising way.

I think the boot is on the other foot, that is the U.N. Observers Commission have neglected their duty in this matter all these years. Our people have been shot up in this corridor, and others have been allowed to come in. Therefore, this is not a new proposal and should not be dressed up as such, and we should not enter into a long-winded controversy in this matter.

The second point with regard to the Kashmir question is this. Every day you open a newspaper, and you hear about the various efforts made by do-gooders, peace-mongers, peddlers of various proposals, various kinds of people with prestige perhaps, but not the responsibility or the power to implement them, whereby we are told about the possibilities of creating a new situation between Pakistan and ourselves. I think it is not necessary, it is sheer hypocrisy to turn round and say we want good relations between uneighbours and so on. That is the truth. But the fact of the matter is that Pakistan, now with China as well is an aggressor on our territory. She occupies 40,000 square miles of our territory in Kashmir. Furthermore, the last twelve years, she has not given us one day of peace, and therefore, it is not that we are seeking a counsel of vengeance. When it is said by the Minister that we have our point of view and they have their point of view, it may be very polite. But if anybody says that I have my point of view, I would say that my point of view is I am trying to live? These matters cannot be discussed in the abstract. There is only one way of dealing with Pakistan and that is: she must vacate aggression and learn to live like a civilised nation. I say this not in order to whip up any ill feeling but because I believe all this peace-peddling business and all the naive proposals have the effect of demoralising our friends abroad. It has also

the effect of creating feelings inside Pakistan that we are giving in or something of that kind. The then Prime Minister in this House on the last occasion when Mr. Swaran Singh was having a round of talks said that if those talks failed, the situation might be worse. What happened in the round of talks? Pakistan said: Kashmir is an irritant. To us it is part of India; to them it is an irritant. Out of that irritant they wanted all of it, except one and a half districts of Jammu. In the context of invasion, in the context of the situation to which I referred a few weeks ago, where, not skirmishes, not duels between one or two soldiers but something in the way of a small battle has been going on during these weeks, where nearly 300 Pakistan troops were engaged on that side, anti-tank weapons were used, missiles of various kinds including mortars and things of that character were used it is a war-like action. War of course varies; its quality varies with quantity. We have reached a stage where it is no longer some people trying to lift a few cattle or trying to reap somebody's crops or carrying somebody's women, we have come to the position today where it is a certain raiser to the 1947 expedition—I want to say without being a prophet of gloom that we have got to be very careful. I do not want to refer to the internal position in Kashmir. I want to say that if we are softened up and if Pakistan repeats the 1947 situation and says: 'we came in there to defend our co-religionists against Indian tyranny,' we shall be faced with another invasion and, before the United Nations, after they have invaded us, be charged that we have invaded them. That is the position with regard to Kashmir.

The second problem that we have to deal with is Indo-China. I am not going here into the question of the whole of Indo-China problem. The Minister of External Affairs has been good enough to say that the solution of this problem or rather the way to the solution of this problem is the convening of the 14 power Geneva Conference. I think it is good as far

as it goes, but I think the initiative of this country has to be exercised in this direction because we carry a special responsibility in this matter and have done so with some distinction during all that period from 1954 onwards. We have had one or two lapses in this matter in the sense of being on the side of one Co-Chairman as against the other, which has never happened before. Our responsibility as Chairman of the International Commission is that whoever invades the territory, whoever commits aggression on that territory, whether it be Soviets, Chinese or Americans, we being in the position of a judicially appointed officer in that area have to take note of it. We have not to go into their private politics or anything of that kind. In fact as Chairman of the International Commission we are not even expected or allowed to look into the politics of this country. Our political predilections do not come in. And so, if there is another armed attack on any part of Indo-China, the continued presence of a large number of troops threatening that land and the peace of world, then it is a matter for this Commission.

Mr. Speaker, there has been in the newspapers this morning—not that everything that is printed in a newspaper is necessarily correct—some reference to the Embassy of the United States in this country wanting a copy of the speech made by our President in the Soviet Union. I am aware of the procedure of this House that I am not to discuss the President. But I am not discussing the President, Mr. Speaker. I am discussing the action of another country in relation to us. If it is admiration of the President—for the good English that he speaks and so on—that is one matter. But this follows another statement saying that they are unhappy about President's statements in Russia. The United States Ambassador in this country is not like a British Resident in Indian States. He is not here to watch over our activities, and I think it is an affront to our nation; and it is an index of the kind of way people

are looking at us. I think it is high time that we stood up to it.

On the other hand, the President's statement is a good thing. We should be happy that our President has in very terse and concise words enunciated our policy of social justice at home and peace abroad and opposition to imperialism. In my submission, one of those facts of which we should be aware is this: on the one hand, though we are a Gandhian country, we are not thereby essentially a very peace-minded country. Secondly, though the great empire of Britain had abdicated and the empire and France has been reduced somewhat, imperialism as such during the last 300 to 400 years has reappeared in different forms and ways.

In that connection, I want to express my personal opinion. I read a speech of the External Affairs Minister in another place the other day where someone made a reference to the building of communication posts or bases in the Indian Ocean in the Chago archipelago on the one hand, which is to be followed by another base at Aldabra Island, about a 100 miles off Tanganyika. The archipelago is about 900 miles south of Cape Comorin. In strict international law, no one can say that the British cannot build anything there, because they are the remnants of the British empire. They are small islands dotting the Indian Ocean. But if this country is to be told that this is only a "communication" centre, and that we need not worry about it, then, I must say this. If I had the time, I could relate instances after instances. But I will just give only one of them. You know the great North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. It was founded as a cultural organisation. Everybody was told that one had nothing to worry about it: it is only an European notion in order to promote Europeanism; they are getting together. But today it is the largest armed super-state in the world. In recent times, on the 22nd October, 1956, on the assurance of the British Government

[Shri Krishna Menon]

and on the advice I tendered to the then Prime Minister in consequence of that assurance this House was told that there would be no aggressive action by Britain into Egypt. On the 29th October, the British delegate told the United Nations that they were taking action in regard to the reservation, when the concentrations were taking place in Cyprus. The United Nations were afterwards assured that there would be no action of any kind. But on the 30th October, Britain, without telling anybody, during the midnight, gave an ultimatum to Egypt and by the 3rd November, the invasion was in full being.

So, this idea of putting up a few radio posts, nobody believes in. First of all in this age, in 1964, it is not necessary for that country to go to an island in order to have communications. With a small metal plate of the size of a button, you can carry 300 microwaves for thousands and thousands of miles distance, sitting in your drawing room. Therefore, this idea of having this base for this purpose does not cut any ice. It is all part of the spreading of the tentacles of the empire and of its vain attempt to return by the backdoor.

What we have, therefore, to do is—we cannot drive them out from there—at the same time, we should stand foursquare with most of the ex-colonial countries in expressing ourselves against this expansion, against the attempt of 'showing the flag' and in saying what actually it is. It is part of the network of the modern tentacles. It is the old maxim: starting from the English Channel and right through Gibraltar and Australia, all these "block-houses" were built in the past, but they have become liquidated, and now, these new ventures are made.

In regard to the larger aspects of foreign policy, there has been much controversy in the newspapers and some in this House as to whether there has been any change in foreign policy or not. If I may say so, it is entirely an unrealistic question. It

needs no answer. So long as anything is alive, there would be changes, but that does not mean you change the blade and handle. There will be changes in the sense of an adjustment of relationship as such. I think it is a great pity if our citizens would not take the statements of our Government as categorical, which have been categorically repeated and set out seriatim in the speeches—1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6—that the policy of this country is one of friendship with others and so on and so fourth: that broadly is called Non-alignment. I think it would be perhaps helpful if it were said that it is the policy to be practised under that name but did not begin under that name as a doctrine. It is merely the outcome of our historical evolution. When we were being taunted by other people that we are neutralists, sitting on the fence, till the iron sunk into our souls, we chose to say that we are not neutrals, because neutrality is a conception that arises only on belligerency, and we are not aligned to the two armed blocks. So long as there are these two powerful war blocks in the world, each capable of exterminating the world and therefore there is the armaments race in consequence, it is essential that we keep to non-alignment, because it means that we seek to create an area of peace.

The position in the world during the last few months has been that the new forces that have emerged are on the one hand China and all these collecting round her, and on the other, the comparative isolationism, so far as nuclear policy is concerned, of France. So far as we ourselves are concerned, non-alignment has not ever meant a plague on both your houses or trying to get as much as you can from each of the the sides. Non-alignment has been the position where either the moral or whatever influence or weight we may have, would not be thrown on the side of the armament race as such, because what we face is nuclear destruction.

In my short time, I will only refer to one incident. On the 6th August,

1945, at 8.15 in the morning, an airplane flew over Japan, over a city called Hiroshima, a small industrial city of 400,000 people. It was flying at an altitude of 22,000 feet. In a short time, a bomb came down on a parachute and at 2,000 feet above the ground, the bomb exploded. Instantly 60 per cent of the city was destroyed, hundred thousand people were killed and a hundred thousand permanently injured. Three days later, the same happened at Nagasaki. So, we are living in a world of a vast potential destruction. It is not as though those things could not happen. While there have been so many mis-statements about it, the dropping of the bomb on Hiroshima was a result of discussions over a period of three months and not some whim on the part of President Truman. He acted on the advice of Mr. Stimson who said, "This is the way to stop the war. We have lost only 520,000 people in all the wars of America since the Civil War. But if the war with Japan were to continue, we would lose very many more." So, that was the position at that time. But the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima was only 1/1000th of the explosive capacity of an average bomb of today. According to a leading American scientist, in the first few hours of the war, somewhere about 85 million American people would be exterminated. In these conditions, it is the duty of every country, irrespective of its national policy, to make whatever contribution it can to lower the areas of tension.

I think the second aspect of non-alignment has been, in the last ten years, we have been one of the few countries, if not the only country, with whom both from the side of the USA and the Soviet Union, they were prepared to confide and discuss. Irrespective of what is said in the newspapers, this country commands the confidence of these two sides in the sense that they give their points of view in confidence and we would not leak it to the other or take sides in the matter. That is how we found ourselves in Korea, Indo-China or in the

various debates in the UN and we were able to make some useful contributions to the disarmament. As a result of it evolved the 18 nation committee at Geneva and it is my submission that in the coming year, we have to put more energy into this than recently. The small group of much-maligned non-aligned countries, who have made great contributions towards preventing the conference from breaking up and also sometimes found some degree of rapprochement between the rival points of view put forward by the Soviet Union and the United States. There is a proposal before the Geneva Conference that there should be a convention of world powers called which would proclaim the abandonment of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, at one time or other we have got mixed up in the absurd doctrine of nuclear umbrella though we tried to get out of it later on.

In the economic sphere, we have been in the position that our Government has done its best to get away from the imperial off-shoots of economic organisation which is embodied in the GATT agreements, but it is to be regretted that we were rather behindhand in this and the initiative and leadership in this matter had to be taken by other people. This is not said in the way that we must lead everything, but we should not be behindhand in these matters. Ever since the time of the treaties initiated by France or the similar treaties emanating from West Germany in the 19th century, there has been an attempt which has now erupted in what is called a Common Market and all that—to get together in such a way that the poorer countries become poorer. Now the world is no longer satisfied with that. In the teeth of the opposition of the major western powers, the United Nations has at last agreed to the world conference because of the numerical superiority of the non-aligned countries. We should have no reservations in cutting our ties with the imperial powers in this way and going on to a world of ourselves.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

At this conference that will take place at Cairo are gathered together 56 nations. Out of these 56 nations, the most important deviation—I am sorry for using that word—the most important departure from the past is that ten Latin American nations are coming in the Conference. Some of the ten Latin American nations are coming in as observers. But we should not forget the fact that the Latin American nations are part of the system of Monroe Doctrine. In spite of that they are coming to this conference.

It is because, and I say it with great humility, in spite of what the people opposite say, Non-alignment is no longer an Indian obsession, it is no longer an inherited prejudice or anything of that kind. It is regarded as a serious contribution to international relationship, a set of circumstances that should exist in a world where two groups are so armed against each other. The theory has been evolved on what is called the nuclear deterrent. It is only another name for the arms race. Today, in conditions of modern technology an arms race is not a race of one country against another only but each country racing against itself, as well. So we have reached the position now where there are vast quantities of destructive power. The position is such while there is fear of destructive war and that very fear might keep them from jumping into a world conflagration. At the same time, various little incidents take place—it may be the one as it was in Cuba or the one that happened in Vietnam. Accidents also can take place and accidental nuclear war can result. That is to say, if the bomb of one side blows off by accident, the nuclear war has begun. They cannot keep quiet. Because if one goes off by accident, the other people will start and it goes on. If one bomb explodes in the polar region, we have got the nuclear war on our hands.

But the most important factor in this situation, what this country along

with others has been striving very hard to attain—not attained so far on account of the conflict between the two great groups—is the prevention of a proliferation of weapons. We need not go into the abstract position of how many people can make bombs. We can make bombs if we are prepared to destroy ourselves in other ways. What is the immediate position in this matter today? The position is, that China on the one hand, and France and Germany on the other, have threatened to become atomic powers. Germany is sought to be kept out of this by being included in the Western Atomic Club, that is to say, by the distribution of nuclear arms to all the NATO powers. That will be severely resisted by the Soviet Union, because it is only 20 years since the Nazi army tore of the whole of the Ukraine and since the War destroyed nearly 25 millions of their people. No amount of sentiment is going to be allowed. There will be no agreement, no rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the United States in regard to nuclear weapons on the basis of Germany being armed with nuclear weapons.

That is why our proximate menace—though there is no proximateness so far as atom bomb is concerned—China boldly says that she is capable of making these bombs. A very large number of Chinese students had gone everywhere. If they are prepared to starve their people they would then become a great nuclear power. The only way to deal with this is two-fold. One is for the other great powers, either the United States or the Soviet Union or the two of them together, to use atomic weapons against China. But that would be a remedy worse than the disease, because you cannot just use it against China and not destroy the whole world. The other way is to get an atomic ban agreement before it is too late. The world has been going on from 1947 in this way and in 1960 it was recognised by everybody that unless we disarm seriously in five years the disarmament

would become very difficult. Therefore, before China has produced a real atom bomb—she may have one of this kind for demonstration purposes but before China becomes an atomic power, which may take four or five years—it is necessary that the combined forces of the world in which the non-aligned countries, the much maligned non-aligned countries, take a very important part, they should push forward their ideas in regard to nuclear disarmament. This country at no time can depart from the doctrine that there is only one way to deal with nuclear weapons, and that is to question of nuclear. I was horrified to find a statement in one end them. There cannot be any of the newspapers that under the shadow of a nuclear umbrella we would be able to establish disarmament. Fortunately, the Government took notice of it and corrected the position. That is all to the good.

When this kind of debate is taking place, what we would like to do is to be behind our Government delegation so that the people of the world would know that the policy of this country is based on these various principles, including our solidarity with the ex-colonial countries our consciousness of resistance to empire. I am not for a moment saying that the President of this country, under our constitutional system, can adumbrate policy; he has not done so. But he is entitled, as the Head of the State, to say what that policy is, and the fact that he has stated it many times indicates that it is not a new policy but it is an existing policy. If it were a Minister who had stated it as a new policy, he has the right to do it but we could ask about it. But the Head of the State or President has no authority to make policy. He can only proclaim what in fact exists, that is to say, that we are against imperialism, against war and for friendship with the Soviet Union. In such circumstances lest there might be any misunderstanding, we should remember that soon after the President was in the Soviet Union, a Pakistan

representative was also there. They told him point blank, categorically, that "our friendship with India is not a temporary matter; it is permanent and abiding and, therefore, there is no use trying to change our views on this question".

Finally, arising from the combination of China and Pakistan we have one enemy in the two of them, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker. The other day our conversations with Pakistan have been preceded by Pakistan repudiating the surrender of our territory to China and also disclosing the terms of that agreement. In other words, we are negotiating with some one who has got the Western Powers on one side and China on the other. It is an absurd situation. The third factor in the world situation is the Sino-Soviet rift, as it was called. It is no longer a rift when one country claims nearly half a million sq. miles of the territory of the other, as it has done on us by stating that the MacMahon Line is an imperialist inheritance. So, about Russia is said it is a Czarist inheritance, which was countered by Russia by saying that China's is a Mongolian inheritance. Whatever it was, it is today actually a frontier war.

At the conference in Cairo will come up again the other doctrine or the other proposal that the late Prime Minister had put forward, namely, that irrespective of all difficulties between countries, there should be a no-war agreement. I am saying this because till a few months ago, nearly 7,000 skirmishes have taken place between the Soviet and the Chinese personnel in various parts of their frontier.

References have been made that there was no Foreign Minister for the last seventeen years as though it was a great lapse, as though the country suffered thereby. It is quite true that in the changed circumstances the previous position cannot continue. The late Prime Minister does not require any defence from me. The history on the one hand, the affections of our people and the regard with

[Shri Krishna Menon]

which he is held in the world on the other will vindicate him. I think it is the most ungracious thing for us to say that the foreign policy of this country had been neglected by him and because of that something most terrible has taken place. Apart from his very presence and the identification of the foreign policy with him, apart from that, it is constitutionally unrealistic because in a system of parliamentary government the Prime Minister has a special concern with regard to foreign policy, and I think that is the position everywhere. I say that because a statement of that kind was made in this House and should not go unchallenged.

Shri Swaran Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have had the privilege of listening to hon. Members belonging to different parties and the valuable criticism and appreciation that they have made about the international situation as also about some of the problems that immediately concern us in relation to our neighbours. If I may say in all humility, it has been a source of great education for me and, to a certain measure, a source of considerable encouragement.

I was entrusted this responsibility of looking after the External Affairs of our country only about ten weeks ago. During this period I have been trying to understand the various facets and aspects of the international problem. I have also tried to study more closely some of the problems that face us in relation to our immediate neighbours. There are many hon. Members here who have had the opportunity to study this matter more closely and to be associated with the formulation of policies here as well as in the international forum to a much larger measure and they have got much greater experience. Though to some extent I have also been associated with certain specific issues in relation to some of the important matters that we, as a government, had to tackle during the last ten or twelve years, I did not have the privilege of studying more close-

ly and more intimately some of the bigger international issues. Therefore this has been a very useful debate from my own point of view.

It is doubly so because it has come after some of the efforts that I recently made in establishing contacts with our immediate neighbours. It is also important because it precedes another important international event, an event about which many hon. Members from different sections of the House made a reference, namely, the non-aligned conference which is going to take place from the 5th October. Our Prime Minister will be leading the Indian delegation. Therefore it is a source of great satisfaction and encouragement that on both these issues there appeared to be a general consensus of opinion in favour of the steps that have been taken to establish more close relations with our neighbours. Also, the viewpoints that have been expressed, with certain different shades of emphasis about the objectives before the non-aligned conference, and the part that we should play in that conference are very useful and I have derived very great benefit from these observations.

I had ventured to place a factual position about the international situation and I also put forward my appreciation on certain important aspects in my opening remarks. It is not my intention to go over the entire ground. I would be content to refer in reply to some of the important points that have been raised in the course of the discussion. The policy of non-alignment that we have pursued so far, and for which there are certain eloquent advocates in almost all the sections of the House, is a policy which has been evolved as a result of historical events and developments and it is a cardinal principle which we have followed and there appears to be near unanimity about the correctness of this policy.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Question.

Shri Swaran Singh: May I say that I am conscious of the attitude of the hon. leader of the Swatantra Party who even now said that he questioned this? It is interesting, however, that even he did not seriously object to this....

Shri Ranga: We do.

Shri Swaran Singh: But while trying to explain this, he said that non-alignment should not mean this, and it should not mean that. It appears that the basic concept is not disputed by him.

Shri Ranga: Why do you speak on our behalf? Speak for yourself.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is quite interesting that whereas on the one hand he has expressed some satisfaction of our country having received help in the economic field as well as for strengthening our defence potential from countries belonging to different power blocs but, on the other, by queer reasoning ultimately he landed himself with this rather strange suggestion that we should enter into some defence alignments with the Western powers.

Shri Ranga: As against China. We do not believe in non-alignment.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is hard to imagine that he should advocate that thing knowing fully well that that will be a sure way of losing our sympathy in many respects of those who might be opposed to that power block or that defence alignment.

Shri Ranga: No, no.

Shri Swaran Singh: Let us not forget the help that we have been receiving in the economic field from socialist countries like the Soviet Union and other East European countries, particularly the Soviet Union. Let us not forget the defence equipment that we got from the Soviet Union when we faced this danger of Chinese aggression. Let us not forget

the very solid and consistent support that we have always received on the question of Kashmir in the United Nations, in the Security Council and elsewhere.

Some hon. Members there took some exception and wanted to argue that I need not have said that the test of the success of the non-alignment policy is the happy experience that we have got of getting help from the United States of America the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Germany and other countries who are regarded as members of one bloc and also from the Soviet Union and other countries. It is true that I should not cite that as the main reason for adopting that policy. But if by adopting a correct policy, you get a result which gives you the sympathy of the people of countries and of big powers who might be opposed to each other, then certainly that is a reason which should be a source of satisfaction to us and we should not lightly brush it aside.

There were several hon. Members, who, if I may say so, rightly stressed the importance of our own national interests in many respects. I concede that they are of the highest importance, and the ultimate test of any policy that we pursue even in the international field depends upon where it lands us in relation to other people in the world. If by one standard and by one yard-stick we find that the policy which happened to be a correct policy from the international point of view, because it was a policy of not tying ourselves with any power bloc, because it was a policy which gave us independence of action and because it was a policy which enabled us to take correct attitudes, notwithstanding the consideration whether one power or the other would be opposed, if we expressed ourselves fearlessly, and in addition to all this....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Was our attitude towards China correct?

Shri Swaran Singh: Although this is also the correct policy and the right policy, if it has yielded results which are satisfactory to us and has enabled us to get support, sympathy and actual help from the two blocs, this should be a point which should not be lightly ignored, but we should try to give the correct weight to this important aspect.

Shri Shinkre: Was it because of this policy that we got this support or because of some other reason namely that they were afraid of China emerging as a bigger Power?

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear the hon. Minister now. Let the hon. Minister continue.

Shri Swaran Singh: It was the pursuit of that policy, I repeat, which was the main reason, and the main point, which enabled us to get help from the two blocs, as I mentioned earlier.

Shri Nath Pai: And also lose 14,000 square miles of our territory.

Shri Swaran Singh: As we shall be going to the Non-Aligned Conference, and the House has been generous enough, and all sections of the House have been generous enough, to support the Indian Delegation, I would like to state very briefly....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Wish you god-speed.

Shri Swaran Singh:..the concept of non-alignment and the way that we propose to tackle the various problems in the Cairo Conference.

Shri Ranga: That is your *Manu-smṛiti*....

Shri Swaran Singh: We attach the highest importance to the work of the Cairo Conference. We are convinced that it will make a powerful contribution to the promotion of world peace and understanding. No less than 57 countries, according to present indications, will participate in the conference, 11 of them as obser-

vers. These countries hail from the continents of Asia, Africa, Europe and South America, and thus the conference will have a global character. The participants will be meeting not on the basis of geographical or regional associations, but on that of commonly held policies and principles. The policy of non-alignment which India was the first country to adopt, and consistently to follow, has won an increasingly large number of adherents. Whereas at the Belgrade Conference held in 1961, there were only 25 participating countries, now there will be 57 representing between them more than half the membership of the United Nations.

The aim of our delegation will be strongly to reaffirm the validity and relevance of the policy of non-alignment, particularly in the light of the changing world situation. We hope also to assist in the codification of the principles of peaceful co-existence and to devise measures for the promotion of world peace by various means, including disarmament and the strengthening of the United Nations Organisation.

We hope that the conference will raise its voice against the continuing evils of colonialism and racial discrimination which must be speedily eradicated. The conference will also consider the vital question of economic development and co-operation, both between the developing countries and the more economically advanced countries as well as between the developing countries. We hope to play our due part in facilitating the task of the conference and are confident that the results achieved at Cairo will give a fresh dynamism and sense of purpose to the policy and practice of non-alignment.

17.00 hrs.

Shri Ranga: What sense of purpose would there be when Malaysia is not there?

Shri Swaran Singh: Having said that, I will now say a few words about

some of the other points raised. Many hon. Members have referred to the communique issued after the last Commonwealth conference. Some have even gone to the length of not formally suggesting but hinting that we should review our position and should seriously consider whether we should continue in the Commonwealth or not.

Shri Nath Pal: No, but whether we should not expel Britain from the Commonwealth—that was the suggestion.

Shri Swaran Singh: I take it that you feel that the Commonwealth should be there, and as to whether an individual country, Britain or any other country should remain in that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If they do not behave.

Shri Swaran Singh: There is the precedent, you know, of South Africa, which was there, which acted in a particular manner and had found its way out—it was baled out. Similarly any country that does not rise up to the occasion and does not react to the situation may find its continuance very difficult. As to whether if you push out everybody any remnant will be left or not is a matter on which you can form your own opinion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is for the future to decide.

Shri Swaran Singh: But as this matter has been raised, it is well that we may know the correct position.

The Commonwealth today is an expanding commonwealth. Its geographical area and range of different peoples that come within this association have increased from a few countries to 19, and before the end of the year, Zambia will be added to the list—as you know, Zambia will become a free country on the 24th October. We consider our membership of the Commonwealth—the

House will recall that we decided on membership after a great deal of consideration in 1949—as a very useful means of contact with important countries in Asia, Africa, Europe and North America. It helps mutual understanding between important countries from different continents, and thus it is an association which promotes internal understanding.

Amongst the most attractive features of the Commonwealth is the fact that it is not a bloc of states, nor does it lay down any binding obligation on members, who retain their complete freedom of policy and action and their separate entity and individuality. We think, in response to the changing times this feature of the commonwealth would always be preserved in future.

We remember with gratitude the moral and material support we received from commonwealth countries at the time of the Chinese aggression against us, particularly from Australia, Canada, Malaysia, New Zealand and the U.K.

Shri Ranga: What has happened to Malaysia now?

Shri Swaran Singh: A feature of the commonwealth is the periodic meetings of the Prime Ministers at which Prime Ministers of commonwealth countries discuss the international situation and important issues of general commonwealth interest in complete frankness and freedom. These discussions have been found useful in the past. As hon. Members will remember, some three years ago...

Shri Hem Barua: There is nothing common about the commonwealth except the common chamber where the nations meet.

Mr. Speaker: There is everything common except the wealth.

Shri Swaran Singh: You are quite right. Therefore it is also important

[Shri Swaran Singh]
to consider the economic aspect in relation to the Commonwealth.

You might recall that three years ago a declaration on disarmament issued at the conclusion of the Prime Ministers' Conference was regarded as having made a certain contribution to the consideration of this question in the United Nations.

Specific matters relating to any member of the Commonwealth, and any bilateral differences, are by convention barred from discussion at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Will he suggest that we being the biggest member of the Commonwealth, in future the meetings of the Commonwealth should take place in India?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is a good suggestion. If the Commonwealth countries could agree, we will welcome them accordingly; we can even persuade them to do this.

Shri Hem Barua: And invite the Queen also.

Shri Swaran Singh: An objection has been taken to a sentence in the communique that was issued.

Mr. Speaker: Is it desired that she should remain here?

Shri Hem Barua: She should come during the Commonwealth Conference as a guest.

Shri Swaran Singh: Let us not talk about these matters, particularly Heads of State, in this light manner. All of us are convinced of the dialectics of Shri Hem Barua, and he need not demonstrate them by occasional interventions.

Shri Hem Barua: She is the head of the Commonwealth, that is why I said.

Shri Swaran Singh: So far as this particular sentence in the communique is concerned, much has been said about this. The Prime Minister made a statement. The Finance Minister gave a press conference after he had returned. We should not, therefore, try unnecessarily to read into this sentence any implication that Kashmir was discussed. We had made the position absolutely clear that bilateral disputes between any member countries of the Commonwealth could not be discussed in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, and this mention of satisfaction about certain statements that had been made by President Ayub and Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri really should not be taken as, by any means, giving in on that principle. We hold strongly to the view that this cannot be discussed. We further made it absolutely clear that it was not actually discussed. Therefore, after that we should not continue unnecessarily to see any danger in this, because I would be quite frank in saying that this type of attitude does weaken our stand with regard to the basic scope of discussion in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. When we have clearly put across our viewpoint, which is not seriously contradicted by any of the other members of the Commonwealth countries, we should not continue to hammer on this point again and again.

Shri Nath Pal: All right, let us leave it.

Shri Swaran Singh: There are some other points which I would like to mention.

With regard to the visits to the neighbouring countries, many hon. Members have quite rightly drawn attention to the difficulties that are being experienced by persons of Indian origin in Burma and in Ceylon. I am fully conscious of the fact that my visit has not resulted in a solution of these problems. I have not claimed that, but what I do claim is

that as a result of this, there is willingness on the part of the two Governments, and also on the part of the persons affected, to view the problem in the light of the various difficulties and complexities of the situation.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Good result.

Shri Swaran Singh: And it has also been agreed both between the Government of India and the Government of Burma, and also between the Government of India and the Government of Ceylon, that this matter would be further discussed; that specific points that might be there would be discussed, and solutions acceptable to both parties and also to the persons concerned would be evolved.

Shri Hem Barua: This is not the first time that they have said that these matters should be discussed. They have been saying that times without number, and we have also been saying like that.

Shri Swaran Singh: I know Mr. Hem Barua can criticise anything but it is very interesting that he has himself not got anything constructive. How do we solve these matters except by discussing it with the Governments concerned?

Shri Hem Barua: In my speech I have made constructive suggestions.

Shri Swaran Singh: Maybe, we had tried earlier and had not succeeded. I have myself said in my opening speech that this question has been the subject-matter of discussion for several years. We have not succeeded in finding a satisfactory solution. That does not mean that we should give up hope. This is the only way of solving the problem. There is no other way. Therefore, we should give earnest consideration to this matter and try to understand the difficulties that might be faced by the country concerned and evolve a solution which may be acceptable to the Government of Ceylon and to the Government of India and also

broadly acceptable to the concerned persons.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: He is not yielding. What should I do?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: The same point was raised here; whether our Government is prepared to follow what Mrs. Bandaranaike did in her own country. She discussed with the Opposition Parties the problem in a conference. So, before going to the conference which is going to take place on this subject, I want to know whether our Government would follow what she did in her country.

Shri Swaran Singh: I will be glad if Mr. Gupta or any other hon. Member who may have any views on this subject sends them on to me. I welcome them. But even there, there was no question of having a conference or any such discussion of that nature. Let us not view this question from any partisan attitude.

Shri Nath Pai: That is what you do; that is the charge.

Shri Hem Barua: The initiative should come from you.

Shri Swaran Singh: Mr. Hem Barua will have nothing constructive to offer.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: He is not yielding.

Shri Hem Barua: He is challenging me. I have offered several constructive suggestions in my speech. He has sat down, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: He has yielded to me, not to Mr. Hem Barua.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I want to make only one suggestion. Will you please consult the leaders of people of Indian origin before placing your suggestions before Mrs. Bandaranaike?

Shri Swaran Singh: I may inform the hon. Member that the leaders of people of Indian origin there did

[Shri Swaran Singh]

give me the honour of meeting me. They have given their view-point. It was a cross-section from the labour movement, the Chamber of Commerce and several other organisations. We will try to remain in touch with those people. I appeal to the hon. Members of this House that in a matter like this, let us not view it from any angle of our differences of a political nature amongst us; this is a matter in which all of us are equally interested in finding a satisfactory solution. Any suggestion which the hon. Members may have would be most welcome to us. I will be glad to be benefited by their advice in this respect.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, what is the justification for the insinuation and innuendo that we show a partisan attitude? We fully agree with him that this is a national issue.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am glad that they fully agree with what I say. I have nothing further to add to that.

Shri Hem Barua: We do not agree with the insinuation part of the statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let the Minister proceed.

Shri Swaran Singh: My visit to Burma did convince me that the action that they have taken is not discriminatory and is not based on any racial consideration or based on the consideration that the persons concerned are of Indian origin or are Chinese or even Burmese. The steps that the Burmese Government have taken for taking over and nationalising the distributive trade with regard to many commodities is applicable to all traders, irrespective of their nationality.

Shri Hem Barua: He is speaking like a Public Relations Officer for Burma.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There ought not to be so many interruptions.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am not averse to giving the correct picture, to the hon. Members of the House. I think I will be failing in my duty if, with a desire merely to cater to some strong sentiment or even some wrong ideas that might have been created by unwarranted criticism, I do not explain the position. I intend to persevere to do my duty in giving the correct picture and it is my duty to point out—except to say to the people who refuse to accept anything—that there are many others in the country and also in this House who might have a different picture after knowing the correct state of affairs.

Shri Hem Barua: There are people who disagree with both of us.

Shri Swaran Singh: At any rate, there is disagreement on this. The point is that if in the pursuit of a policy which is non-discriminatory, we suffer, and others suffer, I do not mean that, that is any mitigation or that is any solace to the people who suffer. That suffering is there, and it is precisely with that object that we initiated some discussion and they are likely to be pursued. But we must understand the thing correctly and should not get unnecessarily angry or should not at any rate get a picture which is not quite fair. It is not quite fair to say that if I correctly enunciate before the House the policy which is enunciated or followed by other Governments and which runs counter to the sentiments which might be held by any section of the people or any leaders here,—it is very unfair to accuse me—I am acting as a public relations officer for another country. In fact, it is the duty of the Foreign Minister to improve the relations between different countries and the relations round him, and to describe those relations correctly. It will be wrong to take a one-sided view in these matters.

Shri J. B. Kripalan: We have not been told about the exodus of the Chinese from Burma or about the Indian exodus,—their numbers.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is a very pertinent question. I myself made some enquiries. The number of Chinese establishments that have been hit by this nationalisation order is slightly less as compared to the Burmese establishments. Because most of them had been functioning there in private trade—it is very interesting—they want to go to Formosa. The Burmese Government have not got any diplomatic relations with Formosa and they are not sending them back. Some of them have left. The others are still there. But I would like to assure Shri Kripalani that their approach to non-Burmese traders—and even Burmese traders—is precisely at par. There is no discrimination between Chinese traders and Indian traders on that score. If I may add—I will be quite frank with the House—that the Indians are coming here because we are prepared to take them in. The Chinese are not going back because they do not want to go to the mainland and Formosa probably is not prepared to take them. That is the hard fact that he should note and he should not read racial discrimination into that.

Shri Ranga: What about human rights? Did we ask them to behave in a human manner towards these people?

Shri Swaran Singh: If the hon. Member had given even a part of his great intelligence to listening to what I said, he would have known that this is exactly the word I have used in my speech that there are human considerations involved and we should highlight them. We did highlight those human considerations. We have to take these human considerations into account in settling this matter. This matter has been approached precisely from that point of view.

In relation to China, I have very little to add to what I have already said. The various view-points that have been projected here appear to be more or less in consonance with the approach that we have made to this very vital matter, namely, having

accepted the Colombo proposals, we have taken the initiative of creating conditions in which further steps visualised in the Colombo proposals could take place. Some hon. Member—I think Mr. Umanath, belonging to the left wing of the communist party—quoted a statement from Mr. Felix Bandaranaike, which he is said to have made in the Ceylonese Parliament. I did have occasion to discuss this matter both with the Prime Minister of Ceylon and with Mr. Felix Bandaranaike, when I was in Colombo. I explained our position with regard to that. Even as a result of my talks with the Prime Minister of Ceylon as well as with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs and Defence, namely, Mr. Felix Bandaranaike, I did not get an impression that the Ceylonese had any evidence in their possession to indicate that the Chinese had mentioned to them that they would be willing to withdraw from the seven posts in the Ladakh region. So, there the matter stands. We have taken all the steps that we could reasonably take to create an atmosphere for further steps to negotiation. But there is no response from China.

In relation to Pakistan, several view-points have been expressed. On one side of the spectrum is the view-point which was put forward by Prof. Ranga and some other hon. Members that we should go all out to effect some settlement with Pakistan. There was the extreme view-point presented on the other side that having regard to the way that Pakistan has been acting for quite some time, there is very little chance of the two countries coming together and that we should adopt some other policy. I can well understand this divergence of opinion. But I think that all sections of the House appear to agree on the desirability of establishing good neighbourly relations between the two countries. Those who have expressed any doubt about this have done so on the premise that the situation is so bad that this is not possible and so it is not worth trying. But I would strongly urge before the House that difficult and

[Shri Swaran Singh]

complicated as the situation is, we should continue to do our best to improve the relations between two neighbouring countries which have common historical ties and common culture. It is true that the recent tendencies of the Press there, even of certain Pakistan leaders, are not quite helpful, and sometimes one does get a feeling that the way they are approaching these difficult and complicated problems in a spirit which does not show tolerance and does not show understanding, does not create any confidence in the possibility of a satisfactory solution. But, having taken note of all these complexities, let us be quite clear in our mind that it is in the interest of peace, it is in the interest of both the countries, that we should try to settle, whatever may be the differences between the two countries, in a spirit of mutual goodwill, and to that extent we should try to explore all the possibilities of settling these by peaceful means, by talks and the like, and this is the policy which we intend to pursue.

Some hon. Members had mentioned about the present situation in Nagaland. News has been appearing about this from time to time and a statement has been made some time back on this matter. The latest report from Nagaland is not very hopeful. In fact, at present, it is a pity that the hostile Nagas should have gone back upon their agreement which they had already. . . .

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): Sir, on a point of order. We are discussing the international situation here. If anything is said about Nagaland on this occasion, it gives the impression that it is an external matter and we recognise it as such.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Sir, I rise to a point of order. We are discussing the foreign policy here and Nagaland does not come under that. (*Interruption*).

Shri Swaran Singh: I think we need not be so touchy. We know it is an

internal matter. Nagaland is part of India. But one or two hon. Members have said something about it. It is good that the present position is known to the House. I do not see why, merely because I referred to this, it becomes an external matter. I do not know why we should be so touchy about this matter. Two or three hon. Members have raised this point and I am only trying to clarify the Government's stand, that it is the Government's intention to firmly stick to the view that it is for the Government of India to decide as to who will be in the Government of India Delegation. We do not regard the objection as valid. It has been raised that Shilu Ao should not be a member of the Government of India Delegation. That is the position which I wanted to clarify. I do not think we in any way lose anything; if anything, our position is clarified, it is known to the country and also to the Nagas with whom we are dealing with the situation.

Shri Kapur Singh: He deals with the subject so often that it makes us nervous, that something is in the offing.

Shri Swaran Singh: When you raise the subject again and again, I never become nervous. It is better that you also learn not to be nervous merely because we discuss things. It is part of the democratic way of life that we discuss things, that we try to clarify the situation (*Interruption*).

A mention has been made about Indo-China and South-East Asia. I have nothing much to add to what I have said already. The conference of the Laotian princes in Paris has not been quite a success, but it is hoped they will resume the talks either in Paris or elsewhere. After Prime Minister Phouma has attended the Cairo conference we hope they will agree and the way will be clear for the 14-nation conference, for which we have always stood, because we feel

that the solution of this problem of Laos is a matter which can be solved only by political approach. The position in South Viet Nam and North Viet Nam is very, very difficult and delicate and we do continue to hope that the outside influence of any type, whether it is pressurisation or physical presence of troops and the like, some method would be found to eliminate these outside influences and the way would be clear for a solution of this problem when it is not subjected to pressures and pulls from outside.

I have taken a little longer than I thought I would. In the course of these remarks I have tried to cover some of the important points that have been raised by the hon. Members. In the end may I say that I oppose all the amendments that have been moved except the one which has been put forward by Shri V. B. Gandhi?

Shri Nath Pal: This morning also I have tried to raise it in some other form but it did not receive your pleasure. We wanted to know, apart from the many other things which we expect he would deal with, (a) what is the reaction of Government to this complaint lodged by the Foreign Minister of Portugal with the Security Council of the United Nations that the present conditions in Goa have reached a state of despair bordering on revolution—this, we think, is a very slanderous type of propaganda against this country and the Minister should deal with this—and (b), how far is there any truth in the report that the Afro-Asian group has also lodged a complaint with the Secretary-General of the United Nations against racial discrimination and ill-treatment that is practised against them in New York, and in this racial discrimination are any Indian diplomats also involved?

Shri Hem Barua: In the course of my speech I made a reference to the message of condolence sent by the President of Israel to the President of India. That does not find a place in the compilation called *Tributes of*

Homage. May I know if our President recently received a message from the President of Israel and it has been deliberately blacked out and, if so, for what reasons?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: May I know whether the Government have received a communication from the Malaysian Prime Minister that he would like to have an opportunity to explain the Malaysian point of view at the forthcoming Cairo Conference and whether Government is doing anything about it or whether the Government is doing anything to preclude any discussion of this issue by Indonesia at the Conference?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : काहिरा में जो तटस्थ सम्मेलन हो रहा है, उस में सब से बड़ा सवाल शायद गोरे और काले का हो सकता है। और गोरे अत्याचार का प्रतीक दक्षिण अफ्रिका बन गया है। तो क्या हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री उस तटस्थ सम्मेलन में दक्षिण अफ्रिका के इस गोरे अत्याचार के खिलाफ कोई उग्र कार्यक्रम और सिद्धान्त अपनवाने का प्रयत्न करेंगे ?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: In view of the deteriorating situation on the cease-fire line on the international frontier with Pakistan, has Government thought of any immediate action to remedy the situation or it is going to wait until the Foreign Ministers of India and Pakistan or the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan meet to consider the matter? Is it going to take any interim steps pending that meeting?

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): When the late Prime Minister has categorically stated that the acceptance of the Colombo Proposals must be the condition precedent for any further negotiations with China, how could the Foreign Minister react to a statement supposed to have been made by Mr. Felix Bandaranaike to the effect that the Chinese Government is agreeable to vacating the

[Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah]

seven posts? Has that condition been removed and India is prepared to negotiate with China without any conditions?

Shri Swaran Singh: I will take the last question first.

Shri Nath Pai: Why should he take them topsyturvy?

Shri Swaran Singh: The position is not a new one. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had clarified that position. This statement was made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Defence and External Affairs Minister to the Government of Ceylon to suggest a particular solution that is, the compliance with some of the conditions.

17.35 hrs.

Therefore, it was necessary to reiterate our position. This was not a new stand that was taken but this was the position which had already been enunciated by our Prime Minister and, if I may add, that has been our position which has been there throughout.

Shri Shukla has asked me about the violations of the cease-fire line. He may recall that the Defence Minister did mention this morning that this matter had been taken up for discussion between the two Governments at diplomatic level and that because the Indian High Commissioner in Karachi was away to London on account of some illness in his family, we had suggested to the Pakistan Government that further talks might be held in Delhi so that steps might be taken to stop these incidents.

Dr. Lohia has said that the question of apartheid is an important one. I entirely agree with him. We attach the highest importance to taking concrete steps to see that this inhuman treatment to which the non-whites are subjected there, is done away with. We will certainly do our best not only to highlight it but also to

help in evolving of measures which might yield some fruitful results.

Dr. Singhvi has asked as to whether the Malaysian Prime Minister has approached us saying that he would like to express his view-point before the non-aligned conference. It is a fact that we have received a communication very recently from the Malaysian Prime Minister. We are studying it and we will take appropriate action on this.

Shri Nath Pai: Take it before the 3rd October, before you go to Cairo.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: And tell us also.

Shri Swaran Singh: I would remind the hon. Members who appear to be so solicitous on this issue that the Indian Delegation took a very prominent part in putting forward Mayasia's case at the Afro-Asian Ministers' meet at Djakarta. We went to the length of even recording our disagreement with the final communique on the Malaysia issue.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Keep it up at Cairo also.

Shri Nath Pai: Keep up that noble tradition that you have set up.

Shri Swaran Singh: Therefore, we will see as to what we can do with regard to this.

Then, Shri Nath Pai has asked two questions.

An Hon. Member: (a) and (b).

Mr. Speaker: He always asks one question but there is an (a) and a (b).

Shri Swaran Singh: With regard to part (a) of his question, there was a mention that the Goans are putting forward some complaint against India. We did make an enquiry and the latest that I knew about a couple of days ago was that they have not yet actually lodged it. But if they

lodge it or if they have already lodged it in the interval, we will take very serious objection to this because it is an internal matter. It is not a matter which the United Nations can take up. I have no doubt in my mind that no cognisance will be taken of it. What happens in such cases is that these things are circulated. They do some mischief; but we will also give our version which will be circulated and we hope that there will be no adverse propaganda against us on that score.

Shri Nath Pai: May I correct him? He said that the Goans have lodged a complaint. The Portuguese have lodged a complaint.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am sorry; it is the Portuguese.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Just a slip of the tongue.

Shri Swaran Singh: About part (b), he said that there was some discrimination in New York. I did not quite catch it, but if the suggestion was that we will be lukewarm on this issue, he is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Against the non-whites there, the original residents, and our Indian.....

Shri Nath Pai: I do not like the colour word; I am very much against it. I used the word "Afro-Asian Group". Against that there is discrimination and a complaint has been lodged by them, including the Indian Delegation, with U Thant, Secretary General, pointing out this discrimination.

Shri Swaran Singh: I must confess that I have not seen that. But it is very much opposed to our way of thinking that there should not be any discrimination on that score. According to Mr. Nath Pai, we are also complaining in that, if I have understood him correctly. If that is so, we are on the right track. If the complaint is that we are in any way in-

involved and that we are helping in any discrimination, we would very much like to repel that.

Shri Nath Pai: That shows he does not know about what I asked.

Shri Swaran Singh: I can find out as to what is the particular point that is bothering him. But I do want to enunciate our policy which is against any discrimination, against the Afro-Asian group, in any form or against the nationals belonging to any of these countries.

About Mr. Hem Barua's point, my reply is, I do not know, as a matter of fact, if any message of condolence was or was not received. I am not in a position....

Shri Hem Barua: I made a mention of that in my speech.

Shri Swaran Singh: If he were so anxious about it, he could have passed on that information to me. That is all. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put substitute motion No. 2 moved by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia to the vote of the House.

*The substitute motion No. 2
was put and negatived.*

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : पता नहीं लगा, अध्यक्ष महोदय ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं अपना ही बटन दबा लूँ ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं दबाना चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह मौका तो अब चला गया है । अगर उस वक्त एतराज करते, तो हो सकता था । आपके बटन से मेरे बटन का ताल्लुक नहीं है । आपको आवाज देनी होगी ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या करें,
एक सैकंड का इधर-उधर हो गया ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वही एक सैकंड बहुत
जरूरी था जो आपने मिस कर दिया है ।

Now, I shall put the substitute
motion No. 4 moved by Dr. L. M.
Singhvi.

*The substitute motion No. 6
was put and negatived.*

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put sub-
stitute motion No. 5 moved by Shri

Hari Vishnu Kamath. The question
is:

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

"This House, having considered
the present international situation
and the policy of the Government
of India in relation thereto, is of
the opinion that the foreign policy
of Government has failed to
achieve its objective." (5)

Let the lobbies be cleared.

The Lok Sabha divided

AYES

[17.46 hrs.

Bade, Shri
Bagri, Shri
Barua, Shri Hem

Braj Raj Singh, Shri
Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
Lohia, Dr. Ram Manohar

Nath Pai, Shri
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Alagesan, Shri
Alva, Shri A. S.
Alva, Shri Joachim
Aney, Dr. M. S.
Barua, Shri R.
Basappa, Shri
Bhanja Deo, Shri L. N.
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chandrabhan Singh, Shri
Chandriki, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri S. N.
Chaudhuri, Shri D. S.
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala
Chettiar, Shri Ramanathan
Chuni Lal, Shri
Daljit Singh, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri N. T.
Dass, Shri C.
Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Dighe, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. N.
Elayaperumal, Shri
Ganapati Ram, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Goni, Shri Abdul Ghani
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Iqbal Singh, Shri

Jaggiwan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
Keishing, Shri Rishang
Khadilkar, Shri
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Koujalgi, Shri H. V.
Kripa, Shankar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Lakhan Das, Shri
Lalit Sen, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Mahishi, Shrimati Sarojini
Malaichami, Shri
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Malliah, Shri U. S.
Manaen, Shri
Mengi, Shri Gopal Datt
Menon, Shri Krishna
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutta
Mohiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
Murti, Shri M. S.
Niranjan Lal, Shri
Oza, Shri
Pandey, Shri R. S.
Pant, Shri K. C.
Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
Pratap Singh, Shri
Puri, Shri D. D.
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai

Raj Bahadur, Shri
Raju, Shri D. B.
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramakrishnan, Shri P. R.
Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri Hanmanth
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Shri Ramapathi
Rao, Shri Rameshwar
Ray, Shrimati Renuka
Reddiar, Shri
Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
Samnani, Shri
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Shah, Shri Manabendra
Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
Shankaraiya, Shri
Sharma, Shri K. C.
Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Siddananappa, Shri
Siddiah, Shri
Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
Singh, Shri D. N.
Singh, Shri R. P.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinhasan Singh, Shri
Soundaram Ramachandran,
Shrimati
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Sumat Prasad, Shri
Surya Prasad, Shri
Swaran Singh, Shri

Tantia, Shri Rameshwar
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tyagi, Shri
 Ukey, Shri

Umanath, Shri
 Vashan, Shri M. B.
 Veerabasappa, Shri
 Verma, Shri K. K.

Vidyalankar, Shri A. N.
 Wadiwa, Shri
 Yadava, Shri B. P.
 Yusuf, Shri Mohammad

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is:

Ayes 8; Noes 120

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I shall put Shri Shinkre's substitute motion, namely substitute motion No. 6, to vote.

The substitute motion No. 6 was put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I shall put Shri V. B. Gandhi's substitute motion to vote.

The question is:

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted,

namely:—

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

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The half-hour discussion which was scheduled for today has been postponed for tomorrow;

17.48 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, September 29, 1964|Asvina 7, 1886 (Saka).